



State of California – Natural Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
Bay Delta Region
2825 Cordelia Road, Suite 100
Fairfield, CA 94534
(707) 428-2002
www.wildlife.ca.gov

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director



June 24, 2024

Kevin Sheridan, Authority's Executive Director
Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority
2600 Kitty Hawk Road, Suite 103
Livermore, CA 94551
Comments@valleylinkrail.com

Subject: Valley Link Rail Project, Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report,
SCH No. 2018092027, Alameda and San Joaquin Counties

Dear Ms. Payne:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) received a Notice of Availability of a Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) from Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority for the Valley Link Rail Project (Project) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines.¹ CDFW previously submitted comments in response to the originally circulated draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

CDFW is submitting comments on the draft SEIR to inform the Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority, as the Lead Agency, of potentially significant impacts to biological resources associated with the Project.

CDFW ROLE

CDFW is a **Trustee Agency** with responsibility under CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15386 for commenting on projects that could impact fish, plant, and wildlife resources (i.e., biological resources). CDFW is also considered a **Responsible Agency** if a project would require discretionary approval, such as permits issued under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) or Native Plant Protection Act, the Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Program, and other provisions of the Fish and Game Code that afford protection to the state's fish and wildlife trust resources.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Proponent: Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority

Objective: The objective of the Project is to establish a new passenger rail service along a 22-mile corridor in Northern California between the existing Dublin/Pleasanton Bay Area

¹ CEQA is codified in the California Public Resources Code in section 21000 et seq. The "CEQA Guidelines" are found in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, commencing with section 15000.

Kevin Sheridan
 Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority
 June 24, 2024
 Page 2

Rapid Transit (BART) Station in Alameda County and the proposed Mountain House Community Station in San Joaquin County. Primary Project activities include construction and operation of four stations: 1) Dublin/Pleasanton Station, 2) Isabel Station, 3) Southfront Road Station, and 4) Mountain House Community Station. It also includes construction of facilities to support the operations and maintenance and ancillary project activities at the following three locations: 1) The Altamont Maintenance of Way (MOW) Staging Area (10-acre site of the Alameda County Transportation Corridor right-of-way, 2,250 feet east of Dyer Road), 2) The Mountain House Layover Facility (75-acre site east of Mountain House Parkway and north of Interstate [I]-205), 3) and the Tracy Operations and Maintenance Facility/Operations Support Site (200-acre site along West Schulte Road just west of the Owens-Brockway Glass Container Plant west of the City of Tracy).

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND LOCATION

The Project is a 22-mile linear path within the city of Dublin, Pleasanton, and Livermore, in the Community of Mountain House, and unincorporated areas of San Joaquin County. The Project is located within Alameda and San Joaquin Counties. The Project alignment's westernmost point begins in the City of Livermore and follows I-580 to the Altamont Hills. It then shifts adjacent to Altamont Pass Road within the Alameda County Transportation Corridor right-of-way from just east of Greenville Road in the City of Livermore to a point north of the existing railroad tunnel under I-580. From there, the alignment will transition out of the Alameda County Transportation Corridor right-of-way, extend southeast toward the westbound lanes of I-580, and extend east, staying generally within the existing California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) right-of-way to the proposed Mountain House Community Station just west of Mountain House Parkway and north of the I-205 westbound lanes. The alignment will then cross under Mountain House Parkway east into the proposed Mountain House Layover Facility.

Special-status species documented to occur, or with the potential to occur, on or near the Project area include, *but are not limited to*, those listed in the table below.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Rare Plant Rank
Alkali milk vetch	<i>Astragalus tener var. tener</i>		1B.2
Bent-flowered fiddleneck	<i>Amsinckia lunaris</i>		1B.2
Big-scale balsamroot	<i>Balsamorhiza macrolepis</i>		1B.1
Big tarplant	<i>Blepharizonia plumosa</i>		1B.1
Brewer's western flax	<i>Hesperolinon breweri</i>		1B.2

Kevin Sheridan
 Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority
 June 24, 2024
 Page 3

Brittlescale	<i>Atriplex depressa</i>		1B.2
California alkali grass	<i>Puccinellia simplex</i>		1B.2
Caper-fruited tropidocarpum	<i>Tropidocarpum capparideum</i>		1B.1
Chaparral ragwort	<i>Senecio aphanactis</i>		2B.2
Congdon's tarplant	<i>Centromadia parryi ssp. congdonii</i>		1B.2
Contra Costa manzanita	<i>Arctostaphylos manzanita ssp. laevigata</i>		1B.2
Delta button-celery	<i>Eryngium racemosum</i>	SE	1B.1
Delta mudwort	<i>Limosella subulate</i>		1B.2
Delta tule pea	<i>Lathyrus jepsonii var. jepsonii</i>		1B.2
Diablo helianthella	<i>Helianthella castanea</i>		1B.2
Diamond-petaled California poppy	<i>Eschscholzia rhombipetala</i>		1B.1
Hairless popcorn flower	<i>Plagiobothrys glaber</i>		1A
Heartscale	<i>Atriplex cordulata var. cordulata</i>		1B.2
Hispid bird's beak	<i>Chloropyron molle ssp. hispidum</i>		1B.1
Hospital canyon larkspur	<i>Delphinium californicum ssp. interius</i>		1B.2
Large-flowered fiddleneck	<i>Amsinckia grandiflora</i>	SE	1B.1
Lemmon's jewelflower	<i>Caulanthus lemmonii</i>		1B.2
Lesser saltscale	<i>Atriplex minuscula</i>		1B.1
Livermore tarplant	<i>Deinandra bacigalupii</i>	SE	1B.2
Long-styled sand-spurrey	<i>Spergularia macrotheca var. longistyla</i>		1B.2
Mason's lilaeopsis	<i>Lilaeopsis masonii</i>	R	1B.1
Mount Diablo fairy-lantern	<i>Calochortus pulchellus</i>		1B.2
Oregon polemonium	<i>Polemonium carneum</i>		2B.2

