WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP DEIS

60 messages

ted royal (ted.royal@frontier.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
ted royal
maple falls, Washington

Michael Sennett (mdsennett@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Michael Sennett
Bellingham , Washington

Robert Bumford (realrobert8@msn.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Robert Bumford
Sumas, Washington 98295

Carl Franz (franz.carl@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Carl Franz
Acme, Washington 98220

Marian Beddill (marian@NoneoftheThree.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM

To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Marian Beddill
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Rick Hatten (Rickerbock@aol.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Rick Hatten
Bainbridge Island, Washington

Ryan Provonsha (rprovonsha@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Ryan Provonsha
Lynnwood, Washington 98087-8424

Ken Alsobrook (getequitynow@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Ken Alsobrook
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Gary McNally (garymcnally@earthlink.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Gary McNally
Blaine, Washington 98230

marian L.Volpe (merriumvolpe@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
marian L.Volpe
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Hal Glidden (hglid@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Hal Glidden
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Louann Chapman (Loumura@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Louann Chapman
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Gordon Wood (transhuman@earthlink.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Gordon Wood
Seattle, Washington 98144

Bettina Stokes (hestokes@msn.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,

Bettina Stokes
Bellevue, Washington 98005

Jeffrey Garrison, MD (f8bthr@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Jeffrey Garrison, MD
Bellingham, Washington 98229

Anne Whirledge Karp (anne@awish.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Anne Whirledge Karp
Lopez Island, Washington 98261

Helen Glidden (hmg4600@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Helen Glidden
Bellingham, Washington 98225

---

mike contezac (contezmc@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
mike contezac
bellingham, Washington

Pam Borso (borsope@aol.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Pam Borso
Custer, Washington 98240

Stephan Gruenheit (mattp@re-sources.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Stephan Gruenheit
Bellingham, Washington

Rocky Rantz (sinspore21@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Rocky Rantz
Bellingham, Washington

Geoff Lowery (geoff_lowery@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Geoff Lowery
Bothell, Washington 98021

Susan Wechsler (susanwechsler@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Susan Wechsler
Corvallis, Oregon

Jack MacSlarrow (jac.macslarrow@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Jack MacSlarrow
Ferndale, Washington 98248

Brent Rocks (brent_rocks@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Brent Rocks
Portland, Oregon 97201

Kristin Sykes-David (mulepower@msn.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Kristin Sykes-David
Bellingham, Washington 98229

Cynthia Flora (florafam@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Cynthia Flora
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Christine Hansen (mkbabe_71@msn.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Christine Hansen
Bellingham, Washington 98228

Jenny Thomson (jennson@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Jenny Thomson
Bow, Washington 98232

Clarence Holmes (clarence.holmes@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Clarence Holmes
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Louann Chapman (Loumura@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

Ann Mulvey (nebulann@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Ann Mulvey
Birch Bay, Washington 98230

Margaret HASHMI (sakibaytu@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Margaret HASHMI
BELLINGHAM, Washington 98226

Leslie Jackson (leslienatasha@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM

To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Leslie Jackson
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Stephanie Trasoff (strasoff@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Stephanie Trasoff
Blaine, Washington 98230

Keith Dangelo (jkeithdangelo@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Keith Dangelo
Bellingham, Washington 98229

Marian Beddill (marian@NoneoftheThree.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
When an adult has been harmed, or is at risk of being harmed, the rights of an adult provides them the authority to hire an attorney to prosecute a case; When a child has been harmed, or is at risk of being harmed, the rights of a child does not provide them the authority to hire an attorney to prosecute a case, so some person or persons must act as their legal representative to do that; When Nature has been harmed, or is at risk of being harmed, the rights of Nature does not provide it the authority to hire an attorney to prosecute a case, so some person or persons must act as the legal representative of Nature, to do that. Nature _is_ being harmed, and with more harm likely if current conditions continue. Thus, we the caring people, who have the authority, must act as the legal representatives of Nature - some of us have the ability to do so on the front lines, and the rest of us must support them, in whichever way each can do. Support your favorite environmental justice organization, with whatever resources you have, so that Nature may retain and recover its health - which is in truth a benefit to us all.
[Quoted text hidden]

Michael Sennett (mdsennett@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
I lived in the Birch Bay area for about 22 years before moving to Bellingham last year. I became aware of the many issues in the local waters in that time. The dramatic decrease in the Cherry Point Herring is the most

troubling indicator of the degraded condition of our coastal waters. The fluctuations in pollution levels in Drayton Harbor and Birch Bay are warning signs. The state's primary interest should be in keeping our aquatic habitats in as healthy as possible as the off-shore waters and coastal lands are critical to the well being of its residents.
[Quoted text hidden]

Ryan Provonsha (rprovonsha@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,
[Quoted text hidden]

John Chadwick (COSbelongMOS@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): PLEASE consider my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I understand that the DNR might be in violation of an incidental take permit if the plan is not officially revised to address the following concerns: The standard for cumulative impacts should be NO NET LOSS of habitats or native plant and animal population. ANY PROJECT, regardless of its size or duration, is the antithesis of conservation! The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in MOST CASES should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. Thank you again,

Thank you,
John Chadwick
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Emily Cone (emily.cone@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Emily Cone
Bellingham, Washington

---

ted royal (ted.royal@frontier.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): We need to have safe guards built into the transport of oil by trains and coal being dumped so close to herring spawning grounds. No herring means no whales and no salmon. How can a pile of coal 5 stories high, being sprayed with millions of gallons of good drinking water, I might add, be allowed to flow into the ocean right where the herring live? We can't keep pandering to big business that socialize their costs and privitize their profits.
[Quoted text hidden]

Deborah Thatcher (dt2002beachbum@aol.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Now is the time to care before it's too late

Thank you,
Deborah Thatcher
Mulberry, Florida 33860

Carl Franz (franz.carl@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Dear Commissioner Goldmark, On my 70th birthday a few days ago I took a long reflective walk in the woods. On that walk I recalled the delight I experienced as a child growing up in Lynnwood when salmon literally ran in every creek and many roadside ditches. I spent countless days roaming the beaches on Puget Sound and developed a lifelong interest in that amazing sea. I urge you sir to please do whatever you can to promote the recovery of these waters and their once abundant wildlife. We've been greedy in our use of natural resources. Isn't it time to pay back a bit more before it is too late? thank you, Carl Franz Acme, WA
[Quoted text hidden]

David Turnoy (davidgeri@centurylink.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
David Turnoy

Eastsound, Washington 98245

Jim Scarborough (jims701@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Jim Scarborough
Bellingham, Washington

Brenda Michaels (brenda@conscioustalk.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Brenda Michaels
Issaquah, Washington 98027

Cynthia Flora (florafam@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Please do more...allow fewer threats to our aquatic environment's fragile health. We as citizens have no way of protecting it if you do not. Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

Paula Rotondi (perotondi@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
I live in Birch Bay. WA and each day here brings an appreciation of the beauty and bounty provided by our aquatic habitats. Each day also brings increasing concerns regarding the varied and compounding threats endangering our Aquatic Habitats. I grew up in New England during destruction of North America's northeastern aquatic habitat which resulted in the loss of the entire fishing industry and thousands of jobs. America cannot lose another aquatic habitat. You have it in your power to protect what remains of our aquatic habitat in the Pacific Northwest. My hope is that you will do everything possible within the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) to protect our shared natural aquatic treasures. Please consider my comments on the proposed HCP. I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you for considering my comments.

