Science Evaluation

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

Coastal Ecosystem Enhancement and Restoration in Barataria-Terrebonne Basin

LOCATION

Lafourche and Terrebonne Parrish/ SE LA

SPONSOR(S)

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

Project, Technical Assistance, Implementation

REVIEWED BY:

DATE:

1/09/15

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

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

Literature cited appears to be extensive and comprehensive for the scale of the project

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

In basic means...could use a little more detail and expansion

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

5 years. More information and discussion for longer term management would be beneficial

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:

support staff and documents were demonstrated within the proposal

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:

Could use a little more detail and discussion.

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, although the agricultural redirection portion is conveyed as more of a pilot program...it seems well thought out and worthy of funding as a model for future projects.

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

Yes, or has the support in place to carry the project through

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)

Not detailed within document

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

Not cited in proposal

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

Yes, with benefits cited. May need some more information pertaining to longer term assessments to measure success/failures

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)

Yes...could be more detailed.

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)

Same as "G" above

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)

Not specifically cited within proposal, but it appears that they have adequate background information and projects reviewed in the works cited portion.

Please summarize any additional information needed below:

I feel that this proposal (especially the agricultural run-off reduction) seems in line with the RESTORE Act goals and well thought out. Although much of the proposal seems like a pilot program in nature, it seems that the right support staff and agencies are in place to carry through on successful implementation with perhaps a little more detail for long term monitoring. I would be in support of this project.