**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Doris (Jody) Wilson** <jodyhere24doris@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 12:44 AM
Reply-To: jodyhere24doris@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.

Doris (Jody) Wilson
12711 NE 129th Court, G-104
Kirkland, WA 98034

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Doris and Dr Burton Johnson** <dellenj@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:36 PM
Reply-To: dellenj@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.

Doris and Dr Burton Johnson
11405 Interlaaken Dr SW
Lakewood, WA 98498

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Dorothy Jordan** <dorriewolf@earthlink.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:12 AM
Reply-To: dorriewolf@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.

Dorothy Jordan
1407 Abbott Rd
Lynden, WA 98264

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Earl White** <wildtrv@wolfenet.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 8:49 PM
Reply-To: wildtrv@wolfenet.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.

Earl White
25903 27PL S Q 103
Lake Stevens, WA 98258

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Ed Chadd** <edchadd@olypen.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:56 PM
Reply-To: edchadd@olypen.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, if the true costs of marine development are to be accounted form.

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 Chadd
307 W. 6 St.
Port Angeles, WA 98362

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Edwin Brown** <ehbrown@geol.wwu.edu> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:08 PM
Reply-To: ehbrown@geol.wwu.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.

Edwin Brown
1003 CHUCKANUT DR
BELLINGHAM, WA 98229

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Eleanor Dowson** <eleanordowson@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:33 PM
Reply-To: eleanordowson@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.

Eleanor Dowson
2007 Millpointe Drive SE
Mill Creek, WA 98012

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Elena Rumiantseva** <coficat24@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:32 PM
Reply-To: coficat24@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.

Elena Rumiantseva
310 N 46th St
Apt 103
Seattle, WA 98103

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Elizabeth Hauser** <elizha@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 4:48 PM
Reply-To: elizha@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.

THIS COULD HAVE A HUGE EFFECT ON OUR FUTURE!

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Hauser
210 17th Ave SE
Olympia, WA 98501

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Elizabeth Schermer** <schermer@clearwire.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 9:54 PM
Reply-To: schermer@clearwire.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,

Elizabeth Schermer
1807 Mill Ave
Bellingham, WA 98225

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Eric Holtz** <eholtz716@hotmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:12 AM
Reply-To: eholtz716@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.

Eric Holtz
716 2ND ST
Kirkland, WA 98033

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Evan Escamilla** <Evan.escamilla@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:29 AM
Reply-To: Evan.escamilla@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,

Evan Escamilla
2960 Eastlake Ave E
213
Seattle, WA 98102

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**FORREST RODE** <onlyonesf@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 10:01 PM
Reply-To: onlyonesf@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.

FORREST RODE
1616 SUMMIT AVE 502
SEATTLE, WA 98122

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Frank and Janet Loudin** <loudin@rockisland.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:44 PM
Reply-To: loudin@rockisland.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, 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.
We await your reply.

Frank and Janet Loudin
P. O. Box 1017
Eastsound, WA 98245

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Galen Davis** <neorenfield@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:32 PM
Reply-To: neorenfield@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.

Galen Davis
9114 8th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Gary Murrow** <g.murrow@earthlink.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 4:26 PM
Reply-To: g.murrow@earthlink.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

I understand 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:

I am further concerned that:
· 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,

Gary Murrow
5524 Johnson Point RD NE
olympia, WA 98516

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Gary Pierson** <gpiers@mac.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 11:55 PM
Reply-To: gpiers@mac.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.

Gary Pierson
126 I ST.SE
auburn, WA 98002

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Gretchen Allison** <gretchen@rockisland.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 12:32 PM
Reply-To: gretchen@rockisland.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,

Gretchen Allison
426 Mountain Shadows Lane
Friday Harbor, WA 98250

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Gudrun Murti** <gudmurti@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 8:47 PM
Reply-To: gudmurti@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.

Gudrun Murti
1250 NW 120th Street
Seattle, WA 98177

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Haifa Iversen** <Haifadw@yahoo.vom> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 7:52 PM
Reply-To: Haifadw@yahoo.vom
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.

Haifa Iversen
20912 Frank Waters Rd
Stanwood, WA 98292

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Helen Cavallaro** <tinker.cavallaro@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 8:17 PM
Reply-To: tinker.cavallaro@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,

Helen Cavallaro
3302 Haines St
Port Townsend, WA 98368

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**L Sherwood** <bravols1@aol.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:29 AM
Reply-To: bravols1@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.

