WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Valerie Stewart <vstewart.edmonds@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 16, 2014 at 10:54 PM
Reply-To: vstewart.edmonds@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

Valerie Stewart
Edmonds Planning Board

Valerie Stewart
923 Cedar Street
Edmonds, WA 98020

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Joelle Robinson <joellesoliel@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 1:05 PM
Reply-To: joellesoliel@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Joelle Robinson
8707 13th Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98117

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

EMILY MEYER <emeyer1935@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:03 PM
Reply-To: emeyer1935@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

EMILY MEYER
8608 nw Old ORchard Drive
Vancouver, WA 98665

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Allison Ciancibelli <newbelli@centurytel.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 6:22 PM
Reply-To: newbelli@centurytel.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Allison Ciancibelli
240 Twisp River Rd
98856, WA 98856

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Amy Mower <almower@earthlink.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 5:55 PM
Reply-To: almower@earthlink.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Amy Mower
PO Box 2004
Maple Falls, WA 98266

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

antonia potter <antoniapotter@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 5:21 PM
Reply-To: antoniapotter@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

antonia potter
19548 47th ave ne
lake forest park, WA 98155

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Arthur Kaufman <arthurlkaufman@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 5:32 PM
Reply-To: arthurlkaufman@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Arthur Kaufman
6555 NE Windermere Rd.
Seattle, WA 98105

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Barb Scavezze <barb@scavezze.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:54 PM
Reply-To: barb@scavezze.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Barb Scavezze
Amhurst
Olympia, WA 98501

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Caitlin Guthrie <caitlinroseguthrie@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:33 PM
Reply-To: caitlinroseguthrie@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Caitlin Guthrie
1717 5th Ave SE
Olympia, WA 98501

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Carlo Voli <carlovoli@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:30 PM
Reply-To: carlovoli@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Carlo Voli
9605 239th St
Edmonds, WA 98020

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Chris Stay <cstay@aol.com>
Reply-To: cstay@aol.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 4:11 PM

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Chris Stay
540 Seamont Lane
Edmonds, WA 98020

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Christopher Lawrence <ramgold101010@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:58 PM
Reply-To: ramgold101010@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Christopher Lawrence
19 East 32nd Avenue
Spokane, WA 99203

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Chuck Rohrer <cerohrer@hotmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 4:49 AM
Reply-To: cerohrer@hotmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Chuck Rohrer
520 10th Avenue E Apt. 6
Seattle, WA 98102

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Constance Rodman <elycia@msn.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:21 PM
Reply-To: elycia@msn.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Constance Rodman
1920 1st Ave. #507
#507
Seattle, WA 98101

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Dan Streiffert <dan_streiffert@hotmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 4:07 PM
Reply-To: dan_streiffert@hotmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Dan Streiffert
10102 SE 270th PL
Kent, WA 98030

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Darby Ringer <rdr.green@earthlink.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 5:25 PM
Reply-To: rdr.green@earthlink.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Darby Ringer
8220 40th Ave. NE
Seattle, WA 98115

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

David Cosman <cosmand@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:27 PM
Reply-To: cosmand@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

David Cosman
239 Shannon Drive SE
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

David Edwards <mjdocdle@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 6:28 PM
Reply-To: mjdocdle@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

David Edwards
1607 East Bay Drive
Olympia, WA 98506

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Deborah Feldman <dfeld@seanet.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:52 PM
Reply-To: dfeld@seanet.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how the Aquatic HCP relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. The record of coal companies protecting the environment and obeying environmental laws is not confidence-building.

2. What about climate change? How do concerns about climate change get incorporated into planning?

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you.

Deborah Feldman
5324 NE 86th St.
Seattle, WA 98115

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Del E. Domke <delyicious@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 6:36 PM
Reply-To: delyicious@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Del E. Domke
16142 N.E. 15th. Street
Bellevue, WA 98008

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Ed Laclergue <edlaclergue@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 7:19 PM
Reply-To: edlaclergue@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Ed Laclergue
3604 Holiday Dr.
Olympia,Wa., WA 98501

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Elaine Phelps <efphelps@earthlink.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:51 PM
Reply-To: efphelps@earthlink.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management of our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Elaine Phelps
17238 10th Ave NW
Shoreline, WA 98177

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Enid Havens <enidwalt@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 6:20 PM
Reply-To: enidwalt@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Enid Havens
9858 26 Ave SW,Seattle
Seattle, WA 98106

