Final Environmental Assessment
of
The Effects of Issuing an Incidental Take Permit (No. 21516) to Virginia Electric and Power Company, Doing Business as Dominion Virginia Power for Incidental Take of Atlantic Sturgeon from the Chesapeake Bay Distinct Population Segment in the Tidal Freshwater Portion of the James River from the Operation and Maintenance of Chesterfield Power Station

December 2020

Lead Agency: USDOC National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Fisheries Service
Protected Resources Division
Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office

Decision Maker: Michael Pentony
Regional Administrator

For Further Information Contact: Office of Protected Resources
National Marine Fisheries Service
55 Great Republic Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930
(978) 281-9328

Location: Tidal Freshwater Portion of the James River, Virginia

Abstract: We, the National Marine Fisheries Service, propose to issue an Incidental Take Permit to Virginia Electric and Power Company, doing business as Dominion Virginia Power, under Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 as amended (16 U.S.C. 1539(a)(1)(B)), and the regulations governing the incidental taking of endangered and threatened species (50 CFR 222.307). The permit would authorize the incidental take of Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*) from the Chesapeake Bay Distinct Population Segment during the conduct of otherwise lawful activities associated with operation of the Chesterfield Power Station. Specifically, these activities include surface water withdrawals from the James River, Virginia for cooling purposes and performance of required entrainment sampling. The permit would be valid for five years. The Chesterfield Power Station would continue to operate in accordance with the Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Number VA0004146 issued and effective on October 1, 2016, and other required state and federal authorizations held by Dominion for the operation of CPS. We prepared this Environmental Assessment to consider the environmental impacts of our decision on Dominion Virginia Power's revised application for an incidental take permit.

Contents

1 Background

Virginia Electric and Power Company doing business as Dominion Virginia Power (Dominion) has submitted a revised application to us, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), for issuance of a permit to authorize the take[1] of Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*) incidental to the operation, permitting, and maintenance of the Chesterfield Power Station (CPS). Atlantic sturgeon that originate from rivers in the United States are listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) as five distinct population segments (DPS). Take of Atlantic sturgeon from any of the five DPSs is prohibited by the ESA. We may, however, issue a permit to authorize the incidental take of ESA-listed species that occurs in the course of carrying out an otherwise lawful activity (50 CFR 222.307). This permit is known as an incidental take permit (ITP).

The Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon is listed as endangered and occurs in the James River up to Richmond, Virginia. Take of Atlantic sturgeon belonging to the Chesapeake Bay DPS occurred at CPS in 2015 incidental to the otherwise lawful operation of the facility, and at that time Dominion determined that take may occur in the future. Dominion, therefore, submitted a complete ITP application and Habitat Conservation Plan (Conservation Plan) to us in 2017. We prepared a draft Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and published notice in the *Federal Register* announcing the availability of the EA and ITP application for public comment (82 FR 37849; August 14, 2017). Dominion subsequently revised and resubmitted their application to us in response to new information, public comment, and questions stemming from our further review. There have also been operational changes at CPS since their original submission. Given the extent of the changes, we conducted a new NEPA analysis and announced the availability of the new, draft, EA in the *Federal Register* (85 FR 36563; June 17, 2020) for review and comment.

1.1 Dominion's Revised ITP Application

Take of Atlantic sturgeon occurs at CPS as a result of cooling-water intake from the James River that is necessary for CPS to operate. Dominion is currently withdrawing less water from the James River for CPS operation than what was described in the 2017 ITP application. CPS is a coal-fueled power generating station located in Chesterfield, Virginia, along the upper tidal portion of the James River, Virginia (river mile 82; river kilometer 132). The power-generating units at CPS utilize a once-through cooling water system that withdraws water from the James River through cooling water intake structures (CWIS). The openings of all the intake pipes associated with the CWISs are constantly submerged and aligned flush with and parallel to the river's axis. Dominion's 2017 ITP application stated that there were six power-generating units. Each unit required cooling water for power generation, and all operated as base-load. Since then, two of the power-generating units have been retired, and two others are now operating as cycling, which means that the generating units are operated at varying load levels that are in

[1] The ESA defines "take" as "to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct."

response to changes in system load requirements rather than running continuously to produce electricity at a constant rate (https://www.eia.gov/tools/glossary/).

Dominion's authority for withdrawing cooling water from, and discharging water to, the James River for CPS operation is the same as described in their 2017 ITP application; a Virginia Pollution Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) Permit, Number VA0004146, that was issued October 1, 2016 (VDEQ 2016). The VPDES permit is one of several required authorizations held by Dominion for the operation of CPS. The VPDES permit program is authorized under the Clean Water Act (CWA), which requires all point source discharges of pollutants to waters of the United States to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit (33 U.S.C. § 1342). The Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ) is the NPDES permitting authority for the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Dominion revised their 2017 ITP application for take of Atlantic sturgeon larvae by entrainment. In December 2015, two Atlantic sturgeon larvae were found in entrainment samples collected at CPS in October 2015. These were the first known takes of Atlantic sturgeon larvae at CPS. For the 2017 application, Dominion estimated future take of Atlantic sturgeon larvae by entrainment based, in part, on these two known takes and the number of entrainment samples collected in the spring and fall. In 2018, we advised Dominion that Atlantic sturgeon early life stages (e.g., eggs, larvae) would not be present in the vicinity of CPS during the spring or early summer because spring spawning for the Chesapeake Bay DPS in the James River (i.e., April–June; Balazik and Musick 2015) occurs downriver of CPS. Also in 2018, new information became available that affirms that Atlantic sturgeon spawned in the James River in the fall move downriver, into the vicinity of CPS, within weeks of hatching (*Sturgeon Making a Comeback in the James River*, Chesapeake Bay Magazine, October 30, 2018). Finally, there was reconsideration of Dominion's estimated take by entrainment based on public comment and subsequent discussion with us regarding the take estimate.

Dominion revised their methodology for estimating take by entrainment in response to the comments. Based on the revised methodology, Dominion estimates an average annual take of 10,949 Atlantic sturgeon larvae. However, there is considerable uncertainty around this average because of the limited data available (i.e., the two known takes in 2015). Dominion initially considered the uncertainty around the flow rate and calculated that the annual take could range from 10,745 to 11,156 Atlantic sturgeon larvae per year based on flow rates at each unit and the uncertainty for flow rate at each unit. By comparison, a NMFS statistical expert recommended considering uncertainty for the estimate based on uncertainty around the take estimate. Under his calculations, the annual take with an interaction rate of 0.000132423 (0.000022013–0.000408657) and 82.685 million cubic meters of water flow would be an average of 10,949 with a range of 1,820 to 33,789 larvae per year. He did not generate uncertainty for the flow volumes because he considered that the flow volumes can be reasonably assumed to be known. Following review and discussion, Dominion requested that we proceed with processing the application using 10,949 as the average estimated take with 1,820 and 33,789 sturgeon larvae as the lower and upper 95% confidence interval of the estimate. In light of the uncertainty, Dominion has requested that the ITP, if issued, be valid for five years instead of ten years. Dominion is also requesting take of one Atlantic sturgeon larvae that may occur during the entrainment sampling that they are required to complete at CPS per section 316(b) of the CWA.

Dominion's revised application does not include a request for authorization of take of Atlantic sturgeon by impingement. For their 2017 ITP application, Dominion requested the authorization of take of one Atlantic sturgeon by impingement over the course of 10 years based on the October 2015 impingement of an adult-sized Atlantic sturgeon at CPS. The sturgeon, which was injured but released alive, was the only known impingement to have occurred at CPS. Then, in September 2018, four adult Atlantic sturgeon, all in apparent post-spawn condition, were impinged and found dead the Unit 5 intake unit. Dominion examined all of the intake guards following this event and discovered that the Unit 5 intake guard was missing, and all but one of the intake guards for the remaining units was degraded. Dominion also requested examination of the four carcasses by a sturgeon expert. He could not definitively determine the cause of death for any of the four carcasses but, based on multiple lines of evidence, it was his opinion that the fish were likely impinged while alive and later died on the trash rack. It was also his opinion that the high river flows were likely a contributing factor before and as the sturgeon moved downriver past CPS (M. Balazik, pers. comm., September 30, 2018).

Following the 2018 impingement event and based on expert opinion regarding the size of the smallest adult Atlantic sturgeon in the James River, Dominion replaced the missing and degraded intake guards with new guards that have less distance between the bars. The reduced spacing is expected to prevent all adult-sized Atlantic sturgeon from getting past the guards so that impingement is unable to occur on the trash racks within the intake unit. In addition, Dominion enlarged the intake openings for Units 5 and 6 to reduce the velocity of the river water moving past the guards (i.e., through water velocity) so that impingement is unlikely to occur on the river side of the intake guards. Dominion calculated the through water velocity at the intake guards for all of the intake units and, in consideration of the available information on sturgeon swimming ability, concluded that healthy adult Atlantic sturgeon could outswim the less than two feet per second intake velocity and therefore, would not be vulnerable to impingement at the intakes. Dominion concluded that impingement of adult Atlantic sturgeon will not occur in the future at CPS because of the new guards and based on the calculated intake velocity and the swim speed of adult Atlantic sturgeon. Therefore, Dominion is not requesting authorization for take for impingement of adults in the revised ITP application. Dominion will continue to monitor CPS's trash racks for Atlantic sturgeon but will not monitor the intake guards of the intake structures because the guards are below the water surface and turbidity inhibits visibility, and because of the safety issues for personnel.[2] Dominion is not requesting take by impingement for juvenile and subadult[3] Atlantic sturgeon because those life stages are not present in the area.

[2] River water must first pass the intake guards then, as the river water is drawn toward the intakes, it first encounters a floating curtain wall that extends 4.0 to 4.5 feet below the water surface at all tide levels. On the intake side of the curtain wall are vertical trash racks installed in front of the screen bays at each cooling water intake structure. Trash racks are designed to prevent large debris from entering the screen houses. On the intake side of the trash racks are traveling screens with 3/8-inch mesh (Figure 1, Dominion's revised application).

[3] Dominion's ITP application appears to be using the terms juvenile and subadult the same as in the ESA listing rules and critical habitat designations for the Atlantic sturgeon DPSs. Both terms refer to immature Atlantic Sturgeon but, juveniles are still resident in the natal estuary whereas subadults have emigrated from the natal river estuary.

Dominion's revised ITP application does not include any other ESA-listed species or any other activity. Dominion previously concluded that maintenance dredging, constituent discharge, thermal discharge, vessel movements, and shoreline and structure maintenance at CPS will not result in incidental take of any ESA-listed species under NMFS jurisdiction, and we have agreed with their conclusions. Dominion also previously concluded that sea turtles, marine mammals, and other ESA-listed fish, including Atlantic sturgeon belonging to one of the other four DPSs, do not occur in the vicinity of CPS.

2 Purpose and Need

NMFS is proposing to issue an ITP to Dominion pursuant to Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA and the regulations governing the incidental taking of endangered and threatened species (50 CFR 222.307). The purpose of our action is to consider issuance of an ITP to Dominion, for take incidental to lawful operation and maintenance of Dominion's CPS facility, as well as entrainment sampling required under CWA § 316(b). Permit issuance would require Dominion to minimize the incidental capture and killing (i.e., take) of Atlantic sturgeon larvae at CPS and to mitigate the impacts of such taking to the maximum extent practicable.

This action is needed to reduce the capture and killing (i.e., take) of Chesapeake Bay DPS sturgeon larvae, because the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon is endangered and at risk of extinction. The ESA prohibits the incidental take of ESA-listed species with limited exceptions. Dominion's 2015 water sampling showed that Chesapeake Bay DPS sturgeon larvae could be entrained at CPS. Dominion anticipates that additional takes will occur in the future because Dominion is required to conduct additional entrainment sampling for its VPDES renewal application by the CWA section 316(b) Rule for existing facilities, and Dominion will continue to operate CPS for power generation which requires the withdrawal of water from the James River. The VPDES permit issued to Dominion sets technology requirements for cooling water intake operations of CPS and authorizes the discharge of heated water to the James River. It does not provide an exemption from the ESA prohibitions. Dominion has requested an ITP to continue lawful operation of CPS and required sampling, and in compliance with the ESA.

Dominion anticipates that Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon could be incidentally captured and killed by entrainment in the next five years during the continued operation of the cooling water intakes at CPS, and incidentally captured during fall sampling collection to complete the CWA section 316(b) studies. Therefore, Dominion has applied for an ITP per section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA and has requested that the permit, if issued, be valid for up to five years.

To issue an ITP, we must find that: (1) the taking will be incidental; (2) the applicant will, to the maximum extent practicable, monitor, minimize and mitigate the impacts of the taking; (3) the taking will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of the survival and recovery of the species in the wild; (4) the applicant has amended the conservation plan to include any measures (not originally proposed by the applicant) that we determine are necessary or appropriate; and, (5) there are adequate assurances that the conservation plan will be funded and implemented, including any measure that we required. We prepared this EA to inform the public of our proposed action and the effects of the proposed action and its alternatives, and to use information

collected and analyzed to make better informed decisions concerning this incidental take permit application.

This EA analyzes the effects to the human and natural environment caused by the issuance of an ITP to Dominion for the incidental take of Atlantic sturgeon from the Chesapeake Bay DPS, associated with the operation of CPS cooling water intakes and the performance of CWA section 316(b) studies. Given the continued operation of CPS, and the need to conduct additional CWA section 316(b) sampling, Dominion anticipates that take of Atlantic sturgeon may occur in the future.