L Sherwood
1256 pine
Bham, WA 98229

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Irmgard Conley** <irmorcas@rockisland.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:05 PM
Reply-To: irmorcas@rockisland.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

At 86, I had hoped that we had come much further in protecting the only world we have!

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.

Irmgard Conley
36 Olga Park Lane
PO Box 88
Olga (Orcas Island), WA 98279

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Jack Burke** <jburke102@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:54 PM
Reply-To: jburke102@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.

Jack Burke
15944 259th Ave SE
Issaquah, WA 98027

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Jack Stansfield** <jacks8981@frontier.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 7:37 PM
Reply-To: jacks8981@frontier.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 lifelong 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.

Jack Stansfield
16314 62nd Ave. NW
Stanwood, WA 98292

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Jake Jaramillo** <jakejaramillo@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:07 PM
Reply-To: jakejaramillo@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.

Jake Jaramillo
4518 51st PL SW
Seattle, WA 98116

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**James Carter** <otis4x4@frontier.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:06 PM
Reply-To: otis4x4@frontier.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.

James Carter
4223 Lupine Drive
Mount Vernon, WA 98273

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**James French** <forrestfrench@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:10 PM
Reply-To: forrestfrench@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.

James French
Apt. #301
9233 Interlake Avenue North
Seattle, WA 98103

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**James Mulcare** <xsecretsx@cableone.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:39 PM
Reply-To: xsecretsx@cableone.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 Mulcare
1110 Benjamin St
Clarkston, WA 99403

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**James Roberts** <jimrobj@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
Reply-To: jimrobj@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.

James Roberts
215 S Ellis
Palouse, WA 99161

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**jane steadman** <janesteadman@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 3:30 PM
Reply-To: janesteadman@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,

jane steadman
5612 7th ave nw
seattle, WA 98107

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Janette Warren** <janette.warren@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:37 AM
Reply-To: janette.warren@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.

IN SHORT: OIL SPILLS, FUKISHMA, COAL PLANTS and TRANSPORTATION, PESTICIDE AND ROUNDUP RUNOFFS ARE THE BIGGEST AREAS OF CONCERN WHICH YOU DO NOT ADDRESS!!!

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Janna Rolland** <jannarolland@hotmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 12:47 PM
Reply-To: jannarolland@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,

Janna Rolland
6227 34th Avenue NE
Seattle, WA 98115

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Jean Berolzheimer** <jeanberolz@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:16 PM
Reply-To: jeanberolz@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.

Jean Berolzheimer
311 N 160th Place
Shoreline, WA 98133

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Jennifer Purcell** <purcelj3@wwu.edu> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 7:29 PM
Reply-To: purcelj3@wwu.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.

Jennifer Purcell
218 Sea Pines Road
BELLINGHAM, WA 98229

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Jerry Kessinger** <jerrykessinger@me.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:08 PM
Reply-To: jerrykessinger@me.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.

Jerry Kessinger
6727 Willow Road
Everett, WA 98203

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Jim Milstead** <Joakworm@aol.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:47 PM
Reply-To: Joakworm@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.

It is essential that the environment be protected against the ravages of greed.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Jim Milstead
1469 Oriental
Bellingham, WA 98229

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**John bayer** <johnbayer10@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:16 PM
Reply-To: johnbayer10@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.

John bayer
3599 X street
Washougal, WA 98671

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**John Stott** <johnjstott@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
Reply-To: johnjstott@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.

John Stott
311 N. 160th Place
Shoreline, WA 98133

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Jourdan Keith** <urbanwildernessproject@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:39 AM
Reply-To: urbanwildernessproject@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:

·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.

· 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:
- Preventing and responding to oil spills;
- Managing stormwater controls; and
- Ensuring that there are no gaps in our aquatic lands usage.

· 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,

Jourdan Keith
9217 38th Avenue S
Seattle, WA 98118

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Joyce Gillingham** <Joycegillingham@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:54 PM
Reply-To: Joycegillingham@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.

Joyce Gillingham
PO b 193
Box 193
Clearlake, WA 98235

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Joyce Grajczyk** <jag4848@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:20 PM
Reply-To: jag4848@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.

