

**From:** Michael Weiss - NOAA Federal  
**To:** [Emily Lindow](#)  
**Cc:** [Bowman, Randal](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Follow on NOAA Questions - EO 13795  
**Date:** Friday, August 25, 2017 10:12:45 AM

---

Excellent!

Thank you

On Fri, Aug 25, 2017 at 8:42 AM, Emily Lindow <[emily.lindow@boem.gov](mailto:emily.lindow@boem.gov)> wrote:  
I received her final approval last night and the document will be submitted this morning.

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 25, 2017, at 8:33 AM, Bowman, Randal <[randal\\_bowman@ios.doi.gov](mailto:randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov)> wrote:

I just talked with the chief of staff for the A/S, stressing the unusual partnership relationship for this project and noting the disparity in response times for requests, yours and Earl's to us vs ours to you. He immediately saw the issue and is checking on it now. I'm hopeful Emily will have the OK to send rest of the material later this morning.

On Fri, Aug 25, 2017 at 5:11 AM, Michael Weiss - NOAA Federal  
<[michael.weiss@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.weiss@noaa.gov)> wrote:

Thank you Randy and Emily.

Appreciate your help and BOEM's providing us this information.

Michael

On Thu, Aug 24, 2017 at 6:34 PM, Bowman, Randal  
<[randal\\_bowman@ios.doi.gov](mailto:randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov)> wrote:

I had good reason to believe I had approval to send the document when I sent it. I subsequently discussed the matter with the Acting A/S and came away with the impression that whatever additional material was to be provided would be ready shortly, and that it was not a substantive change to the initial material; but I did not ask her for details. I will raise the issue of NOAA needing the final quickly when I next see her. There is no need to route the final or the responses to the additional questions through me, although I would appreciate receiving a copy.

On Thu, Aug 24, 2017 at 6:02 PM, Michael Weiss - NOAA Federal  
<[michael.weiss@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.weiss@noaa.gov)> wrote:

Thank you Emily.

Apologies for any confusion. It was our understanding that the material was essentially final in terms of substantive information.

Looping in Randy B. directly so we are all on the same page.

Much appreciated.

Michael

On Thu, Aug 24, 2017 at 4:58 PM, Lindow, Emily

<[emily.lindow@boem.gov](mailto:emily.lindow@boem.gov)> wrote:

Hi Bill - those were a version of the comments that had not been fully cleared through our building and were still in draft form. Our AS requested additional analysis, which has just been completed. We are waiting for her to review and provide clearance for us to send the final version of the document to NOAA.

I will forward the follow up questions you just sent to our technical staff.

Thanks,  
Emily

On Thu, Aug 24, 2017 at 4:45 PM, William Douros - NOAA Federal

<[william.douros@noaa.gov](mailto:william.douros@noaa.gov)> wrote:

Good afternoon Emily.

About a week ago Michael received and passed along DOI/BOEM's responses to questions we had posed back in June related to Executive Order 13795. Thank you for that material. As you can appreciate, BOEM's responses to our questions have generated the follow-on questions below. We have limited these to only the critical questions we need clarified so that we may complete the report directed by the President. All page numbers refer to the draft document provided to us dated August 5, 2017.

As we are scrambling with completing the section regarding opportunity costs, we appreciate in advance as rapid a turn around as you can provide. If you want to direct me to key staff people to get these resolved, happy to do that. Also we can take answers in pieces or batches, and no need to wait until all are answered.

Warm regards, Bill

\*\*\*\*\*

1. Page 2 – Regarding NCSMNM, can you provide more information about how wells drilled in Africa increase the confidence about potential oil and gas resource estimates off New England?
2. Page 2 – Regarding NCSMNM, unless BOEM can provide more specific estimates of “risked mean undiscovered technically recoverable oil and gas resources” for this monument, NOAA will calculate the percent of the North Atlantic OCS Planning Area that the monument overlays and assume this percentage of oil and gas resources are potentially within the monument. Please advise if you

have a more accurate estimate.

3. Page 2 and 3 – Regarding NCSMNM and Davidson Seamount/MBNMS, past NOAA analyses to expand MBNMS to include Davidson Seamount assumed, based in part on input from BOEM Pacific Region representatives, that historical volcanic activity at the seamount was not conducive to long term reservoir storage of hydrocarbon resources. Hence, why Davidson Seamount likely contains no recoverable oil and gas reserves, despite there being estimated reserves in adjacent yet somewhat distant basins. Does BOEM believe that is still an accurate assumption for Davidson Seamount? And if so, should NOAA extrapolate that assumption – about the impact of past volcanic activity degrading petroleum reserves – to the seamount area of NCSMNM?

4. Page 4 – Regarding CBNMS and GFNMS, under NOAA Data Request 2, has BOEM identified any specific challenges to or difficulties with establishing a leasing/development program for the Central California and Northern California planning areas, and if so, how are those challenges to be factored in to assessing confidence in developing these reserves?

5. Page 5 – Regarding CBNMS and GFNMS, the document assumes about 20% of the reserves within the Point Arena Basin and Bodega Basin lie within these two sanctuaries. However, the response regarding the economic value of those reserves does not reach any conclusion. Does BOEM believe it is accurate to assume 20% of the NEV for Central California Planning Area can be attributable to the expansion areas of GFNMS and CBNMS, assuming costs for developing necessary infrastructure are born by many, future development projects?

6. Page 8 – Regarding CBNMS and GFNMS, under NOAA Data Request 3, BOEM states that it cannot provide estimates of the net value of the offshore renewable energy potential in these sanctuaries' expansion areas, and that "project proponents are better suited to provide such estimates". BOEM then outlines some potential benefits of allowing offshore wind in these areas. It would be similarly beneficial to understand, like in BOEM's analysis for oil and gas, whether any challenges or difficulties with leasing offshore wind in these areas have also been identified (e.g., lack of efficient and cost effective technology, new infrastructure development, etc.).

---

William J. Douros, Regional Director  
NOAA Sanctuaries West Coast Region  
99 Pacific Street, Suite 100F  
Monterey, CA 93940

Note New Phone: [\(831\) 647-6452](tel:831-647-6452)

--

Emily Lindow  
Chief of Staff  
Bureau of Ocean Energy Management  
US Department of the Interior  
[202-208-6300](tel:202-208-6300) (main)  
[202-513-0825](tel:202-513-0825)

--

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

--

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

--

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