3 Alternatives Including the Proposed Action

The withdrawal of water from the James River for operation of CPS to produce electrical power is an otherwise legal activity. This activity may result in the incidental take of Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon by entrainment during cooling water intake at CPS. Entrainment may also occur when Dominion subsamples cooling water for entrainment studies that are a requirement under EPA's 2014 CWA § 316(b) Rule for renewal of their VPDES permit. We have the authority to issue an ITP to Dominion if all of the permit issuance criteria have been met. We considered the following alternatives for our action.

3.1 Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, an ITP would not be issued. The CPS would likely continue to operate in accordance with VPDES Permit No. VA0004146 and other required authorizations held by Dominion for the operation of CPS. Facility and operational changes might occur at CPS in the future as a result of changes to their VPDES permit following completion of Dominion's studies to comply with the CWA § 316(b) Rule for Existing Facilities. Dominion would be required to implement the best technology available for the CPS cooling water intake structures under CWA section 316(b) and consistent with any future VPDES permit. Dominion has also stated that if an ITP was not issued, Dominion would expect to implement necessary changes to avoid the risk of incidental take, but cautioned that such changes could require approval by other regulatory bodies or entities. Therefore, there is no certainty as to what, if any, changes would occur. If take of Atlantic sturgeon occurred at CPS then those takes would be prohibited takes under the ESA (i.e., in violation of section 9 of the ESA). As a result, Dominion could be subject to NOAA law enforcement action or private litigation against Dominion. However, the likelihood of either action occurring, or the outcome if it were to occur, is highly uncertain.

If an ITP is not issued, Dominion would not be required to implement the minimization and mitigation measures that they have proposed in their Conservation Plan. Monitoring at CPS would occur only as required by the VPDES permit, which, unlike the Dominion proposed monitoring, is unlikely to be specific to detecting and reporting the entrainment of sturgeon larvae. Therefore, take of Atlantic sturgeon larvae might not be detected if Dominion was not required to specifically monitor for larval sturgeon.

The Chesapeake Bay DPS is listed as endangered because it is at risk of extinction, and the production and survival of offspring is necessary for recovery of the DPS. Therefore, the No Action Alternative is not the preferred alternative because: it does not afford the certainty of incidental take authorization provided by ESA Section 10(a)(1)(B); it would not provide for additional minimization and mitigation measures; and, it does not meet the purpose and need.

3.2 Alternative 2 – Issue Permit as Requested in Application (Proposed Action)

Under Alternative 2, we would issue an ITP to Dominion authorizing the incidental take of Atlantic sturgeon larvae that occur when Dominion is operating CPS and when they complete entrainment sampling for their required CWA section 316(b) studies. Dominion would continue to withdraw water as under Alternative 1 with no additional changes to facility operations other than what would be required by their VPDES permit. However, in addition to any requirements of the VPDES permit, Dominion would also be required to implement the Conservation Plan submitted with their ITP application. The goals of the Conservation Plan are to avoid and minimize take, and to aid in the conservation of Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon in the James River. There are three elements to the plan: minimization that has been implemented while the application was in-progress; mitigation resulting from the implementation of data collection; and, monitoring.

Dominion's changes to, and repair of, the intake guards minimizes the risk that adult Atlantic sturgeon will be impinged on the intake guards and should prevent impingement at the trash racks of even the smallest adults. Dominion undertook these changes after four adult Atlantic sturgeon were impinged and found dead at the Unit 5 intake in September 2018. Examination of the carcasses suggested that each was alive when impinged on the trash racks during a high flow event in the river. Dominion's investigation of the event revealed that the Unit 5 intake guard was missing at the time of the impingement event, and other guards needed repair. Based on information from a sturgeon expert for the James River, Dominion took steps to modify, repair and replace all intake guards, including reducing the grid openings so that the smallest adult Atlantic sturgeon could not pass through.

Dominion worked with sturgeon experts throughout the impingement event and modification of the intake guards, including: examination and salvage of the four carcasses; investigation of whether there were any additional carcasses at the trash racks of the other power-generating units; and, identifying the best spacing for the grid bars. Dominion has revised their proposed mitigation by replacing what had been proposed with an expanded approach for identifying presence of adult Atlantic sturgeon near CPS, and a new approach for identifying early life-stage (e.g., larvae) Atlantic sturgeon at CPS. Dominion describes how they expect the new information to be used and the contribution that the new information will make toward mitigation.

There is only rudimentary knowledge of the occurrence of adult sturgeon in the part of the freshwater reach of the James River where CPS is located. Dominion sees an opportunity to obtain information for movement of adult Atlantic sturgeon near CPS that could answer questions about how much time adults occur near CPS and their movement patterns. Specifically, for that part of the mitigation that Dominion is calling "Sturgeon Movement

Research", Dominion is proposing a partnership with Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) that will allow Dominion to have access to real-time data for VCU's acoustically-tagged Atlantic sturgeon that are making their way upriver to spawn. The information will be used by Dominion to inform them when the spawning window occurs so that Dominion can better anticipate when sturgeon larvae are likely to be in the James River within the vicinity of CPS. Dominion will also contract with VCU to deploy and maintain receivers to detect acoustically-tagged sturgeon downriver of CPS where receivers do not currently exist. The new information will be used by Dominion to inform the movement of spawning condition adult sturgeon near CPS (e.g., when spawning condition adults move upstream of CPS, how far upstream of CPS do sturgeon occur, the frequency of individual sturgeon near CPS during the spawning season). The new information will also be shared with sturgeon researchers, including academia, and state wildlife managers.

Dominion is also proposing to implement a pilot study that would test the use of digital holography to identify Atlantic sturgeon larvae at CPS. Digital holography uses imaging to detect and count the targeted species. For Dominion's proposed study, traditional water sampling serves as the control. The digital holography instruments would be deployed at the same time as traditional sampling, and the results compared. Since this is a pilot study, the goal is to determine whether the technique can reliably detect Atlantic sturgeon larvae and if the data is sufficient to determine abundance. It is unknown whether digital holography will prove successful for detecting Atlantic sturgeon larvae or other early life stages. However, there are currently no other successful methods for detecting these other than entrainment sampling. Therefore, the pilot study could provide new information which would otherwise not be collected and, if successful, will provide a new tool that has many beneficial applications for recovery of the Atlantic sturgeon DPS (e.g., abundance or distribution surveys of Atlantic sturgeon early life stages).

Dominion's monitoring protocol is focused on entrainment of Atlantic sturgeon larvae and, therefore, differs from their protocol to complete the CWA 316(b) studies. Dominion also revised their monitoring approach from the 2017 ITP application by increasing the frequency of sampling during the targeted months of September and October, when the fall spawning period for Atlantic sturgeon in the James River typically occurs, and for the full permit duration. Dominion is no longer proposing to monitor for entrainment of Atlantic sturgeon larvae in the spring since larvae from spring spawning would only occur downriver of CPS and, therefore, would not be susceptible to entrainment at CPS.

Dominion will monitor entrainment of fall-spawned Atlantic sturgeon larvae by collecting four 24-hour diel entrainment samples (one every six hours), three times per week during September to October for a total of 96 samples per year. As previously proposed, samples will be collected near-bottom (i.e., approximately 3 feet above the intake bottom) and by pumping water through a 0.5-m diameter mouth plankton net constructed of 335-µm[4] netting suspended in a buffering tank. The target water volume for each entrainment sample is a total of 100 m^3 (26,417 gallons). Each sample will be comprised of four subsamples with a targeted water volume of 25 m^3 per

[4] Dominion's revised ITP application mentions both 335 micrometer netting and 500 micrometer netting. Email correspondence with staff on December 19, 2019, confirmed that the netting will be 335 micrometers.

subsample. The net will be removed from the buffer tank after each subsample collection, immediately replaced with a second net, and the contents will be washed down into a sample container. The second, third, and fourth subsamples will be washed down into the same sample container. Throughout the collection, water flow will be monitored and adjusted as necessary, and will not exceed 250-275 gallons per minute to minimize potential damage to organisms collected in the net. Samples will be sorted on site for Atlantic sturgeon larvae and eggs. Although free-floating Atlantic sturgeon eggs are generally considered non-viable, Dominion's entrainment methodology includes sorting for and retaining any suspected Atlantic sturgeon eggs. All Atlantic sturgeon eggs and larvae will be appropriately preserved.

Dominion proposes to collect entrainment samples on the riverside, directly in front of the trash racks at the Unit 6 CWIS. If Unit 6 is not operating or it is unsafe or infeasible to sample at Unit 6 for other reasons, the secondary sample location will be at Unit 4. Unit 6 was selected as the primary sampling location because it withdraws the highest proportion (approximately 40 percent) of the total water volume used at the CPS; additionally, pumps at Unit 6 have been operated most often. Unit 4 was chosen as the secondary location since Unit 3 (the secondary location originally identified by Dominion in their 2017 application) has been retired. Unit 4 has relatively close access to the water and sufficient deck space, which facilitates sampling. As explained by Dominion in their August 31, 2018, letter to us, entrainment samples are not collected at the intakes for Units 5, 7, or 8 because it is unsafe and impractical given discharge or the elevation of the intake units relative to the river.

As described above, Dominion does not anticipate take of Atlantic sturgeon by impingement because the changes made to the intake guards should prevent impingement of adults, and juvenile and subadult Atlantic sturgeon do not occur near CPS. As a precaution, Dominion will continue to inspect trash rack debris at the water surface, and debris removed from the trash racks, for sturgeon. Dominion has sturgeon handling procedures in the event a living or dead sturgeon is found among the debris floating in the water or in the debris removed from the trash racks. Monitoring will not occur at the intake guards because it is not feasible due to the turbidity of the river and the safety risk for personnel.

Lastly, Dominion has revised their ITP application by requesting a five-year permit instead of a ten-year permit. The shorter timeframe will afford opportunity to gather information from the proposed mitigation studies and to more promptly implement changes based on new information. In addition, as part of their VPDES permit renewal process (ongoing), Dominion will have to comply with a Best Technology Available (BTA) standard for impingement and entrainment mortality, which will require Dominion to consider a variety of fish and shellfish protection measures. Therefore, an ITP issued for five years instead of a longer permit duration helps to prevent the preclusion of operational changes at CPS that may be considered or necessary for Dominion to meet the BTA standard of the future VPDES permit.

3.3 Alternatives Considered But Rejected

Issue Permit with a Requirement for Operational Changes: We considered issuance of an ITP that would require Dominion to either eliminate cooling water intake at CPS by changing to closed cycle cooling or to annually suspend cooling water intake operations at CPS from

September through October when Atlantic sturgeon larvae are most likely to be in the vicinity of the CWISs. In their initial ITP application and Conservation Plan, Dominion provided information indicating that seasonal shutdowns and changing the intake structures to convert to closed cycle cooling was not feasible. We requested further elaboration. In their August 31, 2018, letter to us, Dominion explained the requirements for renewing their VPDES permit. That process requires Dominion to collect water samples from the cooling water intakes (i.e., entrainment samples). Using the data acquired from the entrainment samples and other required information, VDEQ will make a site-specific BTA determination for reducing entrainment at CPS. The draft VPDES permit would be issued after a 60-day review period by the NMFS and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and also a 30-day public review. After the final VPDES permit is issued, Dominion would need to implement the chosen BTA for impingement mortality and entrainment reduction technology(s) and/or operational measures at CPS.

Dominion needs to complete the required fall entrainment sampling for their VPDES permit renewal. Dominion suspended the fall sampling after the two Atlantic sturgeon larvae were discovered in 2015. If we issued an ITP that required Dominion to eliminate cooling water intake or to annually suspend cooling water intake operations from September through October, it would eliminate Dominion's ability to collect their remaining required entrainment samples for the VPDES permit renewal, and would force Dominion to be out of compliance with the CWA. We cannot issue an ITP that would cause the permit holder to not comply with other existing laws. In addition, the CWA benefits the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon, humans, other species, and the environment, in general. Water quality in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries has considerably improved since implementation of the CWA, particularly in the past 30 years (Zhang et al. 2018). Issuance of an ITP which prevents compliance with the CWA is not appropriate and would likely result in harm to the Chesapeake Bay DPS, and other species in the James River ecosystem.

Larval sturgeon entrainment could potentially be reduced at CPS, possibly to zero, if CPS were changed over to closed cycle cooling. However, completely changing the cooling water system at CPS would take a considerable amount of time to authorize and implement, if even feasible. It would also be impracticable to require Dominion to make costly changes to CPS's CWIS when its impacts to the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon is already so low, while it still is unknown what changes Dominion will have to make at CPS to comply with a BTA standard for impingement and entrainment mortality for their VPDES permit renewal, and given that Virginia's biggest utilities (e.g., Dominion) are required to deliver electricity from 100 percent renewable sources by 2045 which means that CPS would no longer operate as a coal-fired power plant by that time.

