From: Michael Weiss - NOAA Federal
To: Bowman, Randal
Subject: Re: Request for information on commercil fishing
Date: Thursday, July 13, 2017 4:26:15 PM

Thanks.

Assumed as such but just wanted to be doubly sure.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 13, 2017, at 5:24 PM, Bowman, Randal <randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

> It been a hectic day and I was not focused on that, but you are right; there is no basis for us to make any announcements on marine monuments until the final report, in conjunction with DOC.
>
> On Thu, Jul 13, 2017 at 5:20 PM, Michael Weiss - NOAA Federal <michael.weiss@noaa.gov> wrote:
>
> > Thanks Randy.
> >
> > I'll get back to you on this tomorrow but I did see one thing that raised my eyebrow...
> >
> > On the rolling announcements you said you expect more to come but you will ask for word in advance on any marine announcements. I would not expect DOI to take any action on marine monuments w/out first coordinating with and with DOC concurrence. So just to clarify, DOI will not be making any unilateral decisions on the marine monuments, correct?
> >
> > Thanks again,
> >
> > Michael
> >
> > On Thu, Jul 13, 2017 at 5:11 PM, Bowman, Randal <randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov> wrote:
> >
> > > Thank you on my request. On yours, in reverse order - yes, I do expect a rolling/trickle of such announcements over time, but I do not have the schedule and did not know in advance the timing of this announcement or what determines which ones will be announced in advance. I will ask for word in advance on any marine announcements. Appreciate the word on the Post and will pass on to our public affairs folks.
> > >
> > > On the reports and information, as your folks saw yesterday, there are thousands of pages in multiple notebooks on the marine monuments. The overwhelming majority of the material in those notebooks, including comments, was generated in prior years, and we are not considering this as comments on the review. I told your folks yesterday they are welcome to borrow the notebooks (i.e. we'll put them on a cart and take out to cab with one of your people in it, put them the trunk, and you unload on your end) if they want to copy and return them, but I presume you will receive duplicates

of the material, as some of the cover letters are addressed to both Secretaries. I am a "one-man-band" on this operation, and do not have any admin support, so I can't copy it myself.

I should be able to check on State and local government comments by COB tomorrow; our intergovernmental affairs person has been out of town, his assistant out of the office every time I have gone by, and he keeps these in boxes, so emailing him wouldn't get anything. I've sent a note to BIA asking if there are any Tribal comments on marine monuments. Will recheck on Congressional, but believe you have all of those that relate to marine monuments.

On the public comments, as your have seen and your folks saw in more detail yesterday, there is unfortunately nothing to summarize except what percent of comments are for or against the review overall. We had plans to do a second round of coding for comments with new information, breaking them down by EO factors and traditional DOI issues like grazing, hunting etc, and then reporting on that. We had to abandon because there is virtually nothing submitted with any of that information. And due to many of the comments referencing multiple or all monuments, as below, we are not currently planning to do a monument-by-monument count, as that would likely add up to more than 27 million and further confuse the issue.

I will be glad to sort out the marine monument comments and put them on spreadsheets for you as per the Rose Atoll example, but as your folks saw yesterday, they are just expressions of opinions, not new information; or I can generate counts for and against review of the marine monuments by monument or overall. We do not at this point plan on a "response to comments" as we would do if this were a rulemaking. We are uploading all written comments to regs.gov, so everything will be available for public inspection, and barring a change of plan, that is all we will do. For comments received on regs.gov through June 28, which is the last group fully reviewed, 80% are form comments. When the bulk comments submitted as attachments on regs.gov are fully counted, it will likely be well over 90%. I want to stress that what was displayed on the screen when your team was over here and what Candace and Adele saw on the screen yesterday were the lists of comments and actual comments, not some summary generated by our system.

For example, here is a full copy of the first comment that popped up in a "Rose Atolll" search - acreage figures in the comment:

What the heck??? Why would you not want to protect these vital areas?

Rich mineral and fossil fuel investors do not need to rape our beautiful earth for their profit. Protect them all!!!

Location Year(s) Acreage Basin and Range Nevada 2015 703,585 Berryessa Snow Mountain California 2015 330,780 Canyons of the Ancients Colorado 2000 175,160 Carrizo Plain California 2001 204,107 Cascade Siskiyou

Oregon 2000/2017 100,000 Craters of the Moon Idaho 1924/2000 737,525 Giant Sequoia California 2000 327,760 Gold Butte Nevada 2016 296,937 Grand Canyon-Parashant Arizona 2000 1,014,000 Grand Staircase-Escalante Utah 1996 1,700,000 Hanford Reach Washington 2000 194,450.93 Ironwood Forest Arizona 2000 128,917 Mojave Trails California 2016 1,600,000 Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks New Mexico 2014 496,330 Rio Grande del Norte New Mexico 2013 242,555 Sand to Snow California 2016 154,000 San Gabriel Mountains California 2014 346,177 Sonoran Desert Arizona 2001 486,149 Upper Missouri River Breaks Montana 2001 377,346 Vermilion Cliffs Arizona 2000 279,568

