SCIENCE EVALUATION

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

BAYOU GREENWAYS 2020

LOCATION

Texas- Harris County, adjacent to TCMP boundary

SPONSOR(S)

Texas

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

Implementation

REVIEWED BY:

DATE:

12-30-14

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 references an adequate number of peer reviewed reports and publicly available information to justify the objectives.

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

Reports by the Chesapeake Bay Commission and the Wisconsin RPC reasonably support the methods.

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

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

Comments

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

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

Comments

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

The proposal only identifies uncertainties with the acquisition process and is silent about uncertainties or risks associated with the scientific basis that assumes protecting additional land will lead to restoration, enhancement, or protection of habitat. The proposal should at least indicate uncertainties and risks as minimum based on the previous body of science referenced.

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

The proposal does not discuss uncertainties or risks associated with achieving the objectives over time. This is particularly concerning given no description of monitoring or maintenance is provided.

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:

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:

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:

The proposal lacks documentation regarding risks and uncertainties that habitat will be restored, enhanced, or protected.

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. Sufficient reports and studies are referenced that support a scientifically sound basis for the project.

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

Yes, often.

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)

No risk management plan is included.

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

No.

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

Yes.

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

Yes, objectives are clear.

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

Yes, but none relate to specific habitat enhancements over baseline conditions. Statements are very broad such as, "...a goal for a net gain in ecological services provided by these corridors will be determined once the parcels of land are acquired (pg 10).

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)

No. A monitoring program is not included in the proposal.

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

Yes.

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)

The proposal adequately discusses successes similar efforts, but not failures.

Please summarize any additional information needed below:

Overall a very worthwhile project with high likelihood of success. The proposal should have addressed the uncertainties and risks associated with achieving the desired ecological benefits, not just acquisition.