Dominion has been able to reduce cooling water intake. As described above and in Dominion's revised application, two of the power-generating units have been retired and two others are now operating as cycling. In the first year of cycling operations, CPS water withdrawals for September-October were approximately 50 percent of design intake flow. However, Dominion anticipates that incidental take of Atlantic sturgeon larvae could still occur. Therefore, another approach we considered was for Dominion to suspend or further reduce cooling water intake operations at CPS from September through October, when sturgeon larvae are most likely to be near CPS, in all years of the permit other than when sampling will occur to complete the CWA

section 316(b) studies. However, CPS is a power generating facility and the facility cannot generate electricity to meet the energy needs of its customers without withdrawing cooling water. In addition, Dominion participates in a regional transmission interconnection which coordinates the movement of wholesale electricity and may demand generation under certain conditions. Therefore, actual water withdrawals necessary to meet Dominion's commitments to its customers and its participation in the regional transmission interconnection for September through October of all years are difficult, if not impossible, to predict. For all of these reasons, it is not currently practicable for Dominion to suspend or reduce cooling water intake operations during September and October each year, and we, therefore, rejected this alternative.

Issue Permit for up to 10 Years: This alternative would not require Dominion to make any facility or operational changes. It is the same as Alternative 2 with the exception that the permit would be valid for up to 10 years as originally requested by Dominion. As described above, in their revised submission Dominion requested that the ITP, if issued, be valid for five years instead of ten years in light of the uncertainty for the estimated take of Atlantic sturgeon larvae by entrainment. We nevertheless considered issuing a 10-year permit because a 10-year permit would allow more time for data collection from Dominion's proposed mitigation (i.e., the Sturgeon Movement Research and pilot study), and issuing a 10-year permit could reduce the administrative burden. However, the CPS VPDES permit that will set the specific BTA measures for the cooling water intake structures is expected to be issued in 2021 as Dominion's current VPDES permit expires on September 30, 2021. Although neither we nor Dominion know what might be required for BTA measures because entrainment sampling is incomplete, it is unlikely that new BTA requirements would increase entrainment of Chesapeake Bay sturgeon larvae since doing so would be counter to the intent of using BTA. As such, it is more prudent to issue an ITP for 5 years instead of 10 years.

In addition to the VPDES permit renewal, in March 2020, Virginia's General Assembly passed the Virginia Clean Economy Act. It requires the state's biggest utilities (e.g., Dominion) to deliver electricity from 100 percent renewable sources by 2045. This may result in additional changes to CPS in the future.

We cannot change the ITP after it is issued because the ITP process includes a "No Surprises" rule which provides assurances to Section 10 permit holders that, as long as the permittee is properly implementing the conservation plan and the ITP, no additional commitment of land, water, or financial compensation will be required with respect to covered species, and no restrictions on the use of land, water, or other natural resources will be imposed beyond those specified in the conservation plan without the consent of the permittee. We are required to consider what circumstances might change over the permit duration and as best as possible address those by including measures for changed circumstances in the conservation plan before the ITP is issued. However, given the level of uncertainty for what changes might occur in CPS operations over the next 10 years, we cannot predict what changes might occur and we, thus, cannot identify how to address those changed circumstances. We, therefore, in consideration of the additional uncertainty that exists in a 10-year period compared to a 5-year period, rejected the alternative of issuing an ITP valid for 10 years.

4 Affected Environment

The affected environment is the tidal, freshwater reach of the James River where CPS is located including the intake pipes that bring water into CPS and the trash racks that prevent debris from entering CPS. This section presents baseline information necessary for consideration of the alternatives for the area of the James River where CPS is located, as well as others areas of the James River where the Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon occurs in the river (i.e., from the river mouth to the Bosher Dam, upriver of CPS, near Richmond, VA). We describe the resources that would be affected by the alternatives. The effects of the alternatives on the environment are discussed in Section 5 of this EA.

4.1 Physical and Biological Environment

The James River has a diverse biological environment, including native and non-native species. The 340 miles (547 km) long James River is Virginia's largest river and the largest tributary to the Chesapeake Bay. Many alterations have been made to the approximately 25 foot deep river channel to accommodate ship traffic to and from the port at Richmond, including alterations that affect flow in, and sedimentation of, natural oxbows. Sediment types include mud, sand, silt, and clay (Bushnoe et al. 2005). Water quality remains a concern in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, including the James River (VDEQ 2015). Issuance of the proposed ITP will have an impact on the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon because measures to minimize and mitigate take of the DPS will be implemented as a requirement of the ITP. If the minimization and mitigation measures reduce effects to another native species, then issuance of the ITP may have an impact on that other native species as well. Otherwise, no other physical or biological features of the James River are likely to be impacted. In the absence of the ITP, the actual operation of CPS would likely continue per the VPDES permit.

The James River is one of three known spawning rivers for the Chesapeake Bay DPS, and likely has the largest spawning population of the three rivers (ASSRT 2007; Balazik et al. 2012a; Hager et al. 2014; Kahn et al. 2014; Balazik and Musick 2015; Richardson and Secor 2016). Based on modeling work using features associated with spawning habitat (e.g., suitable substrate), Bushnoe et al. (2005) concluded that the Turkey Island oxbow and the James Neck oxbow were potential spawning sites for Atlantic sturgeon in the James River. Spawning may occur as far upstream as Richmond (river mile 96; river kilometer 155), which is also the head of tide and close to the upstream extent of Atlantic sturgeon in the river given the presence of Bosher Dam at the fall line (approximately river mile 99; river kilometer 160) (Bushnoe et al. 2005; Hager 2011; Balazik et al. 2012a). More than one spawning site may be used depending on the location of the salt front in a particular year or spawning season.

Adult Atlantic sturgeon enter the James River in the spring. Based on the locations of tracked adults, the availability of hard-bottom substrate that is necessary for spawning, and the salinity distribution in the James River, adult sturgeon occur further upstream during the late summer and early fall residency than during the spring and early summer residency (Balazik et al. 2012a; Balazik and Musick 2015). Adults disperse through downriver sites and begin to move out of the river in late September to early October, occupy only lower river sites by November, and are undetected on tracking arrays in the lower river by December suggesting that adult sturgeon

leave the river for the winter (Hager 2011; Balazik et al. 2012a). Dominion provided additional information describing the physical and biological environment of the James River in the vicinity of CPS. The following was provided by Dominion as part of their ITP application.

The river in the area of CPS is downriver of the fall line, is tidal and freshwater year round, and is characterized as a meandering channel with adjacent oxbows (Figure 4-1).



Map Source: USGS Topographic Map of Petersburg, VA; Map ID #37077-A1-TM-100 (1984)

Figure 4-1. Chesterfield Power Station Area Map

Prevailing river depths at the CPS range from 2 to 39 feet at Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW) and the navigational channel is maintained (e.g., dredged) at 35 feet of water depth at MLLW to accommodate deep-draft vessels traveling upriver to the port at Richmond (VEPCO 2000). A bathymetric survey in front of CPS was conducted in 2011. Water depths immediately adjacent to the CWISs and outfalls range between 1 to 15 feet, but rapidly descend to mid-channel depths (Figure 4-2). The James River at the CPS experiences a mean tidal amplitude of approximately 2.0 feet. The water level in this portion of the James River fluctuates greatly with an extreme high elevation of 19.0 feet and an extreme low elevation of -3.5 feet. Maximum tidal current is approximately 2.8 fps with average maximum ebb and flood tidal currents of 1.34 fps and 1.5 fps, respectively.

Biological resources in the vicinity of CPS include phytoplankton, zooplankton, benthic macroinvertebrates, juvenile and adult fishes, aquatic macrophytes, and vertebrate wildlife as described in the results of the CPS CWA 316(a) demonstration study conducted between 1997 and 1999.

Benthic macroinvertebrates near the CPS are dominated numerically (98%) by Oligochaeta (worms) and Chironomidae (midges). Additionally, Blue Crabs (*Callinectes sapidus*), Asiatic Clams (*Corbicula fluminea*), and Common Grass Shrimp (*Palaemonetes pugio)* were collected in the 2005-2006 finfish surveys as part of impingement studies (EA 2007).

A total of 35 native and introduced, riverine, and estuarine species have been collected (VEPCO 2000). Juvenile and adult fish species most frequently caught in electrofishing samples included Gizzard Shad (*Dorosoma cepedianum)*, Threadfin Shad (*Dorosoma petenense)*, Bluegill Sunfish (*Lepomis macrochirus)*, Largemouth Bass (*Micropterus salmoides)*, Common Carp (*Cyprinus carpio*), Spottail Shiners (*Notropis hudsonius*), and White Perch (*Morone americana*). Gillnet catches included Gizzard Shad, Threadfin Shad, White Perch, Blue Catfish (*Ictalurus furcatus*), and Channel Catfish (*Ictalurus punctatus*).

Hydrodynamics in the James River drive the presence of aquatic macrophytes and plant community diversity. Protected oxbows, such as the Farrar Gut support richer and more diverse plant communities consisting of Pickerelweed (*Pontederia cordata*), Wild Rice, Smartweed (*Polygonum pensylvanicum*), Arrow-Arum (*Peltandra virginica*), and Broadleaf Cattail (*Typha latifolia*). Conversely, regions of the river subject to current scouring appear to support reduced plant diversity consisting of Water-willow (*Justicia americana*) and Smartweed patches (VEPCO 2000).

Temperature, dissolved oxygen, and nutrient monitoring were conducted from May 1997 through February 1999 for the CWA 316(a) study (VEPCO 2000). Results indicated that despite the influence of the thermal discharge at Outfall 003, river water temperature mirrored seasonal changes in air temperature. The oxbows act as heat sinks, but the tidal cycle influences the thermal plume, confining it to Farrar Gut on the incoming tide, and extending it downriver on the outgoing tide. Dissolved oxygen in the tidal freshwater James River typically varies between 13 mg/L during winter months to 6 mg/L during the summer, with no values of less than 5 mg/L recorded (Moore et al. 2006).

Median Total Suspended Solids (TSS) in the area of Turkey Island and Shipley Cove (approximately 8 miles downstream of the CPS) ranged from 16.0 to 35.0 mg/L during April to October over the period of 1999 to 2005 (Moore et al. 2006). These TSS levels are typical of the tidal freshwater portions of the James River (Moore et al. 2006).

4.2 Status of Species Affected

For the purposes of this EA, the focus is on the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon which is the only affected ESA-listed species in the permit application and the species for which incidental take coverage is sought. No other ESA-listed species occur near CPS or are otherwise affected by the covered activities.

The Chesapeake Bay DPS is listed under the ESA as endangered because it is at risk of extinction given low abundance, limited spawning, threats to habitat, and anthropogenic mortality (77 FR 5880; February 6, 2012). The DPS includes all anadromous Atlantic sturgeon that are spawned in the watersheds that drain into the Chesapeake Bay and into coastal waters from the Delaware-Maryland border from Fenwick Island to Cape Henry, Virginia (50 CFR 224.101). Within this range, Atlantic sturgeon historically spawned in the Susquehanna, Potomac, James, York, Rappahannock, and Nottoway Rivers (ASSRT 2007). Spawning still occurs in the James River and in the Pamunkey River, a tributary of the York River (Balazik et al. 2012a; Hager et al. 2014; Kahn et al. 2014). Spawning is also likely occurring in Marshyhope

Creek, MD, a tributary of the Nanticoke River (Richardson and Secor 2016). Designated critical habitat for the DPS includes that part of the James River from the Bosher Dam and downstream to where the river drains into Hampton Roads (82 FR 39160; August 17, 2017).

The 2017 ASMFC stock assessment determined that abundance of the Chesapeake Bay DPS is "depleted" relative to historical levels (ASMFC 2017). The assessment also determined there is a relatively low probability (37%) that abundance of the Chesapeake Bay DPS has increased since the implementation of the 1998 fishing moratorium, and a 30% probability that mortality for the Chesapeake Bay DPS exceeds the mortality threshold used for the assessment (ASMFC 2017). Based on research captures of tagged adults, an estimated 75 Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon spawned in the Pamunkey River in 2013 (Kahn et al. 2014). A total of 239 adult-sized Atlantic sturgeon were captured in the James River from 2010 through spring 2014 (Balazik and Musick 2015). This is a minimum count of the number of adult Atlantic sturgeon in the James River during the time period because capture efforts did not occur in all areas and at all times when Atlantic sturgeon were present in the river. The authors did not provide an estimate of the total number of adult Chesapeake Bay Atlantic sturgeon likely present in the James River. However, Dominion's revised ITP application includes a personal communication from one of the authors who, based on captures of spawning male sturgeon in the fall, estimated that there are 3,707 males in the fall spawning population, and who reasoned that the annual estimate of the number of spawning females is 1,250 individuals assuming that the sex ratio is 1:1 and females return to spawn every 3 years.

Historical records provide evidence that Atlantic sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries were targeted for the large-scale 19th century commercial Atlantic sturgeon fisheries. Harvest continued, albeit at reduced levels, into the 20th century. All directed Atlantic sturgeon fishing as well as retention of Atlantic sturgeon bycatch is currently prohibited. Atlantic sturgeon can only sustain low levels of mortality because they have a long period of growth before reaching maturity, adults do not necessarily spawn every year, and there are a relatively limited number of rivers suitable for successful spawning and rearing (Boreman 1997; ASSRT 2007; Kahnle et al. 2007). In addition, their wide-ranging nature and their need for and use of river-estuarine and marine waters expose Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon to multiple threats throughout their range and at every life stage. Persistent degraded water quality, habitat impacts from dredging, continued bycatch in state and federally-managed fisheries, and vessel strikes remain significant threats to the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon (Pyzik et al. 2004; ASSRT 2007; Balazik et al. 2010; Brown and Murphy 2010; Niklitschek and Secor 2010; Austin 2012; Balazik et al. 2012b). Information regarding the vulnerability of Atlantic sturgeon to climate change (Hare et al. 2016) suggests it poses a greater threat to the Chesapeake Bay DPS than what was anticipated when the DPS was listed in 2012.