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Eric Bard <geologyonline@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 4:37 PM
Reply-To: geologyonline@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Eric Bard
338 Twisp River Road
Twisp, WA 98856

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Eric Hirst <erichirst@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:24 PM
Reply-To: erichirst@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Eric Hirst
1932 Rhododendron Way
Bellingham
Bellingham, WA 98229

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Eric Madis <emadis@juno.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 4:19 PM
Reply-To: emadis@juno.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Eric Madis
11756 12th Avenue NE
Seattle, WA 98125

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Evelyn Mcchesney <evelynmcchesney@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:29 PM
Reply-To: evelynmcchesney@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Evelyn Mcchesney
2901 NE Blakeley St. # 208
Seattle, WA 98105

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Felicity Devlin <felicitydevlin@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 4:52 PM
Reply-To: felicitydevlin@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Felicity Devlin
2417 N. Washington St
Tacoma, WA 98406

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Francis Wood, MD <fbwood@uw.edu> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 5:46 PM
Reply-To: fbwood@uw.edu
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Francis Wood, MD
412 36th Street
Seattle, WA 98122

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Your plan is too weak! Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Gayle Janzen <cgjanzen@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 5:56 PM
Reply-To: cgjanzen@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management of our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Gayle Janzen
11232 Dayton Ave N
Seattle, WA 98133

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Glenn Phillips <glennmphillips@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 7:36 PM
Reply-To: glennmphillips@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Glenn Phillips
1711 23rd AveS Apt217
Seattle, WA 98144

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Gordon Hait <joeythegrey@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:27 PM
Reply-To: joeythegrey@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Gordon Hait
2216 Lakewood Dr.
503 Mission Dr.
Olympia, WA 98501

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Ilene Silver <ilenes@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 4:27 PM
Reply-To: ilenes@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. Unfortunately the plan is woefully inadequate and ignores essential elements such as the overwhelmingly negative impact of coal terminals.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need significantly more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

The importance of this plan on the future of our state, our environment, our way of life cannot be overstated. This is your and our opportunity to get it right, or forever rue that we permitted the gutting of what we Washington residents value to our core.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Ilene Silver
2810 Simmons RD NW
Olympia, WA 98502

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Ingrid Erickson <kashmirdream@aol.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 7:23 PM
Reply-To: kashmirdream@aol.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Ingrid Erickson
1104 E. Maryland St. #1
Bellingham
Bellingham, WA 98226

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

James Keeley <jkeeley36@earthlink.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:54 PM
Reply-To: jkeeley36@earthlink.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

James Keeley
7300 ne vancouver mall drive apt 68
apt. h68
Vancouver, WA 98662

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Janna Rolland <jannarolland@hotmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:49 PM
Reply-To: jannarolland@hotmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Janna Rolland
6227 34th Avenue NE
Seattle, WA 98115

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Jonny Layefsky <rockyjon@earthlink.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:25 PM
Reply-To: rockyjon@earthlink.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Jonny Layefsky
6013 Beach Dr SW
Seattle, WA 98136

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Joseph Reid <joe.reid@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 4:43 PM
Reply-To: joe.reid@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Joseph Reid
98 Sage Canyon Drive
Winthrop, WA 98862

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Judith Hance <judithhance2@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:19 PM
Reply-To: judithhance2@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Judith Hance
7300 47th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Justin Roberts <justinclined@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 4:26 PM
Reply-To: justinclined@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Justin Roberts
104 2 24th ave s
seattle, WA 98144

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Katherine Nelson <nicoeli3@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 7:10 PM
Reply-To: nicoeli3@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Katherine Nelson
9445 S 232nd st
Kent, WA 98031

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Kerry Kovarik <kerrykovarik@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:36 PM
Reply-To: kerrykovarik@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Kerry Kovarik
341 N 102nd Street
Seattle, WA 98133

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Larry Daloz <larry.daloz@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 4:42 PM
Reply-To: larry.daloz@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Larry Daloz
6299 Hinman Dr.
Clinton, WA 98236

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Laura Geiger <phantomscrapper_2000@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:25 PM
Reply-To: phantomscrapper_2000@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Laura Geiger
22041 Se 261st PL
Maple Valley, WA 98038

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Lily Rand <Lilyjane413@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 8:13 PM
Reply-To: Lilyjane413@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Lily Rand
4800 harbor view drive NE
Tacoma, WA 98422

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Liz Campbell <zil@uw.edu> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 8:03 PM
Reply-To: zil@uw.edu
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Liz Campbell
605 n 64th street
seattle, WA 98103

