Science Evaluation

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

Biloxi Marsh Living Shoreline

LOCATION

St. Bernard Parish, Southeastern Louisiana

SPONSOR(S)

State(s): Louisiana

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

$3,220,460

REVIEWED BY:

DATE:

January 7th 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

The proposal is well grounded in state of the art knowledge. Well justified. Highly convincing

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

Work to be done in the Gulf

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

- ◉ YES
- ○ NO
- ○ NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

Great coverage of pertinent literature. Good balance and elaboration of pros and cons

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

- ◉ YES
- ○ NO
- ○ NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

Most definitely. Honest and reassuring presentation

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

Very much. One gets the impression that, despite the many implicit risks, this proposal will be succesful

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

Yes. Great adaptive management plan

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:

Definitely. Great coverage of pertinent literature

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:

Yes. The work proposed builds up on current knowledge in a logical and convincing way

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:

Certainly. The applicants present a frank elaboration of risks and caveats, and most importantly they provide a compelling case for success despite those risks

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)?

Yes. The authors justify well the methods selected, and it is clear they are making the best choice possible

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

Yes

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)

Yes. Despite the risks implicit to this proposal, one gets reassured the applicants will be successful

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

Yes. Implementation measures as part of adaptive management strategies are well elaborated

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

Very much so

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

Very much so

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

Very clearly stated

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)

Superb monitoring program

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

Yes. See my comments above

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)

Yes. This project is based on lessons learned from past failing and successful projects. As such, the project is highly reassuring

Please summarize any additional information needed below:

Excellent proposal