Science Evaluation

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

Tampa Bay Watershed Restoration

LOCATION

Southwest Florida (Tampa Bay)

SPONSOR(S)

TYPE OF FUNDING REQUESTED (Planning, Technical Assistance, Implementation)

REVIEWED BY:

DATE:

6 January 2015

Best Available Science:

These 6 factors/elements help frame the reviewers answers to A, B and C found in next section:

1. Have the proposal objectives, including methods used, been justified using peer reviewed and/or publicly available information?

- ○ YES
- ◉ NO
- ○ NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

Virtually no justification is provided, merely an statement indicating that it needs to be done. Cited references are not peer-reviewed but are generally publicly available. Methods are not treated in detail and are not justified with citation in most cases.

2. If information supporting the proposal does not directly pertain to the Gulf Coast region, are applicant's methods reasonably supported and adaptable to that geographic area?

- (●) YES
- ( ) NO
- ( ) NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

3. Are the literature sources used to support the proposal accurately and completely cited?

- (●) YES
- ( ) NO
- ( ) NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

Although, as noted above, literature sources are generally not peer-review quality and do not justify the need nor the methods (which are only vaguely mentioned).

4. Are the literature sources represented in a fair and unbiased manner?

- ( ) YES
- (●) NO
- ( ) NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

Many references related to the justification, monitoring, and measures of success for restoration projects are available in the literature but few of these are cited.

5. Does the proposal evaluate uncertainties and risks in the scientific basis for the proposal, including any identified by the public and Council members?

- ( ) YES
- (●) NO
- ( ) NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

Risks are only given cursory treatment with little analysis or careful consideration of both positive and negative features of risks and uncertainties.

6. Does the proposal evaluate uncertainties and risks in achieving its objectives over time? (e.g., is there an uncertainty or risk that in 5-10 years the project/program will be obsolete or not function as planned given projections of sea level rise?)

- ○ YES
- ◉ NO
- ○ NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

Little treatment is given to this consideration as most aspects are to be given over to other agencies to be responsible for follow up or long-term assessment.

Based on the answers to the previous 6 questions, and giving deference to the sponsor to provide within reason the use of best available science the following three questions can be answered:

A. Has the applicant made a reasonable determination that the proposal is based on science that uses peer-reviewed and publicly available data?

- ○ YES
- ◉ NO
- ○ NEED MORE INFORMATION

Information Needed:

Very little science has been offered in this proposal.

B. Has the applicant made a reasonable determination that the proposal is based on science that maximizes the quality, objectivity, and integrity of information (including, as applicable, statistical information)?

- ○ YES
- ◉ NO
- ○ NEED MORE INFORMATION

Information Needed:

Virtually no treatment of statistical analysis of data is offered. No quantitative measures of success are presented.

C. Has the applicant made a reasonable determination that the proposal is based on science that clearly documents and communicates risks and uncertainties in the scientific basis for such projects?

- ○ YES
- ◉ NO
- ○ NEED MORE INFORMATION

Information Needed:

Science Context Evaluation

A. Have other methods been discussed and reasons provided to why the method is being selected (e.g., scientifically sound; cost-effectiveness)?

No careful consideration of any alternatives or rational to the proposed methods are offered.

B. Has your agency/vendor/project manager conducted a project/program like the one proposed?

No

C. Is there a risk mitigation plan in place for project objectives? (captures risk measures as defined under best available science by the Comprehensive Plan and Act)

None that are readily identifiable as such

D. Does the project/program consider consequences with implementation? (captures risk measures as defined under best available science by the Comprehensive Plan and Act)

Little regard for consequences are offered.

E. Does the project/program have clearly defined goals?

Yes

F. Does the project/program have clearly defined objectives?

Yes

G. Does the project/program have measures of success? (captures statistical information requirement as defined by the Comprehensive Plan and Act)

Measures of success are not clearly identified or defined. There are no quantifiable measures of success.

H. Is a monitoring program in place to determine project goals, success and help adaptive management (if applicable)? (captures statistical information requirement as defined by the Comprehensive Plan and Act)

The monitoring program information infers that monitoring with occur but the proposal does not describe these in sufficient detail to allow an accurate assessment as to their appropriateness and applicability.

I. Does the project/program consider recent and/or relevant information? (captures statistical information requirement as defined by the Comprehensive Plan and Act)

Some recent information is provided but only for one of the five projects.

J. Has the project/program evaluated past successes and failures of similar efforts? (captures the communication of risks and uncertainties in the scientific basis for such projects as defined by the Comprehensive Plan and Act)

Evaluation is not detailed although statements are made in reference to other projects and activities.

Please summarize any additional information needed below:

My opinion is that the proposal has poorly defined the methods and measures to evaluate success of the activities. Moreover, the methods to conduct the restoration are not described in sufficient detail. While the overall goal and objectives are important the presenters have offered little to allow a review as their ability to conduct the restoration and to monitor and evaluate its success.