Thank you,
Paula Rotondi
Birch Bay, Washington 98230

Douglas Smith (doughsmith1@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Douglas Smith
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Stan Parker (parkerstan1@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am

concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Stan Parker
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Mary Ruth Holder (mruthholder@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Mary Ruth Holder
Mount Vernon, Washington 98274

Diane Smith (zetaclaw@q.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Diane Smith
Bellingham, Washington 98229

Susan Hass (hass@ibiblio.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM

To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Susan Hass
Sammamish, Washington 98075

Robert Briggs (rsb@turbonet.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Robert Briggs
Pullman, Washington 99163

Margaret Keene (margaret2@clearwire.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Margaret Keene

White City, Oregon 97503

Laulette Hansen (ledouxhansen@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Laulette Hansen
Missoula, Montana 59802

Trey Culhertson (fhe_3@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Trey Culhertson
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Max Jones (maxart44@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Max Jones
Bellingham, Washington 98225-3033

Susan Hass (hass@ibiblio.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP DEIS

60 messages

William Nolan (will.brendan@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
William Nolan
Bellingham, Washington

June Dean (junestan2007@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
June Dean
Diamond Springs, California 95619

Annapoorne Colangelo (anapurna@whidbey.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Annapoorne Colangelo
Clinton, Washington 98236

June Dean (junestan2007@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

[Quoted text hidden]

Dr. Carolynn Cory (love2hugtrees@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Dr. Carolynn Cory
Bellingham, Washington

Shari Tarantino (orcaconservancy@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Please shut down the increase of giant tanker ships in the fragile Cherry Point Aquatic area where herring and salmon need to be given a fighting chance to survive along with other marine life that is ultimately essential to our survival. Herring are key players in the local marine ecosystem and are an important prey resource for Chinook salmon and ESA listed marbled murrelets. Puget Sound has 19 Pacific herring stocks; the populations from all have decreased since 2002. Most notably -- Cherry Point herring are a “Distinct Population Segment” under the Endangered Species Act. Puget Sound Chinook salmon are just one of many species whose populations have declined to precariously low levels (ESA endangered status) due to a variety of perturbations. Southern Resident Killer Whales (SRKWs) are listed as endangered under both the U.S. Endangered Species Act (ESA) and Canada's Species at Risk Act (SARA). Scientific information and analyses about the Southern Resident population and the extent of their reliance on salmon - particularly large Chinook salmon - strongly suggest that Chinook abundance is very important to survival and recovery of the SRKWs. Ultimately, food chains and food webs show the flow of energy through an ecosystem. Herring ---> Salmon ---> Killer Whales. A strong 'Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan' will mean better conservation of these important public resources into the future. Thank you. Shari Tarantino President, Board of Directors Orca Conservancy 216 630-5177 orcaconservancy@gmail.com

Thank you,
Shari Tarantino
Seattle, Washington 98109

Linda Gregory (zgrbell3@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the

management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. We've already experienced a significant decline and impact at Cherry Point in the smelt population, which feeds salmon and other marine life in the last several decades. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Linda Gregory
Bellingham, Washington 98227

Tosha Kerr (mattp@re-sources.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Tosha Kerr
Bellingham, Washington

John Chadwick (COSbelongMOS@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
John Chadwick
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Clarence Holmes (clarence.holmes@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Clarence Holmes
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Nate Doogan (doogan.nate4@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM

To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Nate Doogan
Bellingham, Washington

Hal Glidden (hglid@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): The HCP needs to be comprehensive to address the entire aquatic habitat at Cherry Point. The current "carve-out" of the Pier proposal is absurd and totally inadequate to address environmental impacts resulting from heavy ship and vessel-assist traffic, shading of the seabed and disruption of an already fragile marine habitat for herring populations.

Thank you,
Hal Glidden
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Suzann Finch (suzyque1957@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Suzann Finch
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Gary McNally (garymcnally@earthlink.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): As a 66 year old, I have witnessed the decimation of herring at Cherry Point to near extinction; any further development is not in our best interests.

Thank you,
Gary McNally
Blaine, Washington 98230

Helen Glidden (hmg4600@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Dear Scott Anderson, NOAA Fisheries, and Tim Romanski, US Fish and Wildlife Service: Please consider my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is revised to address the following: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities need another, higher level of scrutiny, as the HCP can not be a "one-size fits all" in these instances. Indeed, additional individual, in depth research into such projects may determine they should be avoided completely. The time-frame of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter than currently specified, since many things can happen over the years, i.e. further ocean acidification, more extreme weather conditions affecting the environment, other unforeseen events, that could negatively impact aquatic areas. A shorter time-frame would allow for mitigating damage. Additionally, the plan should specify actions to ensure that management can, and will, adapt during the time-frame. Will there be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented? Budgetary constraints, other priorities, could prevent this from happening. There is insufficient guarantee there will be funding available, especially for monitoring. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. New evidence from credible research sources should be incorporated going forward. The standards for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal populations. These standards and accountability are the important factors needing consideration. Thank you, Helen Glidden hmg4600@gmail.com

Thank you,
Helen Glidden
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Douglas Smith (doughsmith1@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Douglas Smith
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Alex Chose (mattp@re-sources.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Alex Chose
Bellingham, Washington

Max Jones (maxart44@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Max Jones
Bellingham, Washington 98225-3033

S. P. Almskaar (spaspa9@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
S. P. Almskaar
Everson, Washington 98247

James Murphy (j.murphy.7@mac.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
James Murphy
Seattle, Washington

Doug Swanson (skagitkey@aol.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Doug Swanson
Blaine, Washington

Anne Whirledge Karp (anne@awish.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am

concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Anne Whirledge Karp
Lopez Island, Washington 98261

Debra Smith-Hicks (bobanddebrainskagit@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Debra Smith-Hicks
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Jane Palajac (lunagtr1@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Jane Palajac
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Linda Gregory (zgrbell3@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

Rick Hatten (Rickerbock@aol.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
I support the strongest possible protections for our waters and inhabitants.

