

From: patty_gates
To: [ECY.RE.SWQS](#)
Subject: Washington Water Quality/Fish Consumption Rules
Date: Thursday, February 19, 2015 7:07:38 AM

To Whom It May Concern,

As a citizen of the State of Washington for 63 years I am well acquainted with the richness and diversity of our region's unique and precious natural resources. The value of our state's lands, rivers and coastal shorelines cannot be measured and deserve to be protected accordingly for present and future generations.

I would like to address the new rule changes that are being considered by the Dept. of Ecology that will determine allowable toxins in fish. Every citizen of our state has a right to clean water and fish that are free from carcinogenic toxins. My concerns about the revisions to the fish consumption rules are as follows:

The rule:

- **Increases the level of cancer risk for the public. The new rule changes the Risk Level (RL) from 1:1,000,000 (1 case of cancer in 1 million citizens over 70 years) to an RL of 1:100,000. This is unacceptable.** We see no reason to cook the books by increasing cancer risk levels for Washington State citizens who eat fish from our states waters.
- **Increases fish consumption levels. This is a step in the right direction and reflects reality in our state.** The rule proposes a consumption rate of 175 grams per day which is more realistic than the current rule which maintains citizens eat 6.5 grams of fish per day. Keep in mind that in reality, some people eat much more fish (250-300 grams /day).
- **Is environmentally un-just. Tribal communities, immigrant communities and low income people shoulder a disproportionate risk of eating more locally sourced fish.**
The current and new rules are potentially unjust. We know that tribal populations and immigrant populations tend to eat a higher ratio of locally caught and/or sourced fish from local waters. Asking these folks to shoulder the risk of toxics in their food and our water is unacceptable.

Thank you for your consideration of my public comment on this important ruling.

Sincerely,
Patricia K. Gates
Spokane, WA