From:	DElia, Jesse
To:	Hollar, Kathy
Cc:	Lee Corum; Ted Koch; Theresa Rabot; Mike Gregg; Cyndi Sidles; Todd Hopkins; Kevin Doherty; Jason Pyron; Michael Carrier; Jeff Everett; Lou Ballard; Carolyn Swed; Steve Abele; Pat Deibert; Matt Kales
Subject:	Re: May 22 Wildfire and Invasives Team Meeting, WAFWA Fire and Invasives Gap Summary
Date:	Thursday, May 22, 2014 3:18:33 PM
Attachments:	Comments on FIAT Final Draft Fire and Invasives doc 5-22-14.docx

FWS Fire and Invasives Team,

Apologies for the delay, but I've finally carved out some time to go over the latest FIAT draft and cross-walked it with our initial comments. Thanks to Cyndi who did the same.

You'll note that I've separated the comments into comments on the prioritization vs. comments on policy. The FIAT team told us they were not at liberty to address policy issues, so those are the ones we may need to follow up with BLM directly on. Ted - I'd be happy to work with you to set something up with Joe Tauge if that is helpful.

The biggest concern remains that focal areas are being defined as those areas with low resistance and resilience; we are asking for a broader view which would allow some flexibility to prioritize projects in areas of moderate or even high resistance and resilience where local conditions support this. Mike Pellant thinks the document already allows for this, but my read (and others') is that the document does not clearly allow for this.

I'd like to transmit these to Mike Pellant sooner rather than later given he is trying to finalize the draft and has asked for a fatal flaw review. Please let me know if you have any concerns by COB Tuesday May 27. I'm going to talk to Mike Pellant tomorrow, so will let him know we are working on this.

Jesse

On Thu, May 15, 2014 at 2:54 PM, Hollar, Kathy <kathy_hollar@fws.gov> wrote:

> Hi All, our next Wildfire and Invasives Team Meeting is scheduled for a week from today, May 22, 11 am PST, 866-560-1158, code 7422224#.
> During this call, we'll discuss:
>
> - What is the status of each identified gap in the WAFWA Fire and Invasives Gap Summary?
> - What's not being addressed?
> - What we can do to help initiate action or make progress?
>
> I understand that Ken Mayer will be joining us on this call so we can have a thorough discussion.
>
> If you haven't already done so, please review the attached list of gaps from the WAFWA Fire and Invasives Gap report, fill out what you know for each of those gaps, and send your input to Lee Corum. See emails below from Ted and Terry for additional info.

Talk with you next Thursday.

Kathy Hollar
503-231-6156 office
503-961-3993 cell

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Ted Koch** <ted_koch@fws.gov>
Date: Thu, May 8, 2014 at 4:23 PM
Subject: RE: WAFWA Fire and Invasives Gap Summary
To: Theresa Rabot <theresa_rabot@fws.gov>, Jesse DElia <jesse_delia@fws.gov>
Cc: Kathy Hollar <kathy_hollar@fws.gov>, Carolyn Swed <Carolyn_Wells@fws.gov>, Steve Abele <steve_abele@fws.gov>, Mike Gregg <mike_gregg@fws.gov>, Todd Hopkins <todd_hopkins@fws.gov>, Lou Ballard <lou_ballard@fws.gov>, Michael Carrier <michael_carrier@fws.gov>, Ken Mayer <Ken.E.Mayer@gmail.com>, Lee Corum <lee_corum@fws.gov>, Sarah Kulpa <sarah_kulpa@fws.gov>

Terry et al.-

I copied Lee on this e-mail so you have his address. Please send your 1-2 sentences per row to Lee by next Friday, and he'll incorporate them early the following week so we can discuss.

Thanks,

Ted

Ted Koch

Nevada State Supervisor

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

1340 Financial Boulevard

Reno, Nevada 89502

775-861-6300

From: Theresa Rabot [mailto:Theresa_Rabot@fws.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2014 10:43 AM
To: Ted Koch; Jesse DElia
Cc: Kathy Hollar; Carolyn Swed; Steve Abele; Mike Gregg; Todd Hopkins; Lou Ballard; Michael Carrier; Ken Mayer
Subject: RE: WAFWA Fire and Invasives Gap Summary

All –

Ted and I just chatted about this – we think if everyone could fill out column "b" on what you know – one or two sentences, and if you don't know anything obviously you don't need to provide input on those items. Send your responses back to Lee Corum and he'll compile. Once that's done we can discuss on a conference call and compare notes.

If you could have your input back to Lee within a week, that would be appreciated.

Kathy – if I'm missing a name or two please forward.

Thanks

From: Ted Koch [mailto:ted_koch@fws.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 06, 2014 4:46 PM
To: Terry Rabot; Jesse DElia; Ken Mayer
Cc: Kathy Hollar; Carolyn Swed; Steve Abele; Mike Gregg; Todd Hopkins
Subject: FW: WAFWA Fire and Invasives Gap Summary

Terry, Jesse and Ken-

As we discussed within the Service on our last invasives-fire call, and I subsequently discussed with you, Ken, attached is a table formatted to reflect the 22 “gaps” identified by the WAFWA fire-invasives team GAP Report. The next step is to fill in column “B” with what, if anything, has been done for each gap.