Thank you,
Rick Hatten
Bainbridge Island, Washington

Leslie Jackson (leslienatasha@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Leslie Jackson
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Stephan Gruenheit (mattp@re-sources.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Stephan Gruenheit
Bellingham, Washington

Debra Smith-Hicks (bobanddebrainskagit@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations

of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

Donna Hinton (whatcomdmh@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Donna Hinton
Sedro Woolley, Washington 98284

Ken Alsobrook (getequitynow@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): I retired in What com county not for access to development but for the areas natural resources. Protecting these resources is most important to me and my family. Coal trains, coal dumps, and oil trains will be very harmful to this area in terms of noise, pollution, exposure to horrific accidents, the herring spawning grounds and the natural beauty of the area. Please protect this resource.

Thank you,
Ken Alsobrook
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Suki Aufhauser (spinaltone@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Suki Aufhauser
Sedro Woolley , Washington

Diane Smith (zetaclaw@q.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Diane Smith
Bellingham, Washington 98229

Alan Hetterly (alanandnancy@q.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Alan Hetterly
Lummi Island, Washington 98262

---

marian L.Volpe (merriumvolpe@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Please protect our aquatic habitat lands by not leasing to agriculture and public use.

Thank you,
marian L.Volpe
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Elizabeth Hartsoch (elizabethhartsoch@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Elizabeth Hartsoch
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Geoff Lowery (geoff_lowery@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Geoff Lowery
Bothell, Washington 98021

Paula Rotondi (perotondi@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Paula Rotondi
Birch Bay, Washington 98230

Suzanne Hamer (tedsuza@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Suzanne Hamer
Woodinville, Washington 98072

Susan Wechsler (susanwechsler@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management

is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Susan Wechsler
Corvallis, Oregon

Alan Hetterly (alanandnancy@q.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

Dena Jensen (dbobena@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): My name is Dena Jensen, I live in Birch Bay, Washington and I am especially concerned about the fragile coastline area at Cherry Point where herring populations have been in dangerous decline for the last number of years. The threat to herring and its implications for salmon and orca populations are representative of the strong need to protect and restore the Salish Sea at this moment in time before we have suffered irreparable damage to this ecosystem that will degrade and destroy the lives and lifestyles of peoples depending on them for survival. Jobs and industry are optional for our survival and well-being. Food and water are essential. Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Dena Jensen
Birch Bay, Washington 98230

James Murphy (j.murphy.7@mac.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
James Murphy
Seattle, Washington

Ann Mulvey (nebulann@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Ann Mulvey
Birch Bay, Washington 98230

Louann Chapman (Loumura@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): I believe that the best available and most current science will be critically necessary to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species. But the regularity and quality of monitoring all of this is of most concern to me. Where is this money going to come from? Certainly there is no evidence or even likelihood that this expense will ever come from the State or Feds! What happens when one defaults? Monitoring MUST be paid up front through placement of bonds by the company that is proposing a big project, such as GPT. There is simply NO WAY we will be assured monitoring will be done properly otherwise. Monitoring and maintenance is a huge cost that the corporations have more than ample $ to spend if they truly want their projects to go through. HEAR THIS: Go out and look in the waters under the Phillips Conoco dock and assess the condition of the dock and roads around there. Has anyone done this recently? It is rotting away, and the clams down under the dock have no shells! This is fact. This is why regular independent monitoring is critical. Another example: When the city of B'ham and Port took over the waterfront land from GP, the cost of cleanup was estimated, and NOW it is 10 times the cost of this estimate because the estimate was BOGUS as well as exponentially increased as the years pass. Taxpayers got really screwed. GP totally got off the hook and this is a perfect example that no corporation cares a bit about preserving the integrity

of our environment, only how much money they can get out of it, albeit temporary. BONDS must be part of this plan, there is no other solution. Finally, the standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you

Thank you,
Louann Chapman
Bellingham, Washington 98225

WILLIAM COLGROVE (bcolgrove1@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Lets get this right guys. As I'm sure you're very aware, we (humans) are rapidly depleting and poisoning our own planet... particularly our oceans. And we need to do everything possible to slow, and then reverse that trend, or humans will not survive here in the future. It seems we've nearly destroyed our oceans in a short 150 years, after nature took millions of years to make them perfect and healthy. We (all humans and animals) are counting on people like you in positions to make important choices for all of us, to do what is necessary to protect us in the long run... not just help us make more jobs or more profits in the short term. We'll all get by just fine. You take care of the planet, and the rest of use will take care of each other! 100 years from now I want you guys to be know as the people who did the right thing for the future, and stood up against profiteering pressure and took action to save our oceans! I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
WILLIAM COLGROVE
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Bettina Stokes (hestokes@msn.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Bettina Stokes
Bellevue, Washington 98005

Cynthia Bentley (CwithGod@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Cynthia Bentley
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Nancy Swanson (swanson@abacus-ent.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Nancy Swanson
Lummi Island, Washington 98262

Teresa Van Haalen (vhaalen@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Teresa Van Haalen
Bellingham, Washington

Marjorie Leone (marjlion@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). Our aquatic preserves are special and need maximum protection. I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank

you again,

Thank you,
Marjorie Leone
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Maeghan Cer (mattp@re-sources.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Maeghan Cer
Bellingham, Washington

William Nolan (will.brendan@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
William Nolan
Bellingham, Washington

Jack Stansfield (jacks8981@frontier.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,

Jack Stansfield
Stanwood, Washington 98292

Laulette Hansen (ledouxhansen@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Laulette Hansen
Missoula, Montana 59802

Nancy Swanson (swanson@abacus-ent.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: Specifically, Cherry Point used to be home to a large herring population. This population has been in serious decline for some time. The herring depend on eel grass beds to lay their eggs. These beds are susceptible to human activity. http://daily.sightline.org/2013/03/29/the-real-story-of-puget-sounds-disappearing-herring/ Almost everything in Puget Sound depends on the herring for survival and lack of herring has been blamed for the disappearance of sea birds. http://www.oregonlive.com/today/index.ssf/2014/07/northwests_vanishing_seabirds.html Isn't it time that we started doing something to reverse this trend rather than to continue doing more damage? Public lands should not be used for commercial ventures. Particularly, already fragile ecosystems must not be further disturbed. The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

James Hipp (jrhipp010@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe

of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
James Hipp
Bellingham, Washington 98226

