

From: Bowman, Randal
To: [Michael Weiss - NOAA Federal](#)
Subject: Re: FWS Executive Summaries
Date: Tuesday, August 01, 2017 10:46:37 AM

Perhaps that is something we should do by phone. I have nothing on my schedule at this point

On Tue, Aug 1, 2017 at 11:43 AM, Michael Weiss - NOAA Federal

<michael.weiss@noaa.gov> wrote:

Randy, I am very sorry to hear that. My sincere condolences.

Hate to even bother you given the circumstances, but appreciate your being back and continuing to work on this. I was just typing some questions for you regarding how DOI is handling reporting on the comments to your policy folks, as given where we are I think DOI needs to bring the readout on the marine monument comments to the discussions with DOC. I will send those via separate email.

Michael

On Tue, Aug 1, 2017 at 11:35 AM, Bowman, Randal <randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

Thank you. (b) (6)

I don't see needing anything further on the Schatz letter, will likely have some other questions once I have a chance to read the material on the tuna treaty and the allocation system. Will try to get you one set of marine monument comments daily. (b) (6)

On Thu, Jul 27, 2017 at 8:49 PM, Michael Weiss - NOAA Federal

<michael.weiss@noaa.gov> wrote:

Hi Randy. Hope the birthday celebration goes well

Response to your follow up questions.

Let me know if this does it or if you have additional follow up questions.

Thanks,

Michael

To arrive at the potential economic impact of the Monument expansion, the analysis assumed full loss of fishery revenues (from actual longline and dealer data annual estimates) from waters where fishing would no longer be permitted. The study clearly notes that the estimates given are at the "maximum upper-bound of potential direct economic impact" and suggests

alternative methodologies could be employed for a more robust assessment of the impacts.

It may be true that there are other places within the ocean where the fishermen can fish for their full quota and therefore the actual landings are unchanged after a closure. That does not mean that there was no economic impact. Fishermen should be presumed to have been fishing in the most economical fashion before the closure. In other words, they were fishing in the future monument because that was the most economical method for them to catch their quota. When you force them to move, you increase their costs (fuel, labor, international waters vs. domestic, quality of fish, etc.) in ways that are often hard to quantify without access to the industry's business records. So there is some level of actual economic impact to displaced effort, it is just difficult to quantify.

Therefore, to make the assumption that this study is "divorced from reality" or based on something other than "real-world basis" is not

On Wed, Jul 26, 2017 at 6:08 PM, Bowman, Randal <randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

Here is my initial follow-up question; I have not had a chance yet to read the information on the tuna treaty and allocation system, and so can't yet formulate questions on the territories.

On the Sen. Schatz question, the response said his letter did not accurately describe the situation, and referred to the attached economic report. However, the economic report expressly stated "The potential direct and indirect revenue loss estimates provided in section 3 are provided under the assumption that catch from the NWHI is completely "lost", which is likely an overly restrictive assumption."

The Senator's letter and other information I have received indicated that for tuna, the catch is completely made up in other areas, as the fishermen meet their quota before the end of the year and need to acquire quota rights from other areas to continue fishing. This, if correct, would seem to make the assumption underlying the study divorced from reality, in that there is no apparent economic harm to the tuna fishery, and thus also none to those who benefit from it. While I am sure that the economic analysis itself is valid, it appears to rest on a hypothetical rather than real-world basis. I have not heard any complaints on the swordfishing industry, and it would seem as if they were also able to make up their previous NWHI catch from elsewhere.

Are any of my presumptions in the previous sentence incorrect, and if so, in what manner?

On Tue, Jul 25, 2017 at 3:09 PM, Michael Weiss - NOAA Federal
<michael.weiss@noaa.gov> wrote:

Hi Randy. Attached are the responses to the questions re: Tuna fishery. Also attached is the Pacific Island Fishery Science Center Internal Report IR-17-06 that is referenced in the last response. Will send the NE information when I get it.

On Tue, Jul 25, 2017 at 12:25 PM, Bowman, Randal
<randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

yes, and there are some things we need to cover. As of right now, any time this afternoon after 2 or tomorrow is open.

Also, I do not need information from NMFS on catch etc in the NE C&S monument, as we received a letter from NE Council that had that. Copy was also sent to Sec. Ross, dated June 29. It wasn't sent to our comment mail stop, so just showed up. I still need the information I requested for the Pacific.

On Tue, Jul 25, 2017 at 12:16 PM, Michael Weiss - NOAA Federal
<michael.weiss@noaa.gov> wrote:

Hi Randy.

Thanks for the response.

Do you have time today or tomorrow to catch up?

Michael

On Mon, Jul 24, 2017 at 1:43 PM, Bowman, Randal
<randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

Not exactly. BLM prepared these for each of their monuments as part of the material submitted, and I expanded them to include other material we had asked for. Downey liked the results and asked that I get them for the other monuments (i.e. NPS and FWS). I included the marine so the information would be available. My request is below, with the sample summary. At the same, as I have indicated before, the Secretary has been impressed by arguments raised by fishermen in New England and the case presented on Pacific tuna fishery, on both of which I have asked you for information. Perhaps we should talk further on going forward.

On Thu, Jul 6, 2017 at 5:51 PM, Bowman, Randal <randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

BLM has provided Executive Summaries for each of their monuments under review, which Downey found very helpful. Would you please provide the same for your monuments - a sample is attached.

I have deleted from all of the BLM reports, including the sample, information which is addressed in the economic reports, to avoid duplication, so please don't include economic data in your summary.

Jeff, one for Hanford Reach, one covering the Pacific marine monuments and one for NE Canyons and Seamounts might be the easiest approach for you, but if you want to do more for the Pacific, feel free.

Could both agencies have them done within 2 weeks?

On Mon, Jul 24, 2017 at 12:43 PM, Michael Weiss - NOAA Federal

<michael.weiss@noaa.gov> wrote:

Morning Randy. Hope you had a nice weekend.

Hoping you can provide some clarity here.

On Friday, our folks received from FWS regional staff "Executive Summaries" for reviews of each of the Pacific marine national monuments. These summaries were, I believe, prepared by FWS HQ. We were asked to provide comments by 9:00am this morning.

Trying to get some clarity as to what are these Executive Summaries. Is DOI developing its own report on the marine national monuments?

Thanks,

Michael

--

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)

--

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 (w)
(b) (6) (c)