

The Washington State Department of Ecology received comments during the public review period for the Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Tools Rule, Chapter 173-201A WAC.

A variation of the following form letter was received via email from 30 individuals. The specific comments of each individual that provided a variation of this letter are provided below.

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Sincerely,

From: [Anthony Albert](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 2:45:16 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Or we could just boycott Washington products.

Sincerely,

Anthony Albert
285 NW 35th Street, Apt.8
Corvallis, OR 97330
5417532910

From: [Sigrid Asmus](#)
To: [ECY.RE.SWOS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Friday, February 27, 2015 4:38:46 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Washington Department of Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable.

Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. Just to mention one egregious example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. This is not sound ecology; it is supporting policy written by those emitting toxic pollution.

In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable.

Washington State residents deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes for unaccountable violators.

If Ecology chooses, whether under pressure from outside interests, or its own failure to understand the danger of its policies, to avoid following the law and instead fails to protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Sincerely,

Sigrid Asmus
4009 24 Ave W
Seattle, WA 98199
206-283-1382

From: [Janna Auslam](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 9:44:01 PM

Dear EPA and WA Dept. of Ecology,

WA Dept. of Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is reprehensible! We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Sincerely,

Janna Auslam
1718 SE 42nd Ave.
Portland, OR 97215

From: [Marty Bankhead](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 11:11:51 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,
Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology's proposal:

takes short cuts and creates loopholes
increases allowable cancer risk tenfold.
does nothing to increase restrictions on known cancer-causing pollutants & neurotoxins
and ignores current increased fish consumption rates

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone.

If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people. We are all exposed to toxins every day from a variety of sources, some outside our control. This is one source where the government has control, and they need to protect Washington citizens.

It's time now to make a positive change. Washington can lead the region with stronger water quality standards without pollution loopholes, that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways for everyone.

Sincerely,

Marty Bankhead
17709 Hill Way
Lake Oswego, OR 97035
503-804-7849

From: [bruce bauer](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 2:42:35 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

How many people get sick because of these pollutants?

Sincerely,

bruce bauer
PO Box 1604
medford, OR 97501

From: [Linore Blackstone](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 6:01:23 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

More than unacceptable, unethical, cruel, immoral. Amazing what monsters we humans have become. Are we blind to what we are doing, all that we are destroying?

Sincerely,

Linore Blackstone
1745 NE 29th Ave
Portland, OR 97213

From: [Linore Blackstone](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 5:58:55 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Why is it that we won't stop killing the waters, chopping the trees, hunting the animals just because we have blood in our eye.

Sincerely,

Linore Blackstone
1745 NE 29th Ave
Portland, OR 97213

From: [Fritz Cohen](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 2:50:44 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish. '

Obviously this is a very complex issue, but I have first hand knowledge of the pollution in Willapa Bay as a result of the use of pesticides for over 60 years in the case of carbaryl. The scientific information on glyphosate which has been used indiscriminately all over Washington state is linking this chemical to various cancers, parkinsons et al, and yet neither carbaryl or glyphosate are mentioned as chemicals to be reviewed in any clean water assessment. Chris Grue a researcher for the University of Washington and the Pacific Coast Oystergrowers association had an abstract published(2003) that stated that glyphosate had been found in the gonads of willapa bay oysters. The study on which that was based has not been released. These are only the tip of the iceberg in Washington State and the DOE's failure to protect the health of our ecosystem and the people who eat the fish and shellfish et al. It seems to never be mentioned that the water does not belong to those who pollute the water, it belongs to the people and the people deserve better from the agencies who have the responsibility to take of our precious water resources.

Sincerely,

Fritz Cohen
PO Box 82
Nahcotta, WA 98637
3606654543

From: [Stephen Couche](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 7:55:07 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

In a state known for its pristine beauty, gorgeous waterways, towering mountains, and beautiful forests it seems preposterous that Washington does not have the protections in place to protect its water quality. It is time that changes!

Sincerely,

Stephen Couche
4718 SE 31st Ave.
Portland, OR 97202
5039980185

From: [jonnel covault](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Sunday, March 15, 2015 1:41:13 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

There should be 0 tolerance for toxic chemical pollution. It is our duty to future generations to take care of this planet. We are losing species daily due to chemical pollution. Our generation will be an embarrassment in the future, if we do not stop fouling our nest!

