To: CN=David Jewett/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Gregory Oberley/OU=R8/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Dominic Digiulio/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Rick Wilkin/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Gregory Oberley/OU=R8/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Dominic Digiulio/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Rick Wilkin/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Dominic Digiulio/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Rick Wilkin/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Rick Wilkin/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]
Cc: []
From: CN=Ayn Schmit/OU=R8/O=USEPA/C=US
Sent: Wed 7/11/2012 5:26:05 PM
Subject: Fw: Invitation to nominate peer reviewer for Pavillion Data Report
http://www.usgs.gov/fsp/policies.asp
http://www.usgs.gov/usgs-manual/500/502-3.html
SM 502.4
http://www.usgs.gov/usgs-manual/500/502-3.html
http://wy.water.usgs.gov/

We should talk about who would be the most appropriate to serve as the reviewer...

Ayn E. Schmit
Water Policy Advisor

(PH) 303-312-6220 (FAX) 303-312-7150
EPA Region 8
1595 Wynkoop Street
Denver, Colorado 80202-1129
schmit.ayn@epa.gov
----- Forwarded by Ayn Schmit/R8/USEPA/US on 07/11/2012 11:25 AM -----

From: David N Mott <dmott@usgs.gov>
To: martel@wyoming.com, John Corra <john.corra@wyo.gov>, Ayn Schmit/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, David Jewett/ADA/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Warren C Day <wday@usgs.gov>, Peter R Wright <prwright@usgs.gov>, Jerad D Bales <jdbales@usgs.gov>
Date: 07/11/2012 11:09 AM
Subject: Invitation to nominate peer reviewer for Pavillion Data Report

Wes, John, Ayn, and Dave:

I am beginning the process of coordinating peer review of the Draft USGS Pavillion Data Report currently under preparation in my office, and am offering each of you the opportunity to nominate one peer reviewer.

USGS Fundamental Science Practices report publication guidance can be found at http://www.usgs.gov/fsp/policies.asp with specific guidance on peer review at http://www.usgs.gov/usgs-manual/500/502-3.html. Some important excerpts are:

1.) USGS defines peer review (also referred to as technical peer review, refereeing, or scientific peer review) as scrutiny of work or ideas by colleagues (peers) who are well qualified and who are of equal standing with another. In the scientific field the implication is that education and/or experience qualify one to comment on the work of others in a particular field of expertise. Qualified peer reviewers of USGS information products must have no stake in the outcome of the review or publication of the work, are not associated with the work being performed, and are without conflict of interest.

--- with regard to this excerpt, we are requesting nominations of individuals that are not associated with the Technical Team or the work at Pavillion, but that are considered to be subject matter experts in groundwater data collection, complex laboratory analysis and quality assurance procedures, and/or review of data reports for technical accuracy and completeness of provided information for use by others.

2.) To ensure safeguarding unpublished USGS information, draft manuscripts that have not received Bureau approval and that are sent for peer review to outside entities, such as peer-reviewed journals and others outside the USGS, must carry the nondisclosure statement in 5.F below that explicitly states the manuscript is being distributed for peer review only and may not be disclosed prior to USGS approval for release. Additionally, a draft USGS manuscript may be submitted to an outside entity, for example as a courtesy to co-authors, and in these cases, the courtesy review statement found in SM 502.4, section 5.A(4) must be included.

Nondisclosure Prior to USGS Approval for Release. In agreeing to be a peer reviewer for a USGS information product, reviewers must agree to be bound by the strictest scientific ethics in ensuring confidentiality of the science that is being reviewed and to not disclose or divulge any results or conclusions, or to make any public statements regarding the science before it is published and released. Information distributed for peer review must carry the following statement requiring nondisclosure prior to the information being approved by USGS for release: "This draft manuscript is distributed solely for purposes of scientific peer review. Its content is deliberative and predecisional, so it must not be disclosed or released by reviewers. Because the manuscript has not yet been approved for publication by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), it does not represent any official USGS finding or policy."At a minimum, this statement must appear on the title page of the manuscript.

--- this excerpt is self explanatory and highlights the need for the peer reviewer you nominate to be a professional that can be trusted to not share the draft document, their formal comments, or their perceptions, with anyone other than the USGS project managers and authors prior to bureau approval and public release by USGS.

Please have any prospective peer reviewers read Section 5. Guidelines for Peer Review found at http://www.usgs.gov/usgs-manual/500/502-3.html to better acquaint themselves with their responsibilities, prior to submitting their names. A brief resume or description of qualifications would also be appreciated. Reviewers should anticipate receiving the Draft report in early to mid-August with an approximate two-week review period.

Please nominate peer reviewers by July 25th. If you do not wish to nominate a peer reviewer this will not encumber the process as we will also be sending the document to at least two USGS peer reviewers.

Thank You,

David N. Mott, USGS
Director, Wyoming Water Science Center
521 Progress Circle, Suite 6
Cheyenne, WY 82007
(307)775-9162
http://wy.water.usgs.gov/