

**From:** [Troy Andersen](#)  
**To:** [Jennifer Stanhope](#)  
**Subject:** RE: TANSWR: FW: MVP James Spinymussel  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 9:59:04 AM

---

Upon further reflection last night and this morning, I think it would be a good idea for us to call Taina and discuss. I think you have a firm handle on the jist of the issue as you've laid it out in your draft email. In my head the order of the conversation is:

- Can the pipeline be rerouted so it stays out of the vegetative buffers?
- What analysis did you complete to determine that open-cut dry ditch crossing is the construction methods with the least amount of impacts?
- What other avoidance and minimization measures can be incorporated to reduce sedimentation impacts?
- A habitat assessment is an worthy effort but understand that the expectation will be to conduct surveys in within all suitable habitat.

I'd be happy to sit in on the call with you.

Troy

---

**From:** Jennifer Stanhope [mailto:[jennifer\\_stanhope@fws.gov](mailto:jennifer_stanhope@fws.gov)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 04, 2017 12:12 PM  
**To:** Troy Andersen  
**Subject:** TANSWR: FW: MVP James Spinymussel

Hi Troy,

In re-reading Taina's email below, would it be better to call her and discuss our questions about next steps if they find suitable habitat (e.g., will they conduct surveys, assume presence if find suitable habitat, etc?) and if they can implement other measures to reduce sedimentation and erosion impacts? I started drafting a response if you think email would be better. See link. I am hoping we can get back to her soon.

[P \ ENDANGERED SPECIES & CONSERVATION PLANNING ASSISTANCE\PROJECT REVIEWS\2015FY Projects\Mountain Valley Pipeline\\_2016-SLI-0880\ 20170104\\_MVP JSM mussel habitat assessment response \\_draf](#)

Jen

---

**From:** Taina Pankiewicz [mailto:[TPankiewicz@envsi.com](mailto:TPankiewicz@envsi.com)]  
**Sent:** Friday, December 23, 2016 2:20 PM  
**To:** Sumalee Hoskin ([sumalee\\_hoskin@fws.gov](mailto:sumalee_hoskin@fws.gov)); Kimberly Smith ([kimberly\\_smith@fws.gov](mailto:kimberly_smith@fws.gov)); [jennifer\\_stanhope@fws.gov](mailto:jennifer_stanhope@fws.gov)  
**Cc:** Troy Andersen ([troy\\_andersen@fws.gov](mailto:troy_andersen@fws.gov)); Stahl, Megan D.; Valerie Clarkston  
**Subject:** MVP James Spinymussel

Hey Sumalee et. al.,

At our last in person meeting you all brought up the issue of the effects determination for James Spiny mussel in Craig and John's Creek. We all acknowledged that it is not possible to do a presence / absence survey along the entire 9+ miles both in terms of manpower and timing. But we need more data within the document in order to make an effects determination. We have been collaborating with VDGIF regarding known records and habitat modeling that has been completed for the species. Of the stream reach that is to be impacted from sediment, all but about 3 km is estimated to be potentially suitable habitat. While this species continues to be found in a variety of stream bottom habitats, it is true that there is a correlation between substrate type and population densities. As such, we would like to conduct a habitat assessment in order to facilitate occurrence and abundance estimates. Do you agree that this effort would provide some value in that analysis?

Thanks much for your input!

Taina



**Taina Pankiewicz**

President, COO

Environmental Solutions & Innovations, Inc.  
4525 Este Avenue | Cincinnati, OH 45232 | USA  
**office:** 513.451.1777 **direct:** 513.591.4311  
**fax:** 513.451.3321 **cell:** 513.910.1676  
[tpankiewicz@envsi.com](mailto:tpankiewicz@envsi.com) | [www](http://www.envsi.com)

**Subject: MVP James Spiny mussel**

We support conducting a habitat assessment by an approved surveyor in the action area to identify suitable habitat for James spiny mussel and that a survey for the mussel be conducted within all suitable habitat identified. Surveys are not needed if the approved surveyor determines that no suitable habitat is present.

In the draft BA on page 140, it is stated that “Substantial sedimentation rates in Craig Creek are predicted to extend approximately 15.07 stream kilometers (9.36 mi) downstream of the downstream-most crossing.” We recommend that additional minimization and avoidance measures be considered to reduce sedimentation and erosion impacts, thus the total action area. We have concerns about the proposed pipeline alignment (dated October 2016) and recommend that alternative routes be evaluated, particularly where it parallels the creek and has undisturbed vegetated buffer zones less than 100 feet in width adjacent to the creek. We also recommend that an analysis be conducted that supports the conclusion that open-cut dry ditch crossing of Craig Creek will have the least amount of impact.