Sincerely,

jonnel covault
14114 SE Redwood Ave
Portland, OR 97267
503 407 2144

From: [Ramona Crocker](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 5:23:14 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but mainly to maintain the lax status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is not acceptable.

Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does absolutely nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants. This is not acceptable.

We deserve standards that genuinely protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology will not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has a duty to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Sincerely,

Ramona Crocker
9720 SW Robbins Dr.
Beaverton, OR 97008
503-524-7547

From: [Tod Fiste](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 2:39:57 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Since the Columbia River borders Oregon, and I enjoy the outdoors (and spend money in the process) in Washington, this issue affects me even though I am not a Washington resident.

Sincerely,

Tod E. Fiste
Portland, OR

Tod Fiste
2037 N Winchell St
Portland, OR 97217
5033511665

From: [Janet Hammer](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Friday, February 27, 2015 9:15:32 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

I am writing to support strong environmental regulations that reduce the level of toxins allowed to enter our rivers and maintain or increase (not decrease) the allowable cancer risk. Doing so is important for human health and environmental quality and sends a message that it's time to innovate so that our industrial practices deliver triple bottom line performance.

Sincerely,
Janet Hammer

Janet Hammer
2502 NE 58th Ave
Portland, OR 97213
503-493-1120

From: [George Jacobs](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 4:04:27 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

It is time to move beyond maintaining the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish. Rather than cook the numbers and definitions of what is acceptable, what is needed here is just a small bit of bravery (since this quality is completely absent at the federal level). As a state governing authority, you are more connected to the communities which are effected by the health of our water byways. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. Please establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes.

Sincerely,

George Jacobs

George Jacobs
3104 SE Morrison St.
Portland, OR 97214
5032368083

From: [Gayle Janzen](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 7:10:30 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

It's absolutely astounding that WA state has some of the nation's least protective toxic pollution standards. And your current proposal does nothing to keep the toxins out of our waterways. For being such a progressive state, it's really frustrating that the polluters clearly are running the show when it comes to stopping them from continuing to poison our waterways. Enough is enough. Please go back to the drawing board and come up with a proposal without loopholes that will protect our precious waters from this onslaught of toxins.

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Sincerely,

Gayle Janzen
11232 Dayton Ave N
Seattle, WA 98133
(206) 362-9278

From: [Tel Jensen](#)
To: [ECY.RE.SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Friday, February 27, 2015 5:19:50 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

I love it here. I have lived in Washington my entire life and one of the very greatest things about living here is enjoying the amazing rivers and coasts and the bounty that they support. It is so important to me that this water remains safe and clean, both for the humans that enjoy it and the diverse ecologies that depend on it.

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Sincerely,

Tel Jensen
Post Office Box 436
Woodland, WA 98674
425-417-1368

From: [David & Judith Laws](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 5:11:24 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

I can't believe we actually have to ASK you to stop the poisoning of our food supply. DO THE RIGHT THING!

Sincerely,

David & Judith Laws
1718 Valencia Street
Bellingham, WA 98229
360 650-1015

From: [Darvel Lloyd](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 3:00:52 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

I'm from Oregon now, but toxic pollutants entering Washington waterways draining into the Columbia River and the Pacific Coast affect me and everyone else in this state, not to mention the entire food chain throughout the Pacific Northwest. Please do everything you can to strengthen standards, NOT weaken them!

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Sincerely,

Darvel Lloyd
54 S.E. 74th Ave.
Portland, OR 97215
503-251-2784

From: [Jennifer Nitz](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 3:28:52 PM

EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to mess with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo concerning toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. The state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does not increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer causing pollutants.

We deserve standards that protect public health. Ecology must establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Nitz
802 Front
Missoula, MT 59802

From: [Laura Patterson](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 10:34:18 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Please be sure to do the right thing. Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable to me. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I Laura Patterson, urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Sincerely,

Laura Patterson
5416 N. McKinzie Rd
Otis Orchards, WA 99027
5094758979

From: [Cal Roberts](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 2:27:14 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish. Protect us NOW!!