Annapoorne Colangelo (anapurna@whidbey.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

WILLIAM COLGROVE (bcolgrove1@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

[Quoted text hidden]

Phyllis Dolph (pidolph@frontier.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Phyllis Dolph
Anacortes, Washington 98221

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP DEIS

61 messages

Alan & Kelly Bell (bellbase2@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Alan & Kelly Bell
Custer, Washington 98240

Carole Tabb (NonaCarole1@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Carole Tabb
Blaine, Washington 98230

Kassi Honcoop (Kassi.L.Honcoop@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Kassi Honcoop
Bellingham, Washington 98226

Louann Chapman (Loumura@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Louann Chapman
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Louann Chapman (Loumura@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM

To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

Deborah Thatcher (dt2002beachbum@aol.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Deborah Thatcher
Mulberry, Florida 33860

Marjorie Leone (marjlion@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Marjorie Leone
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Henry Lagergren (hstellar1@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Henry Lagergren
Bellingham, Washington 98229

Darian Wiseman (mattp@re-sources.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Darian Wiseman
Bellingham, Washington

Tracy Ouellette (tracyjouellette@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Tracy Ouellette
Bow, Washington 98232

Cynthia Bentley (CwithGod@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Cynthia Bentley
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Emily Cone (emily.cone@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Emily Cone
Bellingham, Washington

Mary Ruth Holder (mruthholder@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Mary Ruth Holder
Mount Vernon, Washington 98274

Kathleeen Wolfe (catlight45@msn.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Kathleeen Wolfe
Des Noines, Washington

Phyllis Dolph (pidolph@frontier.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Phyllis Dolph
Anacortes, Washington 98221

Jill Brubaker (mattp@re-sources.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Jill Brubaker
Bellingham, Washington

Jeffrey Garrison, MD (f8bthr@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Why build for a slowly dying industry and one which is potentially damaging our community and planet irreversibly? Any such projects are highly irresponsible and only benefit the greed of a few.

Thank you,
Jeffrey Garrison, MD
Bellingham, Washington 98229

---

mike contezac (contezmc@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
mike contezac
bellingham, Washington

Dennis Parent (Parentease46@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Dennis Parent
Mount Vernon, Washington 98273

Gordon Wood (transhuman@earthlink.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Gordon Wood
Seattle, Washington 98144

Jane Palajac (lunagtr1@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Jane Palajac
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Kassi Honcoop (Kassi.L.Honcoop@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk for violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns. The plan should explicitly state that large high impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny and in some cases completely denied of land leasing rights. The time frame of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter (10 years) and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal populations."
[Quoted text hidden]

---

ronnie mitchell (ronniemitchell1@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
ronnie mitchell
bellingham, Washington

Donna Hinton (whatcomdmh@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Donna Hinton
Sedro Woolley, Washington 98284

Alex Chose (mattp@re-sources.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the

management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Alex Chose
Bellingham, Washington

James Hipp (jrhipp010@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
James Hipp
Bellingham, Washington 98226

Christine Hansen (mkbabe_71@msn.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Having recently attended a presentation by Department of Natural Resources personnel concerning the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), I am all in favor of having strong protections in place for our aquatic lands. Washington State (and our little corner of it) is perhaps one of the last areas of our country where people are working together to preserve our pristine environment and to protect the various species residing here. By putting into effect a strong HCP, we can help to ensure that all biological studies are thorough and complete -- and that our aquatic preserves are safely maintained. In addition, by having the DNR's policies on how it operates its leases set down in writing as part of the HCP, it will provide clarity for those who wish to [potentially] build over-water structures in aquatic reserve areas. I'm particularly concerned about SSA's proposed pier near (or over) the aquatic reserves at Cherry Point and the possibility that this project could destroy current marine life residing there. I would prefer that a lease for such a project not be issued. If such a lease does exist, it should be reviewed against the HCP and discontinued. Please move forward with the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan and Draft EIS. It is a well thought out and documented plan that is designed to ensure the preservation of our aquatic lands.

Thank you,
Christine Hansen
Bellingham, Washington 98228

Mary Ruth Holder (mruthholder@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations

of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

---

ronnie mitchell (ronniemitchell1@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

[Quoted text hidden]

Dennis Parent (Parentease46@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

Brenda Michaels (brenda@conscioustalk.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Brenda Michaels
Issaquah, Washington 98027

Jill Brubaker (mattp@re-sources.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Jill Brubaker
Bellingham, Washington

---

l sherwood (bravols1@aol.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
l sherwood
bham, Washington 98229

---

l sherwood (bravols1@aol.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

[Quoted text hidden]

Dr. Carolynn Cory (love2hugtrees@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Dr. Carolynn Cory
Bellingham, Washington

Kathleeen Wolfe (catlight45@msn.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used

to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

David Turnoy (davidgeri@centurylink.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
David Turnoy
Eastsound, Washington 98245

Carole Tabb (NonaCarole1@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
This is one of the most important assets of Washington state! Do not ruin this.... we MUST preserve this "gift" & not allow the "greed" to drain us of our beautiful water, shellfish & lands. Emphatically opposed to the proposed coal terminal @ Cherry Point... DO NOT ALLOW this "attack" on us & our environment! Living on Drayton Harbor we see/hear the attack on our peaceful area from the absurd increase in coal trains... shaking our homes & assaulting our hearing... ruining the beauty of a train ride for visitors & basic transportation needs. DO NOT make us sorry for relocating here!
[Quoted text hidden]

Margaret HASHMI (sakibaytu@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Margaret HASHMI
BELLINGHAM, Washington 98226

Ursula Mass (ursmas919@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Ursula Mass
La Conner, Washington 98257

Louann Chapman (Loumura@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): With biannual appropriation of funding dependent on Congress, how in the world could funding be counted on? Corporations need to commit the funding for monitoring and frequent maintenance up front before any large project gets a lease. It is a nice idea that we have an HCP. You can just look at the industry at Cherry Point right now that DOESN"T have and HCP and see the devastation. Phillip Conoco's dock is rotting, roads are broken down and the clams in the water beneath the dock have no shells! We can't let this happen elsewhere. Another concern is what jurisdictions/controls are outside the DNR's? Perhaps each mega project should have to conduct their own HCP before being given a lease? Generally, your HCP isn't complete when it comes to inclusion of cumulative effects/impacts over years. Thank you
[Quoted text hidden]

L Urbanec (jurbanec2001@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
L Urbanec
Bellingham, Washington 98226

Robert Briggs (rsb@turbonet.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Robert Briggs
Pullman, Washington 99163

