

From: Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation <CTURTLE@LISTS.UFL.EDU> on behalf of honu world <itsahonuworldinhawaii@HOTMAIL.COM>

Sent: Friday, May 6, 2016 9:35 AM

To: CTURTLE@LISTS.UFL.EDU

Subject: [CTURTLE] For the Archives of Cturtle

On May 6, 2016, about 30 minutes from now, the final USA rulemaking will go into effect retaining the Hawaiian green turtle population as a Threatened Species under the USA Endangered Species Act. The following testimony submitted on this topic is being sent for awareness of my views among colleagues and friends of the global sea turtle community, and for permanent historical preservation in the archives of Cturtle. The scientifically-sound and appropriate listing of sea turtle populations is too much of a fundamental issue for conservationists to leave to emotion and political correctness. Hence, May 6, 2016 is a day that should be of deep disappointment to all of us, as it is to me. Of course not everyone will agree, and I respect the views of those who do not. But as time moves forward you may see things differently. I speak from experience. Sincerely, George Balazs

"It was as though we had been consumed."

Quote from "Then There Were None" (2003) about the experience of being Hawaiian over the past 200 years.

Date: Fri, 25 Sep 2015 22:47:43 -0400

From: no-reply@regulations.gov

To: itsahonuworldinhawaii@hotmail.com

Subject: Your Comment Submitted on Regulations.gov (ID: NOAA-NMFS-2012-0154-0269)

Please do not reply to this message. This email is from a notification only address that cannot accept incoming email.

Your comment was submitted successfully!

Comment Tracking Number: 1jz-8lc2-s74f

Your comment may be viewable on Regulations.gov once the agency has reviewed it. This process is dependent on agency public submission policies/procedures and processing times. Use your tracking number to find out the status of your comment.

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)

Document Type: Rulemaking

Title: Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants: Identification and Proposed Listing of Eleven Distinct Population Segments of Green Sea Turtles (*Chelonia mydas*).

Document ID: NOAA-NMFS-2012-0154-0269

Comment:

I declare that I have been professionally and personally involved in the research and conservation of marine turtles in the Hawaiian Islands, and elsewhere in Oceania and globally since 1972. In my professional scientific capacity involving marine turtles I have worked in leadership roles for the University of Hawaii (1972-1982), and the National Marine Fisheries Service based in Hawaii (1982-present). In my personal but professionally-focused capacity I have been a member of the IUCN SSC Marine Turtle Specialist Group since 1976. I am presently the Co-Chair of the Oceania Region of the IUCN Marine Turtle Specialist Group, again in the professional capacity of my personal life. For the record, I declare that the professional views expressed in this testimony are mine alone, in my personal capacity as a 50-year resident of the Hawaiian Islands. In this capacity, I express disagreement with the proposed rulemaking for the listing status of DPS10 (Central North Pacific that includes exclusively the Hawaiian Islands and range of the genetically discrete green turtle population). My disagreement is based on the fact that the proposed listing is scientifically discordant, contradictory, incongruent, and simply at odds with the biological and population assessment findings and information presented in the NMFS NOAA document by Seminoff et al. (2015) "Status Review of the Green Turtle under the Endangered Species Act." I further declare that I am a co-author of this report, however I had no involvement in the listings being proposed. The principal reason given relating to the proposed rule making for DPS 10 is climate-change induced sea level rise, hence eventual submergence of nesting beaches at French Frigate Shoals. This opinion runs oppositional to the fact that green turtles are highly resilient and adaptable resulting in short and long term successful nesting beach and other changes for millennia. The rationale simply "does not hold water" in that no science-based information of support was presented in the rule-making proposal.

The proposed rulemaking for DPS 1 (North Atlantic), DPS 7 (Central West Pacific), and DPS 9 (Central South Pacific) are also viewed in my professional view as discordant with the findings presented in Seminoff et al. 2015.