Atlantic sturgeon are spawned in freshwater of tidal rivers, spend months to years developing in the natal estuary and use waters of increasing salinity in the river estuary before making their first emigration to the marine environment. Once in the marine environment, the immature sturgeon undertake seasonal movements similar to adults. In general, immature and mature Atlantic sturgeon move into estuaries in the spring through summer, and leave the estuaries in the fall to return to marine waters. The whereabouts of the fish in the winter is not clearly known, and they may occur throughout their broad marine range. Aggregation areas have been

identified and can occur in all seasons. The purpose of aggregating is not understood but likely includes foraging in some locations given the presence of prey items in stomachs of sampled sturgeon.

For the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon, males mature at about age 10 and females at about age 15 years (Balazik et al. 2012c). When the fish are sexually mature, they return to their natal river to spawn. In more northern river systems, spawning occurs in the spring. The Chesapeake Bay DPS spawns in the late summer-early fall (Balazik et al. 2012a; Hager 2014; Richardson and Secor 2016), and is referred to in the literature as fall spawning. However, there is also evidence that among the Chesapeake Bay DPS spawning rivers, only the James River supports both spring and fall spawning, comprised of genetically-different Atlantic sturgeon spawning populations (Balazik and Musick 2015).

4.3 Anticipated Incidental Take of Atlantic Sturgeon DPSs

As described above, Dominion is requesting an ITP for the incidental take of Chesapeake Bay DPS larvae associated with CPS cooling water intake operation and CWA section 316(b) studies. Estimating take of Atlantic sturgeon larvae by entrainment at CPS is very difficult given the paucity of information. The only information available is the known take of two Atlantic sturgeon larvae in October 2015 that were discovered when the samples were examined in December 2015. None of the other samples that were collected during the 24-hour sampling period on October 7-8, 2015 contained Atlantic sturgeon larvae, and there were no Atlantic sturgeon larvae identified in samples collected before or after the date when the two larvae were collected.

Dominion's revised estimated take for entrainment is based on the known take of the two larvae, and the volume of water that was sampled during that sampling period. Based on the revised methodology, Dominion estimates an average annual take of 10,949 Atlantic sturgeon larvae. Dominion initially considered the uncertainty around the flow rate and calculated that annual take could range from 10,745 to 11,156 Atlantic sturgeon larvae per year based on flow rates at each unit and the uncertainty for flow rate at each of those. By comparison, our expert considered uncertainty for the estimate based on uncertainty around the take estimate. Under his calculations, the annual take with an interaction rate of 0.000132423 (0.000022013 - 0.000408657) and 82.685 million cubic meters of water flow would be an average of 10,949 with a range of 1,820 to 33,789 larvae per year. He did not generate uncertainty for the flow volumes because he considered that the flow volumes could be reasonably assumed to be known. Dominion requested that we proceed with processing the application using 10,949 as the average estimated take with 1,820 and 33,789 sturgeon larvae as the lower and upper 95% confidence interval of the estimate. The range of the estimate reflects the uncertainty given the very limited data available to estimate take. The estimate does consider the reduction in cooling water given operational changes at CPS that occurred after the 2017 ITP application was submitted to us. Dominion is also requesting take of one Atlantic sturgeon larvae that may occur during entrainment sampling that they are required to complete at CPS per section 316(b) of the CWA.

All Atlantic sturgeon taken as a result of CPS operations will be from the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon. Tagging records and the relatively low rate of gene flow reported in

population genetic studies provide evidence that Atlantic sturgeon return to their natal river to spawn (ASSRT 2007). Therefore, all Atlantic sturgeon larvae entrained as a result of CPS operations will belong to the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon because all larvae in the James River belong to the DPS.

4.4 Essential Fish Habitat

The proposed action occurs in tidal fresh waters. Essential fish habitat (EFH) for federally managed species is not designated in the area. While a number of species are affected by the operation of CPS and the required 316(b) studies, no other species are likely to be affected by issuance of the proposed permit to take Atlantic sturgeon incidental to activities associated with the continued operation and maintenance of CPS as all effects would occur regardless of permit issuance.

4.5 Social and Economic Environment

A variety of human activities may occur in the action area such as commercial fishing, recreational fishing, recreational boating, ecotourism, and other commercial uses, such as shipping. Largemouth bass fishing, for example, has been a draw for large-scale tournaments. Blue catfish were introduced to the James River years ago as a sport fish and it continues to be popular in the sport fishing community. Other native species such as striped bass support both recreational and commercial fisheries in the James River as far upriver as Richmond.

The river is also popular for other recreational activities such as boating, camping, and outdoor activities focused on viewing and learning about Atlantic sturgeon (*https://thejamesriver.org/great-return/*). The popularity of the James River Park System, including the riverside parks in Richmond, and other nature areas such as the Dutch Gap Conservation Area located in proximity to CPS, demonstrate the value that people place on the natural resources of the area and on Atlantic sturgeon (James River Association State of the James Report; available at *https://thejamesriver.org/about-the-james-river/state-of-the-james/)*.

Richmond, Virginia, upriver of CPS, is generally considered the upper limit of the lower James River and of the tidal freshwater reach of the river. Richmond's port handles a variety of containers and cargo that are transported on the James River from Hampton Roads to Richmond. The cargoes cover a variety of products including chemicals, pharmaceuticals, forest products, paper, machinery, consumer goods, frozen seafood, produce, campers, steel, steel products, stone, tobacco leaf, aluminum, project cargo, vehicles, boats, wire coils, wire rods, and pipe. More than 100 motor freight companies and brokers serve the area. CSX provides a direct rail connection for transport of product to and from the Port at Richmond.

4.6 Historic Places, Scientific, Cultural, and Historical Resources

There are no specific historic, scientific, cultural, or historical resources in the specific area of CPS. There are numerous historic places, scientific, cultural, and historical resources along the James River. Historic sites in proximity to CPS include Henricus Historical Park. Downriver of CPS the James River National Wildlife Refuge is part of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Refuge

system and was established to protect endangered and threatened species including anadromous fish, such as the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon that occurs in the river adjacent to the refuge. Also downriver of CPS is historic Jamestown. Excavations of the settlement and historical records demonstrate the importance of sturgeon to the colonists and as part of our cultural history (Virginia Commonwealth University News 2012).

5 Environmental Consequences of the Alternatives

This section presents the scientific and analytic basis for comparison of the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the alternatives. Regulations for implementing the provisions of NEPA require considerations of both the context and intensity of a proposed action (40 CFR 1508.27).

5.1 Effects of the No Action Alternative (Alternative 1)

Under the No Action Alternative, an ITP would not be issued to Dominion for take of Atlantic sturgeon larvae by entrainment. Dominion would not be required to implement the Conservation Plan which includes monitoring for entrained Atlantic sturgeon larvae, and actions to mitigate the take. Actions to minimize the taking of Atlantic sturgeon adults by impingement have already been implemented and are not likely to be impacted if the permit is not issued. However, takes of Atlantic sturgeon by entrainment could occur and would not be apparent because Dominion would not be required to monitor for take if the permit was not issued. These takes would be prohibited takes under the ESA but without the monitoring required under the Conservation Plan, it is uncertain whether take would be detected.

Dominion could choose, but would not be obligated, to suspend water withdrawals from the James River during times when Atlantic sturgeon larvae are most likely to occur based on currently available information (e.g., September – October). However, Dominion's application does not include suspending water withdrawals and they have explained that the facility cannot generate power without withdrawing water. Even if Dominion voluntarily chose to suspend water withdrawals for part of the September – October time period, entrainment could still occur if larvae were present at a different time within that timeframe than when water withdrawals were suspended. Dominion's proposed Conservation Plan includes studies to better inform when Atlantic sturgeon larvae are present near CPS. These studies will not occur if the permit is not issued.

In addition, the best technology available for minimizing impacts from impingement and entrainment under CWA § 316(b) will be identified and implemented through the VPDES process. Dominion must complete the fall entrainment sampling to complete its VPDES renewal application and support the identification of BTA.

Impacts of No Action (Alternative 1) on the Physical and Biological Environment:
The species most affected by any of the alternatives is the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon which is the affected species in the permit application and the species for which incidental take coverage is sought. No other ESA-listed species occur near CPS or are otherwise affected by operations at CPS.

The potential effects of cooling water intake operations can generally be characterized as effects of entrainment of Atlantic sturgeon eggs and larvae because these would be the only two Atlantic life stages that occur upriver of CPS and are small enough to be entrained at CPS. However, CPS is not expected to entrain viable (i.e., living) Atlantic sturgeon eggs because Atlantic sturgeon eggs that are viable become sticky within minutes of fertilization and adhere to the substrate for the relatively short and temperature-dependent period of larval development (Ryder 1888; Vladykov and Greeley 1963; Murawski and Pacheco 1977; Smith et al. 1980; Van den Avyle 1984; Mohler 2003). CPS is also not expected to entrain non-viable eggs because the circumstances by which an egg would be susceptible to entrainment at CPS are improbable and unlikely to occur. To become entrained at CPS, a non-viable egg would need to float downriver from the spawning site, evade all predation, and float out of the main channel flow of the river and into the area of the cooling water intake flows for one of the CPS operating units. Based on the best available information, this scenario is unlikely to occur. Fall spawning for Atlantic sturgeon is believed to occur near Richmond, which is miles upriver of CPS. Pre-fertilized Atlantic sturgeon eggs are less than 3 mm in diameter (i.e., by volume, approximately 80-120 pre-fertilized eggs per milliliter (Van Eenennamann et al. 1996; Mohler 2003)), and are spawned over and very near hard bottom substrate with interstitial spaces. Sturgeon do not protect their eggs after spawning and, although not quantified, predation of eggs is likely common given the nutritional value of fish eggs, in general. Therefore, it is most likely that a non-viable egg would either settle on the bottom or carried away by the current but eventually caught among the interstitial spaces, and then eaten or decomposed. Even in the unlikely circumstance that a non-viable sturgeon egg floated miles downriver to CPS, it would still need to be floating at the specific depth and in the specific proximity of the CWIS intake flow to be entrained which is improbable given the large volume of water in the James River and the distance of the CWIS from the main channel flow of the river.

Very little is known about Atlantic sturgeon larvae or about their movements in their natural setting. Most of what we know about this life stage is the result of hatchery or laboratory studies. Upon hatching, Atlantic sturgeon are nourished by a yolk sac, are mostly pelagic (e.g., exhibit a “swim-up and drift-down” behavior), and move away from light. Within days, the fish exhibit more benthic behavior which lasts until the yolk sac is absorbed at about 8 to 10 days post-hatching. Once the yolk sac is absorbed, the fish occur in the water column but feed at the bottom of the water column and use the substrate’s interstitial spaces to shelter from predators (Ryder 1888; Smith et al. 1980; Van Eenennaam et al. 1996; Bain et al. 2000; Kynard and Horgan 2002; Mohler 2003; Richardson et al. 2007; Greene et al. 2009). Studies that tracked the movements of post-larval sturgeon in other spawning rivers found that Atlantic sturgeon young-of year occur in low salinity waters for their first year and grow relatively quickly (Bain et al. 1997; Hale et al. 2016; Hilton et al. 2016).

The only known take of Atlantic sturgeon larvae at CPS are the two Atlantic sturgeon larvae that were collected during a single 24-hour sampling period on October 7-8, 2015. No other sturgeon larvae were identified in entrainment samples collected between July and December 2015, or during prior entrainment sampling at CPS during the periods of June 2005 to June 2006 (EA 2007) and January to December 1977 (VEPCO 1977). In October 2018, post-larval, juvenile, Atlantic sturgeon were found downriver of CPS (*Sturgeon Making a Comeback in the James River*, Chesapeake Bay Magazine, October 30, 2018) suggesting that, consistent with the

available literature on larval movements, Atlantic sturgeon spawned upriver of CPS move downriver, past CPS, within weeks of hatching. There are several factors that may impact the distribution of sturgeon larvae in this system including the number and precise location of spawning areas, how long the spawned offspring remain in the vicinity of the spawning grounds, and the effect of high river flows on the dispersion and distribution of larval Atlantic sturgeon in the James River. However, we have very limited information for these factors. Consequently, based on our best available information, we conclude that Atlantic sturgeon larvae are likely to be present in the vicinity of CPS in the fall.

We do not know how many sturgeon larvae are produced each spawning season or the natural mortality rate for the larvae. Sturgeon researchers have been unsuccessful in collecting Atlantic sturgeon eggs and larvae during targeted sampling in the vicinity of CPS (Garman 2016) and, until 2018, had very little success in capturing young-of-year Atlantic sturgeon in the James River. As a result, we have very little information for how successful Atlantic sturgeon spawning is in the James River or the factors that affect spawning success. Dominion concluded that the number of Atlantic sturgeon larvae likely to be entrained is small relative to the potential number of larvae produced at each fall spawning event. We agree that Atlantic sturgeon females can produce a prolific number of eggs. While comparisons of the number of Atlantic sturgeon larvae likely to be entrained to the number of larvae produced are speculative given the paucity of available information, egg production per spawning female per year is considerable (e.g., 400,000 to 4 million eggs). The take of up to 54,746 Atlantic sturgeon larvae over the 5-year duration of the permit is a fraction of the eggs produced by even a single female in a single spawning year of a single spawning population belonging to the Chesapeake Bay DPS.

