WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Amy Mower <almower@earthlink.net> Wed, Dec 10, 2014 at 5:10 PM
Reply-To: almower@earthlink.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,

Amy Mower
PO Box 2004
Maple Falls, WA 98266

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Patricia Hawley <patriciachawley@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 10, 2014 at 8:59 PM
Reply-To: patriciachawley@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.

Patricia Hawley
4908 N. Deception Cir
Oak Harbor, WA 98277

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Janet Marx <janetmarx_76@msn.com> Thu, Dec 11, 2014 at 2:40 PM
Reply-To: janetmarx_76@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,

Janet Marx
112 Lockerbie Pl
Port Angeles, WA 98362

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Mary Bonnier <newparadigm@olympus.net> Thu, Dec 11, 2014 at 3:13 PM
Reply-To: newparadigm@olympus.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 Bonnier
5790 Old Mill RD NE
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Cate O'dahl <caoesp@aol.com>
Reply-To: caoesp@aol.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Fri, Dec 12, 2014 at 3:40 PM

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Cate O'dahl
4210 236th Street SW
v208
mountlake terrace, WA 98043

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Cheri Carlson <cjbaw@hotmail.com> Sat, Dec 13, 2014 at 8:25 PM
Reply-To: cjbaw@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.

Cheri Carlson
20505 64th Dr NE
Arlington
Arlington, WA 98223

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Katherine Hardy <hardykatielady@gmail.com> Sat, Dec 13, 2014 at 10:27 AM
Reply-To: hardykatielady@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.

Katherine Hardy
11th Ave
Seattle, WA 98102

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Pam Borso <borsope@aol.com>
Reply-To: borsope@aol.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Sat, Dec 13, 2014 at 6:12 PM

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Pam Borso
P O Box 154
2940 Arnie Rd
Custer, WA 98240

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Peter Albrecht <petenpals10@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 16, 2014 at 10:29 PM
Reply-To: petenpals10@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.

Peter Albrecht
5021 E Fairview Ave
Spokane, WA 99217

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Karen Price <bobiddia@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 17, 2014 at 12:44 PM
Reply-To: bobiddia@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.

Karen Price
11626 7th Ave SW
Burien, WA 98146

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Peter Rimbos <primbos@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 17, 2014 at 9:51 PM
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

Ed Chadd <edchadd@olypen.com>
Reply-To: edchadd@olypen.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Sun, Dec 21, 2014 at 10:33 PM

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

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

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Terry Eaton <john.and.terry@gmail.com> Sun, Dec 21, 2014 at 5:12 PM
Reply-To: john.and.terry@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, although it potentially is the largest issue we will need to address. 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, as well as toxic overflow related to increased flooding and poorly managed barriers. ref. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2014_Elk_River_chemical_spill

4. Harm to aquatic lands have human, 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.

Terry Eaton
10824 NE 172nd Ave
Brush Prairie, WA 98606

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Carol von Borstel <carolvb@olypen.com> Mon, Dec 22, 2014 at 8:35 AM
Reply-To: carolvb@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.

Carol von Borstel
2922 West Sequim Bay Rd.
Sequim, WA 98382

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

PROTECT Washington's habitat from coal.

1 message

Glen Anderson <glen@olywa.net> Mon, Dec 22, 2014 at 11:59 AM
Reply-To: glen@olywa.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.

Glen Anderson
5015 15th Ave SE
Lacey
Lacey, WA 98503

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Julia Cochrane <willowtree@olypen.com> Mon, Dec 22, 2014 at 8:02 PM
Reply-To: willowtree@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.

Julia Cochrane
1175 23rd Street
Port Townsend, WA 98368

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Ruth Darden <dseattlered@seanet.com> Mon, Dec 22, 2014 at 12:30 PM
Reply-To: dseattlered@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.

Ruth Darden
900 University St. #401
SEATTLE, WA 98101

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

William Payne <volumesofcube@gmail.com> Mon, Dec 29, 2014 at 8:34 AM
Reply-To: volumesofcube@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

As public servants like myself, you're top priority must be to serve the public interests whether or not this coincides with well financed business interests. Doing so at this time requires careful sheparding of natural resources that are stressed by over use. These are now both local and global. Locally we want clean waters and good habitat for local flora and fauna. Globally, we must take climate into account at every turn.

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,

W. Russ Payne

William Payne

7821 8th Ave. NW
Seattle, WA 98117

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

R A Larson <rayakama@yahoo.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 7:46 AM
Reply-To: rayakama@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.

R A Larson
109 S 27th Street
Mount Vernon, WA 98274

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Rachael Fairbanks <burstingjoy@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 1:12 PM
Reply-To: burstingjoy@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,

Rachael Fairbanks
518 44th ave. n
seattle, WA 98102

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Rae C <raeraesmash@live.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 1:33 PM
Reply-To: raeraesmash@live.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,

Rae C
6816 25th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Ramona Owen <vajrarso@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 8:17 PM
Reply-To: vajrarso@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.