Kevin Sheridan
 Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority
 June 24, 2024
 Page 4

Palmate-bracted bird's-beak	<i>Cordylanthus palmatus</i>	SE	1B.1
Prostrate vernal pool navarretia	<i>Navarretia prostrata</i>		1B.1
Recurved larkspur	<i>Recurved larkspur</i>		1B.2
Saline clover	<i>Trifolium hydrophilum</i>		1B.2
Sanford's arrowhead	<i>Sagittaria sanfordii</i>		1B.2
San Joaquin spearscale	<i>Extriplex joaquinana</i>		1B.2
Shining navarretia	<i>Navarretia nigelliformis ssp.radians</i>		1B.2
Slough thistle	<i>Cirsium crassicaule</i>		1B.1
Suisun marsh aster	<i>Symphyotrichum lentum</i>		1B.2
Watershield	<i>Brasenia schreberi</i>		2B.3
Woolly rose-mallow	<i>Hibiscus lasiocarpus var. accidentalis</i>		1B.2
Wright's trichocornis	<i>Trichocoronis wrightii var. wrightii</i>		2B.1
Crotch bumblebee	<i>Bombus crotchii</i>	SSC	
California tiger salamander	<i>Ambystoma californiense</i>	FT, ST	
California red-legged frog	<i>Rana draytonii</i>	FT, SSC	
Foothill yellow-legged frog	<i>Rana boylei</i>	CT, SSC	
western pond turtle	<i>Emys marmorata</i>	SSC	
western spadefoot toad	<i>Spea hammondii</i>	SSC	
Coast horned lizard	<i>Phrynosoma blainvillii</i>	SSC	
California legless lizard	<i>Anniella pulchra</i>	SSC	
California glossy snake	<i>Arizona elegans occidentalis</i>	SSC	
Pallid bat	<i>Antrozous pallidus</i>	SSC	
Golden eagle	<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	SFP	
Giant garter snake	<i>Thamnophis gigas</i>	FT, ST	

Kevin Sheridan
 Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority
 June 24, 2024
 Page 5

Townsend's big-eared bat	<i>Corynorhinus townsendii</i>	CT	
Western red bat			
Hoary bat	<i>Lasiurus cinereus</i>	(Western Bat Working Group – Medium	
San Joaquin coachwhip	<i>Masticophis flagellum ruddocki</i>	SSC	
Swainson's hawk	<i>Buteo swainsonii</i>	ST	
Northern harrier	<i>Circus cyaneus</i>	SSC	
White-tailed kite	<i>Elanus leucurus</i>	FP	
western bumblebee	<i>Bombus occidentalis occidentalis</i>	SSC	
Grasshopper sparrow	<i>Ammodramus savannarum</i>	SSC	
Short-eared owl	<i>Asio flammeus</i>	SSC	
Burrowing owl	<i>Athene cunicularia</i>	SSC	
Loggerhead shrike	<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>	SSC	
Bank swallow	<i>Riparia</i>	ST	
Song sparrow (Modesto population)	<i>Melospiza melodia</i>	SSC	
Tricolored blackbird	<i>Agelaius tricolor</i>	ST	
Yellow-headed blackbird	<i>Xanthocephalus</i>	SSC	
Western mastiff bat	<i>Eumops perotis californicus</i>	SSC	
San Joaquin kit fox	<i>Vulpes macrotis mutica</i>	FE, ST	
American badger	<i>Taxidea taxus</i>	SSC	
Riparian brush rabbit	<i>Sylvilagus bachmani riparius</i>	FE, SE	
Mountain lion	<i>Puma concolor</i>	CT, CE	
Central Valley fall-run Chinook salmon	<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>		

Kevin Sheridan
 Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority
 June 24, 2024
 Page 6

Delta smelt	<i>Hypomesus transpacificus</i>	FT, SE	
Longfin smelt	<i>Spirinchus thaleichthys</i>	FC	
River lamprey	<i>Lampetra ayresi</i>	SSC	
Green sturgeon	<i>Acipenser medirostris</i>	FT, SSC	
Central Valley steelhead	<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>	FT	

FE = federally listed as endangered under Endangered Species Act (ESA); FT = federally listed as threaten under ESA; FC = federal candidate; FP = fully protected; SE = state listed as endangered under CESA; ST = state listed as threatened under CESA; SFP = state fully protected under Fish and Game Code; SSC = state species of special concern; CE= candidate for state listing as endangered; CT= candidate for state listing as threatened; R = rare

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CDFW offers the comments and recommendations below to assist Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority in adequately identifying and/or mitigating the Project's significant, or potentially significant, direct and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife (biological) resources.

