

Joseph Jauquet

I am dismayed that Cooke has tried to change the rules and get it's way in Puget Sound by it's application with a new species. May I call the SHT they propose "androids"? The SHT genetics raise great unknown risks for the few all-endangered SHT and Pacific Salmon and Coastal Cutthroat remaining in Puget Sound rivers without distinguishing wild from hatchery stocks. I am further dismayed at WDFW's ...Nonsignificance determination, apparently a political sell-out given the agency's own widely published goal and mission statements. (One would want to review campaign contributions made by Cooke or it's proxies.)

Cooke's escape prevention plan includes the information that they will uniquely fin clip their android SHT! This admits in advance that Cooke expects their nets to fail and their androids will escape. They are admitting escape a-priori! The escape plan Cooke posits puts the lie to their argument that a different species (SHT) will solve all their problems with escape, net failures, and toxic waste.

Replacing, repairing and so on of pens that were already in disrepair-and had been cited for disrepair- is another recipe for failure in the next big November storm. Same locations, same plan, same design, etc.; this admits of the same result, failure. Here we have an example of the cautionary principle being replaced by the Peter Principle!

Expectations for density and toxicity of fish waste with the greater numbers of smaller SHT existing in the same net space are also flawed. Is there something about SHT poop that doesn't stink in very similar or the same ways as the problems with prior Atlantic's? There is a significant body of peer-reviewed research from the U.S. west coast and B.C. on negative impacts of net pens for the pollution, certainty of escape, and strange genetics.

A final huge risk entails the well-documented, but suppressed, findings in BC of the killing effect of dense concentrations of sea lice on out-migrating wild/hatchery salmon smolts, where approximately 2-5 sea lice per smolt were determined to be lethal. See the B.C. researcher's results on local pink salmon runs that had no other marine passage to open ocean but past a concentration of net pens. Our long, narrow Puget Sound suggests similar negative outcomes for our few remaining free-swimming Salmon, SHT and Char.

By now you know I am clearly against any all net pens, by any business, for any species for any reason in Puget Sound. Overall on reading the EIS summary of Cooke's seeming new plan I'm reminded of Albert Einstein's sharp definition of insanity. Something about repeating the same behavior (Cooke's plan) and expecting a different result.

I fear that the mass of scientific data being hurled in opposition to Cooke's plan in this IES will be displaced by political concerns, which are usually short-term, risk-averse, and hidden from public view.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Jauquet