Carolyne Pion (carolynepion@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Carolyne Pion
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Elizabeth Hartsoch (elizabethhartsoch@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). My home is in Bellingham, Washington, between Bellingham Bay and Mount Baker. The proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal has piqued my interest in policies regarding aquatic habitat. I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Elizabeth Hartsoch
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Tracy Ouellette (tracyjouellette@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
As a resident of Skagit county I am very thankful to live within the bounty of the Salish Sea, and we need to make sure to protect that bounty for the future. Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,

[Quoted text hidden]

Suki Aufhauser (spinaltone@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Suki Aufhauser
Sedro Woolley , Washington

Margaret Keene (margaret2@clearwire.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Margaret Keene
White City, Oregon 97503

Louann Chapman (Loumura@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
I am gravely concerned about the timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases in the HCP Due to the fact scientific research is moving in an unbelievably rapid fashion with regard to climate change issues, 50 years is unacceptable! Just look at what information we have accumulated in the last 5 years that could change the whole course of how we perceive going forward on environmental issues! I understand renewing the terms of the HCP too often could be costly, but tweeking it where necessary to keep abreast of changes should not be less than every 10 years, 5 being even more acceptable. I totally oppose waiting a ridiculous period of 50 years! Who are you kidding? Thank you The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

BRAD JOHNSON (bradj@microtech-electronics.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
BRAD JOHNSON

Ferndale, Washington 98248

BRAD JOHNSON (bradj@microtech-electronics.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,
[Quoted text hidden]

Stan Parker (parkerstan1@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Stan Parker
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Teresa Van Haalen (vhaalen@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Teresa Van Haalen
Bellingham, Washington

Stan Parker (parkerstan1@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

[Quoted text hidden]

Keith Dangelo (jkeithdangelo@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population Remember the declining Herring Population is the base of the food web for Salmon Or a and mankind Thank you again,

Thank you,
Keith Dangelo
Bellingham, Washington 98229

Stan Parker (parkerstan1@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

Keith Dangelo (jkeithdangelo@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population Remember the declining Herring Population Thank you again,

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

Suzann Finch (suzyque1957@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Suzann Finch
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Nate Doogan (doogan.nate4@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Nate Doogan
Bellingham, Washington

Robert Bumford (realrobert8@msn.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Dear Peter, I am a citizen of Whatcom County asking you to increase protections for Puget Sound marine species and aquatic lands particularly, efforts to restore the herring populations around Cherry Point industrial port. Species protection should trump economic concerns in my opinion. Actually, it is my belief that protecting the environment will be far more beneficial to the overall economy in the long term rather than the short term benefits to a small number of employees and corporations wishing to see the status quo of protections either maintained or reduced. Thank you for your attempts to do the right thing. Sincerely, Robert Bumford

Thank you,
Robert Bumford
Sumas, Washington 98295

Alan & Kelly Bell (bellbase2@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): My wife and I have been monitoring the sea star population diminish over the last summer. Unless we take action, we will see more des- truction of other species due to pollution and the natural balance of the food chain being disrupted. Please act now to save our aquatic resources.

[Quoted text hidden]

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP DEIS

39 messages

Shari Tarantino (orcaconservancy@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Shari Tarantino
Seattle, Washington 98109

L Urbanec (jurbanec2001@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
L Urbanec
Bellingham, Washington 98226

Jim Scarborough (jims701@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Jim Scarborough
Bellingham, Washington

Dena Jensen (dbobena@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Dena Jensen
Birch Bay, Washington 98230

Brandon Pope (mattp@re-sources.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM

To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Brandon Pope
Bellingham, Washington

Gretchen Clay (clay488@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Gretchen Clay
Bellingham, Washington 98225-2304

Trey Culhertson (fhe_3@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Trey Culhertson
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Keith Dangelo (jkeithdangelo@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Keith Dangelo
Bellingham, Washington 98229

Jack MacSlarrow (jac.macslarrow@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Jack MacSlarrow
Ferndale, Washington 98248

June Dean (junestan2007@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
June Dean
Diamond Springs, California 95619

Kristin Sykes-David (mulepower@msn.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Kristin Sykes-David
Bellingham, Washington 98229

Jack Stansfield (jacks8981@frontier.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): First, thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Jack Stansfield
Stanwood, Washington 98292

Laulette Hansen (ledouxhansen@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Laulette Hansen
Missoula, Montana 59802

Esther Faber (bellinghamesther@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Esther Faber
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Susan Hymas (hymas@fidalgo.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Susan Hymas
Bellingham, Washington 98225

S. P. Almskaar (spaspa9@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:23 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
S. P. Almskaar
Everson, Washington 98247

Ursula Mass (ursmas919@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Ursula Mass
La Conner, Washington 98257

Brent Rocks (brent_rocks@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe

of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Brent Rocks
Portland, Oregon 97201

June Dean (junestan2007@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Please preserve and protect aquatic habitat for future generations to use and enjoy.
[Quoted text hidden]

Esther Faber (bellinghamesther@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

Henry Lagergren (hstellar1@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Henry Lagergren

Bellingham, Washington 98229

Susan Hymas (hymas@fidalgo.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

[Quoted text hidden]

Doug Swanson (skagitkey@aol.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Doug Swanson
Blaine, Washington

Maeghan Cer (mattp@re-sources.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Maeghan Cer
Bellingham, Washington

Stephanie Trasoff (strasoff@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native

plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Stephanie Trasoff
Blaine, Washington 98230

Laulette Hansen (ledouxhansen@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

[Quoted text hidden]

Brandon Pope (mattp@re-sources.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Brandon Pope
Bellingham, Washington

Darian Wiseman (mattp@re-sources.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Darian Wiseman
Bellingham, Washington

Rand Guthrie (r_guth7@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Rand Guthrie
Snohomish, Washington 98290

Suzanne Hamer (tedsuza@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Suzanne Hamer
Woodinville, Washington 98072

Carolyne Pion (carolynepion@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The time frame of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Carolyne Pion
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Jenny Thomson (jennson@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations

of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Jenny Thomson
Bow, Washington 98232

Mary Ruth Holder (mruthholder@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

Thank you,
Mary Ruth Holder
Mount Vernon, Washington 98274

Rocky Rantz (sinspore21@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
"Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk for violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns. The plan should explicitly state that large high impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny and in some cases completely denied of land leasing rights. The time frame of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter (10 years) and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal populations."