I’m not sure how to start doing this. Who knows most comprehensively what is being done? Ken – should you and I sit down together when you’re back in town, take a first crack at it, and share it with others to add what they may know?

When we have a handle on tasks completed and remaining we can then discuss the “subcommittee” part of the GAP Report directive and think about how to best fulfill that intention.

Thanks,

Ted

Ted Koch

Nevada State Supervisor

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

1340 Financial Boulevard

Reno, Nevada 89502

775-861-6300

From: Lee Corum [mailto:lee_corum@fws.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 06, 2014 12:41 PM
To: Ted Koch
Subject: WAFWA Fire and Invasives Gap Summary

Attached.

==========

Lee Z. Corum

Sage-Grouse Energy Biologist

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Nevada Fish & Wildlife Office

lee_corum@fws.gov

775-861-6352

--

Jesse D'Elia
Candidate Species Conservation Coordinator
Endangered Species Division, Pacific Regional Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
911 NE 11th Avenue, 4th Floor, Portland, OR 97232
503.231.2349 phone; 503.231.6243 fax
jesse_delia@fws.gov

FWS comments on Final Draft Greater Sage-Grouse Wildfire and Invasives Assessment, May 11, 2014
May 21, 2014

The following FWS comments were not addressed in the final draft FIAT report.

Prioritization Comments

1. Our original comments expressed concern for prioritizing areas of low resistance and resilience within the areas of highest sage-grouse density over all other categories of resistance and resilience.

The final report continues to define focal areas as those with low resistance and resilience. As currently written, we are concerned that the report places all of the emphasis on these areas, potentially to the detriment of areas of moderate or high resistance and resilience. As noted in the Chambers et al. (in press) paper on resistance and resilience, there may be targeted actions within or adjacent to areas of mid- to high-resistance and resilience that warrant intervention. Furthermore, according to that paper, "A large proportion of remaining high density centers within PACs occur on moderate-to-high resilience and resistance habitats."

We continue to recommend that the focal areas be the areas of highest sage-grouse density and that the resistance and resilience information be used to inform prioritization at the local management scale.

2. We recommended that the prioritization process include information on lightning danger and fire occurrence.

We understand that the team is now working to include this information in the report. We support this effort.

3. The purpose of prioritizing PACs is unclear, as is the breakpoint for removal of some PACs from the prioritization. We suggest clarifying the purpose of prioritizing PACs (e.g., for scheduling development of step-down assessments) and including all PACs in the prioritization rather than removing some from the analysis. This would ensure that step-down assessments are prepared for those PACs.

Although the FIAT team suggested this was outside of their ability to address, we remain concerned that the prioritization process cannot be clearly understood without first understanding the purpose of prioritizing the PACs. We recommend that the team work with BLM and FS to clarify this purpose and include a discussion of this purpose in the report.

4. We asked that the four management strategies identified in the report be grouped into three management strategies, namely (1) habitat restoration (proactive), (2) habitat protection, and (3) habitat rehabilitation (reactive – post fire).

The final draft groups its four categories into proactive and reactive management strategies, which is an improvement over the draft; however, but the fire terminology (fuels management, fire operations, etc.) continues to be used.

5. We asked that the document add reference to additional considerations for step-down assessments, including climate change, aroga moths, and areas of cheatgrass die-off.

Reference to these factors has been added. However, methods for fuels treatments in step down assessments to address these considerations were not addressed. If possible, we recommend including examples of management actions to address these issues.

Policy Comments

Policy comments were not addressed by the FIAT team. These comments will need to go to BLM planners for further consideration. Comments are directly from our April 25, 2014 transmittal except those shown in red.

6. The draft document describes a general framework for prioritizing areas for management treatments to address the primary threat to sage-grouse and sagebrush ecosystems in the Great Basin. We applaud the effort and provide recommendations below for improving the prioritization framework. However, we remained concerned that the document does not provide sufficient details for us to evaluate whether step-down assessments will be completed, implemented, and determined to be effective. Without assurances of implementation and effectiveness we will not be able to rely on such assessments in our listing determination. To remedy this situation we recommend that BLM/FS complete the highest priority step-down assessments immediately and develop a detailed schedule for completing the remainder of the step-down assessments in a timely manner. We also recommend providing some assurances that adequate funding and resources will be made available to complete the step-down assessments, implement the assessments, monitor results, and adapt as necessary to ensure effectiveness.

7. Given that invasive and wildfire are the primary threat to sage-grouse in the Great Basin, areas of highest resistance and resilience with high densities of sage-grouse should be prioritized for protection against other disturbances (e.g., infrastructure development). The document should describe the relationship of the resistance and resilience concepts and how they interface with land use planning efforts that are underway. Alternatively, the land use plans should describe and quantify how they are conserving the areas of highest resistance and resilience to invasives and fire.