Sincerely,

Cal Roberts
9305 NE 25th CT
Vancouver, WA 98665
1360 892 1985

From: [David Scheer](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 2:42:28 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is UNACCEPTABLE!! Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and CREATING LOOPHOLES! For example, the state's proposal INCREASES allowable CANCER RISK TENFOLD---and in many cases, Ecology's proposal does NOTHING to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants!!

This is UNACCEPTABLE! We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I STRONGLY URGE Ecology to establish STRONGER water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA HAS AN OBLIGATION TO STEP IN and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Sincerely, David M. Scheer, DC

David Scheer
2715 Cody Circle...#102
Bellingham, WA 98225

From: [Howard Shapiro](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 3:51:10 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone not only corporations and Ecology is charged with this duty. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Sincerely,

Howard Shapiro
7426 SE 21st Ave.
Portland, OR 97202
9712795819

From: [Isa Silver](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Friday, March 06, 2015 9:10:53 AM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Sincerely,

Isa Silver
431 Hess Road
White Salmon, WA 98672

From: [Janet J. Slobin](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Friday, February 27, 2015 12:36:04 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish. A no-brainer!

Sincerely,

Janet J. Slobin
2340 Brewer Lane
Portland, OR 97229
503-200-2202

From: [Laurie Solamon](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Monday, March 09, 2015 7:41:00 AM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

My boyfriend has terminal lung cancer. Many other people in my life are fighting different kinds of cancer. This is why I have a serious concern about the Department of Ecology's proposal to continue to not seriously regulate toxic pollution to our waterways in Washington State. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In most of these regulation "adjustments", the Dep't of Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. The people and the aquatic species that many rely on for their livelihoods in this state and country and world deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Sincerely,

Laurie Solamon
741 SE 48th Ave.
Portland, OR 97215
360-666-1070

From: [Tamara Stephas](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Friday, February 27, 2015 9:03:03 AM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to continue allowing toxic pollution in our waterways and fish is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Sincerely,

Tamara Stephas
809 23rd Ave E
Seattle, WA 98112
206.726.9845

From: [andrew stone](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Sunday, March 22, 2015 5:25:01 AM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

I am a systems ecologist, teacher and I vote.

I live in Oregon. Many of WA's watersheds drain to the Columbia. I live on the Columbia.

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Sincerely,

andrew stone
2229 se orange ave
portland, OR 97214
5032395524

From: [Crissy Trask](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Sunday, March 22, 2015 2:56:48 PM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Washingtonians love their coastlines, rivers and lakes. In fact, many of us live here because of them. I want Ecology to do more to protect our waterways from pollution.

Ecology's proposal amounts to largely maintaining the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish. But worse, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold! Please deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health in a serious way. Please place strict and aggressive restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish.

Sincerely,

Crissy Trask
PO Box 475
White Salmon, WA 98672

From: [Sam Valdez](#)
To: [ECY RE SWQS](#)
Subject: Comment on Washington's Proposed Human Health Criteria and Implementation Rules; Chapter 173-201A WAC
Date: Friday, February 27, 2015 9:00:58 AM

Dear EPA and Ecology,

Ecology's proposal to tinker with numbers, but largely maintain the status quo when it comes to toxic pollution in our waterways and fish, is unacceptable. Rather than deal with the serious problem of toxic pollution threatening public health, Ecology is taking short cuts and creating loopholes. For example, the state's proposal increases allowable cancer risk tenfold. In many cases, Ecology's proposal does nothing to increase restrictions on potent neurotoxins and known cancer-causing pollutants.

This is unacceptable. We deserve standards that protect public health for everyone. I urge Ecology to establish stronger water quality standards that will lead to cleaner, safer waterways without pollution loopholes. If Ecology does not follow the law and protect public health, EPA has an obligation to step in and protect people who rely on local fish and shellfish. I personally for years, have watch the the paper company's along the river dump untold amounts of material in the river that turn the water a red amber this can not be good for anyone but the polluters.

Sincerely,

Sam Valdez
1198 altoona Pillar Rock Rd.
Rosburg, WA 98643
360-465-2647