Thank you,
Rocky Rantz
Bellingham, Washington

Rand Guthrie (r_guth7@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

Gretchen Clay (clay488@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

[Quoted text hidden]

Louann Chapman (Loumura@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
I am concerned about this plan as its written. I am all for protecting habitat and endangered species and believe that incidental permitting needs strict regulations. Due to the ambiguity of where this funding of monitoring these big projects will come from. I am taking past foe paws of both State and Fed promises historically promising to fund projects without the money to back them up. It happens over and over again (No Child Left Behind is just ONE that comes to mind for me). I believe that any large project like GPT for instance, should come up front and pay a bond before ever putting a shovel in the dirt to start. The bond would be enough to fund the whole project AND may for independent monitoring (by the DNR or another entity). I have NO confidence that the Feds can fund the necessary monitoring of enormously expensive projects like this one. Realistically, if the State defaults, the Feds get holding the bag and we all know what happens then. I am opposed including any large fossil fuel project in the HCP without proof beyond a doubt the money is there. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Louann Chapman
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Pam Borso (borsope@aol.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Pam Borso
Custer, Washington 98240

Tosha Kerr (mattp@re-sources.org) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 5:22 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Tosha Kerr
Bellingham, Washington

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP DEIS

29 messages

Rebecca Westlake (drivenfolkmusic@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Rebecca Westlake
Bellngham, Washington 98225

---

fred karlson (fkarlson@frontier.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
fred karlson
ferndale, Washington

Martha Hammer (spmuzz@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: I am against leasing land to the coal/oil/railroad corporations because monitoring of the large, secretive oil, coal & railroad companies may be beyond what state agencies can handle due to their size, planned expansion and inadequate state funds. If a lease is granted, the wealthy companies should pay for

the monitoring and the cleanup when necessary. No lease agreement should be more than 5 or 10 years. The large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities should be avoided, they are going to degrade our state. If they are permitted, they will need additional scrutiny, and they should pay for the scrutiny and for any damage they to to our state.and state waters, although we know from the Gulf of Mexico, you cannot put it back together again. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and if the environment is being degraded the lease should be terminated. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. funding should come from the Corporations before the project is started, or no lease. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. This should be paid for by the corporations, not the taxpayers whose "home" is being put in harms way. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Martha Hammer
Ferndale, Washington 98248

Jeanne Miller (jamiller_studio@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Jeanne Miller
Olympia, Washington 98501

---

leslie smith (lesliegraysmith@yahoo.om) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
I am a registered nurse and know how important it is for human health as well as for the environment to safeguard our natural resources. Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,

leslie smith
bellingham, Washington 98226

Barbara Rosenkotter (skye@ucdavis-alumni.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Barbara Rosenkotter
Deer Harbor, Washington 98243

Sandra Randall (onesandyr@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): The coal terminal at Cherry Point will benefit only the coal industry. It has the potential to due great harm to Bellingham Bay. The herring are already in bad condition and this is just the beginning. Many people make their living fishing, shell fish farms, recreation, etc. Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Sandra Randall
Bellingham, Washington 98229

Kelsey Severson (kskittles18@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:50 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations

of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Kelsey Severson
Bellingham, Washington 98225

George Lawrence (sandy.george.lawrence@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): I appreciate the fact that three representatives of the Department of Natural Resources for Washington State came to Bellingham and other locations to patiently delineate their role in both protecting and promoting the use of the 2.6 million acres of bedlands, tidelands and shorelands that represent the shared aquatic resources of our state. Our shared obligation now is to prevent what Garrett Hardin famously called the "tragedy of the commons," namely should inadequate protection be provided. Thus is it critical that a robust Habitat Conservation Plan be crafted. There are some subtleties here. An example is that the DNR has researched intensively 29 species that are pertinent and potentially at risk. But best possible science should require that a broader ecosystem perspective be taken, which entails examining and monitoring species interrelationships, nutrient cycles, concentration of toxics in food chains and so forth. Some species are keystone and emblematic or popular, but I am concerned about varietites of microscopic and macroscopic plankton, fungi, protists and not just plants and animals. There should be a firm principle that commercial title to aquatic lands does not automatically establish a priori any greater leverage in gaining access to or use of adjacent acerage that is state controlled, no matter how strong the financial and political influence of that corporate entity. Another important perspective is time. I study and teach about energy systems and their intersection with climate change. Clearly there are data indicating that acidification in the Pacific Northwest is proceeding faster than in some other areas of the world. And in this century we must plan for and mitigate the effects of sea level rise. The Fifth Assessment Report of the International Panel on Climate Change in its highest Representative Concentration Pathway or RCP projects an upper limit of rising waters of a mean of nearly four meters. The implication obviously is that the extent and location of aquatic lands could change remarkably. One obvious protection of aquatic lands is to minimize the duration of leases and to explicitly establish options for revisiting an existing lease or contract if new data or occurrences justify it. An example would be if new data on individual species or the biotic community as a whole are generated. Apparently there is now precedent for leases as short as a dozen years, and I would strongly encourage this duration or even shorter. Another parameter is the size or potential impact of a proposed project. In particular fossil fuel projects involving coal, natural gas and crude and condensate or finished petroleum projects should be scrutinized as a unique and much higher risk and therefore occupy a category of their own. It would be entirely reasonable that some of these projects would significantly exceed the boundaries of what is acceptable and should be flatly rejected. Funding for establishment of best management practices needs to be guaranteed. State budgetary shortfalls and the vagaries of political decision-making could lead to underfunding these vital activities. Thus lease income for higher risk projects should be substantially higher, and held in escrow or dedicated as excise tax to specifically support monitoring and management. Furthermore, dedicated insurance and bond should be required of leasees to guarantee that adverse events such as oil spills could be managed. This is especially pertinent with tar sands [diluted bitumen] or extra heavy oil which is not buoyant in water and extremely difficult to clean up in marine or freshwater. The final broader perspective is that the commendable effort by the Department of Natural Resources should be matched by a requirement that companies seeking leases on DNR aquatic lands should simultaneously be required to establish their own Habitat Conservation Plan that they separately and privately own. Thankyou for your attention, Sincerely

Thank you,
George Lawrence
Bellingham, Washington 98226-7410

Heather Chapin (Heatherchapin@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Heather Chapin
Portland, Oregon 97217

George Lawrence (sandy.george.lawrence@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
[Quoted text hidden]

Paula Rotondi (perotondi@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Paula Rotondi
Blaine, Washington 98230

Gwen Hunter (maremuse@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Hi. I appreciate this opportunity to influence my grandchildren's future. I was lucky enuf to be born in Whatcom County at a time when our lakes, rivers and sound were not privatized. We had clean beach access and healthy fish. Now most of these areas are "owned," often by people and corporations who worship status & the Almighty Dollar at the expense of our environment. I wonder at their ignorance: even they cannot eat, drink or breathe $$! I am very concerned about the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). It needs to be revised to provide optimum protection of our OUR waters, air and lands. The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities are a dangerous threat to our area's (indeed, our planet's) natural resources. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of all species. The standard for

cumulative impacts should be restoration leading to improved natural habitats for all species indigenous to our area. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Gwen Hunter
Bellingham, Washington 98226

