

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

We are rapidly destroying life around us. Humans cannot survive for long without the bounties of this wonderful planet. Please protect our seas.

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Mary G. Cherry
625 Lydig Ave.
Bronx, NY 10462 - 2260
mgcherryusa@netscape.net

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Patricia J. Jennings
49 Florence St.
Winchester, MA 01890 - 2047
jenningspj@comcast.net

Thursday, April 8, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

MaryLou Grolimond-Olson
11520 SW 92nd Street
Miami, FL 33176 - 1020
mary_loug@hotmail.com

Thursday, April 8, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Emmett J. Murphy
3730 Cadbury Circle
Apt/Suite# 913
Venice, FL 34293
ejmurphy@amherst.edu

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Judith J. Peterson
1535 Buckshot Court
Worthington, OH 43085 - 1547
jjpandrap@aol.com

Thursday, April 8, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Thadeus Dziekonski
97 Springville Ave
Buffalo, NY 14226 - 3115
tdz31@localnet.com

Thursday, April 8, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

David Bessire
2796 Auburn Blvd
Port Charlotte, FL 33948
dave.bessire@floridaea.org

Thursday, April 8, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Miriam Iosupovici
1320 Seacoast Drive South
Apt/Suite L
Imperial Beach, CA 91932 - 3165
zevsmom@hotmail.com

Thursday, April 8, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitt
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitt,

Our fisheries are declining at exponential rates, and those fish left for taking are poisoned with mercury. I truly believe that the only way we have a chance of ensuring a future for fisheries is to leave certain areas alone to act as nurseries and "safe havens" for populations to thrive, so that we may continue to have populations from which to fish responsibly. Please, protect the current guidelines. Do what you can do to protect habitat now, so that we may continue to look to the ocean for food and livelihood. It is in all our interests, and it is imperative.

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitt
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitt:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before

protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Debra Hansen
518 Baker Street
San Francisco, CA 94117
qbee@well.com

Thursday, April 8, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

John Fischer
230 Grove Acre, #313
Pacific Grove, CA 93950 - 2342
snowy@ecologyfund.net

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Thunderr Wolf
2644 Finlaw Ave.
Pennsauken, NJ 08110
thunderrwolf@earthlink.net

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Rebecca Trelfa
34 Forest Rd.
Salisbury, MA 01952
virtual_asst@yahoo.com

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Our ocean fisheries are becoming an increasingly necessary resource to our health and survival on this planet. They are delicate ecosystems which require good management to protect their integrity and their viability. Please strengthen, rather than weaken their protection!

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection

process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Betty J Van Wicklen
41 Lake Shore Dr. #2B
Watervliet, NY 12189 - 2915
g10121@care2.com

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Theresa Terhark
9019 Jasmine Ave
Cottage Grove, MN 55016
jas90m@aol.com

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Brandon Ballengee
Franklin Ave
Queens, NY 11355
bioart@rcn.com

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Luis Jorge Rivera-Herrera
Cond. Montebello, Apt. H-315
Trujillo Alto, PR 00976
idspr@hotmail.com

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

John Seider
21 Grand Street
Oneonta, NY 13820
jseider@stny.rr.com

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

mana hideki
17 garnet rd
X
NYC, NY 11485
ladytzing@aol.com

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Save our FISH

Extinct..is..FOREVER*

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Deborah Limanek
588 Hill St
Whitinsville, MA 01588
heroness@bellatlantic.net

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

melinda bashen
570001 arbor club way
boca raton, FL 33433 - 5613
bluedog727@aol.com

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Kenneth Bozek
9 Skinner Lane
South Hadley, MA 01075
kbozek.newdell@juno.com

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Rachel Meltzer
400 Central Park West, 12K
New York, NY 10025 - 5844
rachel_meltzer@yahoo.com

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Big companys need to be Responsible for their Actions.. No More Polluting the Water!!
And people need to stop Throwing their Garbage in all of the bodies of Water.

