

0074861

From: [Patrick Field](mailto:Patrick.Field@nps.gov)
To: [Mike Murray@nps.gov](mailto:Mike.Murray@nps.gov)
Subject: Re: peer review USGS Protocols
Date: 06/10/2008 10:03 AM

MIKE

You answered the question below (it's in the acknowledgements in the document).

PAT

On 6/10/08 8:33 am, "Mike_Murray@nps.gov" <Mike_Murray@nps.gov> wrote:

> I'm not sure of your question. The reviewers of the CAHA recommendations
> ("the USGS protocols") are identified in the Acknowledgements section near
> the end of the respective documents. The USGS policy (see below) is to
> have peer review of all information products released by the agency. In
> other words, the USGS protocols for CAHA were peer reviewed in accordance
> with USGS policy and the reviewers are identified in the documents.

>
> Policy. Peer review is required for all information products, whether
> published and disseminated by the USGS or by an outside entity, and
> regardless of media (print, digital, audiovisual, or Web), if the work was
> funded, whole or in part, by the USGS or if USGS affiliation is identified
> with the authorship. In keeping with practices in the broader scientific
> community, directives from Government authorities, and USGS Fundamental
> Science Practices, the following is policy:

>
> A. Peer reviews must include at least two qualified scientists who have no
> stake in the outcome of the review, who are not associated with the work
> being performed, and who are without conflict of interest.

>
> B. Only peer-reviewed information products may be forwarded to an Approving
> Official for Bureau Approval for official release (see SM 502.4 and SM
> 205.18). Information products sent to an Approving Official must include a
> reconciliation document indicating how review comments were addressed.

>
> C. Articles for publication in a scientific journal must have first gone
> through the USGS peer review process, as outlined in this policy, and
> receive Bureau Approval for release prior to being submitted to the
> journal.

>
> D. Involvement of non-USGS authors does not allow USGS authors to bypass
> the USGS review and approval process. Conversely, USGS scientists who are
> authors in publications by outside entities, or where a non-USGS author is
> the lead, must comply with USGS review and approval processes first or the
> USGS scientist may not be listed as an author.

>
> E. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) requirements for peer review must
> be met (Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review).

>
> Mike Murray
> Superintendent
> Cape Hatteras NS/ Wright Brothers NMem/ Ft. Raleigh NHS
> (w) 252-473-2111, ext. 148
> (c) 252-216-5520
> fax 252-473-2595

> CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE
> This message is intended exclusively for the individual or entity to which
> it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is
> proprietary, privileged or confidential or otherwise legally exempt from
> disclosure.

>
> Patrick Field
> <pfield@cbuilding.org>
>
> 06/10/2008 05:01 AM
>
> <Mike_Murray@nps.gov>,
> <rcf@fisherccs.com>
>
> To
> cc
> Subject
> Re: peer review USGS Protocols

> MIKE

0074862

> Was this part of the protocols in terms of the document and being clear
> that
> the reviewers were as stated? If so, then it's just part of the protocols.
> If not, then, as much as it would raise consternation, in some way it needs
> to be available.

> PAT

> On 6/9/08 3:39 pm, "Mike_Murray@nps.gov" <Mike_Murray@nps.gov> wrote:

>> See below. Your thoughts about distributing the information before the
>> meeting?

>> Mike Murray
>> Superintendent
>> Cape Hatteras NS/ Wright Brothers NMem/ Ft. Raleigh NHS
>> (w) 252-473-2111, ext. 148
>> (c) 252-216-5520
>> fax 252-473-2595

>> CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

>> This message is intended exclusively for the individual or entity to
> which
>> it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is
>> proprietary, privileged or confidential or otherwise legally exempt from
>> disclosure.

>> ----- Forwarded by Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS on 06/09/2008 02:38 PM -----

>> Sandra
>> Hamilton/DENVER/N
>> PS

> To

06/09/2008 02:05

Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS@NPS

> cc

PM

Sherri Fields/Atlanta/NPS@NPS,
Thayer Broili/CAHA/NPS@NPS

> Subject

Re: peer review USGS Protocols
(Document link: Mike Murray)

>> Hi Mike,

>> No doubt. Given that Walker has been doing research in NC on shorebirds
>> for a long time it doesn't surprise me that he's considered a "peer," and
> I
>> don't think it's all that unusual for NGO research scientists to peer
>> review scientific publications if the topic is in their field of research
>> expertise. With hindsight it seems odd, but there was no lawsuit at the
>> time, or as far as I know any indication Audubon would be involved if
> there
>> was one.

>> Rather than distributing it to everyone, I'd favor simply having a copy
>> available at the meeting if the topic comes up. Distributing it
> beforehand

>> will just ensure the committee spends time discussing it, and I don't see
>> that being helpful to the committee in moving forward. But I don't have
>> strong objections, so send it out if you think it'll be helpful.

>> Sandy

>> Sandy Hamilton
>> National Park Service - Environmental Quality Division
>> Academy Place
>> P.O. Box 25287
>> Denver CO 80225
>> PH: (303) 969-2068
>> FAX: (303) 987-6782

>> Mike
>> Murray/CAHA/NPS

> To

06/09/2008 12:37
PM EST

Sandra Hamilton/DENVER/NPS@NPS

> cc

Sherri Fields/Atlanta/NPS@NPS,
Thayer Broili/CAHA/NPS@NPS

> Subject

Re: peer review USGS Protocols
(Document link: Sandra Hamilton)

>>
>>
>>
>> Thanks Sandy,
>>
>> Any concern about sharing this information with Committee members before
>> the meeting?
>>
>> Does it seem odd to you that Walker Golder was one of the peer reviewers
>> for the PIPL protocol? The USGS guidance (section 4.B.) talks about the
>> review being conducted "by one or more other (peers) who are sufficiently
>> well qualified, who are without conflict of interest, ..." Most of the
>> other reviewers clearly has NPS, USFWS, or affiliated CESU connections.
> No
>> doubt Walker's involvement will raise some questions.
>>
>>
>> Mike Murray
>> Superintendent
>> Cape Hatteras NS/ Wright Brothers NMem/ Ft. Raleigh NHS
>> (w) 252-473-2111, ext. 148
>> (c) 252-216-5520
>> fax 252-473-2595
>>
>> CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE
>> This message is intended exclusively for the individual or entity to
> which
>> it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is
>> proprietary, privileged or confidential or otherwise legally exempt from
>> disclosure.
>>
>>
>>
>> Sandra
>> Hamilton/DENVER/N
>> PS
> To
>> 06/09/2008 12:12 PM
>> Sherri Fields/Atlanta/NPS@NPS,
>> Thayer Broili/CAHA/NPS@NPS, Mike
>> Murray/CAHA/NPS@NPS
>>
>> cc
>>
>>
> Subject
>> peer review USGS Protocols
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> FYI per the question about whether the USGS protocols were peer reviewed.
>>
>> Attached are a list of peer reviewers lifted from each of the protocols
> and
>> the USGS Manual section on peer review.
>>
>> (See attached file: Peer Review USGS Protocols.doc)(See attached file:
>> 502_3 - Fundamental Science Practices Peer Review.mht)
>>
>> Sandy
>>
>> Sandy Hamilton
>> National Park Service - Environmental Quality Division
>> Academy Place
>> P.O. Box 25287
>> Denver CO 80225
>> PH: (303) 969-2068
>> FAX: (303) 987-6782
>
>
>
>