Peer Review Plan

(Reference Information Quality Act)

◉ Influential Scientific Information Pe   ○ Highly Influential Scientific Assessment Peer

Agency

US Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Inventory and Monitoring Program

Agency Contact (name/ email/ phone)

Sean Healey / sean.healey@usda.gov / 801-391-7536

Title of Review

Forest Health and Inventoried Roadless Areas

Purpose of Review

Verify scientific validity of a manuscript that considers speculation that roads are needed to maintain forest health

Type of Review

○ Panel Review   ◉ Individual Review

○ Alternative Process (Briefly Explain):

Timing of Review			Number of Reviewers	
10/16/2019	Start	10/15/2019	◉ 3 or fewer	
	End	10/31/2019	○ 4 to 10	
			○ More than 10 r	

Primary Discipline/Types of Expertise Needed for Review

Forest Health; Spatial Analysis

Reviewer Names and Affiliations

James Ellenwood, National Program Lead, Remote Sensing Research and Spatial Analysis (Forest Service)
Irene Lockman, Regional Forest Pathologist, Pacific Northwest Region, National Forest System (Forest Service)

Expected Publication Outlet (Science or Similar Peer Reviewed Journal)

Science (if accepted)
Commentary manuscript type: Perspectives (1000 words max, not focusing on author's own work)

Reviewers Selected by: ◉ Agency   ○ Designated Outside Organization

Organization's Name: _____

Opportunities for Public Comment?   ○ Yes   ◉ No

If yes, briefly state how and when these opportunities will be provided:

How: _____

When: _____

Peer Reviewers Provided with Public Commentary ○ Yes ◉ No

Summary of Peer Reviewers' Comments

Guiding questions
1. Does the manuscript rely upon the best available monitoring data and research? Are there conflicting authoritative data sources that are not considered?
2. Does the manuscript appropriately acknowledge limitations and uncertainties of the source data?
3. Are the cited monitoring data appropriately interpreted? Is the conclusion ("Speculation that roads are needed in IRAs from a forest heath perspective is unsupported by the available data") consistent with the information presented?

Irene "Blakey" Lockman - Region 6 Regional Pathologist

I am in agreement with the points you make in your manuscript regarding forest health, specifically forest diseases, and have briefly commented on Q#1 and Q#3 below in your trailing message (in red).
+ "you captured the papers/diseases that I am aware of regarding roads and diseases"
+ monitoring data is appropriately interpreted

James Ellenwood, WO Lead for Remote Sensing Research and Spatial Analysis

+ Questioned whether mention of deforestation was relevant in a statement about forest health
   -- Result: Dropped mention of deforestation in manuscript
+ Provided Forest Service health risk map context
   -- Result: Forest Service health monitoring is now cited
+ Pointed out that road effects on Port Orford cedar root disease is limited in scope
   -- Result: This limitation is now noted
+ Suggested change in the order of presentation: invasive species and disease
   -- Result: Done

Public Nominations Requested for Review Panel ○ Yes ◉ No

Other Comments

Dan Child, P.E.
Public Services Staff Officer
Former Coordinator of Utah Roadless Rule and Utah Shared Stewardship initiatives for Region 4
"Hi Sean, thanks for sharing this with me. My detail in the R.O. has concluded and I'm now back on the Fishlake N.F., but I really enjoyed reviewing your summary this afternoon. Your conclusions appear to be well-founded and I think this information is very valuable. Looks good!"