Ramona Owen
7743 33rd Ave. NW
Seattle, WA 98117

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Rand Guthrie <magiktreez@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 11:31 PM
Reply-To: magiktreez@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.

Rand Guthrie
7102 77th ave se
Snohomish, WA 98290

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

2 messages

Reginald Mac Rae <reggie17001@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:05 PM
Reply-To: reggie17001@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.

Reginald Mac Rae
2900 N.W. Alpine Lane
Camas, WA 98607

Reginald Mac Rae <reggie17001@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:05 PM
Reply-To: reggie17001@yahoo.com

To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Robert Bachman <BOBGBACH@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:35 PM
Reply-To: BOBGBACH@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.

Robert Bachman
102 Panorama Pl
Friday Harbor, WA 98250

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Robert Briggs <rsb@turbonet.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 11:09 PM
Reply-To: rsb@turbonet.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.

Robert Briggs
837 SE Edge Knoll Drive
Pullman, WA 99163

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Robert Brown <larkbrown@comcast.net> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 9:06 PM
Reply-To: larkbrown@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.

Robert Brown
1443 Edwards Avenue
#301
Fircrest, WA 98466

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Robert Swope <frhn@nwinfo.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:13 PM
Reply-To: frhn@nwinfo.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.

Transporting coal across the United States will not only pollute the areas through which it is transported, but once it arrives at it's destination in Asia or elsewhere it's pollution will contribute to the pollution of the world. Please, do not allow/promote coal consumption as it is not in the best interest of humanity.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Robert Swope
16191 Tieton Drive
Yakima, WA 98908

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Robin Thomas <robint@paciifier.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:51 PM
Reply-To: robint@paciifier.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.

Robin Thomas
3912 Clark Ave
Vancouver, WA 98661

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Ron & Marci Moore <ronsmoore@msn.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:18 PM
Reply-To: ronsmoore@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.

Ron & Marci Moore
708 Bunker Hill Rd
Longview, WA 98632

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Ron Lindsay <rwlindsay@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 8:31 PM
Reply-To: rwlindsay@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.

Ron Lindsay
7548 Mary ave NW
Seattle, WA 98117

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Ron Sikes <sikes@olympus.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 4:50 PM
Reply-To: sikes@olympus.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,

Ron Sikes
1709 Gise Street
Port Townsend, WA 98368

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Rosalie Paulgen <gnrpaulgen@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:07 AM
Reply-To: gnrpaulgen@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,

Rosalie Paulgen
16250 NE 180th St.
Woodinville, WA 98072

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Ryan Misley <ryan.misley@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 1:32 PM
Reply-To: ryan.misley@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,

Ryan Misley
14916 15th Ave Ct E
Tacoma, WA 98445

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Ryan Provonsha <rprovonsha@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 2:18 PM
Reply-To: rprovonsha@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.

Ryan Provonsha
15415 35th Ave W #G102
#G102
Lynnwood, WA 98087

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Ryan Swanson <ryanswanson30@hotmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:17 AM
Reply-To: ryanswanson30@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,

Ryan Swanson
6611 58th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Sammy Low <cougarcreek7@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 3:24 PM
Reply-To: cougarcreek7@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.

Sammy Low
20420 Marine Dr, Apt P2
Ferndale
Stanwood, WA 98292

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Sandra Randall <onesandyr@yahoo.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 6:04 AM
Reply-To: onesandyr@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.

Coal is a diminishing commodity in our economy. OPEC did not raise the price of its oil hoping that the expensive to produce tar sands oil will out price itself. Exports of coal from Australia are growing, ours are not. Rockefeller's divestiture shows their belief coal isn't a good investment .Why would we jeopardize beautiful area for a future that is iffy a tbest?

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.A huge percentage of scientists view climate change as fact and that it will have a a negative impact on our future.

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.

Sandra Randall

Alabama St.
Bellingham, WA 98229

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Sandy Wood <columbiagrove@msn.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 9:05 PM
Reply-To: columbiagrove@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.

Sandy Wood
P O Box 871660
Vancouver, WA 98687

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Sarah Collmer <sicollmer@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 9:07 PM
Reply-To: sicollmer@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.

Sarah Collmer
704 W 20th St.
Vancouver, WA 98660

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Scott Fortman <scottf37@aol.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 3:55 PM
Reply-To: scottf37@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,

Scott Fortman
10028 126th Ave NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Sean Edmison <sedmison@hotmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 3:30 PM
Reply-To: sedmison@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 that 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. Given how much the environment has already changed in the prior 50 years, it is clear that any plan for 50 years into the future must take into account the effects of and possible mitigations for climate change.

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

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.

Sean Edmison
11820 167th Place NE
Redmond, WA 98052

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

S.F. Brown <sbrown@ecologyfund.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:19 PM
Reply-To: sbrown@ecologyfund.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.

S.F. Brown
4611 159th St. S.W.
Lynnwood, WA 98087

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Sharon Miller <smilertoo@aol.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:09 PM
Reply-To: smilertoo@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.

