

From: Cindy Osorto
To: [Bowman, Randal](#)
Cc: [Timothy Fisher](#); [Butts, Sally](#)
Subject: Re: Request for Summary of Public Comments Review
Date: Friday, September 15, 2017 8:44:52 AM

Thanks so much Randy! Please don't feel bad. We have everything we need. Hope you have a nice weekend!

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 14, 2017, at 8:47 PM, Bowman, Randal <randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

Glad you understand - I felt bad with that answer due to all the help BLM has provided, but I'm not a free agent on this.

The total number of comments received, including attachments on [regs.gov](https://www.regulations.gov) comments and those mailed to DOI, is 2,836,268 as of today. Of those, about 25% were individual comments submitted and 75% were in the attachments on the [regs.gov](https://www.regulations.gov) comments. There is still a double-checking of the attachment comments count going on, so the number could go up or down slightly over the next week or so. The count is on the [regs.gov](https://www.regulations.gov) site.

On Thu, Sep 14, 2017 at 5:42 PM, Osorto, Cindy <cosorto@blm.gov> wrote:
Thanks! I completely understand and I don't want to ask for anything that is unreasonable. I'll include everything that is publicly available, such as the press release and the official summary report by Mr. Zinke. Is it possible for us to also include any numbers? Perhaps just the total of comments that we received? If not, that's okay and I'll work with what is already available.

On Thu, Sep 14, 2017 at 3:45 PM, Bowman, Randal
<randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

I hate to be difficult, particularly in light of all the help BLM provided on the review overall and on the public comment aspect. but the Secretary's office has not yet authorized release of any specific information. I suggest the following, from the press release and the report summary the Department released on August 24, when a draft of the Secretary's report was delivered to the White House:

The extensive 120-day review included more than 60 meetings with hundreds of advocates and opponents of monument designations, tours of monuments conducted over air, foot, car, and horseback (including a virtual tour of a marine monument), and a thorough review of more than 2.4 million public comments submitted to the Department on [regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov). Additionally, countless more meetings and conversations between senior Interior officials and local, state, Tribal, and non-government stakeholders including multiple Tribal listening sessions.

The review was initiated by President Trump in order to restore trust in the multiple-use mission of the Department and to give rural communities a voice in federal land management decisions. In order to make the process transparent and give local residents and stakeholders a voice, the Secretary [announced](#) on May 5, 2017 the opening up of a formal comment period for the review, as the President directed. This was the first time ever that a formal comment period was open on [regulations.gov](#) for national monuments designated under the Antiquities Act.

Public comments can be divided into two principal groups. Proponents tended to promote monument designation as a mechanism to prevent the sale or transfer of public land. This narrative is false and has no basis in fact. Public lands within a monument are federally owned and managed regardless of monument designation under the Act. Proponents also point to the economic benefits from increased tourism from monument recognition. On this point, monument status has a potential economic benefit of increased visitation, particularly to service related industries, outdoor recreation industries, and other businesses dependent or supported by tourism. Increased visitation also places an additional burden and responsibility on the Federal Government to provide additional resources and manpower to maintain these lands to better support increased visitation and recreational activities.

Comments received were overwhelmingly in favor of maintaining existing monuments and demonstrated a well orchestrated national campaign organized by multiple organizations. Opponents of monuments primarily supported rescinding or modifying the existing monuments to protect traditional multiple use, and those most concerned were often local residents associated with industries such as grazing, timber production, mining, hunting and fishing, and motorized recreation. Opponents point to other cases where monument designation has resulted in reduced public access, road closures, hunting and fishing restrictions, multiple and confusing management plans, reduced grazing allotments and timber production, and pressure applied to private land owners encompassed by or adjacent to a monument to sell.

On Thu, Sep 14, 2017 at 2:56 PM, Osorto, Cindy <cosorto@blm.gov> wrote:
Hi Randy,

Thanks again for leading the effort to review public comments!

John Ruhs and Mike Nedd has asked our division to put together a summary of the National Monument Review. On that end, I was wondering if you could please provide us materials that would be helpful in summarizing the public comment review process and results? Some examples could include: briefing papers, the statistics of total public comments in support or against the review, notable public comments, or anything else that you think would be useful for our BLM leadership to be aware about.

Best,
Cindy

--

Cindy G. Osorto
Planning & Environmental Specialist
National Conservation Lands (WO-410)
Bureau of Land Management
20 M St. SE Washington, DC 20003
Office: (202) 912-7476; Cell: (202)591-6632
Email: cosorto@blm.gov

--

Cindy G. Osorto
Planning & Environmental Specialist
National Conservation Lands (WO-410)
Bureau of Land Management
20 M St. SE Washington, DC 20003
Office: (202) 912-7476; Cell: (202)591-6632
Email: cosorto@blm.gov