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Lorraine Hartmann <lorrainehartmann@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:41 PM
Reply-To: lorrainehartmann@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Lorraine Hartmann
10627 Durland Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98125

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Mary Eisenfeld <petermark3@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:24 PM
Reply-To: petermark3@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Mary Eisenfeld
902 Latourell Way
Home
Vancouver, WA 98661

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

matt myer <mattgmyer@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:26 PM
Reply-To: mattgmyer@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

matt myer
418 18th AVE SE
Olympia, WA 98501

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Mike Conlan <mickconlan@hotmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 6:15 PM
Reply-To: mickconlan@hotmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Mike Conlan
6421 139th Place NE, #52
Redmond, WA 98052

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Nancy Lovejoy <nl.99336@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:50 PM
Reply-To: nl.99336@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil and coal spills;
b. Managing storm-water controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Nancy Lovejoy
12 S. Lincoln Street
Kennewick, WA 99336

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Norman Baker <ntbakerphd@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 5:28 PM
Reply-To: ntbakerphd@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Norman Baker
3789 Lost Mountain Road
Sequim, WA 98382

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Owen tkins <owenatkins@harbornet.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:20 PM
Reply-To: owenatkins@harbornet.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Owen tkins
1001 N Yakima #507
Tacoma, WA 98403

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Patricia Glaser <Patsyglaser@hotmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:51 PM
Reply-To: Patsyglaser@hotmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Patricia Glaser
521 Alameda Are
Fircrest, WA 98466

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Peter Smith <petertumpy@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:17 PM
Reply-To: petertumpy@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Peter Smith
14021 232 ave SE
14021 232 ave SE
Issaquah, WA 98027

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Richard Bergner <fidalgowildlifehabitat@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 5:38 PM
Reply-To: fidalgowildlifehabitat@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

I am the founder and continuing member of Fidalgo Backyard Wildlife Habitat, a volunteer group that worked for 3 years to earn for Fidalgo Island/Anacortes the designation from the National Wildlife Federation and the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife as a Community Wildlife Habitat. We had a community celebration commemorating this achievement on August, 2008. Over 600 residents' yards, some parks, church grounds, businesses were part of that number of certified yards. I want to make sure that our lands and waters continue to be wildlife friendly.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Richard Bergner
15515 Yokeko
Anacortes, WA 98221

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Ricky Taylor <taylorrl@outlook.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 7:10 PM
Reply-To: taylorrl@outlook.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Ricky Taylor
4221 114th ST SE
Everett, WA 98208

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Ron DiGiacomo <mrdigiacomo@q.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 5:56 PM
Reply-To: mrdigiacomo@q.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Ron DiGiacomo
2307 22nd Ave E
Seattle, WA 98112

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Sally Neary <sallyneary@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 4:43 PM
Reply-To: sallyneary@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Sally Neary
22608 115th Pl SE
Kent, WA 98031

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Sara King <sara.king@pobox.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 4:29 PM
Reply-To: sara.king@pobox.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Sara King
6647 Montevista Dr SE
Auburn, WA 98092

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Sharon Wilson <thuja8@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 4:30 PM
Reply-To: thuja8@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change or ocean acidification. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change or ocean acidification. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change and ocean acidification on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Sharon Wilson
3240 NE 96th St
Seattle, WA 98115

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Stephanie Davis <stephaniedbham@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 5:00 PM
Reply-To: stephaniedbham@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Stephanie Davis
2398 E Hemmi Rd
Bellingham, WA 98226

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Steve Leombruno <Snobruno@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 6:26 PM
Reply-To: Snobruno@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Steve Leombruno
322 Glen Ave.
Snohomish, WA 98290

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Susan Davidson <susandavidson@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 6:54 PM
Reply-To: susandavidson@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Susan Davidson
7712 39th Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98136

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Susan McRae <smcrae66@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 7:18 PM
Reply-To: smcrae66@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing storm water controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Recently, the Pentagon has issued several reports which concur that the greatest threat to U.S. national security is posed by climate change and potential environmental disasters. We need to take this seriously and work hard to ensure that there is a sustainable world for the future.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Susan McRae
1231 Miller Ave NE
Olympia, WA 98506

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Please act for stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Ted Grudowski <tgrudowski@hotmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:33 PM
Reply-To: tgrudowski@hotmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. Like many in our community, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Transparency and public input is of critical importance. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems. We can and should do better.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. Do the right thing, and Washington residents will support you.