Sharon Miller
720 Lakeside Ave S
304
Seattle, WA 98144

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Sheila Brown <sheilatree@comcast.net> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 1:02 PM
Reply-To: sheilatree@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.

Sheila Brown
19834 Vashon Highway SW
Vashon, WA 98070

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

sibyl james <sibyljames@hotmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:37 PM
Reply-To: sibyljames@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.

sibyl james
1712 22nd s
seattle, WA 98144

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Stephen Yates <yatesart123@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:33 AM
Reply-To: yatesart123@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,

Stephen Yates
PO Box 74
Port Townsend, WA 98368

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Steve Thompson <steve93thompson@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 7:56 PM
Reply-To: steve93thompson@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Steve Thompson
9050 Avondale Rd NE
Redmond
Redmond, WA 98052

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Stuart Mork <morkabu@aim.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 12:34 PM
Reply-To: morkabu@aim.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,

Stuart Mork
7710 31st ave nw
Seattle, WA 98117

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Sylvia Murray <sylvia.murray2008@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:51 PM
Reply-To: sylvia.murray2008@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.

Sylvia Murray
2006 E Columbia Ave
Tacoma, WA 98404

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Ted Brookes <tbrookes@whidbey.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:17 AM
Reply-To: tbrookes@whidbey.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely, Ted Brookes

Ted Brookes
3531 Overlook Drive
Langley, WA 98260

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Tess Morgan <Tessmorganlimitless@gmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 6:22 AM
Reply-To: Tessmorganlimitless@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,

Tess Morgan
4701 SW Admiral Way #71
Seattle, WA 98116

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Thomas Bougher <tombougher@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:50 AM
Reply-To: tombougher@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,

Thomas Bougher
P.O.Box 355
1410 C. Street
Hoquiam, WA 98550

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Tim Norgren <t_norgren@juno.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:09 PM
Reply-To: t_norgren@juno.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Given that I live in a place that is directly on the Columbia river, my wife and I have a vested interest in your decisions. I'd intended to write a "more personal" comment, but the following covers the ground I'd have covered with likely greater precision:
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.

Tim Norgren
407 Rock Creek Dr
Stevenson, WA 98648

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Timothy Hohn <thohn@email.edcc.edu> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 8:20 PM
Reply-To: thohn@email.edcc.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.

Timothy Hohn
18923 Forest Park Dr NE
Lake Forest Park, WA 98155

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Victor Odlivak <victor@converttolinux.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 8:45 AM
Reply-To: victor@converttolinux.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.

Victor Odlivak
5312 Woodlawn Ave. N
Seattle, WA 98103

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

virginia jarvis <virginia_jarvis@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:36 PM
Reply-To: virginia_jarvis@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.

virginia jarvis
13000 LINDEN AVE N
211
Seattle, WA 98133

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Vivian Henderson <vmail@cedarcomm.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 6:16 PM
Reply-To: vmail@cedarcomm.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.

Vivian Henderson
POB 1745
Stanwood, WA 98292

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

3 messages

Wendy Bartlett <wendyvw74@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 9:35 PM
Reply-To: wendyvw74@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.

Wendy Bartlett
255 N Forest Street #116
Bellingham, WA 98225

Wendy Bartlett <wendyvw74@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 9:35 PM
Reply-To: wendyvw74@yahoo.com

To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

Wendy Bartlett <wendyvw74@yahoo.com> Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 9:35 PM
Reply-To: wendyvw74@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

William Atlas <wiatlas@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:17 AM
Reply-To: wiatlas@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,

William Atlas
1420 E Pine St. Apt E502
Seattle, WA 98122

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Anne Hall <annehall@familyhealing.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 11:00 AM
Reply-To: annehall@familyhealing.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,

Anne Hall
1226 Lopez Rd.
Lopez Island, WA 98261

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Ardeth L. Weed <frogdog13@comcast.net> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 4:21 PM
Reply-To: frogdog13@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.

Ardeth L. Weed
520 Hemlock Way, #4
Edmonds, WA 98020

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Barbara McKee <barbaramckee@comcast.net> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 8:18 PM
Reply-To: barbaramckee@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.

Barbara McKee
8824 Boulder Ave
VANCOUVER, WA 98664

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Brie Gyncild <brie@wordyfolks.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 2:37 PM
Reply-To: brie@wordyfolks.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.

Brie Gyncild
1407 15th Ave
Seattle, WA 98122

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Catherine Prendergast <prenderop@harbornet.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 2:33 PM
Reply-To: prenderop@harbornet.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Catherine Prendergast
1015 N. Sheridan Avenue
Tacoma, WA 98403

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Catherine Sloan <csloan277745@gmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 3:54 PM
Reply-To: csloan277745@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 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 is a gross oversight, 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. 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.

Catherine Sloan
8348 22nd Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98117

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Charles Bronson <hazelgate@mac.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 5:02 PM
Reply-To: hazelgate@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,

Charles Bronson
9522 86th Ave NW
Gig Harbor, WA 98332

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Dave Werntz <dwerntz@gmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:41 AM
Reply-To: dwerntz@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

I'm writing to provide comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan. 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 require different types of scrutiny and regulation.