William Young (loon13@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
William Young
Bellingham, Washington 98226-8872

Thomas Reidy (tjs_rebirth07@yahoo.Com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Thomas Reidy
Seattle, Washington 98106

LeeAnn Cogert (noblegoddess@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe

of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
LeeAnn Cogert
Blaine, Washington 98230

Caroline Armon (onboardtours@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided, particularly in the Salish Sea where many endangered and threatened species would be adversely impacted. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Caroline Armon
Friday Harbor, Washington 98250

Paula Rotondi (perotondi@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Now living in Birch Bay Washington I have daily opportunities to appreciate the beauty and bounty of the Pacific Northwest's aquatic habitat. Decades ago, growing up in New England I witnessed the final destruction of North America's North Atlantic aquatic habitat along with its fishing industry and jobs. We simply can not afford to lose another aquatic habitat - anywhere - and that includes the aquatic habitat of the Pacific Northwest. You have the power to protect the aquatic habitat and I along with all future generations are depending upon you to do so. Please use the full extent of the your power to write and enforce the strongest and most comprehensive Aquatic Habitat Protection Plan (HCP) possible - no loopholes - such as in the incidental take permit; DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you for considering my comments, Paula Rotondi

Thank you,

Paula Rotondi
Birch Bay, Washington 98230

Kim Carlton (kcarlton@farallonconsulting.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Kim Carlton
Bellingham, Washington 98229

Jayne Freudenberger (freudbj7@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
I am writing on behalf of the League of Women Voters of Bellingham/Whatcom County I am their advocacy chair. The league is especially concerned that you protect our fragile shore lands and .the Salish Sea as you consider new guidelines for leases of fossil fuel projects. As you must know there is no mitigation possible if we have an major oil spill from an oil ship or coal freighter in these waters. Our shellfish, tourist, and fishing industries would be gone. No new projects of the magnitude proposed by GPT should be permitted and the expansion of the oil refineries in order to ship crude across the oceans should b stopped. Please carefully monitor the existing industry carefully and examine any attempt to expand them. There should be no net loss of habitat or native plants and aninimal populations when you are evaluating proposals. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. There should be no net loss of habitat Thank you again,

Thank you,
Jayne Freudenberger
Bellingham, Washington o8229

Sandra Randall (onesandyr@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
I moved to this beautiful area and I want to see that it is preserved and protected. I worry that these standards will not be high enough to truly protect the habitats and animals. They should be set according to current scientific findings. Also, 50 years is too long. Climate change and ocean acidification are major concerns. Funding for monitoring is essential. Thank you for considering my comments.
[Quoted text hidden]

Sandy Robson (sjrer2@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):

I live in Birch Bay, WA which is about a mile and a half from Cherry Point. The Cherry Point herring are a unique population of Pacific herring that spawn in that area, and that Herring population is a keystone in the food chain for many marine animals including Chinook salmon and orcas. Approximately two thirds of the diet of local Chinook salmon relies on these herring. The herring's distinct spawning location within the Straits of Georgia in Puget Sound has reproductively isolated them from other Puget Sound herring populations, making Cherry Point herring the most genetically divergent species of herring in the state of Washington. In contrast to herring that migrate out to sea, the Cherry Point herring travel inland to freshwater environments, like estuaries coming into Birch Bay State Park, to feed and spawn. This unusual behavior makes the Cherry Point herring susceptible to harm arising from shoreline development and pollution. Unfortunately the herring have still not yet been given federal protection status under the Endangered Species Act. The Cherry Point herring populations were once the most abundant herring species in Washington state waters, have dramatically dropped in the last 3 decades, declining by 90 to 95% percent. The Cherry Point herring is likely headed towards extinction unless it is protected under the Endangered Species Act, so the idea of adding more heavy industries, or substantially developing heavy industries such as the BP and the Phillips 66 refineries, and Intalco Alcoa which are already there at Cherry Point, is extremely questionable. Therefore, we need to make sure the Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan ensures the protection of vital species such as the Cherry Point herring and many other species in our local aquatic areas. Protection for threatened and endangered species, and those like the herring which should already be protected but somehow have been overlooked or ignored, should be first and foremost, above and beyond any development in our aquatic areas supposedly in the name of economic prosperity. Without a healthy enviornment there is no prosperity. Additionally, the Lummi Nation and its way of life (Schelangen) and survival depends on salmon. The Chinook Salmon is already an endangered species which is dependent on the herring. It is extremely important that the Aquatic HCP provides the highest level of protection of species such as the Cherry Point herring and Chinook Salmon, and other species which the Lummi Nation is dependent on. I appreciate you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you. Regards,

Thank you,
Sandy Robson
Blaine, Washington

Erika Thorsen (erikathorsen@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Erika Thorsen
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Carolyn Gastellum (ecgastel@wavecable.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
I agree with the comment letter sent to you by Earthjustice dated Dec. 4, 2014 and signed by Jan Hasselman. In addition, I am submitting the following comment: Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Carolyn Gastellum
Anacortes, Washington

Dustin Davis (dudavis14@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Dustin Davis
Bellingham, Washington