We also have very limited information to inform what environmental factors affect spawning success. The take of larvae during entrainment sampling at CPS in 2015, and the observation of post-larval juveniles downriver of CPS in 2018 both occurred in the fall during years of high river flow. We received comment on the previous draft EA that successful spawning in the James River is likely limited and that spawning only occurs during high flows. However, we disagree with the comment because the triggers for spawning in the James River in 2015 and in 2018 occurred before the high flow events, and adults in spawning condition have been captured and observed in the James River for the past several years, including years with normal flows. It is possible that high river flows contributed to more successful outcome of spawning in 2015 and 2018. Conversely, it is also possible that spawning success in 2015 and 2018 may have been no greater than in other years but, the high flows may have forced that year's offspring further downriver and into the vicinity of CPS where they otherwise would not have occurred under normal flow conditions.

Though not required under Alternative 1, Dominion has already taken steps to minimize impingement of adult Atlantic sturgeon at CPS, as described in Section 3. Changes to the grid openings for the intake guards will prevent even the smallest adult Atlantic sturgeon from getting past the guards so that impingement is unable to occur on the trash rack within any of the intake units. We did consider, however, whether Atlantic sturgeon could become impinged at the intake guards. As described above, the intake guards are the first structure to reduce the amount of river debris and living organisms from entering each intake. Dominion expanded the intake openings at Units 5 and 6 (located inward of the guards) to reduce the velocity of the river water

moving past the guards and through the respective intake opening, making it even less likely that an adult Atlantic sturgeon would be impinged on the river side of the intake guards. After modifications, the calculated water velocities at the approach to the intake guards range from 0.67 feet per second (fps) at Unit 8 to 1.01 fps at Unit 6. Water velocities at the intake guards range from 0.85 fps at Unit 7 to 1.35 fps at Unit 6[5].

Until recently, there was limited available information for swimming speed of Atlantic sturgeon (Hilton et al. 2016). Dominion, therefore, used swim speed of juvenile white and juvenile green sturgeon as a proxy and concluded that adult Atlantic sturgeon would not be overcome by the CPS intake velocities, and would not be impinged. New information became available since the application, and it demonstrates that even the slowest average swim speed for fall spawning Atlantic sturgeon migrating past CPS from the spawning grounds exceeds the CPS intake velocities (Balazik et al. 2020). Therefore, given that the calculated water velocities at the approach to the intake guards and the water velocity moving past the intake guards at CPS is less than the swimming speed of an adult Atlantic sturgeon, adult sturgeon are expected to readily avoid impingement on the intake guards. Therefore, the risk of impingement for adult Atlantic sturgeon at the guards has been minimized to the extent practicable and take from this source is not likely.

Overall, Alternative 1 is expected to have negative impacts on the biological environment. As an anadromous fish, Atlantic sturgeon belonging to the Chesapeake Bay DPS help to transfer nutrients from the ocean to the James River estuary. Given their large volume of eggs, spawning Atlantic sturgeon likely contribute to the food web of the James River estuary and, thus, benefit the overall physical and biological environment. If no ITP is issued, some amount of take of Atlantic larvae is expected to continue to occur in the future as described above, and limited information may be available about this level of take. That take has the potential to negatively impact recovery of the Chesapeake DPS and of the James River spawning population, in particular. Compared to the Alternative 2, Alternative 1 is expected to result in at least moderate negative impacts to the biological environment because additional information would not be acquired that could benefit the Chesapeake Bay DPS, and other measures in Alternative 2 designed to benefit sturgeon populations (as described in Section 3) would not be required.

Impacts of No Action (Alternative 1) on Essential Fish Habitat: The No Action alternative will not have an impact on EFH for federally managed species because none is designated in the vicinity of CPS.

Impacts of No Action (Alternative 1) on Social and Economic Environment: The No Action alternative is expected to have no negative or positive impact on the social and economic environment because the current activities (e.g., use of the river by the local community) that contribute to the social and economic environment would continue to occur. Impacts to human activities as a result of the operation of CPS are related to the issuance and implementation of the regulatory authorities for operation of CPS, but those are outside of our authority and the scope of the ITP.

[5] See Table 3 of the revised application for Dominion's calculated water velocities at the trash racks and at the traveling screens.

Impacts of No Action (Alternative 1) on Historic Places, Scientific, Cultural, and Historical Resources: The No Action alternative is expected to have no negative or positive impact on the historic places, scientific, cultural, or historical resources compared to what is now occurring. If impacts to these places and cultural resources occur as a result of the operation of CPS, then those impacts are related to the regulatory authorities for the operation of CPS, regardless of whether an ITP is issued.

5.2 Effects of Issuing the Permit as Requested (Alternative 2 - Proposed Action)

As under alternative 1, under Alternative 2 Dominion would continue to operate CPS with water withdrawals from the James River. However, under Alternative 2, Dominion would also undertake the measures described in their Conservation Plan to minimize and mitigate anticipated take, and to monitor for take, as summarized in Section 3. As a result of the ITP process, and as described in Section 3, Dominion has already taken steps to minimize impingement of adult Atlantic sturgeon to the extent practicable. Impingement of adult Atlantic sturgeon is no longer anticipated to occur at CPS.

Impacts of Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) on the Physical and Biological Environment: As under Alternative 1, the species most affected by Alternative 2 is the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon which is the affected species in the permit application and the species for which incidental take coverage is sought. No other ESA-listed species occur near CPS or are otherwise affected by operations at CPS. As described above, Alternative 2 includes steps Dominion has already taken to minimize impingement of adult Atlantic sturgeon at CPS. Because these modifications have already been made, impingement of adult Atlantic sturgeon is unlikely to occur at CPS in the future.

The entrainment of larvae under Alternative 2 is likely as in Alternative 1. The difference is that under Alternative 2, Dominion's proposed monitoring and mitigation measures would address the lack of information for the number of sturgeon larvae likely to be entrained. The new information collected as a result of the Conservation Plan measures would allow for new, informed action(s) to minimize and mitigate the takes such as planned outages during peak larval abundance. Such changes in CPS operation could be made after the ITP is issued because Dominion has included them as part of the Conservation Plan.

As described under the No Action Alternative, Atlantic sturgeon benefit the physical and biological environment of the James River estuary because they transfer nutrients between the ocean and the estuary. Therefore, Alternative 2 is likely to have at least a moderate positive impact on the physical and biological environment because it has a positive impact on the survival of adult Atlantic sturgeon and on their offspring. If the proposed minimization and mitigation measures for Atlantic sturgeon incidentally reduce effects to another native species, then issuance of the ITP may have a positive impact on that other native species as well. No other physical or biological features of the James River are likely to be impacted because the actions taken under Alternative 2 will not impact the quality or quantity of water (e.g., will have no impact on the location of the salt front), and will not change the type or quantity of the river substrate. Any equipment placed in the river as part of the mitigation will be temporary, small in

scope, and typically attached to an already fixed structure (e.g., a buoy). The equipment placed as part of the minimization measures (i.e., new intake guards) replaces what was already existing and part of the CWISs.

Impacts of Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) on Essential Fish Habitat: As in Alternative 1, Alternative 2 will not have an impact on EFH for federally managed species because none is designated in the vicinity of CPS.

Impacts of Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) on the Social and Economic Environment: As with the No Action Alternative, Alternative 2 is not expected to have a negative impact on the social and economic environment. Compared to the No Action Alternative, Alternative 2 could have a slight positive impact on the social and economic environment by virtue of the at least moderate positive impacts to Atlantic sturgeon survival and reproduction in the James River. For example, an increased abundance of Atlantic sturgeon would contribute to ecotourism focused on Atlantic sturgeon in the river, and could contribute to the economy of cities, such as Richmond, where people view sturgeon in the river. Other fish species, such as those targeted for recreation and commercial purposes, could also benefit from the positive impacts to the physical and biological environment with concomitant economic benefits to the human environment.

Impacts of Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) on Historic Places, Scientific, Cultural, and Historical Resources: Alternative 2 is not expected to have a negative impact on historic places, scientific, cultural, and historical resources. Compared to the No Action Alternative, Alternative 2 could have a positive impact on scientific resources such as VCU with whom Dominion is partnering to further knowledge of Atlantic sturgeon presence in the upper, tidal portion of the James River estuary. Alternative 2 could also have a slight positive impact on cultural resources because Atlantic sturgeon has a valued place in the pre- and post-colonial history of the James River and measures, such as those proposed in Dominion's Conservation Plan, that benefit and support the recovery of Atlantic sturgeon spur public interest for further action to benefit the DPS and the environment. No limits or changes to other ongoing activities in the area are expected to occur as a result of issuance of the ITP or implementation of the Conservation Plan. If impacts to places and cultural resources occur as a result of the lawful operation of CPS, then those impacts are related to the regulatory authorities for the operation of CPS, regardless of whether an ITP is issued. Impacts to human activities as a result of the lawful operation of CPS may be related to the issuance or implementation of the regulatory authorities for operation of CPS, but those are outside of our authority and the scope of the ITP.

5.3 Summary of Impacts

While the take of Atlantic sturgeon larvae is expected to continue to occur in the future as described above, the proposed monitoring and mitigation measures included in Alternative 2 will provide new information about sturgeon populations that support improvements to future management and mitigation measures. Compared to the No Action Alternative, Alternative 2 is expected to result in positive impacts to the biological, social, and economic environment in the long-term, and will have a positive impact on science and culture. Information acquired under the proposed permit terms would provide a benefit to the Chesapeake Bay DPS and affords

Dominion the opportunity to comply with the ESA while otherwise legally operating CPS for power generation.

5.4 Cumulative Impact

"Cumulative impact" is defined in the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations as "the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of which agency (Federal or non-Federal), or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions that take place over a period of time." (40 CFR 1508.7). The negative effects of past actions (e.g., the directed fishery) are part of the existing environment described in Section 4, Affected Environment.

For this analysis, the spatial area considered is from the mouth of the James River to the CPS. The temporal scope of the action extends from the submission of Dominion's complete application and up to five years into the future beyond issuance of the ITP, if issued as proposed. The principle past threat to the Chesapeake Bay DPS was overharvest in the directed sturgeon fisheries. The directed harvest of Atlantic sturgeon in Virginia's state waters was prohibited in 1974 and was prohibited in all remaining state fisheries in 1998. Harvest in federal waters has been prohibited since 1999. Other past and current impacts to the DPS are unintended bycatch in state and federally managed fisheries, degraded water quality, habitat impacts from dredging, and vessel strikes (77 FR 5882, NOAA 2016b). As described below, the magnitude of these impacts has likely lessened since 1992 for a number of reasons (e.g., improvement in water quality, reduced fishing effort to rebuild managed fish stocks, protections to the DPS as a result of the ESA-listing). However, there is not enough information to determine the change in magnitude of the impacts to the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon.

Spawning habitat for the Chesapeake Bay DPS is accessible in nearly all current and known historical spawning rivers. However, even where spawning habitat is available, accessibility does not necessarily equate to functionality. Many alterations have been made to the James River channel to accommodate ship traffic to and from the port at Richmond. Habitat disturbance caused by in-river work such as dredging for navigational purposes is suspected of having reduced available spawning habitat in the James River (Holton and Walsh 1995; Bushnoe et al. 2005; ASSRT 2007). Water quality, while showing signs of improvement, continues to rate only fair to poor in areas of the Chesapeake Bay. Non-point sources for pollution from terrestrial activities have caused reductions in water quality leading to degradation of habitat. In addition, dredging for navigation channels has significantly altered depth, rates of sedimentation, substrate and water flow in some areas.

Other activities that may affect Atlantic sturgeon within the action area include point and non-point sources associated with industry and agriculture, including those authorized through the Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES), and vessel traffic. Vessel strikes of Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon are evidenced by sturgeon carcasses found within the James River with damage consistent with a vessel strike (e.g., severed tails or heads, equally spaced gashes across the dorsal surface of the sturgeon body). Research suggests that most carcasses are not found or reported (Balazik et al. 2012). More information is needed to

accurately quantify the number of Chesapeake Bay DPS sturgeon that are struck and killed by vessels.

Many factors acting on Atlantic sturgeon populations occur outside of the zone of influence of the ITP to be issued to Dominion associated with plant operations of CPS, such as bycatch in federally-managed fisheries. Atlantic sturgeon belonging to the Chesapeake Bay DPS are incidentally caught in U.S. fisheries that operate in federal waters (Wirgin et al. 2015). Overall, there is limited observer coverage of fisheries that interact with Atlantic sturgeon. As a result, the total number of Atlantic sturgeon interactions with fishing gear in federal waters is unknown. Even when a fish is observed captured and released alive, the rate of post-release mortality is unknown.

In recent years, plans for offshore wind energy projects have developed and a number of leases for future project siting have been issued within the marine range of Atlantic sturgeon. One offshore wind pilot project off Virginia installed two turbines in 2020, and additional potential offshore wind energy sites have been identified in the Mid-Atlantic, including a proposal for Dominion Energy's commercial-scale Coastal Virginia Offshore Wind project. If permitted, this potential large-scale development would occur in an 112,800-acre commercial wind site located approximately 27 miles offshore. The Virginia Clean Economy Act requires the state's biggest utilities (e.g., Dominion) to deliver electricity from 100 percent renewable sources by 2045. A recent study examined Atlantic sturgeon movement and seasonal occurrence in shelf waters off Maryland, including within the Maryland Wind Energy Area (Rothermel et al. 2020). The results help to establish a baseline of Atlantic sturgeon movement and seasonal incidence within the Mid-Atlantic Bight for comparison to changes that may occur with the development of offshore wind energy. Currently, the overall impact of offshore wind energy on the Chesapeake Bay DPS is unknown, but likely to range from no impact to moderate negative, depending on the number and locations of projects that occur, as well as the effects of mitigation efforts.