Ted Grudowski
7312 9th Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98117

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Thomas Hammond <tphammond@hotmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:17 PM
Reply-To: tphammond@hotmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Thomas Hammond
2010 NE 96th Street
Seattle, WA 98115

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Tiffany McGuyer <tiffanymcguyer@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:22 PM
Reply-To: tiffanymcguyer@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Tiffany McGuyer
2156 Boyer Ave E
Seattle, WA 98112

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Toby Bright <toby@tobybright.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:19 PM
Reply-To: toby@tobybright.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Toby Bright
1000 1st Ave #2200
Seattle, WA 98104

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Tony Buch <Maritoni_buch@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 5:47 PM
Reply-To: Maritoni_buch@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Tony Buch
6221 35 ave
Seattle, WA 98115

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Adele Reynolds <adelereynolds@netscape.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 3:33 PM
Reply-To: adelereynolds@netscape.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

Adele Reynolds
900 University St., Apt CU
Seattle, WA 98101

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Adina Parsley <dickandpat3@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 3:45 PM
Reply-To: dickandpat3@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Adina Parsley
20420 Marine Dr, Apt P2
Ferndale
Stanwood, WA 98292

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Alec and Sandy McDougall <alecsandym@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 9:18 PM
Reply-To: alecsandym@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington residents, we are extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While we support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, we believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Alec and Sandy McDougall
16387 Calhoun Road
Mount Vernon, WA 98273

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Alice Perry Linker <twolinkers@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 8:25 PM
Reply-To: twolinkers@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Alice Perry Linker
8821 NE 111th Ave.
Vancouver, WA 98662

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Amanda Rudisill <Stapleton23@q.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 12:28 PM
Reply-To: Stapleton23@q.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

Amanda Rudisill
P.O. Box 13196
7830 84th Lane SW
Olympia, WA 98508

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Amelia Apfel <amelia.apfel@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:05 AM
Reply-To: amelia.apfel@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

Amelia Apfel
520 N 45th St
Seattle, WA 98103

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Andreas Enderlein <aenderlein@earthlink.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:32 PM
Reply-To: aenderlein@earthlink.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Andreas Enderlein
7328 17th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Anna Melby <anna.melby@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 2:51 PM
Reply-To: anna.melby@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

Anna Melby
119 NW 51st Street
Seattle, WA 98107

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Annapoorne Colangelo <anapurna@whidbey.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 9:51 AM
Reply-To: anapurna@whidbey.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Annapoorne Colangelo
7651 Scatchet Head Road
Clinton, WA 98236

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Anne Winkes <annewinkes@gmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 6:16 AM
Reply-To: annewinkes@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Anne Winkes
18562 Main St
PO Box 586
Conway, WA 98238

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Barbara Rosenkotter <skye@ucdavis-alumni.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:14 PM
Reply-To: skye@ucdavis-alumni.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Barbara Rosenkotter
201 Crest Drive
Box 136
Deer Harbor, WA 98243

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Barbara Wood <barbara@dobsis.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:46 AM
Reply-To: barbara@dobsis.org
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Barbara Wood
12507 Greenwood Ave., North
A402
Seattle, WA 98133

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Bay Renaud <bay@plantasnativa.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 7:16 AM
Reply-To: bay@plantasnativa.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

We expect better and thank you for listening to my concerns. We need to move forward and immediately move to concerve every scrap of biodiversity and undamaged habitat that is left. This mandate makes the most ecologic and economic sense in all long=term models.

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

Bay Renaud
PO 5271
Bellingham, WA 98227

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Bobbi Hickox <bobbih2@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 12:09 PM
Reply-To: bobbih2@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

Bobbi Hickox
7941 Mullen Rd. SE
Olympia, WA 98503

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Bonita MacPhail <macphailpianostudio@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:09 PM
Reply-To: macphailpianostudio@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

Bonita MacPhail
370 N East Camano Dr 5-79
Camano Island, WA 98282

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Bonnie Duncan <bduncan@srgpartnership.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:04 AM
Reply-To: bduncan@srgpartnership.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Duncan
110 Union Street
Suite 300
Seattle, WA 98101

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Brandie Deal <laughsalot0579@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
Reply-To: laughsalot0579@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Brandie Deal
301 225th St SW
Bothell, WA 98021

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

2 messages

Brian Larson <rocnoggin@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:04 PM
Reply-To: rocnoggin@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