2. The plan must address climate change. This is a 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. Given what we know about the predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems, this significant oversight must be corrected.

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.

Dave Werntz
2303 C. Street
Bellingham, WA 98225

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

David Edwards <mjdocdle@comcast.net> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 4:57 PM
Reply-To: mjdocdle@comcast.net
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

David Edwards
1607 East Bay Drive
Olympia, WA 98506

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Dorothy Moritz <moritzdorothy@hotmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 2:50 PM
Reply-To: moritzdorothy@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,

Dorothy Moritz
6001 24th Ave. NW #402
#402
Seattle, WA 98107

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Esther Faber <bellinghamesther@yahoo.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 8:18 PM
Reply-To: bellinghamesther@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.

Esther Faber
2716 Williams
Bellingham, WA 98225

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Gena DiLabio <gdilabio@frontier.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 4:51 PM
Reply-To: gdilabio@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.

Gena DiLabio
3124 Dakota Dr
Mount Vernon, WA 98274

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Gordon Padelford <gordon.padelford@gmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 1:06 PM
Reply-To: gordon.padelford@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,

Gordon Padelford
328 Bellevue ave E
apt 202
Seattle, WA 98102

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Jacob Steijn <jsteijn@gmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 9:37 AM
Reply-To: jsteijn@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.

My concern is how we balance our needs for energy against the need to preserve the envrionment that supports us in so many intangible but essential ways. It is easy to recognize the desires of industry, the interests there make certain to bring these to our attention. It is much more difficult to see and provide for the preservation of our environment, yet it is at least as important if not more so. Therefore I pay great attention when citizen organizations express reservations about land use planning and environmental impacts. To that end I am passing on the concerns of the Climate Solutions group, they state them better than I can.

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. We are irresponsible if we ignore 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.

Jacob Steijn
973 Quartz Dr SW
North Bend, WA 98045

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

James Paine <akaj2005@yahoo.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 9:45 PM
Reply-To: akaj2005@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 Paine
3007 Rucker ave.
#356
Everett, WA 98201

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Jeanne Poirier <jeannepoirier@yahoo.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 6:15 PM
Reply-To: jeannepoirier@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.

Jeanne Poirier
P.O. Box 228
Cashmere, WA 98815

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

John Saul <johnpaulsaul@gmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 3:08 PM
Reply-To: johnpaulsaul@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 Saul
14212 73rd ave ne, c202
C202
Kirkland, WA 98034

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington's Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan needs to be stronger

1 message

John Tuxill <johntuxill@yahoo.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 11:05 PM
Reply-To: johntuxill@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 Washingtonian who lives less than a mile from the Salish Sea shoreline in Bellingham, I am deeply concerned that this plan promote environmentally responsible and sustainable management of our state's public lands--and is strong enough to handle the threats that our tidelands face. I know you share my understanding that 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 establishing the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan for all state aquatic lands, I believe there are significant issues that must be addressed if the current Plan draft is to be effective and, ultimately, sustainable. Specifically, the plan should be strengthened in the following ways:

1. The plan simply must address climate change. I am astonished that this 50-year plan that currently makes no mention of climate change. Climate change and attendant environmental shifts such as ocean acidification are already a reality for many marine organisms in the North Pacific Ocean and our state waters. We already have the capacity to model and study predicted impacts of climate change on nearshore and aquatic ecosystems, and it is an unforgivable oversight for state natural resource management policies to not address climate change at this point in time.

2. Major project proposals like the Cherry Point and Longview coal export terminals need much more scrutiny and stricter rules to prevent long-term harm of aquatic lands. Using land for a massive coal terminal will have vastly different impacts than if it is leased for a marina or modest aquaculture facility. The management of land for these two projects should not look the same.

3. The HCP should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases in 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. Degradation of aquatic lands–whether accidental or planned as a side-effect of development--has economic and cultural consequences for shoreline communities like mine. Those impacts must 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 in the HCP.

6. The plan should definitely include stronger provisions for:
a. Preventing and responding to oil spills (especially given the rising volumes of oil transport by rail through our state);
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 Tuxill
1604 20th St.
Bellingham, WA 98225

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Karin de Weille <deweille@gm.slc.edu> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 2:06 PM
Reply-To: deweille@gm.slc.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.

Karin de Weille
8817 27th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Kathryn Schetzer <kschetzer@gmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 8:33 PM
Reply-To: kschetzer@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.

Kathryn Schetzer
1134 Finnegan Way #305
Bellingham, WA 98225

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

2 messages

Kay Paine <kpaine@yahoo.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:20 PM
Reply-To: kpaine@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.

Kay Paine
3007 Rucke ave. #356
#356
Everett, WA 98201

Kay Paine <kpaine@yahoo.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:20 PM

Reply-To: kpaine@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Keith Cowan <leftymanu@comcast.net> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 2:55 PM
Reply-To: leftymanu@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.