Information regarding the vulnerability of Atlantic sturgeon to climate change suggests it poses a greater threat to the Chesapeake Bay DPS than what was anticipated when the DPS was listed in 2012. Ocean temperature in the U.S. Northeast Shelf and surrounding Northwest Atlantic waters has increased faster than the global average over the last decade (Pershing et al. 2015). New projections for the U.S. Northeast Shelf and Northwest Atlantic Ocean suggest that this region will warm two to three times faster than the global average (Saba et al. 2015). Global climate change affects all components of marine ecosystems, including human communities. Physical changes that are occurring and will continue to occur to these systems include sea-level rise, changes in sediment deposition; changes in ocean circulation; increased frequency, intensity and duration of extreme climate events; changing ocean chemistry; and warming ocean temperatures. A first-of-its-kind climate vulnerability assessment, conducted on 82 fish and invertebrate species in the Northeast U.S. Shelf, concluded that Atlantic sturgeon from all five DPSs were among the most vulnerable species to global climate change (Hare et al. 2016). Weather events such as those that contribute to low water flows and high water flows in the James River are likely to occur as a result of climate change.

Other current and reasonably foreseeable future projects are described in Table 5-1. The majority of these activities are ongoing activities that were implemented as a result of protections to the DPS following its listing as endangered in 2012.

Table 5-1. Current and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Projects Considered for Potential Cumulative Impacts

Project Title	Project Description	Size	Potential Impacts on Atlantic Sturgeon	Project Date(s)
NMFS 2018 Biological Opinion - Gear Regulations in the Virginia Pound Net Fishery	Gear regulations enacted for the pound net fishery operating in Virginia nearshore coastal and estuarine waters including waters of the James River seaward of the Hampton Roads Bridge Tunnel (Interstate Highway-64).	See Biological Opinion	The action is likely to result in the capture of up to 13 adult or subadult Atlantic sturgeon and the mortality of one of these, annually. The 13 Atlantic sturgeon captured in Virginia pound net gear per year are anticipated to come from a mix of the five listed DPSs since sturgeon from each DPS occur where the action occurs.	2018-ongoing
NMFS 2018b Biological Opinion - Norfolk Harbors Channel/Craney Island Eastward Expansion	Dredging and placement activities associated with the Craney Island Eastward Expansion Project and Norfolk Harbor Navigation Improvements Project.	Approximately 1,500 square miles of land surrounding the harbor, and approximately 525 acres for the Craney Island Eastward Expansion with an expected total fill volume of 19,500,000 for dredged material placement.	The action is likely to result in a total of 750 non-lethal capture of Atlantic sturgeon of which 100 are expected to have originated from the Chesapeake Bay DPS, and is likely to result in the mortality of up to 23 Atlantic sturgeon belonging to the Chesapeake Bay DPS over 50 years.	2018-2068
NMFS 2018c Biological Opinion -	U.S. FWS funded state fisheries surveys, of which 44 occur in	See Biological Opinion	The action is likely to result in a total take of 136 Atlantic	2018-2022

Project Title	Project Description	Size	Potential Impacts on Atlantic Sturgeon	Project Date(s)
U.S. FWS Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program Grants	waters of the Chesapeake Bay or at least one of its tributaries.		sturgeon by survey gear over 5 years, and of which up to 22 are expected to belong to the Chesapeake Bay DPS with no more than 4 of those resulting in mortality.	
NMFS 2019 Biological Opinion - James River FNP Maintenance Dredging and Disposal	Maintenance (e.g., dredging) necessary to maintain the James River navigation channel within the river from Craney Island to Richmond, VA, and associated vessel traffic use of the channel.	94 river miles (151 river km) of the James River from Craney Island (RM 5/RKM 8), continuing through the Federal Navigation Channel and up to Bosher Dam (RM 99/RKM 159).	The action is likely to result in a total of 47 lethal dredge interactions of subadult/juvenile Atlantic sturgeon over 44 years, and of which 43 are expected to belong to the Chesapeake Bay DPS.	2019-2062
ESA Permit – No. 19642 for scientific research	Permit allowing for take of Atlantic sturgeon for the purpose of scientific research.	Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries; focus on the York and its tributaries, the Potomac, Rappahannock, Susquehanna and their tributaries.	Non-lethal capture of up to 375 adults, subadults, or juveniles, and lethal take of up to 50 eggs or larvae for scientific research that benefits Atlantic sturgeon recovery.	2016-2021

Project Title	Project Description	Size	Potential Impacts to Atlantic Sturgeon	Project Date(s)
ESA Permit – No. 20314 for scientific research	Permit allowing for take of Atlantic sturgeon for the purpose of scientific research.	Chesapeake Bay, and its tributaries with a focus on the James River and its tributaries.	Non-lethal capture of up to 1,400 Atlantic sturgeon over the course of the 10-year permit and throughout the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries as well as lethal take of up to 350 eggs or larvae in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries for scientific research that benefits Atlantic sturgeon recovery.	2017-2027
ESA Permit – No. 21858 for scientific research	NMFS issued Scientific Research Permit 21858 which allows for salvage of Atlantic Sturgeon carcasses or their parts for scientific and educational purposes.	U.S. east coast and western Atlantic Ocean within the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone, and rivers from Maine through Florida.	The permit: (1) maximizes the use of dead Atlantic sturgeon carcasses and parts for research and incidental educational purposes (up to 150, annually) obtained from individuals authorized to collect them in the course of salvage activities; and establishes the NMFS Atlantic and Shortnose Sturgeon Genetic Research Archive. These activities benefit Atlantic sturgeon recovery.	2018-2027
ACOE Regional Permit (RP) - Norfolk District Reissuance of Regional Permit 11	ACOE RP 11 authorizes certain Virginia Department of Transportation roadway and railway projects involving work, structures, and filling. RP-11 allows VDOT to go to	U.S. waters within Virginia's geographical limits under the regulatory jurisdiction of	No impacts to Atlantic sturgeon since the ESA consultation requirements still apply if a proposed project may affect Atlantic sturgeon or its designated critical habitat.	2019-2024

Project Title	Project Description	Size	Potential Impacts to Atlantic Sturgeon	Project Date(s)
	construction more quickly in cases where it can comply with the ESA through informal section 7 consultation.	ACOE Norfolk District.		
Final Comprehensive Conservation plan (CCP) for James River National Wildlife Refuge (NWR),	Promote the transition of 2,651 acres of former pine plantation toward mature pine savanna; protect refuge's other habitats (including for Atlantic Sturgeon); expand conservation, research, monitoring, and management partnerships to help restore and conserve the refuge.	At least 2,651 acres.	No direct adverse effects on Atlantic Sturgeon expected. Potential beneficial effects on Atlantic Sturgeon.	2015-2030
Chesapeake Bay and Virginia Waters Cleanup Plan	A plan for Virginia stream restoration and protection, addressing point and nonpoint pollution sources, as well as air pollution.	Chesapeake Bay and Virginia waters	Atlantic sturgeon are negatively impacted by poor water quality. Improved water quality benefits the Chesapeake Bay DPS and Atlantic sturgeon from other DPSs that occur in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries.	2007-ongoing
Virginia Striped Bass Fishery Regulations	In 2019 the Virginia Marine Resources Commission established new commercial gill net maximum mesh size requirements in the Chesapeake Bay and Coastal areas to protect the largest of striped bass from capture in the fishery.	Virginia waters	Atlantic sturgeon are incidentally captured in gillnet gear used in Virginia's striped bass fishery. Changing the required mesh size is likely to change the size and age class of Atlantic sturgeon	2019-ongoing

Project Title	Project Description	Size	Potential Impacts to Atlantic Sturgeon	Project Date(s)
			incidentally captured in the gear.	
Norfolk, Hampton Roads, Newport News fast ferry	Fast ferry service across the harbor and mouth of James River by ferries traveling up to 35 mph	Unknown	Potential for increased vessel traffic and vessel-sturgeon interactions.	By 2025

Summary of Cumulative Effects: Various governmental agencies, groups, and individuals are carrying out a number of efforts aimed at protecting and conserving the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon. For example, Virginia and Maryland have received funding under the ESA's Section 6, Species Recovery Grants to States, program to conduct studies that resulted in new information necessary for management and recovery of the Chesapeake Bay DPS. The new information has helped to further conservation efforts.

Actions directed at reducing threats faced by Atlantic sturgeon and/or gaining additional knowledge could contribute to the recovery of the DPS in the future. However, there is still considerable uncertainty regarding whether the current efforts to reduce the threats to Atlantic sturgeon are being effective, and, if they are, the extent to which they are reducing threats. The 2017 Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission stock assessment for Atlantic sturgeon determined that abundance of the Chesapeake Bay DPS is "depleted" relative to historical levels, and that there is a relatively low probability (37 percent) that abundance of the Chesapeake Bay DPS has increased since the implementation of the 1998 fishing moratorium (ASMFC 2017). Therefore, overall, cumulative effects are likely having a moderate or more than moderate negative impact on the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon. We are in the process of conducting a 5-year review for the Chesapeake Bay DPS based on the best scientific and commercial data available to ensure that the listing classification remains accurate (83 FR 11730; March 16, 2018).

When considered in conjunction with all other pressures placed on the environment by past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, the preferred alternatives are not expected to result in any significant impacts, positive or negative. As described in Section 5.2, the preferred alternative is expected to have no impact to EFH or to historical and cultural resources. The preferred alternative is anticipated to have no impact or up to slight positive impacts on the biological and physical environment and on the social and economic environment, due to the benefits of collecting new information on the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon. When the direct and indirect effects of the preferred alternative are considered in combination with all other actions (i.e., past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions), the cumulative effects are expected to yield non-significant negative impacts.

6 Summary

We are required to implement the ESA for species under NMFS jurisdiction, including processing complete applications for an ITP. Dominion has provided a complete application. We have considered Dominion's minimization, mitigation, and monitoring measures for the required conservation plan. Based on the regulatory requirements, Dominion's Conservation Plan, and Dominion's request for a relatively short-term ITP (i.e., five years), we have identified Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative. Issuance of an ESA ITP to Dominion will authorize the incidental take of Atlantic sturgeon larvae belonging to the Chesapeake Bay DPS that occur as a result of entrainment from the otherwise legal operation of the CPS. Atlantic sturgeon was the only resource identified as being potentially affected by issuance of the ITP. Issuance of the ITP will benefit the Chesapeake Bay DPS by providing opportunity for monitoring specific to Atlantic sturgeon early life stages that would not occur as part of monitoring for compliance with CPSs VPDES permit. Issuance of the ITP will also require Dominion to implement the

mitigation measures that would otherwise not occur. The monitoring and mitigation may have a secondary effect of providing information that will contribute to knowledge of Atlantic sturgeon habitat use in the James River. Compared to the No Action Alternative, Alternative 2 is expected to result in positive impacts to the biological, social, and economic environment in the long-term, and will have a positive impact on science and cultural resources.

There is a high degree of uncertainty for the number of Atlantic sturgeon larvae likely to be taken at CPS annually, including whether the level of take is consistent among years or highly variable. There is currently no documentation of the number of larvae likely to be produced during fall spawning for the Chesapeake Bay DPS in the James River or the natural mortality of this life stage. While comparisons of the number of Atlantic sturgeon larvae likely to be entrained to the number of larvae produced are speculative given the paucity of available information, egg production per spawning female per year are considerably greater than the number of Atlantic sturgeon larvae likely to be taken at CPS annually.

NMFS conducted interagency section 7 consultation, including completion of a Biological Opinion, on the proposed issuance of an ITP to Dominion. NMFS determined in its Biological Opinion that issuance of the ITP is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any ESA-listed species under NMFS jurisdiction or to result in the destruction or adverse modification of any designated critical habitat. The Conservation Plan and the ITP require Dominion to monitor for take of Atlantic sturgeon larvae which will provide more information about the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon in the James River and further reduce any uncertainty about the effects of operation of CPS on the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon.

7 Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures are those proposed by Dominion and described in the description of the Proposed Action (Alternative 2). Briefly, these are: minimization that has been implemented while the application was in-progress; mitigation resulting from the implementation of data collection for movements of spawning Atlantic sturgeon; and, monitoring.

8 Applicable Laws

8.1 Endangered Species Act

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) requires Federal agencies conducting, authorizing, or funding activities that may affect threatened or endangered species to ensure that those impacts do not jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of habitat determined to be critical. NMFS conducted interagency section 7 consultation, including completion of a Biological Opinion, on the proposed issuance of an ITP to Dominion. The Opinion considered the effects of CPS operations consistent with the proposed ITP including the intake of cooling water and discharge of pollutants, including heated effluent. NMFS determined in its Biological Opinion that issuance of the ITP is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon and is not likely to adversely affect its designated critical habitat. In the Biological Opinion, NMFS also considered the effects of shipments of materials to and from CPS

necessary to support CPS operations; these shipments occur between CPS and the lower James River where several species of ESA sea turtles, shortnose sturgeon, and Atlantic sturgeon from the other four DPSs may occur. NMFS concluded that the proposed action is not likely to adversely affect any of these species. No ESA listed marine mammals occur in the action area.