Brian Larson
6553 25th ave nw
Seattle, WA 98117

Brian Larson <rocnoggin@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:04 PM
Reply-To: rocnoggin@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Brita Mjos <britarm@hotmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:28 PM
Reply-To: britarm@hotmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

Brita Mjos
910 N orth Garden
Apt 201
Bellingham, WA 98225

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Bruce Dobson <hosho@whidbey.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:52 AM
Reply-To: hosho@whidbey.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

Bruce Dobson
5026 Deer Trail Ln
Langley, WA 98260

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Bryan Hook <Hookbj@plu.edu> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 7:04 PM
Reply-To: Hookbj@plu.edu
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources an to its communities. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Best,

Bryan Hook

Bryan Hook
502 73rd ave ne
olympia, WA 98506

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Cal Roberts <crobe86209@aol.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 8:55 PM
Reply-To: crobe86209@aol.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Cal Roberts
9305 NE 25th Ct
Vancouver, WA 98665

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Carol Hiltner <carol.hiltner@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 7:51 PM
Reply-To: carol.hiltner@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Carol Hiltner
700 NW 185th St Apt 404
Shoreline, WA 98177

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Carol Panfilio <Madyapan@yahoo.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 9:00 AM
Reply-To: Madyapan@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

Carol Panfilio
P O Box 2552
Vancouver, WA 98668

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Carolyn Marshall <scrapadoo11@hotmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 8:22 PM
Reply-To: scrapadoo11@hotmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Carolyn Marshall
7850 80th Pl. SE
Mercer Island, WA 98040

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Carolyn Rodenberg <carolynrodenberg@mindspring.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 7:53 AM
Reply-To: carolynrodenberg@mindspring.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management of our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Carolyn Rodenberg
2121 8th Ave. West
Seattle, WA 98119

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Cathy Barich <cbarich@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:05 PM
Reply-To: cbarich@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Cathy Barich
3506 - 108th Pl. N.E., #1
BELLEVUE, WA 98004

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Charles Bell <bellchas@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:00 AM
Reply-To: bellchas@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

Charles Bell
5242 37th Avenue SW
Seattle, WA 98126

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

chris kennedy <chriskida@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 9:18 PM
Reply-To: chriskida@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

chris kennedy
9818 Dempsey Lane SW
Olympia, WA 98512

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Christopher Key <ckey2048@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:16 PM
Reply-To: ckey2048@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Christopher Key
1571 H Street #201
Bellingham, WA 98225

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Christopher Kralik <misterkite@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:36 PM
Reply-To: misterkite@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Christopher Kralik
631 NW 18th loop
Camas, WA 98607

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

CL Burger <calybur@mac.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 3:15 PM
Reply-To: calybur@mac.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

CL Burger
3013 SW CYCLE CT
Seattle, WA 98126

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Claire Morency <Morencyclr@aol.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:12 PM
Reply-To: Morencyclr@aol.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Claire Morency
4918 NE 144th Ct
Vancouver, WA 98682

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Clayton Jones <seajay12@clearwire.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 7:58 PM
Reply-To: seajay12@clearwire.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Clayton Jones
14509 3rd Ave NE
#304
Shoreline, WA 98155

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

connie gagnon <connielg2@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
Reply-To: connielg2@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

connie gagnon
15612 72nd dr se
snohomish, WA 98296

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Daniel and Karen Erlander <erlander@whidbey.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 8:42 PM
Reply-To: erlander@whidbey.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Daniel and Karen Erlander
PO Box 1059
`
Freeland, WA 98249

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

David Chaney <davechaney@earthlink.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 7:55 AM
Reply-To: davechaney@earthlink.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

David Chaney
1220 Farwell Avenue NW
Olympia, WA 98502

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

David Cunningham <sailordavid07@gmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 9:04 AM
Reply-To: sailordavid07@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

David Cunningham
2942 McLeod Rd.
Bellingham, WA 98225

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

David Edwards <mjdocdle@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:14 PM
Reply-To: mjdocdle@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

David Edwards
1607 East Bay Drive
Olympia, WA 98506

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

David Iversen <Haifadw@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 7:54 PM
Reply-To: Haifadw@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

David Iversen
20912 Frank Waters Td
Stanwood, WA 98292

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

David Mayer <corey@olympiafood.coop> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 9:56 AM
Reply-To: corey@olympiafood.coop
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

David Mayer
314 Milroy Street NW
Olympia, WA 98502

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

David Sielaff <mandolinista@live.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 9:01 PM
Reply-To: mandolinista@live.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

