From:	Kinsinger, Anne
To:	Wiley, Christine
Cc:	Edwin Roberson; Helen Riggs; Jacquelynn Hanley (Kallie); James Douglas; James Lyons; Jerold Gidner; Jolie Pollet; Kimberly A Thorsen; Lauren Bogard; Lawrence Roberts; Lori Caramanian; Michael Black; Rodina Cave; Ronald Dunton; Sarah Greenberger; Sarah Peterson; Stephen Small; Theresa Rabot
Subject:	Re: IMPORTANT: DRAFT SO 3336 Final Report - Version 2
Date:	Tuesday, March 24, 2015 1:59:39 PM

Dear Colleagues:

I have reviewed the draft document. Given that it is a first draft, I'd say it's excellent -- the quality of thought and specificity of actions is great. That said, there are, as you would expect, quite a number of redundancies, overlaps, and vocabulary difference. Rather than edit the documents, I will just point out what I think are the major areas that need to be reconciled.

Landscapes. Throughout the document, we discuss landscape scale approaches to fuels treatments, restoration, monitoring, cheatgrass control and science generally. I think discussion is need about what we mean by that, and whether we should think about common approaches and definitions.

NEPA. There are recommendations for NEPA throughout the document: Fuels, Emerging Science, Cheatgrass Control. These should be aligned.

Interagency Coordination/Governance. Actions and ideas for this are articulated in many places, and should be aligned or included with Section 7(b) (vi) Improve and Strengthen Interagency Coordination. Recommendations can be found throughout the document -- for example the science chapter calls for a process for executive leadership engagement in supporting science needs; the Fuels section suggests using a workgroup of WFLC etc. If we aren't thoughtful, we risk a proliferation of coordination structures.

Metrics/Monitoring. There are a very large number of recommendations for metrics and monitoring throughout the document, including restoration effectiveness monitoring, regional integrated monitoring, reporting requirements, cheatgrass control, and broadly throughout the science chapter. Suggest we consider a monitoring plan.

Science needs. In addition to the considering emerging science needs and science and research plan sections, science needs are articulated throughout the document, including fuels, post-fire recovery, restoration and seed strategy. I think the two main chapters should be merged into science priorities and delivery of science - or something more elegant than that -- and it should capture the full range of needs identified throughout the document.

Hope this help for discussion tomorrow.

Anne

Anne E. Kinsinger
Associate Director for Ecosystems
US Geological Survey
12201 Sunrise Valley Dr.
Reston, VA 20192
703-648-4050
Cell: 571-212-6898

On Mon, Mar 23, 2015 at 8:04 PM, Wiley, Christine <christine_wiley@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

> Good evening. I have attached the latest version of the DRAFT SO 3336 Final Report for

your review and comment. Please send me your edits/comments at your earliest convenience so that I can incorporate as many as possible into a version 3 and share it with the group prior to Wednesday morning's call.

Thanks; have a good evening!

Christie

Christie S. Wiley
Communication Program Lead
Office of Wildland Fire
U. S. Department of the Interior
Office: (830) 537-3630
Cell: (208) 899-9464
Email: christine_wiley@ios.doi.gov