

Re USCG 2003-14273 RIN 1625-AA52 Ballast

If the National Invasive species act took effect in 1996, it sure took a long time to get any action on this ballast water - 2003 - looks like somebody is protecting the shipping companies instead of the public or the united states. There should be NO exceptions from these rules - none. The fines for violations of these rules should be \$500,000 and up. Who will be checking these fines - we need to set up a system for this. There is no question that a fair number of owners will lie and cheat to evade the requirements of this act to make money for themselves. We have endless examples of lying by corporations to evade rules - and we need to make sure there is a system of checking regularly to catch these cheaters. And when we catch them, take away their businesses, their ships. We need to require all ships coming into us from foreign ports to have high insurance or bonds that can be sued if any pollution of ballast water takes place. We cannot continue to allow ships to come in that have no assets to attack if they violate our laws. I do not think there should be special requirements for Great Lakes or Hudson River. All of our rules should have exactly the same requirements. The best idea is to retain their own ballast water. We do not want any ballast water from any foreign country in our waters. We are also letting unsafe ships into our waters. If we keep out those ships, we should have no problem in making them retain their own ballast waters. If we require stringent regulations, the ship owners will find a way to comply. It is clear that one new species introduced into american waters virtually every week is completely unacceptable - this is an urgent matter and the matter should be settled soon. Since the Coast guard has waited since 1996 to come up with this proposal, it is clear that somebody in government has been stalling this requirement. Eight years later, we are still being invaded - and that is totally unacceptable.

America is losing its trees because of species that have come in on products from foreign lands - worth many many billions of dollars in losses. This is also unacceptable.

I think the statement "it is likely that most invasions would result