Keith Cowan
3709 SW Trenton St
Seattle, WA 98126

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

kyle pieti <kylepieti@yahoo.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 11:32 PM
Reply-To: kylepieti@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,

kyle pieti
11135 o ave
Anacortes, WA 98221

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Lin Provost <linprovost@gmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 11:35 AM
Reply-To: linprovost@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.

Lin Provost
3707 42nd Ave S
Seattle, WA 98144

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Linda Moore <lmlongview@yahoo.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 6:03 AM
Reply-To: lmlongview@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.

Linda Moore
3102 Pershing Way
Longview, WA 98632

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Lisa Pedersen <lisa_mp52@yahoo.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 1:49 PM
Reply-To: lisa_mp52@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,

Lisa Pedersen
6143 Seabeck Holly Rd NW
Seabeck, WA 98380

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Maribeth Chadwell <curleygrey@gmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 9:07 PM
Reply-To: curleygrey@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.

Maribeth Chadwell
2415 Second Ave #629
Seattle, WA 98121

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

MARSHA BARTON <MARSHABARTON1@frontier.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 1:11 PM
Reply-To: MARSHABARTON1@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.

MARSHA BARTON
6807 164th Pl SW
Edmondss, WA 98026

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

melodie martin <martincat@earthlink.net> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 9:53 AM
Reply-To: martincat@earthlink.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,

melodie martin
2339 11th ave east
2339 11th ave east
seattle, WA 98102

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Miguel de Campos <migueldc@exmsft.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 4:53 AM
Reply-To: migueldc@exmsft.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 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.

Miguel de Campos
1241 21st Ave E
SEATTLE, WA 98112

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Molly Robertson <mollyrobetson@rocketmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:30 AM
Reply-To: mollyrobetson@rocketmail.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,

Molly Robertson
1417 Brawne Avenue NW
Olympia, WA 98502

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Mytzi Rudolph <mytzi@comcast.net> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 11:20 AM
Reply-To: mytzi@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.

Mytzi Rudolph
2221 e st
vancouver, WA 98663

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Nancy Dolan <nandol@comcast.net> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 5:44 PM
Reply-To: nandol@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.

Nancy Dolan
19319 89th Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

PAUL HANSEN <pvhansen@tfon.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 9:43 PM
Reply-To: pvhansen@tfon.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 HANSEN
340 FROST RD
SEQUIM, WA 98382

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Paul Zurfluh <Paul.and.GlendaZurfluh@hotmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 11:02 AM
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

ray ganner <rganner@ganner.com>
Reply-To: rganner@ganner.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:01 AM

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.

ray ganner
13503 SE 37th st
vancouver, WA 98683

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Robert Connor <sheserafarms@gorge.net> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 11:29 AM
Reply-To: sheserafarms@gorge.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.

Robert Connor
50 Moore Road
White Salmon, WA 98672

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Robert Kenny and Julia Glover <synergy@whidbey.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 2:46 AM
Reply-To: synergy@whidbey.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Robert Kenny and Julia Glover
7292 Maxwelton Rd
Clinton
Clinton, WA 98236

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

S. Jacky <stardancer323@msn.com>
Reply-To: stardancer323@msn.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:17 PM

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

S. Jacky
2411 Lexington St
Steilacoom, WA 98388

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Sara Bhakti <sarabhakti@yahoo.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 1:58 PM
Reply-To: sarabhakti@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

The environment is my top priority.

I am commenting on the draft Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan.

The use of aquatic lands greatly affects 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 for this opportunity to comment.

Sara Bhakti
521 7th Ave
Kirkland, WA 98033

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Sarah Salter <ssalter11@comcast.net> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 3:26 PM
Reply-To: ssalter11@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.

Sarah Salter
19432 71st Pl. W.
Lynnwood, WA 98036

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Sheila Morris <redtruck911@gmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:13 AM
Reply-To: redtruck911@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.

Sheila Morris
1710 Nob Hill Ave N
Seattle, WA 98109

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Stephanie Bell <jasperjosh@comcast.net> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 5:39 AM
Reply-To: jasperjosh@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.

Stephanie Bell
21507 42nd Ave S
Seatac, WA 98198

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Stephanie Trasoff <stephanie@stephanietrasoff.net> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:47 PM
Reply-To: stephanie@stephanietrasoff.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.

Stephanie Trasoff
5160 Seaview Dr
Blaine, WA 98230

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Stephen Eichelberger <eichelberger@harbornet.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 12:09 PM
Reply-To: eichelberger@harbornet.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Stephen Eichelberger
4022 N. 19th St.
Tacoma, WA 98406

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Susi Hulbert <susih1313@yahoo.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 11:02 PM
Reply-To: susih1313@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.

Susi Hulbert
530 Hillcrest
Longview, WA 98632

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

2 messages

Tamara Pokorny <valleyrockfarm@gmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 9:14 PM
Reply-To: valleyrockfarm@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,

Tamara Pokorny
1340 Dabob Road
Quilcene, WA 98376

Tamara Pokorny <valleyrockfarm@gmail.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 9:14 PM
Reply-To: valleyrockfarm@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Teresa Robbins <humansol@teleport.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 5:44 PM
Reply-To: humansol@teleport.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.

