

Rachel Thody

Guidance for net pens are at the very least baby steps that we need to move on from. "Guidance" for non-holistic practices that pose ecological threats to a very special environment is not enough. We are surrounded by evidence that the planet is absolutely struggling and if we do our part to tend to our local environment then significant progress can be made. Protecting Puget Sound is important because its our home, its home to marine organisms, and we depend on the ocean to take care of us. Its disgusting and frustrating that people keep digging in their heels against change that needs to happen for necessary conservation. How many more accidents and/or long-term damage will it take weaken Puget Sound to the brink before policy is re-written to abolish pens? Can we come back from those mistake? At this point in the trajectory of human impact on Puget Sound, I'm not sure I like the odds. I'm not a professional scientist, but its pretty clear from the legitimate and concerning data provided from actual scientists (that politics seem to conveniently go deaf around) that net pens are not substantial. "Guidance" is a bandaid on a compound fracture: simply not enough.

I'm a Washington resident and have called Bellingham home for 6 years now. My home is not just the roof I live under; it is the outdoors I recreate in and the ocean that is part of this geography. I decided to apply to graduate school for biology next year because I want to contribute in providing strong reasons for people to make conscious decisions about their lifestyles and policies to take better care of our home that extends beyond our four walls. As a concerned citizen for her home and her planet, "guidance" for farmed fish a weak tactic in taking care of Puget Sound.