

Questions submitted during the USFWS Nashville Crayfish Proposed Delisting Virtual Public Meeting (October 8, 2020 6:00pm – 8:30pm Central Time)

The following questions were submitted via the Zoom chat feature during the Question and Answer portion of the virtual public meeting. This session was attended by 48 members of the public.

Question 1: “Do you all have an anticipated timeline for making a decision and issuing a final rule?”

USFWS Response:

Question 2: “Please speak more about the 2/7, 3/7 etc. measurements.”

USFWS Response:

Question 3: “Is there evidence that the population segments you referenced are reproducing?”

USFWS Response:

Question 4: “Is there information on whether there is significant harvesting of the species by people to eat?”

USFWS Response:

Question 5: “Under the resiliency model projections, where are the areas of low resiliency located?”

USFWS Response:

Question 6: “You refer to ‘population segments’ and the number that would be stable, weak, etc. under various modeling scenarios. Can you explain how you are defining population segment and how you arrived at that designation?”

USFWS Response:

Question 7: “Would a potential administration change have bearing on a decision to delist the Nashville Crayfish from the Endangered Species list?”

USFWS Response:

Question 8: “What is the status of the population found at Paris Landing? Does this mean the distribution is not just in the Mill Creek watershed?”

USFWS Response:

Question 9: “Is there evidence of harvesting the crayfish, and what are your thoughts on the impact of harvesting on the crayfish resilience?”

USFWS Response:

Question 10: “Do the scenarios take into consideration changes in the watershed that would take place under reduced ESA protections?”

USFWS Response:

Question 11: “What would be the reason for the tributaries near the airport not supporting a resilient segment? Predators or development?”

USFWS Response:

Question 12: “Can you define population resiliency, which sounds like a population’s ability to survive some impact, rather than the species’ ability to thrive?”

USFWS Response:

Question 13: “Early in the presentation you mentioned a broad partnership contributing to species recovery, that included ‘numerous private landowners and developers.’ Who are these developers and what have they done to contribute to species recovery?”

USFWS Response:

Question 14: “How is the preliminary information relating to potential existence of species at Paris Landing being incorporated into the decision to delist the species?”

USFWS Response:

Question 15: “Have the effects of climate change including increased flooding, temperature rise, droughts, etc. been incorporated into the scenarios?”

USFWS Response:

Question 16: “[Regarding] the moving of Donelson Pike and the construction of the runway on the airport property for a future runway and or the Harding Place Connector that is planned for this watershed - How can we increase the population in this area so it can withstand this future development?”

USFWS Response:

Question 17: “Will the USFWS be making the genetic analysis and other data related to the Pickwick Landing individuals that have been found available to the public? Is there evidence that this is a viable population that will be sustained over time?”

USFWS Response:

Question 18: “If developers currently have to comply with special permit conditions to protect the crayfish, what will happen to that permitting process and those requirements if the species is delisted? And absent those permitting requirements, what regulations exist that will continue to protect habitat?”

USFWS Response:

Question 19: “What is the evidence for the size, and long-term viability, for the Tennessee River population? And will the USFWS be providing the chance to review the data and analysis demonstrating that this is a distinct population?”

USFWS Response:

Question 20: “Don’t the buffer zones get reduced in size once the ETW designation is removed?”

USFWS Response:

Question 21: Follow up to Question 14: “So to follow up on Paris Landing data question, would the USFWS need to reissue public comment once that information is made available, if it is going to be considered in the rulemaking process?”

USFWS Response:

Question 22: “Are there plans to consider the economic literature on hedonic valuation of ecosystems on adjacent property values?”

USFWS Response:

Question 23: “If the Nashville Crayfish is delisted/downlisted, what situation would trigger it to get relisted as endangered, and how long is that process?”

USFWS Response:

Question 24: “Mill Creek is currently listed as impaired for sedimentation, low DO, and excessive nutrients. Are there any plans in place to remediate the current habitat impairments by your organization to improve the health of the stream prior to the expected development both in Nashville and in Nolensville?”

USFWS Response:

Question 25: “Again, regarding Paris Landing data - It seems like there is a difference between receiving data from the public and data generated by USFWS, in terms of making it available for public review during a public comment period before a final decision. Is that an accurate assumption?”

USFWS Response:

Question 26: “How far in the future does the decision-making board try to look? In other words, here in Cane Ridge, we are trying to do what will be right for 100 years from now. How far in the future are you trying to consider?”

USFWS Response:

Question 27: “Regarding the 5 years just stated - does that mean if delisted, it will remain delisted for 5 years? They can develop every adjacent property in that time.”

USFWS Response:

Question 28: “What data was actually collected with the 2017 review”

USFWS Response:

Question 29: “So, there is no requirement for current and new data to be collected?”

USFWS Response:

Question 30: “Would morphologically distinct and separate populations of *F. shoupi* be viewed and protected independently under the ESA?”

USFWS Response:

Question 31: “What would need to be attached to data provided by the community? gps pictures?”

USFWS Response: