Tim Sullivan

From: Niver, Robyn
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2014 7:45 AM
To: Tim R Sullivan
Subject: Fwd: Addressing your questions relating to the Constitution pipeline bat acoustic survey plan

Do you have any additional questions?
Robyn

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Niver, Robyn** <robyn_niver@fws.gov>
Date: Tue, Jun 10, 2014 at 7:08 AM
Subject: Re: Addressing your questions relating to the Constitution pipeline bat acoustic survey plan
To: "achicks@nycap.rr.com" <achicks@nycap.rr.com>
Cc: "Herzog, Carl" <cjherzog@gw.dec.state.ny.us>, "Hufnagel, Gregory" <Gregory.Hufnagel@aecom.com>, "Sullivan, Tim" <tim_r_sullivan@fws.gov>, "Tomasic, Steve" <smtomasi@gw.dec.state.ny.us>, "Newhall, Christopher" <christopher.newhall@aecom.com>, "Schubring, Linda" <Lynda.Schubring@williams.com>, "King, Andy" <andrew_king@fws.gov>

Thank you for your responses. In the future, it's nice to have the methodology right in the survey scope.

I agree with the statements re: yards and that is what my comment was getting at.... The document incorrectly states that non-linear LOE is being used for those areas.

No further questions on my end.

Robyn

On Mon, Jun 9, 2014 at 4:44 PM, <achicks@nycap.rr.com> wrote:
Hello Robyn,

The reason for 105 locations over 160 km is that, as we had discussed, we were selecting one sample point for every km of forest cover intersected by the pipeline. A 2 km stretch of pipeline that was 50% forested and 50% open fields received one sample point. This is the process that we followed last year in PA. I applied the same approach to the access roads.

In your absence, I double checked this with Andy, and he noted that it was an acceptable approach. However, in regions like Illinois where there were vast open areas and little forest, sampling every KM that contained forested lands was more appropriate as samples would otherwise be spread dozens of km apart.

What you and I had discussed as being contractor yards were not yards, but temporary work spaces. They are areas where crews expect to widen the work area for a short distance to address stream crossings and similar things. Once I understood what they were and you had gone to exotic places, I again spoke to Andy. Since these are part of the linear feature, and no wider than the line itself, he thought it appropriate to consider

them part of the line.

There are two contractor yards (where they really do store equipment and pipe) that included trees within their boundaries, one has a few acres, the other a few dozen trees. Both are being sampled for two nights at each of two sample locations that are spaced >200 meters apart.

I hope that I have adequately addressed your questions. If not, give me a call 518-860-8805.
Hope all is well

Al

---- "Niver wrote:
> Hi Al,
>
> Just a couple questions/comments.
>
> Please explain briefly the rationale for the 105 detector locations vs.
> ~160 km of pipeline (plus the 10 sites for access roads and 4 sites for
> yards). Just a few sentences will suffice.
>
> Also, we discussed including the yards in the linear LOE and that is what
> you did so the discussion on page 6 re: non-linear LOE is confusing. You
> aren't using a non-linear LOE for this project.
>
> Thank you!
> Robyn

--
****
Robyn A. Niver
Endangered Species Biologist
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
New York Field Office
3817 Luker Rd.
Cortland, NY 13045
(607) 753-9334 (voice)
(607) 753-9699 (fax)

--
****
Robyn A. Niver
Endangered Species Biologist

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
New York Field Office
3817 Luker Rd.
Cortland, NY 13045
(607) 753-9334 (voice)
(607) 753-9699 (fax)