

Peer Review Plan for the Proposed Reclassification Rules of Multiple Species

About the Document

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) intends to seek peer review of proposed reclassification rules for the following species:

Title: Removing Cumberland Sandwort from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Plants
Removal of the Interior Least Tern from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife
Removal of the Snail Darter from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife
Reclassifying the *Eugenia woodburyana* from Endangered to Threatened on the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife With a 4(d) Rule
Reclassifying the smooth combflower from Endangered to Threatened on the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife With a 4(d) Rule
Reclassifying the Palo de Rosa from Endangered to Threatened on the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife With a 4(d) Rule
Reclassifying the *Mitracarpus polycladus* from Endangered to Threatened on the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife With a 4(d) Rule

Estimated Timeline of Peer Review: 2019-2020

Determination: This document outlines peer review for proposed reclassification for multiple species that are currently listed under the Endangered Species Act.

About the Peer Review Process

In accordance with our July 1, 1994 peer review policy (59 FR 34270), the Service's August 22, 2016 Director's Memo on the Peer Review Process, and the Office of Management and Budget's December 16, 2004 Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review, we, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will solicit independent scientific reviews of the information contained in our SSA report for these species. For proposed rules that are not informed by SSA reports, we will solicit independent scientific reviews of the proposed rules. The purpose of seeking independent peer review is to ensure use of the best scientific and commercial information available and to ensure and to maximize the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of the information upon which the report or rule is based, as well as to ensure that reviews by recognized experts are incorporated into the SSA process or rules, as appropriate.

The Service will request peer review from three or more independent experts. We will consider the following criteria:

- **Expertise:** The reviewer should have knowledge of or experience with the species biology, habitats in which they occur, and/or threats to the species.
- **Independence:** The reviewer should not be employed by the Service. Academic, consulting, or government scientists should have sufficient independence from the Service if the government supports their work.

- **Objectivity:** The reviewer should be recognized by his or her peers as being objective, open-minded, and thoughtful. In addition, the reviewer should be comfortable sharing his or her knowledge and perspectives and openly identifying his or her knowledge gaps.
- **Conflict of Interest:** The reviewer should not have any financial or other interest that conflicts or that could impair his or her objectivity or create an unfair competitive advantage. If an otherwise qualified reviewer has an unavoidable conflict of interest, the Service may publicly disclose the conflict.

While expertise is the primary consideration, the Service will select peer reviewers (considering, but not limited to, these selections) that add to a diversity of scientific perspectives. We will not be providing financial compensation to peer reviewers. We will solicit reviews from at least three qualified experts.

The Service will provide each peer reviewer with information explaining their role and instructions for fulfilling that role, the SSA report or rule, and a conflict-of-interest form. Peer reviewers will be asked to comment specifically on the quality of the scientific information and analyses and whether the best available information was used or relied on in the document; identify oversights, omissions, and inconsistencies; provide advice on reasonableness of judgments made from the scientific evidence; help ensure that scientific uncertainties are identified and characterized; provide advice on the overall strengths and limitations of the scientific data used in the document; and inform us of any scientific information that we did not use. Peer reviewers will be advised that they are not to provide advice on policy.

Peer reviewers will provide individual, written responses to the Service. Peer reviewers will be advised that their reviews, including their names and affiliations, will: (1) be included in the decisional record of our determinations; and, (2) be available to the public upon request once all reviews are completed. We will summarize and respond to the issues raised by the peer reviewers in the record supporting our determinations. A decision on whether or not any of these species warrant listing under the Endangered Species Act is by expected during 2021-2022.

About Public Participation

This peer review plan is made available to allow the public to monitor our compliance with the Office of Management and Budget's Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review. If appropriate, the Service will publish a final rule following consideration of all comments received from the public.

Contact

For more information, contact:

Interior Least Tern: Stephen Ricks, Mississippi Ecological Services Field Office, telephone: 601-321-1122, email: Stephen_ricks@fws.gov.

Cumberland sandwort; Snail darter: Lee Andrews, Tennessee Ecological Services Field Office, telephone: 502-695-0468 x108, email: lee_andrews@fws.gov.

Eugenia woodburyana; Palo de rosa; Mitracarpus polycladus: Edwin Muñoz, Caribbean Ecological Services Field Office; telephone 787-851-7297, email: Edwin_muniz@fws.gov.

Smooth combflower: Pete Benjamin, Raleigh Ecological Services Field Office, telephone: 919-856-4520, ext. 11, email: pete_benjamin@fws.gov.