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Judy Desreuisseau
2 myrtle street
gill, MA 01376 - 9615
juddes@wildmail.com

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Kenneth Bird
131 Aragon Ave
Rochester, NY 14622
birdman@rochester.rr.com

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Linda Hes
87 Parkway Drive
Olmsted Twp, OH 44138
lhes@sbcglobal.net

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Judith Embry
51 Blackstone Road
Florida, MA 01247 - 9400
emb66@bcn.net

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Edgar Beaver
60-C Town Dock Rd.
Charlestown, RI 02813
nbeaver@docscience.com

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Robert Conlan
1171 East-West Road, MSC 631
Honolulu, HI 96848 - 1711
conlan@hawaii.edu

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Lisa Butch
850 Georgetown Rd.
Salem, OH 44460
butchybonbon@hotmail.com

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Jonathan Lotz
2163 Astoria Circle #302
Herndon, VA 20170 - 4091
jonlotz4@hotmail.com

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Mary Jo Drager
11 Surrey Circle
Ransom Canyon, TX 79366 - 2223
mary.jo@att.net

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

rita persichetty
209 currie av
staten island, NY 10306
ritapersichetty@earthlink.net

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Martina Clark
8 Sherwood Lane
Westampton, NJ 08060
tegg1961@comcast.net

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Gail Herath-Veiby
16 Nipmuck Drive
Westborough, MA 01581 - 3365
herathveiby@earthlink.net

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Bill & Marilyn Voorhies
Clark Point Road
West Tremont, ME 04612 - 9702
lynny@downeast.net

wednesday, April 7, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

Judd Klement
881 E. Meadow Dr.
Palo Alto, CA 94303
judd@birdpac.org

Thursday, April 8, 2004

Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Director A. Schmitten,

Mr. Rolland A. Schmitten
Director
Office of Habitat Conservation
NOAA Fisheries
F/HC - EFH ANPR
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Schmitten:

I am writing to comment on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) guidelines published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2004. The EFH guidelines should not be changed at this time. Concerns with the EFH program can and should be resolved through better implementation. The current guidelines are sufficient to identify EFH, determine the effects adverse of fishing activities on EFH, and protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing and non-fishing activities. I would like to respond to some of the standard industry criticisms of the EFH guidelines.

The current NMFS process for protecting EFH reflects the intent of Congress, it is flexible, and can succeed. Prior to the inclusion of the EFH requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), fish habitat was not adequately protected from damage and destruction due to human activities. Congress added the EFH requirements to the MSA in 1996 specifically to protect marine fish habitat.

A broad scope of EFH is necessary to protect fisheries. The total area currently identified as EFH is broad because marine species have more than one life stage, and each life stage may depend on a different habitat. The combined geographic distributions of the nearly 1,000 species that are managed in federal fisheries require protection of much of the U.S. EEZ. In addition, there is limited scientific data is on habitat-specific growth and survival, as well as productivity by habitat type. Designated areas are large to compensate for the poor resolution on specific habitat needs. These areas can, and should, be refined as the research progresses, but we cannot afford to wait for scientific certainty to protect threatened fish habitat.

Protection of habitat for fish populations is critical to their long-term health and it is the law. The EFH provisions in the MSA are mandatory. Therefore, converting the EFH guidelines to non-mandatory guidelines and making the program advisory in nature would be inconsistent with the law and would weaken protections for EFH.

Do not weaken the review process. Because EFH is critical to the survival of marine fish populations, Congress required that all federally conducted, funded, or authorized activities that "may adversely affect" EFH be specifically reviewed in order "to promote the protection of EFH." This is a clear legal mandate, that NMFS does not have the legal authority to modify. Requiring that a "significance threshold" be met before protecting EFH is not consistent with the law and would undercut EFH protection efforts. However, NMFS has made a good faith effort to streamline the protection process so that activities with minimal impacts may be covered under expedited review procedures.

The legal definition of EFH was created to protect the entire life cycle of managed fish species. The guidelines must apply to the areas where the fish live during all of their life stages. For many species, that includes coastal, riverine and estuarine

waters. Therefore, EFH guidelines must apply where the fish are found, even in state waters.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that this additional ANPR will further undermine NMFS's EFH protection efforts by creating uncertainty regarding the agency's commitment to the program. NMFS should not revise the EFH guidelines; concerns about the program can be addressed through better implementation of the existing guidelines.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sincerely ,

SASKIA SANTOS
205 SE 16TH AVE
Apt/Suite15C
GAINESVILLE, FL 32601
dazoo12@hotmail.com