

Merrill, Hannah

From: Merrill, Hannah
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2012 4:37 PM
To: zSMP
Subject: FW: Clallam County SMP comments from the Olympic Environmental Council

From: Darlene Schanfald [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 11:29 AM
To: Gray, Steve; MClancy@esaassoc.com; kramer.consulting@gmail.com; Merrill, Hannah
Subject: Clallam County SMP comments from the Olympic Environmental Council

These are initial comments for the Olympic Environmental Council (OEC) for the Clallam County SMP you are currently drafting.

Overall, I am pleased with the direction this is going. Herein, I want to comment on two issues in particular, setbacks and aquaculture.

SED

The set backs are reasonable, but are they reasonable enough for the pending sea level rise and climate change we may experience over the next few years? Last week the OEC, Sierra Club, the NW Fund for the Environment and the UW Superfund Research Program hosted a stormwater presentation in which two UW staff presented on global warming and sea level rise--with photos of what is happening in our area. While the western part of the county is rising, the Pt Angeles region is level and the Sequim and east beyond are sinking due to tectonic plate action, we will see different sea level rise issues. However, given global warming and the rise and fall of the ocean seasonally, the currents and the time of the tidal action, as well as the wave action strength, all areas in the future will experience shoreline issues more intense than current, especially during high tides. How in this SMP will we account for these natural events far into the future so that the County is better prepared regarding shoreline development and set backs?

If you would like the power points from these UW presentations, let me know and I will forward them to you.

Global warming and sea level rise should be accounted for in each aspect of the County SMP.

AQUACULTURE

The OEC has a nearly two decade long policy opposing fin fish and shrimp aquaculture due to the drain on the marine environment, impact to marine animals, nutritional and toxic issues of farmed animals, and social impacts to the immediate culture saddled with these sites. We are now learning about destruction of our shorelines and intertidal zones from particular types of farming of geoduck and other shellfish.

It is troubling that this matter continues, since the harmfulness of such industries are well know, yet tolerated and even promoted by government. The Three Governor's review of fin fish aquaculture harm is documented, yet they promote the industry. Escapees, viruses, sea lice, disease transmission between farmed to wild stocks, and farmed fish takeover of wild salmon redds are well documented. The damage of the waters to Scotland, Germany, Italy, Chile, Norway, and to other countries is documented. Still the U.S. lets the industry press on. That this industry is promoted by NOAA under commerce says it all. This is not about good healthy food or marine system protection or water quality.

It is about commerce and politics.

Ecology should have to justify why it is promoting this industry and not allowing municipalities to ban fin fish and other aquaculture. Jefferson County justified why it does not want this industry in its waters. Ecology told the County to justify its position. They already did. Ecology doesn't want "justification;" it wants to say "no banning" under any circumstance. I.e., commerce and politics rule.

Pushing fin fish aquaculture in WA State started with Booth Gardner's governorship, an heir to Weyerhaeuser money. Weyerhaeuser had heavily invested in this industry and was pushing it through the Governor. Particular political forces opposed this industry getting a foothold in this State and has successfully stemmed its advancement. Is the SMP an end run around what the industry cannot get from the Legislature?

In the 1980s, a company tested a pen in the same waters where the current proposed project wants to be sited. The force of the water destroyed the pen. Did the company remove the pen debris?

Troubling fin fish aquaculture has reached the Congressional level with WA State Senator Maria Cantwell calling for investigations now that the ISA virus has been unleashed from penned fish to wild fish.

And Ecology says we need "justification" to ban this industry?!

When this issue is further presented to the Advisory Committee and to the general public, please include the experience of every country that has had, and still has, this industry--the ruinous cost to their waters and communities. Add to this all the pollution and disease problems and who has been responsible for cleaning up the impacts, if anyone.

Please include this in your presentation to the Advisory Committee: <http://theyee.ca/Blogs/TheHook/Food-Farming/2008/11/03/SalmonFarming/>

Salmon farming protest goes to the UN

By Tom Sandborn November 3, 2008 07:59

"Give a man a fish and he can eat for a day. Give him a fish farm and he can destroy the fishery and the ecosystem altogether."

That isn't exactly how the old saying goes, but it's a pretty fair synopsis of an open letter sent to the United Nations on November 3 by a group of scientists, First Nations leaders, environmentalists and fishers.

The blue-ribbon group of experts from Canada, Norway, the US, Chile and the United Kingdom are calling for the UN's Food and Agricultural Organization to take notice of what they call the "ruinous tactics" employed by industrial salmon farming in their countries.

The letter is the end product of a year and a half of international meetings, Alexandra Morton told The Hook in a recent phone interview. The final meeting was held last month near Campbell River.

"The research is showing more and more about the negative impacts of fish farming," she said.

"Only eight to ten thousand pink salmon returned to the Glendale River this fall, on a river that should see up to 100,000 return. When that run left the river for the open ocean, more than 90 per cent of them were infested with sea lice."

Critics of industrial fish farming believe that one of its major negative impacts on migrating wild salmon is sea lice infestation. The marine parasites flourish in the crowded pens of fish farms and spread out into the nearby waterways, where migrating salmon are infested.

Signatories to the letter say that industrial fish farming is ecologically devastating and socially destructive, and poses a threat to both local and world food security. They cite the 1995 United Nations Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries: "As a primary goal, aquaculture development should conserve genetic diversity and minimize negative effects of farmed fish on wild fish populations, while increasing supplies of fish for human

consumption." The signatories say today's salmon farmers violate each of these principles.

The protest letter also highlights negative impacts of fish farming on indigenous people.

"They came into my territory and denied, delayed, distracted us from the truth for 20 years with no regard for their impact on the environment and my people," said Bob Chamberlin, chief of the Kwicksutaineuk/Ah-kwamish First Nation in Broughton Inlet.

"I'm deeply ashamed as a Norwegian," said Kurt Oddekalv of Green Warriors of Norway, also a signatory to the letter. "After damaging our wild salmon, the industrial salmon farmers are fouling the pristine waters of Canada and Chile. Nobody in Norway knows about this, but I will tell them."

UPDATE: The New York Times picked up this story, here.

http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/04/science/04prof.html?_r=1&8dpc&oref=login

Respectfully submitted,

Darlene Schanfald

Olympic Environmental Council