

From: [Jennifer Stanhope](#)
To: [Elizabeth Stout](#); [Sumalee Hoskin](#); [John Ellis](#)
Cc: [Tiernan Lennon](#)
Subject: buffer distance from waterbodies with federally listed species
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2017 2:36:41 PM

Hello,

I double-checked VAFO and WVFO's comments to MVP and this is what we said:

- In waterbodies that support federally listed species (mussels and RLP), increasing the undisturbed vegetation buffer to 100 ft is recommended to avoid or minimize impacts. Please identify waters where this buffer will be less than 100 ft from the permanent ROW/operational easement.
- In waterbodies that support federally listed species (mussels and RLP), we recommend increasing the distance of ATWS to at least 100ft away from the water's edge. Identify waters where this distance will be less than 100 ft from the water's edge and identify any additional protective measures that will be in place.

Hope this helps.

Jen

From: Stout, Elizabeth [mailto:elizabeth_stout@fws.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2017 11:30 AM
To: Hoskin, Sumalee
Cc: Ellis, John; Jennifer Stanhope; Troy Andersen; Cindy Schulz; John Schmidt; Glenn Smith
Subject: Re: ACP/SHP FWS-FERC Meeting Agenda Items

I think just getting on same page with comments about the BA, maybe DEIS, especially with species that are in two or more states to make sure we have a consensus on what we need to move forward. Any other process things to help with the efficiency of our talks on Thursday and meeting next week.

On Tue, Mar 14, 2017 at 11:25 AM, Hoskin, Sumalee <sumalee_hoskin@fws.gov> wrote:
Liz,
Good idea.

Also, in a previous email John brought up a need to have a call with our state partners pronto regarding the HEA efforts and mig. bird mitigation.

Are there additional topics we need to discuss today?
Sumalee

Sumalee Hoskin
US Fish & Wildlife Service
6669 Short Lane
Gloucester, VA 23061

Tel: 804-693-6694 ex. 2414

Fax: 804-693-9032

Visit us at <http://www.fws.gov/northeast/virginiafield/>

On Tue, Mar 14, 2017 at 10:43 AM, Stout, Elizabeth <elizabeth_stout@fws.gov> wrote:
FYI. Let's try to discuss this during our call this afternoon.

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

From: **Kristin Lenz** <klenz@merjent.com>

Date: Tue, Mar 14, 2017 at 10:37 AM

Subject: ACP/SHP FWS-FERC Meeting Agenda Items

To: Elizabeth Stout <elizabeth_stout@fws.gov>

Cc: "Kevin.Bowman@ferc.gov" <Kevin.Bowman@ferc.gov>, "Nancy Fox-Fernandez (Nancy.Fox-Fernandez@ferc.gov)" <Nancy.Fox-Fernandez@ferc.gov>, Leslie Tewinkel <ltewinkel@merjent.com>, Andrea Sampson <asampson@merjent.com>

Hi Liz,

We are finalizing materials and the agenda for next week and wanted to get your input on the format and content. We have been going through the updated Applicant-Prepared BA (1/27/17), other reports provided by the applicant, comments on the DEIS, and agency comments in preparation for this meeting. Through this process, we have been updating the DEIS with new or revised information which we will have on hand electronically during our meeting next week. We are thinking of this as a working session and want to make sure we thoroughly cover each species. Our idea was to use the attached table to review each species in the meeting. We double-checked IPaC for all species, so you will see a couple of new ones in there that we want to confirm do not warrant additional analysis.

The Applicant provided a table that summarizes potential impacts and conservations measures by species in the updated BA (Appendix B-2), and sensitive waterbodies with potential for listed or under review species (Appendix B-3). We will also review these tables to help identify gaps and accuracy. As an aside, any questions, clarifications, or data gaps that we identify during this meeting will be used to generate another data request to the applicant.

Essentially, we want to answer the following questions for each species:

- Confirm federal status and occurrence information is correct
- Survey status and concurrence with survey approach and results?
- Complete impacts analysis?
- Conservation measures – complete and concurrence?
- Concurrence with determinations

With regard to format – I'm not sure how much time we will need for each species. I assume some species will move pretty quickly, but others such as the bats or mussels may require more time. For efficiency, I'm thinking we could start by going through the table with the group and flag those species (or groups of species) that we would like to dedicate more time to first. I think those species should be the primary focus – we could then work through them as a group, or we could break out in separate groups if that works out logistically. We can leave the lower priority species to the end (Wednesday morning), or could finalize those species through a subsequent call or email if we run out of time. When I say "lower priority", I'm

thinking of species where it appears we are resolved on impacts, conservation measures, and determination, such as Cheat Mountain Salamander, or Red-Cockaded Woodpecker.

Are there any special topics that you would also like to discuss? I know you were working with a few specialists on karst related issues and I'm wondering if it would be beneficial for you to speak to that in a more general sense before we get into the details on the species that may inhabit those systems?

We are open to any suggestions on the content or format – we want this to be a productive working session and want participants to feel comfortable sharing their thoughts and information; if you think we should try another approach please let us know.

Thanks for your feedback in advance,
Kristin



Kristin Lenz
Sr. Project Manager

TractorWorks Building	612.746.3660 main
800 Washington Avenue N.	612.924.3962 direct
Suite 315	763.913.4740 cell
Minneapolis, MN 55401	612.746.3679 fax

www.merjent.com

klenz@merjent.com

This e-mail message is intended to be received only by persons entitled to receive the confidential information it may contain. E-mail messages from Merjent, Inc. may contain information that is confidential and legally privileged. Please do not read, copy, forward, or store this message unless you are an intended recipient of it. If you have received this message in error, please forward it to the sender and delete it completely from your computer system.

--

Liz Stout

Fish and Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
West Virginia Field Office
694 Beverly Pike
Elkins, WV 26241
(304) 636 6586 x15
<http://www.fws.gov/westvirginiafieldoffice/index.html>

--

Liz Stout

Fish and Wildlife Biologist

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

West Virginia Field Office

694 Beverly Pike

Elkins, WV 26241

(304) 636 6586 x15

<http://www.fws.gov/westvirginiafieldoffice/index.html>