Teresa Robbins
211 Malfait Tracts Road
Washougal, WA 98671

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Victoria Nelson <johnvick@comcast.net> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 9:41 AM
Reply-To: johnvick@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.

Victoria Nelson
4502 SW Trenton
Seattle, WA 98136

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

William Young <loon13@comcast.net> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 12:02 PM
Reply-To: loon13@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.

William Young
4421 E. Oregon Street
Bellingham
Bellingham, WA 98226

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Alethea Putnam <bk280anp@yahoo.com> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 3:39 PM
Reply-To: bk280anp@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.

Alethea Putnam
11550 35th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98125

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

alice owen <ieater@comcast.net> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 5:06 PM
Reply-To: ieater@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,

Alice Owen

alice owen
603 7th Ave. N A301
Edmonds, WA 98020

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Barbara Menne <menneb@harbornet.net> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 10:31 PM
Reply-To: menneb@harbornet.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.

Barbara Menne
1415 N Anderson St
Tacoma, WA 98406

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

don lapoint <donlap@msn.com> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 9:47 AM
Reply-To: donlap@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.

don lapoint
620 elm pl Edmonds WA 98020
edmonds, WA 98020

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

James Moss <Mossyjam@yahoo.com> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 12:34 PM
Reply-To: Mossyjam@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 Moss
1302 S Tyler St
Tacoma, WA 98405

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

James Ploger <jploger@gmail.com> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 7:20 AM
Reply-To: jploger@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,

James Ploger
1909
S Charles St
Seattle, WA 98144

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Joe Wiederhold <jwiederhold47@gmail.com> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 7:13 AM
Reply-To: jwiederhold47@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.

Joe Wiederhold
1405 Edwards St
Bellingham, WA 98229

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Julie Dugger <girlnumber20@hotmail.com> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 9:16 AM
Reply-To: girlnumber20@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.

Julie Dugger
1604 20TH ST
BELLINGHAM, WA 98225

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan comments

1 message

Kim Lehmberg <homerdomer@comcast.net> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 9:58 AM
Reply-To: homerdomer@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 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 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.

Kim Lehmberg
11727 36th Ave SE
Everett, WA 98208

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Lise Grace <gracel@openaccess.org> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 10:17 AM
Reply-To: gracel@openaccess.org
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Lise Grace
2501 Lynn St
Bellingham, WA 98225

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Rebecca Rose <rebecca4peace8@gmail.com> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 9:56 PM
Reply-To: rebecca4peace8@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,

Rebecca Rose
20119 113th St SE
Snohomish, WA 98290

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Rick Hann <rickhann@hotmail.com> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 10:41 AM
Reply-To: rickhann@hotmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Mr. Romanski,

I have lived on Georgia Strait at Point Whitehorn for 27 years. I have watched the decline of the herring run and the subsequent decline of the salmon fishery. I have also observed the decline of the migratory bird population and the endangered Orca numbers. The aquatic environment is in trouble and needs all the protection and rehabilitation we can give it.

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,

Rick Hann

5513 Maple Way
Blaine, WA 98230

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Robin Hirsch <robinhirsch@yahoo.com> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 5:44 AM
Reply-To: robinhirsch@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.

Robin Hirsch
PO Box 193
P O BO
Orcas, WA 98280

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Shannon Markley <markley.shannon@yahoo.com> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 8:48 PM
Reply-To: markley.shannon@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,

Shannon Markley
P.O. Box 31382
P.O. Box
Seattle, WA 98103

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Susan Dawson <LaPianta@aol.com> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 2:03 PM
Reply-To: LaPianta@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,

Susan Dawson
17855 W Spring Lake Dr SE
Renton, WA 98058

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Tamie Andersen <andets1135@comcast.net> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 10:29 PM
Reply-To: andets1135@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.

Tamie Andersen
Seattle, WA

Tamie Andersen
1545 NW 57th Street
#418
Seattle, WA 98107

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Thelma Follettt <thelmafollett@yahoo.com> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 1:49 PM
Reply-To: thelmafollett@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.

Thelma Follettt
2605 Lakeridge Lane
Bellingham, WA 98226

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Tom Dorosz <abab50f2@opayq.com> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 9:42 AM
Reply-To: abab50f2@opayq.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,

Tom Dorosz
6207 Madrona Dr NE
Tacoma, WA 98422

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Anne Otis <rmot@aol.com>
Reply-To: rmot@aol.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Sat, Dec 6, 2014 at 2:51 AM

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Anne Otis
2663 20th AVE NE
Issaquah, WA 98029

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Colleen Hinton <colleenmhinton@msn.com> Sat, Dec 6, 2014 at 2:37 PM
Reply-To: colleenmhinton@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.

Colleen Hinton
16763 Maplewild Ave SW
Burien, WA 98166

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

debbie thorn <thorndebbie@comcast.net> Sat, Dec 6, 2014 at 1:45 PM
Reply-To: thorndebbie@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.

debbie thorn
710 18th ave w
kirkland, WA 98033

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

DR DELTON YOUNG <drdwyoung@comcast.net> Sat, Dec 6, 2014 at 7:30 AM
Reply-To: drdwyoung@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.

DR DELTON YOUNG
7731 21 NE
Seattle, WA 98115

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Hal Glidden <hglid@comcast.net> Sat, Dec 6, 2014 at 8:43 AM
Reply-To: hglid@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.

Hal Glidden
419 briar rd
Bellingham, WA 98225

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

jan gordon <janimals1@yahoo.com> Sat, Dec 6, 2014 at 8:56 AM
Reply-To: janimals1@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.

jan gordon
16544 colony rd
bow, WA 98232

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Janet Wynne <janetmwynne@gmail.com> Sat, Dec 6, 2014 at 1:53 PM
Reply-To: janetmwynne@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.

Janet Wynne
Pleasant Bay Road
BEllingham, WA 98229

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Paula Lindsay <pdwl1999@yahoo.com> Sat, Dec 6, 2014 at 10:08 AM
Reply-To: pdwl1999@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,

Paula Lindsay
9842 49th Ave SW
Seattle
Seattle, WA 98136

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Tani Douglass <tanidouglass@gmail.com> Sat, Dec 6, 2014 at 5:41 PM
Reply-To: tanidouglass@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.

Tani Douglass
1380 SE 36th Street
Vancouver, WA 98683

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Elizabeth A Heath <purrfull@aol.com> Sun, Dec 7, 2014 at 12:30 AM
Reply-To: purrfull@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.

OK. The above message was prepared on my behalf and I endorse its contents. I wish to add that I am totally opposed to building coal terminals in Washington State regardless of efforts to address environmental concerns. They represent, in my mind, disasters in the making and health hazards for people living near them.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Elizabeth A Heath
8425-B 25th Ave. SW
Seattle, WA 98106

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Janet Duecy <janetduecy@comcast.net> Sun, Dec 7, 2014 at 2:38 PM
Reply-To: janetduecy@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.

Janet Duecy
1302-A 31 Ave. S.
Apt. A
Seattle, WA 98144

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

John Primrose <jfpros@yahoo.com> Sun, Dec 7, 2014 at 6:38 PM
Reply-To: jfpros@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 Primrose
3100 Ferry Ave Apt B311
6
Bellingham, WA 98225

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Marilyn Hall <ak-mj@msn.com> Sun, Dec 7, 2014 at 11:56 AM
Reply-To: ak-mj@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.

Marilyn Hall
10527 NE 148th Ct
Bothell, WA 98011

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Nicholas Gervasi <njg98261@gmail.com> Sun, Dec 7, 2014 at 12:58 PM
Reply-To: njg98261@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.

Nicholas Gervasi
333 McCauley Ln
Lopez Island, WA 98261

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Rev. Richard Gibson <rkgibson@juno.com> Sun, Dec 7, 2014 at 1:22 PM
Reply-To: rkgibson@juno.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Rev. Richard Gibson
18808 68th Ave W
Lynnwood
Lynnwood, WA 98036

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Richard Frith <richardsfrith@yahoo.com> Sun, Dec 7, 2014 at 11:03 PM
Reply-To: richardsfrith@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.

Richard Frith
3011 nw 94th St
Seattle, WA 98117

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Sheliah Roth <sheliah.bunny@gmail.com> Sun, Dec 7, 2014 at 7:41 PM
Reply-To: sheliah.bunny@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.

Sheliah Roth
4322 Grand Ave
Everett, WA 98203

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Terry Nightingale <tnight@pobox.com> Sun, Dec 7, 2014 at 5:28 PM
Reply-To: tnight@pobox.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Terry Nightingale
602 N 46th St
Seattle, WA 98103

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Tetry Nightingale <tnight@pobox.com> Sun, Dec 7, 2014 at 10:16 AM
Reply-To: tnight@pobox.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,

Tetry Nightingale
602 N 46th St
Seattle, WA 98103

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Brian Gunn <gunnbl@comcast.net> Mon, Dec 8, 2014 at 6:54 AM
Reply-To: gunnbl@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.

Brian Gunn
2305 27TH PL SE
Auburn, WA 98002

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Claire Mikalson <clairemikalson@gmail.com> Mon, Dec 8, 2014 at 1:43 PM
Reply-To: clairemikalson@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,

Claire Mikalson
E 302 Wahington
POBOX 135
Farmington, WA 99128

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Connie Segal <segalconnie@yahoo.com> Mon, Dec 8, 2014 at 7:28 AM
Reply-To: segalconnie@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,

Connie Segal
1208 Blaine Street
Port Townsend, WA 98368

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

2 messages

Gary Lindstrom <gwlindstrom@gmail.com> Mon, Dec 8, 2014 at 11:34 AM
Reply-To: gwlindstrom@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.