Joyce Grajczyk
12026 SE 216th St.
Kent, WA 98031

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Jude Armstrong** <judearms@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 7:10 PM
Reply-To: judearms@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.

Jude Armstrong
631 Chenault Ave
hOQUIAM, WA 98550

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

2 messages

**judith cohen** <jctcohen@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:06 AM
Reply-To: jctcohen@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,

judith cohen
1608 E.republican st
seattle, WA 98112

**judith cohen** <jctcohen@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:06 AM
Reply-To: jctcohen@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Judith Landy** <jlwhimsy@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:52 PM
Reply-To: jlwhimsy@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.

Judith Landy
North 30th St.
Mount Vernon, WA 98273

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Judy & Ed Cole-Martin** <mvdreamer02@msn.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:13 AM
Reply-To: mvdreamer02@msn.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,

Judy & Ed Cole-Martin
14548 Wild Swan Lane
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Judith Olmstead** <olympiajudy@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:18 AM
Reply-To: olympiajudy@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

I live in Olympia, on Puget Sound, and the health and long term sustainability of the Sound is of urgent interest to me, especially since we are at the southernmost area. I support the call for improvements to the HCP:

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,

Judith Olmstead
1425 Legion Way SE
Olympia, WA 98501

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Karen Charnell** <K.charnell@frontier.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 8:22 PM
Reply-To: K.charnell@frontier.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.

Karen Charnell
1521 Rucker Avenue
Everett, WA 98201

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Karen Guzak** <Karen@karenguzak.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:11 AM
Reply-To: Karen@karenguzak.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,

Karen Guzak
230 Avenue B
Snohomish, WA 98290

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Karen Helland** <karek21@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 9:39 AM
Reply-To: karek21@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.

Karen Helland
7916 189th PL SW
Seattle, WA 98026

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Karen Ireland** <kipath@aol.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 9:11 PM
Reply-To: kipath@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.

Karen Ireland
6001 Douglas Drive
Yakima, WA 98908

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Kate McClure** <katevilda@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 9:15 PM
Reply-To: katevilda@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,

Kate McClure
217 E St. SW
Auburn, WA 98001

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Kathleen Wolfe** <catlight45@msn.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 8:34 PM
Reply-To: catlight45@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.

Kathleen Wolfe
28701 6th Pl S #201
Des Moines, WA 98198

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**kathryn alexandra** <kalexandra@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:14 PM
Reply-To: kalexandra@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.

kathryn alexandra
4311 ginnett rd
anacortes, WA 98221

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Kay Reinhardt** <foundation@padillabay.gov> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 2:13 PM
Reply-To: foundation@padillabay.gov
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,
Kay Reinhardt, Administrator
Padilla Bay Foundation

Kay Reinhardt
10441 Bayview-Edison Road
PO Box 1305
Mt. Vernon, WA 98273

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Ken Berger** <poi0boy@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 9:48 AM
Reply-To: poi0boy@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.

Ken Berger
6217 181st Pl SW
Lynnwood, WA 98037

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Kevin Fairshon** <kpf1955@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:56 PM
Reply-To: kpf1955@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 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 high-impact projects like the Cherry Point and Longview coal terminals need more scrutiny, thorough scoping and stricter rules to prevent long-term and irreversible harm to aquatic lands. Using land for a coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is used for non-polluting purposes or leased for a marina. The management of land for these widely-varied projects should not look the same.

2. The plan absolutely must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. This gross oversight is patently irresponsible given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on near-shore and, in-fact, all 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 or higher-impact shipping ports, and potential oil spills from a dock or vessel coming in and out of the dock.

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

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.

Further, provisions should be made for accommodating dynamic policy changes and user compliance - linked to emerging scientific data, in order to allow for responding to newly-realized or imminent/irreversable threats to aquatic lands.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Kevin Fairshon
8592 Golden Valley Drive
Maple Falls, WA 98266

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Kimberly Leeper** <kimberly@mariposanaturescapes.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:45 AM
Reply-To: kimberly@mariposanaturescapes.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,

Kimberly Leeper
4819 49th Ave. SW
Seattle, WA 98116

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Kirstin Gruver** <soccernumber13@yahoo.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 8:13 AM
Reply-To: soccernumber13@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.

Kirstin Gruver
1708 26th Ave.
Seattle, WA 98122

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Kris deLancey** <kdelance@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:09 PM
Reply-To: kdelance@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.