Katahadin Woods and Waters Maine 2016 87,563

Marianas Trench CNMI/Pacific Ocean 2009 60,938,240 Northeast Canyons and Seamounts Atlantic Ocean 2016 3,114,320 Pacific Remote Islands Pacific Ocean 2009 55,608,320 Papahanaumokuakea Hawaii 2006/2016 89,600,000 Rose Atoll American Samoa 2009 8,609,045

On Thu, Jul 13, 2017 at 3:00 PM, Michael Weiss - NOAA Federal <michael.weiss@noaa.gov> wrote:

> Thanks Randy.
>
> Will get back to you shortly on best way to get you the information
>
> A few other things.
>
> Thanks again for the time with our folks yesterday. As a follow up--
>
> 1. I understand that you will put together a list of the Hill, states, tribes, and local governments from which DOI received comments. Then we can crosswalk to confirm whether we have copies of everything you received. Thank you. Can we please get that by tomorrow?
>
> 2. We would like to please also obtain by early next week any substantive reports/information DOI received from eNGOs, private sector, academic, or other organizations re: the marine monuments.
>
> 3. Finally as per my email the other day, as it has proven challenging for our folks to get easy access to the public comments and since you and other DOI reps and your contractor are already familiar with the program and have a system in place for reviewing and binning the public comments, that DOI review and have the pen on summarizing the public comments received on the marine national monuments as you are doing for the others. Please confirm.
>
> Also, FYI we had an inquiry from the Washington Post re: how DOI is coordinating with us on the public comments under 13792. We are providing a very brief response that we are collaborating with DOI on the review of the public comments received.
>
> Finally, I just saw the press release on the Secretary Zinke's announcement re: Craters of the Moon National Monument in Idaho and Hanford Reach National monuments. Do you anticipate more of

these types of rolling announcements? Any latest on what the final report to the Secretary and one to POTUS will look like?

Thanks again,

Michael

On Thu, Jul 13, 2017 at 11:28 AM, Bowman, Randal <randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

Secretary Zonke is concerned over claims made by commercial fishermen on the New England Seamounts and Canyons generally, and for the tuna fishermen in the Pacific.

To staff the issue here, I need information and a chance to discuss some of the issues, whether with a group from NMFS or your full team as you prefer.

The sort of information that would be helpful for NE is the type and amount or value of what was previously caught in the monument, how many boats/fishermen were involved, and what options they have for going elsewhere. On that, its my understanding that while there are no formal territorial allotments, commercial fishermen have areas they customarily use and that are respected by others. If so, is there empty space with viable amounts of fish that those who formerly fished the monument could move to?

For the Pacific, I'd appreciate a little more information given our role with the territories - 1) how many American (and foreign, if applicable) tuna boats (long-line and purse seine) were based in American Samoa, Guam and CNMI in 2000, 2005, 2010, 2015 and now - or whatever other set of years NMFS has information most readily available on; I want to be able to show evolution over time, but am not hung up over which years to use for that comparison. Also not sure there are any tuna boats based in Guam and CNMI. 2) for whatever American and foreign boats are based in any of the 3 territories, what percent of their tuna catch was previous to the initial Proclamation taken in the PRI monument, and in the Expansion area, by year of possible. 3) How the tuna treaty works with respect to allocations, and what % of each territory's allocation do boats based there use each year - again, going back to 2000 or when the treaty went into effect. and 4) any information NMFS has about the American Samoa tuna canneries - why they were established there, roles of shortage of fish vs minimum wage being applied to Am Samoa in closures, any possible role of the treaty in cannery closures.

It is my understanding on the above, backed by NO hard information, that there have not been American tuna boats based in Am. Samoa until the recent purchase of 3 purse seine boats by Samoans, and that previous to

that only foreign boats landed tuna there. I'm well aware that some or all of this could be wrong. I have no knowledge of any commercial tuna fishing in Guam or CNMI, except possibly by locals for local consumption.

I am presuming Sen. Schatz' letter of June 6 accurately describes the situation for the Hawaii-based tuna boats, in that notwithstanding the expansion of PMNM they catch their tuna quota well before the end of the year and need to purchase unused quota amounts from the territories to keep fishing; and anything NMFS has to add or expand upon that information would also be very useful.

Don't expect this overnight, but a chance to discuss with knowledgeable people sooner rather than later would be appreciated.

Also, FYI - the number of comments on the monument review coming in to regs.gov on Monday was a record for one-day submissions, and it broke the system. Instead of freezing it started generating duplicate records. As a result, the number of comments shown is too high, although no one knows at this point by how much. The regs/gov staff are withdrawing the duplicated comments - luckily, the system also generated identical tracking numbers for the original and duplicated records, so its possible to find them.

--
Michael Weiss
Office of the Under Secretary
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
202-482-5958 (w)
(b) (6) (c)

--
Michael Weiss
Office of the Under Secretary
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
202-482-5958 (w)
(b) (6) (c)