

From: Patterson, Karen
Sent: Tuesday, August 10, 2004 11:56 AM
To: Sackschewsky, Michael R
Cc: Tony_Banks@dom.com; rlbaker@bechtel.com
Subject: Barking tree frogs at Surry

Mike -- Rich Baker forwarded your question to me. I might be able to clear up some of the confusion.

When TtNUS analyzes T&E species for license renewal ERs, we include in the list of species that could occur (Table 2-3) any animal that the state has listed as a county occurrence in the counties of interest, if the habitat is appropriate. In other words, the VDNR lists the barking tree frog as occurring in Surry County, and there is habitat for it at Surry, so we included it in the table. We try and cover that in the table title as species that "occur or could possibly occur" at a location.

HOWEVER, Dominion has stated many times that they have never found the frog at Surry, hence the statement on page 2-25 of the Surry License Renewal ER. I don't think anyone has looked for it on t-lines.

TtNUS did not prepare the ESP alternatives analysis. I suspect that the person responsible for writing it did not fully understand the approach we used in the Surry OR ER, and missed the not-to-helpful table title. Hence the morph to "with the exception of ... the barking tree frog."

There have never been any barking tree frogs observed at the SAPS site. In my opinion the ESP statement is incorrect. Bill Bolin will likely support that.

Hope this helps.

CC: "Sackschewsky, Michael R" <michael.sackschewsky@pnl.gov>