David Sielaff
3827 Bagley Ave. N
Seattle, WA 98103

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

David Walseth <walseth@msn.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 8:34 PM
Reply-To: walseth@msn.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

David Walseth
1919 NE 123rd Avenue
Vancouver, WA 98684

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Debby Mumm Felnagle <tomdebbyfelnagle@harbornet.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 9:12 AM
Reply-To: tomdebbyfelnagle@harbornet.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Debby Mumm Felnagle
1618 wilton rd s
Tacoma, WA 98465

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Deborah Capwell <deborahflora@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:27 PM
Reply-To: deborahflora@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Deborah Capwell
7020 18 ave SW
Seattle, WA 98106

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Deirdre Arntz <wdarntz@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 4:45 AM
Reply-To: wdarntz@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Deirdre Arntz
4400 Stone Way N
Apt.517
Seattle, WA 98103

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Denis Martynowych <denismarty@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 11:04 PM
Reply-To: denismarty@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Denis Martynowych
7020 18th Ave SW
F12
Seattle, WA 98106

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Dennis McAfee <dennisleslie!@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 12:58 PM
Reply-To: dennisleslie!@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

Dennis McAfee
5720 38th Ave. N.E.
Seattle, WA 98105

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Derek Hoshiko <derekhoshiko@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:50 AM
Reply-To: derekhoshiko@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Derek Hoshiko
3464 Quade Road
Clinton, WA 98236

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Diane Dick <dldick@cni.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:17 PM
Reply-To: dldick@cni.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Diane Dick
13 St. Helens Lane
Longview, WA 98632

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Diane Norman <dianenorm0722@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 7:51 PM
Reply-To: dianenorm0722@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

A personal note.

We moved here from Boulder CO about 10 years ago, lived just south of the NOAA NIST facilities there and respect the work of the agency. We need your help in WA and along this precious coastal area to safeguard the quality of the waters here.

Diane Norman

805 highland dr
bellingham, WA 98225

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Diane Shaughnessy <dshau1@aol.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:18 AM
Reply-To: dshau1@aol.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

The Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan is an important and consequential document for the protection of our public aquatic lands and for the recovery of Puget Sound. I urge you to move forward on establishing this conservation plan with the following changes:

· Big projects like the proposed Cherry Point and Longview Coal Terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. These projects need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· Existing leases that will be up for review within the time period of the Aquatic HCP that have significant consequences on the health and quality of the area such as refineries need more scrutiny and stricter rules beyond what is stated in the HCP. The reevaluation of these leases need to be pulled out from the HCP and reviewed in a more rigorous and tailored approach.
· The Aquatic HCP needs to incorporate and address all the life stages and the food web role of the listed species and identify appropriate BMPs to ensure that use of our aquatic lands are not negatively impacting them.
·The habitat conservation plan needs to be strengthened. We need better protections for:
o Preventing and responding to oil spills;
o Managing stormwater controls; and
o Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

·There is inadequate analysis and discussion of the manifestations and implications of climate change on our aquatic resources and how climate change will be addressed through the best management practices.

· The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences to the water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of the waterbody. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marines and a potential oil spill from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

· Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences and those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

· The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

Sincerely,

Diane Shaughnessy
7308 n Skyview PL A208
same
Tacoma, WA 98406

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Diane Smith <zetaclaw@q.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 8:36 PM
Reply-To: zetaclaw@q.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Diane Smith
1234 Chuckanut
Bellingham, WA 98229

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Don Shank <Donwshank@gmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 7:41 AM
Reply-To: Donwshank@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Don Shank
3214 Blanchard Rd
Bow, WA 98232

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Donna Snow <dsnow3@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 4:34 PM
Reply-To: dsnow3@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. As a proud Washington resident, I am extremely concerned about how this plan relates to responsible management our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and culture, and the overall health of Washington's natural resources. While I support moving forward on establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed.

Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways.

1. Big projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in the best management practices. Examples include discharge from vessels coming in and out of marinas, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

4. Harm to aquatic lands have economic and cultural consequences. Those impacts need to be considered and addressed, particularly for commercial and subsistence fishing.

5. The cumulative impacts of projects associated with an aquatic lease need to be better assessed and addressed.

6. The plan should include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills;
b. Managing stormwater controls; and
c. Ensuring that there are no management gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Donna Snow
1250 Devon Loop NE
Olympia, WA 98506