8.2 Marine Mammal Protection Act

Under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), Federal responsibility for protecting and conserving marine mammals is vested with the departments of Commerce (NMFS) and Interior (USFWS). The primary management objective of the MMPA is to maintain the health and stability of the marine ecosystem, with a goal of obtaining an optimum sustainable population of marine mammals within the carrying capacity of the habitat. Marine mammals do not occur in the vicinity of CPS and are not affected by the proposed action.

8.3 Administrative Procedure Act

In addition to setting forth rulemaking procedures, the Federal Administrative Procedure Act (APA) addresses other agency actions such as issuance of policy statements, licenses, and permits. Dominion submitted a complete ITP application and Conservation Plan to us in 2017. We prepared a draft EA and published notice in the *Federal Register* announcing the availability of the EA, the ITP application and Conservation Plan for public comment (82 FR 37849; August 14, 2017). We received 37 comments during the public comment period. Dominion revised and resubmitted their ITP application and Conservation Plan to us on October 16, 2019, in response to the comments received as well as in response to new information regarding dispersal of Atlantic sturgeon in the James River, the risk of impingement for adult Atlantic sturgeon at CPS, and the operation of the generating units at CPS. We considered this application complete and published notice in the *Federal Register* of the revised application and Conservation Plan, and the availability of the draft revised EA for public comment (85 FR 36563; June 17, 2020). The comment period ended on July 17, 2020. We received response from two commenters and have addressed their comments in the EA. This document is available on NOAA's Office of Protected Resources web page. Announcement of document availability and issuance of the ITP will be made in the *Federal Register*.

8.4 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Including Essential Fish Habitat

The EFH provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act require NMFS to provide recommendations to Federal and state agencies for conserving and enhancing EFH if a determination is made that an action may adversely impact EFH. The proposed action will not have an impact on EFH for federally managed species because none is designated in the vicinity of CPS.

8.5 Executive Order 12898 – Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898 was implemented in response to the growing need to address the impacts of environmental pollution on particular segments of our society. This order requires each Federal agency to achieve environmental justice by addressing "disproportionately high and

adverse human health and environmental effects on minority and low-income populations." Environmental justice concerns typically embody pollution and other environmental health issues, but the Environmental Protection Agency has stated that addressing environmental justice concerns is consistent with NEPA; therefore, all Federal agencies are required to identify and address these issues.

The proposed action is expected to result in positive impacts to the biological, social and economic environment in the long-term, and will have a positive impact on science and culture. No disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations are expected as a result of the proposed action.

8.6 National Environmental Policy Act

NEPA provides a mechanism for identifying and evaluating the full spectrum of environmental issues associated with federal actions, and for considering a reasonable range of alternatives to avoid or minimize adverse environmental impacts. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) has issued regulations specifying the requirements for NEPA documents (40 CFR 1500 – 1508) and NOAA's policy and procedures for NEPA are found in NOAA Administrative Order 216-6. All of those requirements are addressed in this document, as referenced below.

NMFS conducted an environmental review of the application submitted by Dominion and determined an Environmental Assessment (EA) is appropriate for NMFS consideration whether to issue an ITP for the incidental take of Atlantic sturgeon belonging to the Chesapeake Bay DPS. The CEQ Regulations state that the determination of significance using an analysis of effects requires examination of both context and intensity, and lists ten criteria for intensity (40 CFR 1508.27). In addition, the Companion Manual for National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Administrative Order 216-6A provides sixteen criteria, the same ten as the CEQ Regulations and six additional, for determining whether the impacts of a proposed action are significant. Each criterion is discussed below with respect to the proposed action and considered individually as well as in combination with the others.

1. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to cause both beneficial and adverse impacts that overall may result in a significant effect, even if the effect will be beneficial?
As described in Section 5.2, the proposed action involves both beneficial and adverse impacts but, overall, the effects will be insignificant. This action has potential to result in adverse effects to individual animals (e.g., entrainment likely to result in death of larval Atlantic sturgeon). However, this is not likely to result in significant adverse effects to the DPS as a whole or further reduce the likelihood of the survival and recovery of the DPS in the wild since authorized take levels are relatively low and there will be monitoring and mitigation measures required by the ITP and the Conservation Plan. As described in 5.2, the proposed action is not expected to impact any other components of the physical or biological environment, and any potential positive impacts on the social or economic environment resulting from mitigation and monitoring measures are not expected to be significant.

The proposed action will benefit the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon. Dominion's changes to and repair of the intake guards minimizes the risk that adult Atlantic sturgeon will be impinged on the intake guards and should prevent the possibility of impingement at the trash

racks for even the smallest adults. Dominion's partnership with VCU will allow Dominion to have access to real-time data so that Dominion can better anticipate when sturgeon larvae are likely to be in the James River within the vicinity of CPS and take actions (e.g., scheduling maintenance) to further minimize take. New information will also be shared with sturgeon researchers, including academia, and state wildlife managers and can fill critical data gaps since there is only rudimentary knowledge of the occurrence of adult sturgeon in the part of the freshwater reach of the James River where CPS is located.

Dominion is also proposing to implement a pilot study that would test the use of digital holography to identify Atlantic sturgeon larvae at CPS, and could provide new information which would otherwise not be collected. If successful, digital holography would be a new tool that has many beneficial applications for recovery of the Atlantic sturgeon DPS (e.g., abundance or distribution surveys of Atlantic sturgeon early life stages).

2. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to significantly affect public health or safety?
No, NMFS' proposed action to authorize incidental take of ESA-listed Atlantic sturgeon is not expected to significantly affect public health or safety. NMFS will only authorize the incidental take of Atlantic sturgeon larvae associated with the otherwise legal operation of the CPS power plant and completion of the CWA section 316(b) studies for that facility.

3. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to result in significant impacts to unique characteristics of the geographic area, such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas?
The proposed action is not expected to have a negative impact on historic places, scientific, cultural, and historical resources. The proposed action is not likely to change or influence characteristics of the geographic environment because the proposed action does not change where CPS is located, or where water is withdrawn from or discharged to the James River for operation of CPS.

Compared to the No Action Alternative, the proposed action is not expected to result in significant impacts to unique characteristics of the geographic area because the extent of incidental take will be relatively low, and any beneficial impacts to the unique characteristics of the geographic area would be indirect (e.g., as a result of heightened public awareness of the DPS and its role in the environment). Nevertheless, the proposed action could have a positive impact on scientific resources such as for VCU with whom Dominion is partnering to further knowledge of Atlantic sturgeon presence in the upper, tidal portion of the James River estuary. The proposed action could also have a positive impact on cultural resources because Atlantic sturgeon has a valued place in the pre- and post-colonial history of the James River. The measures proposed in Dominion's Conservation Plan benefit and support the recovery of Atlantic sturgeon thus spurring public interest for further action to benefit the DPS and the environment.

4. Are the proposed action's effects on the quality of the human environment likely to be highly controversial?
No. A *Federal Register* notice (82 FR 37849) was published on August 14, 2017, to allow other agencies and the public the opportunity to review and comment on the ITP application and

Conservation Plan. Dominion revised its application, in part, due to the comments received. An additional *Federal Register* notice (85 FR 36563) was published on June 17, 2020, to provide for public comment on Dominion's revised application and NMFS' revised draft EA.

There is some public disagreement over the operation of CPS because it is a coal-fired power plant. However, the action has been occurring for many years, and there are no highly uncertain effects or effects that involve unique or unknown risks. The permit applicant is required to obtain any State and local permits necessary to carry out the action.

5. Are the proposed action's effects on the human environment likely to be highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks?
No. The effects of the proposed action on the human environment would be limited to the Atlantic sturgeon interactions authorized to be incidentally taken during operation of CPS and completion of that facility's CWA 316(b) studies. Those effects are not unique or unknown. NMFS conducted interagency section 7 consultation, including completion of a Biological Opinion, on the proposed issuance of an ITP to Dominion. NMFS determined in its Biological Opinion that issuance of the ITP is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any ESA-listed species under NMFS jurisdiction or to result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. The Conservation Plan and the ITP require Dominion to monitor for take of Atlantic sturgeon larvae which will provide more information about the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon in the James River and further reduce any uncertainty about the effects of operation of CPS on the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon.

6. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration?
The issuance of an ITP may inform the environmental review for future projects but would not establish a precedent or represent a decision in principle about future actions. NMFS' actions under ESA Section 10(a)(1)(B) are considered individually and are based on the best available scientific information, which is continuously evolving. Requests for ITPs are evaluated on their own merits relative to the criteria established in the ESA and in the regulations at 50 CFR 222.307. Therefore, issuance of an ITP to a specific entity for a given activity does not guarantee or imply that NMFS will issue future permits upon request in relation to similar activities. For these reasons, the issuance of this ITP to Dominion would not set a precedent. NMFS will conduct relevant analyses and evaluate each future application for an ITP on a case-by-case basis.

7. Is the proposed action related to other actions that when considered together will have individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts?
No, the proposed action and other individually insignificant actions do not result in cumulatively significant impacts, as described in Section 5.4. The proposed action will authorize the incidental take of Atlantic sturgeon belonging to the Chesapeake Bay DPS. These sturgeon face numerous natural and anthropogenic threats throughout their life histories that shape their status and affect their ability to recover. Effects of past and ongoing human and natural factors occurring in this area have contributed to the current status of these listed sturgeon. Based on the analysis in this EA and supported by ESA section 7 consultation, NMFS expects that issuance of the proposed incidental take permit would not appreciably reduce the species likelihood of

survival and recovery in the wild. The incremental impact of the proposed authorization of takes of Atlantic sturgeon incidental to the otherwise legal operation of CPS, when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, is not expected to result in population-level effects; and, therefore, will not have cumulatively significant impacts.

8. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources?
No. There are no specific historic, scientific, cultural, or historical resources in the specific area of CPS. While there are numerous historic places, scientific, cultural, and historical resources along the James River, including Henricus Historical Park, the James River National Wildlife Refuge, and historic Jamestown, the proposed action is not expected to have a negative impact on any historic places, scientific, cultural, and historical resources. The proposed action would only allow for the incidental take of Atlantic sturgeon larvae at CPS. The incidental take authorized by the ITP will be minimized and the remaining impacts mitigated, relative to what would have occurred in the absence of an ITP and during the otherwise legal operations of CPS. In addition, compared to the No Action Alternative, the proposed action could have a positive impact on scientific resources such as VCU with whom Dominion is partnering to further knowledge of Atlantic sturgeon presence in the upper, tidal portion of the James River estuary. The proposed action could also have a positive impact on cultural resources because Atlantic sturgeon has a valued place in the pre- and post-colonial history of the James River and measures, such as those proposed in Dominion's Conservation Plan, that benefit and support the recovery of Atlantic sturgeon spur public interest for further action to benefit the DPS and the environment.

9. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to have a significant impact on endangered or threatened species, or their critical habitat as defined under the Endangered Species Act of 1973?
The issuance of the ITP is not expected to have a significant impact on Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon or their designated critical habitat. Based on the results of the ESA section 7 consultation completed in November 2020, NMFS found that the proposal to issue an ITP to Dominion for operation of CPS and completion of that facility's CWA 316(b) studies will not jeopardize the continued existence of the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon. NMFS also found that the proposed action is not likely to adversely affect any ESA-listed sea turtles, shortnose sturgeon, the Gulf of Maine, New York Bight, Carolina, and South Atlantic DPSs of Atlantic sturgeon, or designated critical habitat for the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon in the James River, Virginia.

10. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to threaten a violation of Federal, state, or local law or requirements imposed for environmental protection?
No. The proposed action would provide an exemption to the ESA take prohibitions for the taking of Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon incidental to the operation of CPS. The proposed action would not result in any violation of Federal, state, or local laws for environmental protection, as NMFS engaged in consultation and conducted analyses as necessary to ensure compliance with relevant environmental protection laws. As discussed in the EA, NMFS' proposed action will not affect EFH designated pursuant to the Magnuson-Stevens

Fishery Conservation and Management Act or have reasonably foreseeable effects on other uses or resources near CPS and will have only insignificant effects on critical habitat designated pursuant to the ESA. There are no other environmental laws, regulations, federal permits, or licenses applicable to NMFS for the issuance of the ITP. The ITP does not relieve Dominion of the responsibility for obtaining other permits, or complying with other Federal, State, local, or international laws or regulations, if necessary and required.

11. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to adversely affect stocks of marine mammals as defined in the Marine Mammal Protection Act?
NMFS' proposed action is not expected to have an adverse impact on any marine mammals or the habitat necessary for any marine mammal because the issuance of the ITP does not involve activities that can or would have the potential to interact with marine mammals.

12. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to adversely affect managed fish species?
The proposed action is not expected to adversely affect any managed fish population, stock or species because the ITP does not involve activities that can or would have the potential to affect managed fish species.

13. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to adversely affect essential fish habitat as defined under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act?
The proposed action will not have an impact on EFH for federally managed species because none is designated in the vicinity of CPS and issuance of the ITP does not involve activities that can or would have the potential to affect any designated EFH.

14. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to adversely affect vulnerable marine or coastal ecosystems, including but not limited to, deep coral ecosystems?
The proposed action is not expected to adversely affect vulnerable marine or coastal ecosystems because the proposed action would only authorize incidental take of Atlantic sturgeon belonging to the Chesapeake Bay DPS as a result of continued operation of CPS and completion of the facilities CWA 316(b) studies. Therefore, the ITP does not involve activities that can or would have the potential to affect vulnerable marine or coastal ecosystems.

15. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to adversely affect biodiversity or ecosystem functioning (e.g., benthic productivity, predator-prey relationships, etc.)?
The proposed action is not expected to adversely affect biodiversity or ecosystem functioning. The proposed action would benefit the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon by minimizing incidental take and mitigating the impacts of incidental take that occur as a result of the otherwise legal operation of CPS. Improvements in the status of the Chesapeake Bay DPS within the James River should benefit the biodiversity or ecosystem function of that estuarine river. However, the extent of incidental take will be relatively low. Therefore, the extent of the benefit to the biodiversity or ecosystem functioning of the James River estuary is uncertain.

16. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to result in the introduction or spread of a nonindigenous species?
The proposed action will not result in the introduction or spread of nonindigenous species because the minimization and mitigation measures do not require putting anything new into the

environment other than new data receivers. Using these data receivers provides no opportunity for non-indigenous species to be introduced into the James River. Any other equipment used, such as for the digital holography study, will be new or will be thoroughly cleaned before it is put into the river environment at CPS.

DETERMINATION: In view of the information presented in this document and the analysis contained in the supporting EA prepared for the issuance of an ITP to Dominion, it is hereby determined that the issuance of this permit will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment as described above and in the supporting EA. In addition, all beneficial and adverse impacts of the proposed action have been addressed to reach the conclusion of no significant impacts. Accordingly, preparation of an environmental impact statement for this action is not necessary.



December 10, 2020

Michael Pentony
Regional Administrator

Date

9 List of Preparers and Agencies / Persons Consulted

This document was prepared by the Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office, Protected Resources Division (GARFO PRD) in Gloucester, Massachusetts who consulted with Dominion in preparing this document.

10 Literature Cited

ASMFC. 2017. Atlantic Sturgeon Benchmark Stock Assessment and Peer Review Report, Arlington, VA. 456p. Available at http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/AtlMenhadenBoardNov2017/AtlSturgonBenchmarkStockAssmt_PeerReviewReport_2017.pdf.

Atlantic Sturgeon Status Review Team (ASSRT). 2007. Status review of Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*). Report to National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Regional Office. February 23, 2007. 174 pp.

Austin, G. 2012. Essential spawning habitat for Atlantic Sturgeon in the James River, Virginia. M.S. Thesis, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA.

Bain, M.B. 1997. Atlantic and shortnose sturgeons of the Hudson River: Common and divergent life history attributes. Environmental Biology of Fishes, 48:347-358.

Bain, M.B., N. Haley, D. Peterson, J.R. Waldman, and K. Arend. 2000. Harvest and habitats of Atlantic Sturgeon *Acipenser oxyrinchus* Mitchill, 1815, in the Hudson River estuary: Lessons for sturgeon conservation. Boletin-Instituto Español de Oceanografía, 16:43-53.

Balazik, M.T. and J.A. Musick. 2015. Dual annual spawning races in Atlantic Sturgeon. PLoS ONE 10(5): e0128234. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0128234.

Balazik, M.T., G.C. Garman, J.P. Van Eenennaam, J. Mohler, and L.C. Woods III. 2012a. Empirical evidence of fall spawning by Atlantic Sturgeon in the James River, Virginia. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society, 141(6):1465-1471.

Balazik, M.T., G.C. Garman, M.L. Fine, C.H. Hager, and S.P. McIninch. 2010. Changes in age composition and growth characteristics of Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*) over 400 years. Biology Letters, 6:708-710.

Balazik, M.T., K.J. Reine, A.J. Spells, C.A. Fredrickson, M.L. Fine, G.C. Garman, and S.P. McIninch. 2012b. The potential for vessel interactions with adult Atlantic sturgeon in the James River, Virginia. North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 32(6):1062-1069.

Balazik, M.T., S.P. McIninch, G.C. Garman, and R.J. Latour. 2012. Age and growth of Atlantic sturgeon in the James River, Virginia, 1997–2011, Transactions of the American Fisheries Society, 141(4): 1074-1080.

Boreman, J. 1997. Sensitivity of North American sturgeons and paddlefish to fishing mortality. Environmental Biology of Fishes, 48:399-405.

Brown, J.J. and G.W. Murphy. 2010. Atlantic sturgeon vessel strike mortalities in the Delaware River. Fisheries, 35(2):72-83.

Bushnoe, T.M., J.A. Musick, and D.S. Ha. 2005. Essential spawning and nursery habitat of Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus*) in Virginia. Appendix 1 in Musick, J.A. (Prin. Inv.), Essential Fish Habitat of Atlantic Sturgeon in the Southern Chesapeake Bay, Virginia Institute of Marine Science Special Scientific Report Number 145, Final Report to NOAA/NMFS Award NA03NMF4050200(AFC)37.

EA. 2007. Impingement mortality and entrainment characterization report, Chesterfield Power Station, June 2005 – 2006. EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc., Sparks, Maryland.

Garman, G. 2016. 10 years of Atlantic Sturgeon research on the James River. EPRI American Eel Interest Group & Sturgeon Interest Group Joint Workshop. Richmond, Virginia. September 13-15, 2016.

Greene, K. E., J. L. Zimmerman, R. W. Laney, and J. C. Thomas-Blate. 2009. Atlantic coast diadromous fish habitat: A review of utilization, threats, recommendations for conservation, and research needs. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission Habitat Management Series No. 9, Washington, D.C.

Hager, C. 2011. Atlantic Sturgeon review: Gather data on reproducing subpopulation of Atlantic Sturgeon in the James River. Contract EA133FlOCN0317.

Hager, C., J. Kahn, C. Watterson, J. Russo, and K. Hartman. 2014. Evidence of Atlantic sturgeon spawning in the York River System, Transactions of the American Fisheries Society, 143(5):1217-1219.

Hale, E.A., I.A. Park, M.T. Fisher, R.A. Wong, M.J. Stangl, and J.H. Clark. 2016. Abundance estimate for and habitat use by early juvenile Atlantic sturgeon within the Delaware River Estuary. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society, 145(6):1193-1201.

Hilton, E.J., B. Kynard, M.T. Balazik, A.Z. Horodysky, and C.B. Dillman. 2016. Review of the biology, fisheries, and conservation status of the Atlantic Sturgeon, (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus* Mitchill, 1815). Journal of Applied Ichthyology, 32 (Suppl. 1): 30-66.

Kahn, J.E., C. Hager, J.C. Watterson, J. Russo, K. Moore, and K. Hartman. 2014. Atlantic sturgeon annual spawning run estimate in the Pamunkey River, Virginia, Transactions of the American Fisheries Society, 143(6): 508-1514.

Kahnle, A.W., K.A. Hattala, K.A. McKown. 2007. Status of Atlantic sturgeon of the Hudson River Estuary, New York, USA. American Fisheries Society Symposium, 56:347-363.

Kynard, B. and M. Horgan. 2002. Ontogenetic behavior and migration of Atlantic Sturgeon, *Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*, and Shortnose Sturgeon, *A. brevirostrum*, with notes on social behavior. Environmental Biology of Fishes, 63:137-150.

Mohler, J.W. 2003. Culture manual for the Atlantic sturgeon. United States Fish and Wildlife Service Publication, Hadley, Massachusetts.

Moore, K., B. Neikirk, and B.A. Anderson. 2006. Water Quality Conditions and Restoration of Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) in the Tidal Freshwater James River 2005. Retrieved October 21, 2016, from http://www.vims.edu/GreyLit/VIMS/sramsoe392.pdf.

Murawski, S.A. and A.L. Pacheco. 1977. Biological and fisheries data on Atlantic sturgeon, *Acipenser oxyrhynchus* (Mitchill). National Marine Fisheries Service Technical Series Report 10:1-69.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2012a. Biological opinion on the James River Federal Navigation Project: Tribell Shoal Channel to Richmond Harbor in Surry, James City, Prince George, Charles City, Henrico, and Chesterfield Counties and the Cities of Richmond and Hopewell, Virginia (FINER/2012/01183). National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Regional Office; Gloucester, Massachusetts.

NMFS. 2012b. Letter of concurrence, from Mr. D.M. Morris, NMFS, to Ms. Amy Hull, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, that continued operation Surry Nuclear Power Station, Units 1

and 2 is not likely to adversely affect species listed by NMFS. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Regional Office; Gloucester, Massachusetts..

NMFS. 2018. Biological opinion on NMFS gear regulations in the Virginia pound net fishery (NER/2017/14025). National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office; Gloucester, Massachusetts.

NMFS. 2018b. Biological opinion on the construction and maintenance of Chesapeake Bay entrance channels and use of sand burrow areas for beach nourishment (NER/2018/14816). National Marine Fisheries Service, Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office; Gloucester, Massachusetts.

NMFS. 2018c. Biological opinion the issuance of funds to 11 Northeast states and the District of Columbia through the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program from 2018-2022 (NER/2018/14763). National Marine Fisheries Service, Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office; Gloucester, Massachusetts.

NMFS. 2019. Biological opinion on the James River Federal Navigation Project (NER/2018/15090). National Marine Fisheries Service, Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office; Gloucester, Massachusetts.

Niklitschek, E.J. and D.H. Secor. 2010. 2010. Experimental and field evidence of behavioural habitat selection by juvenile Atlantic (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*) and shortnose (*Acipenser brevirostrum*) sturgeons. Journal of Fish Biology, 77:1293–1308.

Peake, S., F.W.H. Beamish, R.S. McKinley, D.A. Scruton, and C. Katopodis. 1997. Relating swimming performance of lake sturgeon, *Acipenser fulvescens*, to fishway design. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 54:1361-1366.

Pyzik, L., J. Caddick, and P. Marx. 2004. Chesapeake Bay: Introduction to an ecosystem. EPA 903-R-04-003, CBP/TRS 232/00. 35 pp.

Richardson, B., C. Stence, M. Baldwin, and C. Mason. 2007. Development of a captive brood stock program for Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrhinchus*) in Maryland. 2006 Progress Report for U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service State Wildlife Grant Funding, T-3. January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2006. 40pp.

Richardson, B. and D. Secor. 2016. Assessment of Critical Habitats for Recovering the Chesapeake Bay Atlantic Sturgeon Distinct Population Segment. NOAA Species Recovery Grants to States (Section 6 Program); NA13NMF4720042, 71 pp.

Smith, T.I.J., E.K. Dingley, and D.E. Marchette. 1980. Induced spawning and culture of Atlantic Sturgeon. Progressive Fish-Culturist, 42:147-151.

Thiem, J.D., J.W. Dawson, D. Hatin, A.J. Danylchuk, P. Dumont, A.C. Gleiss, R.P. Wilson, and S.J. Cooke. 2016. Swimming activity and energetic costs of adult lake sturgeon during fishway passage. Journal of Experimental Biology, 219:2534-2544.

Van Den Avyle, M. J. 1984. Species profile: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (South Atlantic): Atlantic sturgeon. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Report No. FWS/OBS-82/11.25, and U. S. Army Corps of Engineers Report No. TR EL-82-4, Washington, D.C.

Van Eenennaam, J.P., S.I. Doroshov, G.P. Moberg, J.G. Watson, D.S. Moore and J. Linares. 1996. Reproductive conditions of the Atlantic Sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus*) in the Hudson River. Estuaries, 19(4):769-777.

Verhille, C.E., J.B. Poletto, D.E. Cocherell B. DeCourten S. Baird, J.J. Cech Jr, and N.A. Fangue. 2014. Larval green and white sturgeon swimming performance in relation to water-diversion flows. Conservation Physiology, 2: doi:10.1093/conphys/cou031.

VDEQ. 2015. Commonwealth of Virginia State Water Resources Plan. Available at https://www.deq.virginia.gov/programs/water/watersupplywaterquantity/watersupplyplanning/statewaterresourcesplan.aspx.

VDEQ. 2016. Fact Sheet: VA0004146, Dominion Chesterfield Power Station. Retrieved On: October 19, 2016. Available at http://www.deq.virginia.gov.

Virginia Commonwealth University News. Historical Significance of the Atlantic Sturgeon. November 2, 2012. Available at https://news.vcu.edu/article/Historical_significance_of_the_Atlantic_sturgeon.

Virginia Electric Power Company (VEPCO). 1977. Chesterfield Power Station Impingement and Entrainment Study. Final report. Prepared by Virginia Electric and Power, Environmental Services Department, Richmond, VA.

VEPCO. 2000. Section 316(a) Demonstration. VPDES Permit Number VA0004146 - Chesterfield Power Station. Virginia Electric and Power Company, Environmental Policy and Compliance, Glen Allen, Virginia.

Vladykov, V.D. and J.R. Greeley. 1963. Order Acipenseroidei. Pp. 24-60. *In* Fishes of Western North Atlantic. Memoir Sears Foundation for Marine Research, Number 1. 630 pp.

Zhang, Q., R.R. Murphy, R. Tian, M.K. Forsyth, E.M. Trentacoste, J. Keisman, and, P.J. Tango. 2018. Chesapeake Bay's water quality condition has been recovering: Insights from a multimetric indicator assessment of thirty years of tidal monitoring data. Science of the Total Environment, 637-638: 1617-1625.