Kris deLancey
6460 Marshall AVE SW
Seattle, WA 98136

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Lars Johansson** <larsjhome@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 9:58 PM
Reply-To: larsjhome@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.

Lars Johansson
1549 3rd Street
Kirkland, WA 98033

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Laura Brakke** <llbrakke@hotmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:16 PM
Reply-To: llbrakke@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 from birth, 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 Brakke
585 Pleasant Bay Rd
Bellingham, WA 98229

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Lauren Miheli** <Lauren_Miheli@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:52 AM
Reply-To: Lauren_Miheli@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,

Lauren Miheli
3809 Whitman Ave N
Apt 33
Seattle, WA 98103

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Lechai Salah** <Lechaisalah@aol.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 2:54 PM
Reply-To: Lechaisalah@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,

Lechai Salah
1505 NW 60th St
Seattle, WA 98107

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Lehman & Barbara Holder** <tripsguy@aol.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 8:14 AM
Reply-To: tripsguy@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.

Lehman & Barbara Holder
8916 NE 11th St
Vancouver, WA 98664

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Lela Perkins** <lelaperkins@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:15 PM
Reply-To: lelaperkins@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.

Lela Perkins
15109 50th Ave SE
Everett, WA 98208

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Linda Ellsworth** <sandboa51@msn.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 9:53 PM
Reply-To: sandboa51@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.

Linda Ellsworth
61 Rosehip Rd
Eastsound, WA 98245

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Linda Massey** <mlinda16@msn.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 8:04 PM
Reply-To: mlinda16@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.

Linda Massey
819 Virginia St
Seattle, WA 98101

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Lisa Jester** <whonu@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 8:32 PM
Reply-To: whonu@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.

Lisa Jester
1912 nw 106th St.
Vancouver
Vancouver, WA 98685

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Lisa MacLean** <Lisa@moxiemedia.biz> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 8:38 AM
Reply-To: Lisa@moxiemedia.biz
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.

Lisa MacLean
10530 SW Cowan Rd
Vashon, WA 98070

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Lisa Read** <writelread@aol.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:56 PM
Reply-To: writelread@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,

Lisa Read
23 West Galer St.
Seattle, WA 98119

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Lori VanDeMark** <lvdm@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:03 AM
Reply-To: lvdm@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,

Lori VanDeMark
33109 SE 110th St
Issaquah, WA 98027

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Lorraine D. Johnson** <lorraine.d.johnson@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:39 PM
Reply-To: lorraine.d.johnson@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.

Lorraine D. Johnson
4858 S. Kenny St...
Seattle, WA 98118

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Lucia Faithfull** <lfaithfull@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 8:53 PM
Reply-To: lfaithfull@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,

Lucia Faithfull
31021 50th Ave SW
Federal Way, WA 98023

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Lyle Collins** <Collinsl@yakima.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:22 PM
Reply-To: Collinsl@yakima.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.

Lyle Collins
200 N 70th Ave
Apt 4
Yakima, WA 98908

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# We deserve better! Please stregthen WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Maddie Foutch** <foutchmadic@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:09 AM
Reply-To: foutchmadic@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

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. 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. It is irresponsible and negligent to expect this plan to adequately protect the endangered and threatened species intended without this piece.

2, 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.

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.

Maddie Foutch
4718 Wallingford Ave N
B
Seattle, WA 98103

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Margaret HASHMI** <sakibaytu@comcast.net> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 8:39 AM
Reply-To: sakibaytu@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.

Margaret HASHMI
3704 TREE FARM LANE
BELLINGHAM, WA 98226

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Margo Margolis** <margo.margolis@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 7:45 PM
Reply-To: margo.margolis@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.

Margo Margolis
4915 Samish Way #7
Bellingham, WA 98229

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**MARILYN HOBAN** <marilynhoban@embarqmail.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 9:35 PM
Reply-To: marilynhoban@embarqmail.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.

MARILYN HOBAN
25853 Canyon Rd NW
POULSBO
POULSBO, WA 98370

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Mark Blitzer** <pfeffer828@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 8:26 PM
Reply-To: pfeffer828@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 to be under greater scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm to 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 two such projects should not be 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.

We have to get this one right, and from the start. There may be no going back afterward to correct oversights.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Mark Blitzer
8047 Earl Avenue NW
Seattle, WA 98117

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Mark Hennon** <mw.hennon@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:41 PM
Reply-To: mw.hennon@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.

