

Conversation Contents

DepSec response - latest edition

Attachments:

/9. DepSec response - latest edition/1.1 Dep Sec questions on (b) (5) 030618_dwh.docx

/9. DepSec response - latest edition/2.1 Dep Sec questions on (b) (5) 030618_dwh - WG edits.docx

"Houseknecht, David" <dhouse@usgs.gov>

From: "Houseknecht, David" <dhouse@usgs.gov>
Sent: Tue Mar 06 2018 09:14:23 GMT-0700 (MST)
To: Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>
Subject: DepSec response - latest edition
Attachments: Dep Sec questions on (b) (5) 030618_dwh.docx

I started by accepting all changes that had been made in the previous draft, and all my new material is in blue font. I think this approach does not require an additional option, but what do you think?

Dave Houseknecht
U.S. Geological Survey
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive
MS 956
Reston, VA 20192
(703) 648-6466

Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>

From: Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>
Sent: Tue Mar 06 2018 09:24:24 GMT-0700 (MST)
To: David Houseknecht <dhouse@usgs.gov>
Subject: RE: DepSec response - latest edition
Attachments: Dep Sec questions on (b) (5) 030618_dwh - WG edits.docx

Dave, thanks for doing this. All looks good except for the last paragraph on Page 3 (see attached) – I wonder if there's a way to bring the critical rationale forward to the beginning of the paragraph (see my comment). Not wedded to it particularly but it might be good to drive home earlier in the discussion about why we're proposing the particular work plan. All else good.

FYI, I watched Reilly's confirmation hearing just now – when asked if he would protect FSP he obviously said yes but when questioned whether he'd hold assessment results private or release them to DOI if asked, he indicated he'd do the latter...

Walter

From: Houseknecht, David [mailto:dhouse@usgs.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 6, 2018 11:14 AM
To: Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>
Subject: DepSec response - latest edition

I started by accepting all changes that had been made in the previous draft, and all my new material is in blue font. I think this approach does not require an additional option, but what do you think?

Dave Houseknecht
U.S. Geological Survey
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive
MS 956
Reston, VA 20192
(703) 648-6466

"Houseknecht, David" <dhouse@usgs.gov>

From: "Houseknecht, David" <dhouse@usgs.gov>
Sent: Tue Mar 06 2018 09:28:27 GMT-0700 (MST)
To: Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>
Subject: Re: DepSec response - latest edition

Interesting - who asked Reilly that question?

Dave Houseknecht
U.S. Geological Survey
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive
MS 956
Reston, VA 20192
(703) 648-6466

On Tue, Mar 6, 2018 at 11:24 AM, Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov> wrote:

Dave, thanks for doing this. All looks good except for the last paragraph on Page 3 (see attached) – I wonder if there's a way to bring the critical rationale forward to the beginning of the paragraph (see my comment). Not wedded to it particularly but it might be good to drive home earlier in the discussion about why we're proposing the particular work plan. All else good.

FYI, I watched Reilly's confirmation hearing just now – when asked if he would protect FSP he obviously said yes but when questioned whether he'd hold assessment results private or release them to DOI if asked, he indicated he'd do the latter...

Walter

From: Houseknecht, David [mailto:dhouse@usgs.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 6, 2018 11:14 AM
To: Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>

Subject: DepSec response - latest edition

I started by accepting all changes that had been made in the previous draft, and all my new material is in blue font. I think this approach does not require an additional option, but what do you think?

Dave Houseknecht
U.S. Geological Survey
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive
MS 956
Reston, VA 20192
(703) 648-6466

Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>

From: Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>
Sent: Tue Mar 06 2018 09:34:49 GMT-0700 (MST)
To: David Houseknecht <dhouse@usgs.gov>
Subject: RE: DepSec response - latest edition

Cantwell – ranking member from Washington state

From: Houseknecht, David [mailto:dhouse@usgs.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 6, 2018 11:28 AM
To: Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>
Subject: Re: DepSec response - latest edition

Interesting - who asked Reilly that question?

Dave Houseknecht
U.S. Geological Survey
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive
MS 956
Reston, VA 20192
(703) 648-6466

On Tue, Mar 6, 2018 at 11:24 AM, Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov> wrote:

Dave, thanks for doing this. All looks good except for the last paragraph on Page 3 (see attached) – I wonder if there's a way to bring the critical rationale forward to the beginning of the paragraph (see my comment). Not wedded to it particularly but it might be good to drive home earlier in the discussion about why we're proposing the particular work plan. All else good.

FYI, I watched Reilly's confirmation hearing just now – when asked if he would protect FSP he obviously said yes but when questioned whether he'd hold assessment results private or release them to DOI if asked, he indicated he'd do the latter...


Walter

From: Houseknecht, David [mailto:dhouse@usgs.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 6, 2018 11:14 AM
To: Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>
Subject: DepSec response - latest edition

I started by accepting all changes that had been made in the previous draft, and all my new material is in blue font. I think this approach does not require an additional option, but what do you think?


Dave Houseknecht
U.S. Geological Survey
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive
MS 956
Reston, VA 20192
(703) 648-6466

USGS Responses to Questions from Deputy Secretary Bernhardt and Options for 1002 Area



(b) (5)

(b) (5)



(b) (5)

Conclusion

(b) (5)

PRE-DECISIONAL DISCUSSION DRAFT

USGS Responses to Questions from Deputy Secretary Bernhardt and Options for 1002 Area

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

Commented [GWS1]: (b) (5)

(b) (5)

Conclusion

(b) (5)