

From: [Pelizza, Sylvia](#)
To: [BrownScott, Jennifer](#)
Subject: Fwd: Urgent: Please Edit if Possible
Date: Friday, June 12, 2015 10:29:43 AM
Importance: High

Please cc me on the email that goes out as well as Nathan Dexter.

He will be giving you a call. The tribe is contacting him to find out what processes we need to go through and asking for his help to get it done quickly.

You are doing a good job with this subject. Thanks.

~~~~~

**Sylvia R. Pelizza**

Refuge Supervisor - Oregon, Washington, Idaho  
911 NE 11th Avenue  
Portland, OR 97232

Desk: 503-231-6175  
Cell: 503-201-9040

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** McCarthy, Scott <[scott\\_mccarthy@fws.gov](mailto:scott_mccarthy@fws.gov)>  
**Date:** Thu, Jun 11, 2015 at 2:28 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Urgent: Please Edit if Possible  
**To:** "BrownScott, Jennifer" <[jennifer\\_brownscott@fws.gov](mailto:jennifer_brownscott@fws.gov)>  
**Cc:** Sylvia Pelizza <[sylvia\\_pelizza@fws.gov](mailto:sylvia_pelizza@fws.gov)>

Jennifer i think that looks pretty good. a couple of questions - no need to respond, just checking to see if you had considered them.

is there any language in the easement that describes the value of the marine life - something that suggests that aquaculture may not be consistent with FWS management?

is there CWA permit threshold worth mentioning or does it just rely on our compatibility determination?

i think i would remove the "unfortunately" from "Unfortunately, aquaculture was..."

you list the one purpose for native birds - might aquaculture negatively affect native birds?

are there purposes related to managing for fish resources? something like "*.. refuge lands for the development, advancement, management, conservation, and protection of fish and wildlife resources ...*"?

you could also mention the commercial use policy

We may only authorize public or private economic use of the natural resources of any national wildlife refuge, in accordance with [16 U.S.C. 715s](#), where we determine that the use contributes to the achievement of the national wildlife refuge purposes or the National Wildlife Refuge System mission.

On Thu, Jun 11, 2015 at 12:03 PM, BrownScott, Jennifer <[jennifer\\_brownscoott@fws.gov](mailto:jennifer_brownscoott@fws.gov)> wrote:

Scott,

Jamestown Tribe has asked me to send them an email explaining the process for evaluating opening aquaculture on Dungeness NWR. I have drafted the following email and hope you might have a chance to give it a look and make sure I have not missed anything, or worded anything incorrectly.

I greatly appreciate your help,  
Jennifer

### **Background**

As directed by the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.), as amended by the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act ((Public Law 105-57) (Administration Act) requires that lands and waters within the National Wildlife Refuge System are closed to all public access and use unless they are specifically and legally opened. The Administration Act also directs that no refuge use may be allowed or continued unless it is determined to be appropriate and compatible. It further defines a compatible use as a use that will not materially interfere with or detract from the fulfillment of the mission of the Refuge System or the purpose of the Refuge. An appropriate use is one that contributes to fulfilling the refuge purpose or the Refuge System mission. Dungeness National Wildlife Refuge was established by Executive Order 2123 on January 20, 1915 with the purpose of "...a refuge, preserve and breeding ground for native birds." The Act also requires an opportunity for public comment during the re-evaluation of existing uses and evaluation of new uses.

A Comprehensive Conservation Plan was completed for Dungeness National Wildlife Refuge in 2013. Unfortunately, aquaculture was not evaluated during this process.

### **The Path Forward**

In order to evaluate a request to conduct aquaculture on Dungeness National Wildlife Refuge, we first must establish with certainty that the US Fish and Wildlife Service has jurisdiction over the use. We will first request that the US Fish and Wildlife Service Office of the Solicitor read the Use Easement Deed (Deed No. 18251) and confirm the Service's jurisdiction over the proposed use within the Washington State owned tidelands.

If the US Fish and Wildlife Service does have jurisdiction over the proposed use, we

would need to follow requirements set forth in various laws and policies including the Administration Act, the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1251-1376; Chapter 758; P.L. 845, June 30, 1948; 62 Stat. 1155), and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190) (NEPA).

In order to meet NEPA Clean Water Act and Administration Act requirements we must complete the following:

- Environmental Assessment with an open public process. Due to the potentially controversial nature of the request, the public process would be quite involved;
- Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation;
- National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 compliance;
- Compatibility Determination;
- Appropriateness Justification

As you can see, this is a complex process with many moving parts and pieces that are fulfilled by several different offices within the US Fish and Wildlife Service. We are currently working on our request to the Solicitor's Office and will let you know whether or not we need to move ahead with the rest of the planning process as soon as we have established jurisdiction.

I hope this explanation is helpful. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,  
Jennifer Brown-Scott

---

Jennifer Brown-Scott  
Refuge Manager  
Washington Maritime NWRC  
715 Holgerson Rd  
Sequim, WA 98382  
office: (360) 457-8451  
fax: (360) 457-9778

~~Dungeness NWR~Protection Island NWR~San Juan Islands NWR~~  
~~Copalis NWR~Flattery Rocks NWR~Quillayute Needles NWR~~

--

Scott McCarthy  
Conservation Planning Chief  
US Fish and Wildlife Service  
911 NE 11th Avenue

Portland, OR 97232  
503.231.2232  
503.231.6187 fax