Stephen Harvey (steveharvey157@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Thu, Dec 4, 2014 at 10:51 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Stephen Harvey
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Wendy Harris (w.harris2007@comcast.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 12:12 AM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
I retired to Bellingham because I believed the sea breezes would improve my health. I've spent many hours along the marine and freshwater shorelines in Whatcom and Skagit County. My greatest joy has been observing our native wildlife, from tidepool animals, birds, terrestrial and marine mammals and fish to our native fauna. But over the years, I have watched them all dwindle. Local, state and federal laws are not stringent enough, nor adequately enforced. I have tried to support better conservation as a concerned citizen, serving on local committees reviewing landscape planning in Birch Bay, the Whatcom County Critical Area Ordinance, and an RCO citizen committee member, rating grant proposals for urban wildlife. I attended the DNR informational meeting in Bellingham. I entered the meeting knowing little about the project, but after a few hours, the only thing I learned was that I, along with other informed local activists, felt confused and skeptical of this plan. Please understand that I am a strong proponent of comprehensive, conservation strategies designed on a landscape scale, recognizing the fact that ecosystems functions as an integrated, synergistic whole. This is the only way to protect biodiversity and keep our ecosystems resilient. But I oppose the DNR "Habitat Conservation Plan" proposal of aquatic lands for the following reasons: • The HCP fails to address a number of harmful impacts that threaten species. As drafted, it addresses the impacts of shade, sediment compaction, disruption of the flow of water and sediment, contamination and noise. All of these are fish-centric concerns. o The HCP needs to include the increasing threat of aquatic invasive species. This is an increased risk both from climate warming, and increased shoreline modifications and development. o The HCP needs to address the full range of impacts from increased intensity of use, which is not limited to noise. It also includes lights, vibrations, introduction of household pets (dogs and cats), and the increased presence of people. Because the HCP involves more than just fish, impacts to other species include barriers (road and fences, buildings and heights), or obstacles (tall utilities, towers, typical window design in buildings, loss of impervious surface. o It needs to include the impacts of increased vessel traffic. • Overwater Structures Should Not Be A Covered Activity. DNR misrepresents Washington state policies and aquatic habitat guidelines for overwater structures. o The Washington State Aquatic Habitat Guidelines reflect updated BAS recommendations regarding overwater structures, based on an influential white paper indicating that the creation of new overwater structures can cause harm to the aquatic ecosystem, by creating shading, changing wave energy patterns and beach erosion patterns, and by displacement of native aquatic habitat on and near piers. All of these increase mortality rates for many forms of fish. o Local jurisdictions are begun prohibiting docks based on water quality and ecosystem concerns, and these concerns have been supported by administrative boards. o DNR should not be authoring these permits. • The HCP needs to distinguish between existing requirements under NEPA and enhancement standards. Under NEPA and SEPA, DNR must already use BAS to achieve NNL, and establishing NNL requires quantifiable data, baseline standards and monitoring protocols. Unless and until these are in place, the use of the HCP and the kill permits is inappropriate. • The HCP fails to distinquish between the appropriate methods of evaluating, restoring and protecting wildlife from the appropriate method of evaluating project specific impacts. Preserving habitat and connectivity is the key to protecting wildlife, but other factors are also relevant, particularly the intensity of use impacts that result from large development projects, such as the proposed over water bridge in Bellingham Bay. Intensity of use is not only real and quantifiable, but often the most difficult to mitigate. A comprehensive conservation strategy still requires a project specific review and response to development proposals and this is not accomplished through the use of the safe harbor rules. • An interagency policy already exists between the Department of Interior (FWS) and The Department of Commerce (NOAA) to work with local state, tribal and foreign governments, pursuant to authority provided in the ESA. This policy notes that "success of ecosystem management will depend on the cooperation of partners, (federal, state, and private). Setting new internal standards for teamwork and communication between regions and other agencies will be emphasized to support an ecosystem approach to species conservation. Species will be conserved best not by a species- by-species approach but by an ecosystem conservation strategy that transcends individual species. The future for endangered and threatened species will be determined by how well the agencies integrate ecosystem conservation with the growing need for resource use." It is unclear to me what the proposed HCP adds to this, other than imposing "safe harbor" provisions upon the Department of Commerce (NOAA.) • The HCP provides a built in incentive to by-pass mitigation sequencing requirements for avoidance. As long as you comply with the HCP, you are provided assurance that your actions comply with the ESA. Where is the incentive to avoid the

development impacts? Finally, the Federal Register reflects this proposal as a "takings proposal", but DNR has been promoting it as a special conservation protection plan. Given the complexity of the law, this could mislead many citizens. The email address published on your website does not work and I had to hunt down an alternative means of sending this email so I ask that I not be penalized by being slightly past the deadline. Thank you for reviewing my comments

Thank you,
Wendy Harris
bellingham, Washington 98225

Elizabeth Hines (lizzyseth@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 11:36 AM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Elizabeth Hines
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Carol Follett (cafollett@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 11:36 AM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Carol Follett
Bellingham, Washington 98226

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP DEIS

6 messages

Danny Dyche (tolarian@juno.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 4:34 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
I thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. We need adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Signed,

Thank you,
Danny Dyche
Hillsboro, Oregon

---

crystal king (crystaltking@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 4:34 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
crystal king
bellingham, Washington 98226-7880

Kathryn Schetzer (kschetzer@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 6:48 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP):
Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management

is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Kathryn Schetzer
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Giles Sydnor (gsydnor@uw.edu) <mattp@re-sources.org> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 6:50 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Giles Sydnor
Seattle, Washington 98107

---

crystal king (crystaltking@hotmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 8:21 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
[Quoted text hidden]

Mary Rausch (maryr425@aol.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Fri, Dec 5, 2014 at 8:49 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to

address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Mary Rausch
Lynnwood, Washington 98087

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP DEIS

2 messages

Janet Wynne (janetmwynne@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Sat, Dec 6, 2014 at 2:16 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Janet Wynne
Bellingham, Washington 98229

Frank Schmeisser (progressivebum@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Sat, Dec 6, 2014 at 5:31 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Frank Schmeisser
Bellingham, Washington 98225

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP DEIS

2 messages

Leslie Sweeney (ltsweeney@earthlink.net) <mattp@re-sources.org> Sun, Dec 7, 2014 at 7:31 AM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Leslie Sweeney
Bellingham, Washington 98228

---

robert johnston (robert.johnston@nau.edu) <mattp@re-sources.org> Sun, Dec 7, 2014 at 8:04 AM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
robert johnston
Bellingham, Washington 98225

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP DEIS

1 message

Nancy Orlowski (nmorlowski@yahoo.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Mon, Dec 8, 2014 at 8:31 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Nancy Orlowski
Bellingham, Washington 98229

WFWOComments, FW1 <wfwocomments@fws.gov>

WDNR Aquatic Lands HCP DEIS

1 message

Adina Parsley (dickandpat3@gmail.com) <mattp@re-sources.org> Wed, Dec 10, 2014 at 6:00 PM
To: WFWOComments@fws.gov

Please accept the following public comment on the proposed Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP): Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). I am concerned that the DNR could be at risk of violating an incidental take permit unless the plan is further revised to address the following concerns: The plan should explicitly state that large, high-impact projects like fossil fuel export terminals and facilities will need additional scrutiny, and in some cases should be avoided. The timeframe of both the HCP and subsequent leases should be shorter, and more should be done to ensure that management is capable of adapting during the planning period. There needs to be adequate funding in place to ensure the management practices identified in the plan can actually be implemented. Best available science should be used to adapt management and monitoring practices to address changing conditions, habitat quality, and populations of species that are covered. The standard for cumulative impacts should be no net loss of habitats or native plant and animal population. Thank you again,

Thank you,
Adina Parsley
Stanwood, Washington 98292