Gary Lindstrom
1403 18th St
Longview, WA 98632

Gary Lindstrom <gwlindstrom@gmail.com> Mon, Dec 8, 2014 at 11:34 AM
Reply-To: gwlindstrom@gmail.com

To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Janice Tufte <icecwa@yahoo.com> Mon, Dec 8, 2014 at 9:26 AM
Reply-To: icecwa@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,

Janice Tufte
2609-Broadway Ave E #8
Seattle, WA 98102

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Jean Davis <jed8744@gmail.com> Mon, Dec 8, 2014 at 1:45 PM
Reply-To: jed8744@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.

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.

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 DNR resources for commodity export terminals should be specifically addressed.

2. The plan should address climate change. It is widely known that sea level will rise during the next couple of decades. I believe this should be addressed in the regard to impacts on shorelines, public access, protection from storm surge, and likely changes to aquatic ecosystems.

3. This plan should address the implications of existing and proposed aquatic leases. 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.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Jean Davis
PO Box 30164
Seattle, WA 98117

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Jean Olson <orcajean@hotmail.com> Mon, Dec 8, 2014 at 2:46 PM
Reply-To: orcajean@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,

Jean Olson
7030 34th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Karen Erickson <slpcram@gmail.com> Mon, Dec 8, 2014 at 3:08 PM
Reply-To: slpcram@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.

Karen Erickson
3626 Ruckers Ave
Apt 24
Everett, WA 98201

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Laura Rivendell <laura.rivendell@yahoo.com> Mon, Dec 8, 2014 at 3:40 PM
Reply-To: laura.rivendell@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Laura Rivendell
PO Box 3191
Renton, WA 98056

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Lynette Weick <laweick@comcast.net> Mon, Dec 8, 2014 at 7:50 AM
Reply-To: laweick@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.

Lynette Weick
7631 Westlund Rd
Arlington, WA 98223

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

2 messages

amy hammer <amydresses@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 9, 2014 at 9:51 PM
Reply-To: amydresses@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,

amy hammer
7452 ranger station rd.
marblemount, WA 98267

amy hammer <amydresses@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 9, 2014 at 9:51 PM
Reply-To: amydresses@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Jane Landis <janevlandis@aol.com> Tue, Dec 9, 2014 at 8:49 PM
Reply-To: janevlandis@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.

Jane Landis
708 11th Ave East
Seattle, WA 98102

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Katie Briggs <katiekbriggs@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 9, 2014 at 12:20 PM
Reply-To: katiekbriggs@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 of our state's public lands. The use of aquatic lands has far-reaching consequences for water quality, our economy and our shared culture, as well as for 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 as management for other kinds of projects.

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, and what is emerging about the potential of nearshore systems - particularly eelgrass beds - as a carbon sink.

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.

Katie Briggs
461 E Coulter Creek Road
Belfair, WA 98528

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

lee benner <mlbhomebiz@gmail.com> Tue, Dec 9, 2014 at 12:51 PM
Reply-To: mlbhomebiz@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.

lee benner
3018 NE 103 St
Seattle, WA 98125

J P PS

BISON CONNECT

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

People for Puget Sound

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Caitlin Guthrie <caitlinroseguthrie@gmail.com>
Reply-To: caitlinroseguthrie@gmail.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Tue, Dec 2, 2014 at 3:33 PM

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Caitlin Guthrie
1717 5th Ave SE
Olympia, WA 98501

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

janet Rubino <zagiik@msn.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:35 AM
Reply-To: zagiik@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,

janet Rubino
9615 Soles lane
Spanish Fort, AL 36527

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Suzanne Hamer <tedsuza@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:36 AM
Reply-To: tedsuza@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.

Suzanne Hamer
17227 NE 195th St
Woodinville, WA 98072

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

blayney myers <bfmy@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:08 PM
Reply-To: bfmy@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.

blayney myers
242 Shaddox Springs Rd
Underwood, WA 98651

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Karen Dingmon <karendingmon@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 9:59 AM
Reply-To: karendingmon@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,

Karen Dingmon
2610 116th St SE
Everett, WA 98208

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

3 messages

Rein Attemann <reinattemann@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:08 AM
Reply-To: reinattemann@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,

Rein Attemann
316 NW 86th St
Seattle, WA 98117

Rein Attemann <reinattemann@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:08 AM
Reply-To: reinattemann@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

Rein Attemann <reinattemann@yahoo.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 10:08 AM
Reply-To: reinattemann@yahoo.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP EIS

1 message

Rick Romito <stargazer0329@gmail.com> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 7:16 PM
Reply-To: stargazer0329@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,

Rick Romito
4534 Fir Tree Way
Belllingham, WA 98229

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Tom Craighead <craigheadwalker@juno.com> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 6:16 AM
Reply-To: craigheadwalker@juno.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Tom Craighead
23404 107th Ave SW
Vashon, WA 98070

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

Washington deserves stronger habitat protection!

1 message

Patricia Coffey <drcoffey@whidbey.com> Fri, Jan 2, 2015 at 9:12 AM
Reply-To: drcoffey@whidbey.com
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Dear Tim Romanski, Scott Anderson, and Lalena Amoitte,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Patricia Coffey
2253 Wodbine Road
Langley
Langley, WA 98260