Mark Hennon
612 1st Ave W apt 102
Seattle, WA 98119

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Mark Leed** <markleed02@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 3:36 PM
Reply-To: markleed02@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.

Mark Leed
3419 E. 21st St., Unit 4
Vancouver, WA 98661

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Mark Schofield** <schofima@hotmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:49 PM
Reply-To: schofima@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.

Mark Schofield
400 Whatcom Street
Bellingham, WA 98225

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**mark wray** <mark.wray@comcast.net> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 8:53 AM
Reply-To: mark.wray@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.

mark wray
4307 glasgow way
anacortes, WA 98221

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Martha Koester** <fomalhaut2003@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 9:34 PM
Reply-To: fomalhaut2003@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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. My basic issue with the management plan is that it doesn't differentiate between a coal terminal and a boat ramp

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.

.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Martha Koester
10015 2nd Ave S
Seattle, WA 98168

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Martin Westerman** <artartart@seanet.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 7:04 PM
Reply-To: artartart@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 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.

Martin Westerman
9361 47th Av SW
Seattle, WA 98136

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Marty & Toni Adams** <madams32931@frontier.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:11 PM
Reply-To: madams32931@frontier.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.

Marty & Toni Adams
133 140th ave SE
Lake Stevens, WA 98258

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Mary Anne Rangel** <rangelm@wwu.edu> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:39 AM
Reply-To: rangelm@wwu.edu
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,

My own comments;

Your plan does not mention climate change. This is not acceptable. Scientists have been meeting in Lima, Peru to discuss ways to address climate change and stress that there is no time to put off doing something about it. You must include climate change in your plan. You can't just avoid it (something many would like to do). I am not a scientist but I do believe in science and I don't want my grand children blaming our generation for not doing what we should about climate change.

As for the Longview and Cherry Point Coal terminals, it is time to say no to King Coal. China and other Asian countries are already looking at alternative energy and we shouldn't be cutting of beautiful mountain tops,

extracting dirty coal and then shipping it to China that already has some of the most polluted cities in the world. It makes no sense to do so (unless you are reaping millions of dollars in the process of endangering our world).

Sincerely,

Mary Anne Rangel

Mary Anne Rangel
251 South Garden
Bellingham, WA 98225

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Mary Lou Johnson** <johnson-ml@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 9:44 PM
Reply-To: johnson-ml@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 Lou Johnson
3319 W. 23rd Ave.
Spokane, WA 99224

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Mary Lyons** <marylyonsnow@comcast.net> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 12:45 AM
Reply-To: marylyonsnow@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 Lyons
3528 Sunset Way
Longview, WA 98632

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Mary Ruth Holder** <mruthholder@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 4:40 PM
Reply-To: mruthholder@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.

Mary Ruth Holder
1319 Digby Pl
Mount Vernon, WA 98274

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Mary Sebek** <mamasebek@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:37 PM
Reply-To: mamasebek@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.

Mary Sebek
331 N. 78th Street
Seattle, WA 98103

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Mary Skelton** <justabob@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 10:52 PM
Reply-To: justabob@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 Skelton
2142 Gravelly beach Loop NW
Olympia, WA 98502

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Mary Solum** <mesolum@q.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:20 AM
Reply-To: mesolum@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. Thank you for considering this important issue.

Sincerely,

Mary Solum
5 Berry Wood Place
Bellingham, WA 98229

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Mary Sue Prickett** <phrinp@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 12:51 PM
Reply-To: phrinp@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,

Mary Sue Prickett
5445 26th Ave Sw
Seattle, WA 98106

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**MaryLee Mahar** <mlglowingowl@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:26 AM
Reply-To: mlglowingowl@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.

MaryLee Mahar
13201 Linden Ave. N. Apt. 410A
Seattle, WA 98133

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**matthew horwitz** <mhorwitz@centurylink.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 9:20 PM
Reply-To: mhorwitz@centurylink.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.

matthew horwitz
7527 28th ave nw
seattle, WA 98117

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**melody mayer** <cedarrvr@me.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 10:14 PM
Reply-To: cedarrvr@me.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.

melody mayer
6321 Swayne Dr. NE
Olympia, WA 98516

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Michael Bellinger** <michael@michaelbellinger.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 8:14 AM
Reply-To: michael@michaelbellinger.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.

