

Washington State Voluntary Public Access and Habitat Incentive Program June 2011

COMMENTS RECEIVED:

Comment #1;

From: psims@oz.net
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2011 3:37 PM
To: SEPADesk (DFW)
Subject: SEPA 11043

Great Thanks for the hard work and effort to get this kind of program viable, Fully support WDFW efforts in this area.

Comment #2:

From: Diane Weinstein [mailto:diane_weinstein@msn.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 16, 2011 5:24 PM
To: SEPADesk (DFW)
Subject: Comment on SEPA No. 11043

Live and let live. Give wildlife a break. Do not support killing of our nation's wildlife.

Comment #3:

From: Ron Ougland [lindaron@wavecable.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2011 4:52 PM
To: SEPADesk (DFW)
Subject: Comment on SEPA No. 11043

What about opening access to high lakes that are inaccessible due to crossing private lands?

Ronald Ougland (360)595-2609); lindaron@wavecable.com

Comment #4:

From: Dale & Cindy Warriner [dwcw@ritzcom.net]
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 6:36 PM
To: SEPADesk (DFW)
Subject: Comment on SEPA No. 11043

Hunting with written permission is still subject to permission by landowners, some of who limit numbers, and in some cases, limits to specific persons, i.e. brother Bob, uncle Jack, Hank the hired man, etc. I have experienced both those landowners that are generous enough to let as many hunt as wants, God bless em, and those that pick and choose.

I doubt that paying the landowner is going to change that. The money may be an incentive for more landowners to participate, however the pick and choose would probably still occur. It would be even more distastful if they picked and chose and got paid for it.

A draw system or something similar would be better than to allow landowner to pick and choose or offer a free for all, where quality would be gone. Quality time hunting is as important as a successful hunt. Something has to be done however to open up more land. Thanks for your efforts.

Comment #5:

From: Pitts, Tyrel - WLFM [tpitts@cardinalcorp.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2011 3:12 PM
To: SEPADesk (DFW)
Subject: Comment on SEPA No. 11043

Why are you going to use money from a “hunter access-grant initiative” to “establish at least five new watchable wildlife opportunities on private farmlands”? What does wildlife watching have to do with hunter access? Sounds like the government is using a grant for something they should not be using it for. Please do not waste money on opening these “watchable wildlife opportunities on private land” with money that is supposed to be used for opening up private land for hunting.

Thank you,
Tyrel Pitts

Tyrel Pitts
B-Shift Hotend Supervisor
545 Avery Road W
Winlock, WA 98596
Direct: 360-242-4300 x4507
Mobile: 360-880-2536
Fax: 360-266-0047
tpitts@cardinalcorp.com
www.cardinalcorp.com

Comment #6:

From: rsrothwell@comcast.net
Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2011 7:30 PM
To: SEPADesk (DFW)
Subject: Comment on SEPA No. 11043

Hunting on farm lands will most definitely have a significant environmental impact. Most hunters use lead bullets. These become lost on the ground, where the lead will degrade at pH below 7.0. Lead bullets can be ingested by wildlife, almost invariably causing death from lead poisoning. If this proposal is to be implemented, consider requiring the use of non-lead ammunition. This is widely available and is already required for waterfowl hunting in the U.S. Hunting and fishing are moving steadily toward phasing out the use of lead products, especially those that are usually lost to the environment, contaminating soils, water, and wildlife.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rebecca Schroeder

Comment from Squaxin Island Tribe

See attached Letter from Squaxin Island Tribe with concern over impacts to Tribal Hunting Rights. Issue was negotiated with the tribe by USDA. USDA Tribal Relations responded that the issue was resolved in language in most recent EA;

Voluntary Public Access and Habitat Incentive Program Expanding Hunting and Fishing Access to Private Land in Washington. Language in that document is:

The environmental review for the current VPA-HIP program eliminated effects on tribal resources from detailed study, based on the fact that the proposed actions can only be implemented on privately owned lands, and therefore would not directly impact tribal lands. However, during the comment period, USDA received comment from one tribe expressing concerns about how expanded public access could affect tribal treaty hunting rights. Based on the concerns expressed in that comment, and in recognition that the Private Forest Land Access and Feel Free to Fish initiatives could affect tribal hunting and fishing resources, the present assessment includes an analysis of the potential effects of the program on tribal resource.

3.2 Cultural Resources

3.2.1 Affected Environment

The Washington State Inventory of Cultural Resources (DAHP 2010) documents cultural resources in the following categories: buildings, structures, sites, districts, and objects. Washington has a cultural history going back at least 9,000 years. Because of this long history, it is possible that hunters, anglers, or farmers may encounter cultural resource sites (such as

campsites) or objects (such as arrowheads) while engaging in hunting, fishing, farming or habitat-improvement activities.

3.5 Tribal Resources

3.5.1 Affected Environment

There are twenty-six federally recognized tribes in the state of Washington. Each tribe has usual and accustomed areas in which they hunt and fish. In the comment period for the current VPA-HIP program, one tribe pointed out that increased access for hunting and fishing on private lands could affect tribal hunting and fishing in those usual and accustomed areas. In addition, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) are reintroducing spring Chinook salmon in the Walla Walla River; increased public fishing access could affect this tribal resource. WDFW and tribes cooperatively regulate hunting and fishing to maintain harvestable populations of animals. The tribes and states coordinate fishing seasons for salmon and steelhead in the Columbia Basin (and specifically the Walla Walla Basin) to ensure that each party receives access to their court mandated share, consistent with US v OR coordination and consultation process.

3.5.2 Environmental Consequences

3.5.2.1 Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)

Increased public access for hunting and fishing, and changes to habitat through the Optimizing Hunting program may result in minimal changes to populations of target animals that are available to both tribal and non-tribal hunters and anglers.

3.1.1.1 No Action Alternative

The current VPA-HIP program would continue, with no change. No impacts, negative or beneficial, to tribal resources would occur.

E-Mail from Farm Service Agency

Bob,

I was under the impression that the wording we had discussed concerning the tribe would be part of the second EA and no letter would be required. If I am mistaken, please let me know.

Ben

Bennett Horter
Federal Preservation Officer
Farm Service Agency
U.S. Department of Agriculture
1400 Independence Ave., SW
Mail Stop 0513
Washington, DC 20250
202-690-1164