

**NOAA Coastal Services Center
FY2008 Implementation of Regional Integrated Ocean Observing Systems
Proposal Evaluation Form**

Proposal Number: P19

Proposal Title: "Implementation of Regional Integrated Ocean Observing System: Southern California Regional Coastal Ocean Observing System"

Principal Investigator: Eric J. Terrill

Institution: Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego

Scores	Proposal Score
1. Importance (max 30 pts.)	_26_____
2. Technical and Scientific merit (max 25 pts.)	_23_____
3. Qualifications (max 15 pts.)	_15_____
4. Project cost (max 15 pts.)	_10_____
5. Outreach and Education (max 15 pts.)	_13_____
 TOTAL SCORE	 _87_____

Please provide an overall rating for the proposal:

Excellent X Very good _____ Good _____ Fair _____ Poor _____

Excellent: Probably will fall among the top 10% of proposals in the subfield; highest priority for support. This category should be used only for truly outstanding proposals.

Very Good: Probably will fall among the top 1/3 of proposals in the subfield; should be supported

Good: Probably will fall among the middle 1/3 of proposals in the subfield; worthy of support.

Fair: Probably will fall among the lowest 1/3 of proposals in the subfield; should not be supported without serious revision.

Poor: Proposal has serious deficiencies; should not be supported.

Comments:

Proposal #2008-1362: "Implementation of Regional Integrated Ocean Observing System: Southern California Regional Coastal Ocean Observing System"

Principal Investigator: Eric J. Terrill

The applicants present a market basket of instrumentation and observation strategies that addresses a suite of environmental issues. The issues range from global concerns such as global

change to regionally specific (i.e., outfall monitoring, waves, HABs). They also include environmental crisis events such as oil spills, beach closures, and disastrous waves.

To the applicants' credit, they indicate that they intend to apply for state funds to support the overall program. While there are numerous impressive letters of support, I did not see evidence that the users have vetted the proposed program or identified priorities to assist in structuring a lesser program should full funding be unavailable. Such documentation would be helpful to establish the real need for the proposed efforts; supporting letters often narrowly reflect only the organization's narrow perspectives and offer little in terms of commitments of resources.

A strong point of the proposal is the emphasis placed on the importance of data management. In particular, it is encouraging that there is a willingness to work on data management at the national level with NOAA. However, there is also an implication that the data collected will be available for dealing with environmental problems in both the short- and long-term. Data availability is implied during spills of various types, beach closures, and HAB events. One would assume, therefore, that data will be available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. There appears to be no provision for providing such a service. This seems to be a major flaw in the effort, given that the overall program is being sold as service-based.

I am pleased to see that there will be a concerted effort of transforming data into information. Agency heads and spill responders often are not interested in raw data, but in informative products that can be readily used in a decision making, crisis environment. Some examples of existing products would have been nice.

Of all the projects detailed, the one that seems most poorly justified as an observation program as opposed to research is that of sewage plume tracking. While the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project endorses the work, it seems to me that proof of concept should be established. If successful, add to the observation program in subsequent years.

Overall, an excellent team of researchers has been pulled together to undertake a variety of important observations for the California coast. The program certainly deserves to be funded at some level. However, before making that decision, I would want to see the following:

1. A consensus view developed by a responsible organization such as Sea Grant identifying the most pressing coastal oceanographic problems.
2. A prioritization of those problems so that with less than full funding, NOAA will have an idea of what will be done.
3. A plan for how the program is going to be operational around the clock.
4. A sample of some of the information products that will be available and others that will be under development that have the endorsement of the user community.

NOAA deserves credit for encouraging development of regional programs that address regional needs. However, NOAA must show more leadership with regard to providing a national

perspective, weaving the regional programs into a more cohesive whole. There should be national standards for many of the observational efforts proposed here and elsewhere, just as there are national standards for hydrographic surveying and tidal observation. Perhaps data management is a beginning, but given the dollars requested, there is much to be desired concerning a guarantee of consistent, useful output.

Signature and Date

Proposal Number: P19

Proposal Title:

Principal Investigator:

Institution: University of California

Scores

Proposal Score

1. Importance (max 30 pts.)	<u>30</u>
2. Technical and Scientific merit (max 25 pts.)	<u>24</u>
3. Qualifications (max 15 pts.)	<u>15</u>
4. Project cost (max 15 pts.)	<u>14</u>
5. Outreach and Education (max 15 pts.)	<u>15</u>

TOTAL SCORE

Please provide an overall rating for the proposal:

Excellent X Very good _____ Good _____ Fair _____ Poor _____

Excellent: Probably will fall among the top 10% of proposals in the subfield; highest priority for support. This category should be used only for truly outstanding proposals.

Very Good: Probably will fall among the top 1/3 of proposals in the subfield; should be supported

Good: Probably will fall among the middle 1/3 of proposals in the subfield; worthy of support.

Fair: Probably will fall among the lowest 1/3 of proposals in the subfield; should not be supported without serious revision.

Poor: Proposal has serious deficiencies; should not be supported.

Comments: This is a very well thought out approach to address a real world set of issues. Through collaboration, this team can bring a wealth of information to decision-makers and the public. At low relative cost millions of people can be helped and educated. It promises to greatly advance the missions of NOAA, and be a real, positive influence.

Signature and _____ 010908