Michael Bellinger
11574 Entiat River Road
Entiat, WA 98822

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Mike Pelly** <mikepelly@zoho.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 3:09 PM
Reply-To: mikepelly@zoho.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 Pelly
1106 Partridge Dr NW
Olympia, WA 98502-95

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Mike Schutt** <fishincoug@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 9:11 PM
Reply-To: fishincoug@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,

Mike Schutt
4964 Fire Weed Pl
Langley, WA 98260

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**miriam israel** <remedytiger@live.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:20 PM
Reply-To: remedytiger@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.

miriam israel
9229 4th ave. nw
Sea., WA 98117

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Nadine LaVonne** <nlavonne@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:19 PM
Reply-To: nlavonne@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.

Nadine LaVonne
2031 N.W. 59th St. #303
Seattle, WA 98107

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Nancy Brown** <nancypriscillabrown@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:21 PM
Reply-To: nancypriscillabrown@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.

Nancy Brown
4224 Village Rd.
Stanwood, WA 98292

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Nicole Devine** <nicolee02@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:06 AM
Reply-To: nicolee02@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,

Nicole Devine
1740 NE 147th St
Shoreline, WA 98155

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Pat & Dan Montague** <montague30@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 12:05 PM
Reply-To: montague30@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.

Please do not back down from the pressure of these mega corporations and their projects.

Sincerely,

Pat & Dan Montague
647 73rd Ave NE
Olympia, WA 98506

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**pam weeks** <pamweeks@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 1:42 PM
Reply-To: pamweeks@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.

FURTHER I would like to have our plan discussed with
the entire Salish Sea in mind and become an International plan. Thank you, Pam Weeks

pam weeks
418 26th ave East
seattle, WA 98112

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Parker Lindner** <parker@newmediamatters.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:19 PM
Reply-To: parker@newmediamatters.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, who has a 30 year presence on the coast, 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.

Parker Lindner
1909 N 48th St
Seattle, WA 98103

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Patricia Peabody** <Patriciapeabody@mac.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:43 AM
Reply-To: Patriciapeabody@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,

Patricia Peabody
720 Seneca St
Apt 716
Seattle, WA 98101

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Patricia Waterston** <p.waterston@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:54 PM
Reply-To: p.waterston@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.

Patricia Waterston
5815 Princeton Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98105

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Patrick Mulligan** <patrick.mulligan@mtsgreenway.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:10 AM
Reply-To: patrick.mulligan@mtsgreenway.org
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,

Patrick Mulligan
539 31st AVE
Seattle, WA 98122

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

**Patrick Paulett** <patrick_paulett@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:36 AM
Reply-To: patrick_paulett@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,

Patrick Paulett
4449 SW Kenyon Pl
Seattle, WA 98136

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Patrick Van Inwegen** <pvaninwegen@whitworth.edu> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 1:38 PM
Reply-To: pvaninwegen@whitworth.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.

Patrick Van Inwegen
607 W. Cleveland Ave
Spokane, WA 99205

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Paul Zurfluh** <Paul.and.GlendaZurfluh@hotmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 7:06 PM
Reply-To: Paul.and.GlendaZurfluh@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.

Paul Zurfluh
2734 locust
University Place, WA 98466

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Pauline Druffel** <pjdruffel@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:28 PM
Reply-To: pjdruffel@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.

Pauline Druffel
930 S Cannon St # 13
apt 13
Spokane, WA 99204

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Peggy Page** <peggy.page@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:38 AM
Reply-To: peggy.page@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.

Peggy Page
24324 Miller rd
Stanwood, WA 98292

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Peter Rimbos** <primbos@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 8:38 AM
Reply-To: primbos@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 Rimbos
19711 241st Ave SE
Maple Valley, WA 98038

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

**Peter von Christierson** <pvonc@olypen.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:08 PM
Reply-To: pvonc@olypen.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.

Peter von Christierson
1229 - 29th St.
Port Townsend, WA 98368

**WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>**

# Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

2 messages

**Polly Freeman** <polly_freeman@msn.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 9:44 PM
Reply-To: polly_freeman@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.

Polly Freeman
201 NW 60th
Seattle, WA 98107

**Polly Freeman** <polly_freeman@msn.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 9:44 PM
Reply-To: polly_freeman@msn.com

To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

[Quoted text hidden]