

The following is a summary of scores and comments provided by individual reviewers as well as discussion points that emerged during the group conversations that occurred on 9/15/2020 and following presentations by each project sponsor on 6/17/2020 and 7/18/2020. Reviewers were emailed PRISM links to all full proposals on 8/11/2020. There were a total of **8 reviewers** who submitted scores for the full proposals, all of whom reviewed the projects at both the pre-proposal and full proposal phases. Comments prefaced with “For SOW” are places where reviewers specifically wished to make sure the issue is addressed in the Scope of Work for the project if funded, but this does not preclude the inclusion of additional feedback between ESRP and the project investigators should the project be funded.

Zackey (E20-03) Meadowdale Beach and Estuary Restoration Project ecological and geomorphic assessment: Informing recovery strategies and restoration designs along the waterfront railroad corridor

Rank: 11 of 12

Count of Top: 0

Count of Bottom: 2

Reviewer Comment Summary:

- Reviewers appreciated the uniqueness of this project and the interdisciplinary way of understanding both geomorphic and ecological effects of restoration, however there was concern that the results would not lead to actionable information to inform specific aspects of design or planning restoration projects along the railroad.
- There was concern that both the biological and geomorphological data would be highly variable and thus challenging to detect a signal pointing to restoration or an aspect of the restoration.
- There was general appreciation of the social and political benefits of demonstrating an ecosystem response to restoration in this highly visible location.
- Some reviewers recommended sampling benthic invertebrates as well as neuston and terrestrial invertebrates, since they might be more likely to show a site-specific, detectable response to restoration.
- Reviewers appreciated the well-formed hypotheses but were concerned that two years may not be sufficient to answer the study questions.
- Some reviewers felt that even along the railroad, the restoration project was too unique to result in useful guidance for future railroad restoration projects.
- Some reviewers felt that some of the monitoring activities seemed more geared towards facilitating community involvement than necessarily addressing the research hypotheses.
- There was some concern that sediment dynamics may not be adequately captured by the described survey methods, which contributed to uncertainty that the study would yield actionable results.