I. Project Description and Related Impact Shortcoming

COMMENT 1: Light Impact Analysis and Discussion

Chapter 2 – Project Description, Pages 2-21, 2-23 and 2-25

Issue: The draft SEIR explains that for the Altamont MOW Staging Area, Mountain House Layover Facility, and Tracy Operations and Maintenance Facility/Operations Support Site, the facilities will be capable of operations 24 hours a day, with site and facility lighting. In addition to these facilities that support operation and maintenance, four new stations are proposed for construction. Particularly in rural areas, there will be impacts that the facility lighting will have on wildlife in the long-term with a significant increase in night lighting much greater than ambient.

A portion of the proposed Project within the rail alignment and support facilities either do not contain any overhead artificial light sources or a very low number of sources. It is unclear if the Project proposes the installation of new or replacement light sources. Artificial light sources can include overhead streetlights, bridge luminaries, flashing beacons, informational signs, and warning signals. Artificial light spillage beyond the prism of the railway stations and support facilities into natural areas may result in a potentially significant impacts through substantial degradation of the quality of the

Kevin Sheridan
Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority
June 24, 2024
Page 7

environment. Artificial light pollution also has the potential to significantly and adversely affect biological resources and the habitat that supports them. Unlike the natural brightness created by the monthly cycle of the moon, the permanent and continuously powered lighting fixtures create an unnatural light regime that produces a constant light output. Continuous light output for 365 days a year can also have cumulatively significant impacts on fish and wildlife populations.

Evidence the impact would be significant: Night lighting can disrupt the circadian rhythms of many wildlife species. Many species use photoperiod cues for communication (e.g., bird song; Miller 2006), determining when to begin foraging (Stone et al. 2009), behavior thermoregulation (Beiswenger 1977), and migration (Longcore and Rich 2004). Phototaxis, a phenomenon which results in attraction and movement towards light, can disorient, entrap, and temporarily blind wildlife species that experience it (Longcore and Rich 2004). For nocturnally migrating birds, direct mortality as a result of collisions with anthropogenic structures due to attraction to light (Gauthreux, 2006) is another direct effect of artificial light pollution. There are also more subtle effects, such as disrupted orientation (Poot et al. 2008) and changes in habitat selection (McLaren et al. 2018). Frogs and salamanders are particularly susceptible to artificial light pollution. Light pollution may affect physiology, behavior, ecology, and evolution of frog and salamander populations (Wise, 2007). For example, artificial light levels and timing influences melatonin production in salamanders. Melatonin regulates hormones, reproductive development and behavior, skin coloration, an animal's ability to regulate body temperature, and night vision (Gern, 1986). Reduced survival at the population level can result in smaller populations or populations that disappear altogether. There is also growing evidence that light pollution alters behavior at regional scales, with migrants occupying urban centers at higher-than-expected rates as a function of urban illumination (La Sorte et al. 2021). While artificial light pollution can act as an attractant at both regional (La Sorte et al. 2021) and local (Van Doren et al. 2017) scales, there is also evidence of migrating birds avoiding strongly lit areas when selecting critical resting sites needed to rebuild energy stores (McLaren et al. 2018). Due to these reasons, avoidance and minimization measures are recommended to avoid and reduce night lighting.

Recommendation: Due to the high potential for bats, songbirds, migratory birds, amphibians, and mammals, CDFW recommends that no artificial light sources are installed outside of currently populated areas such as cities, especially within the Altamont Hills and the alignment across the landscape to Mountain House, as part of the Project in order to avoid potentially significant impacts to biological resources. Please incorporate the following into the Project SEIR:

Recommended Mitigation Measure 1 – Light Output Analysis: Isolux Diagrams that note current light levels present during pre-Project conditions and the predicted Project light levels that will be created upon completion of the Project shall be included in the

Kevin Sheridan
Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority
June 24, 2024
Page 8

draft SEIR for the station platforms and support facilities. If an increase in light output from current levels to the projected future levels is evident, additional avoidance, minimization, or mitigation shall be developed in coordination with the natural resource agencies to offset indirect impacts to special-status species. Within 60 days of Project completion, the Lead Agency shall conduct a ground survey that compares projected future light levels with actual light levels achieved upon completion of the Project through comparison of Isolux diagrams. If an increase from the projected levels to the actual levels is discovered, additional avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures may also be required in coordination with the natural resource agencies. This analysis should be conducted across all potential alternatives and compared in table and map format.

Recommended Mitigation Measure 2 – Light Barriers: If they do not create a significant barrier to wildlife movement, additional barrier types should be employed when feasible, such as privacy slats into the spacing of cyclone fencing to create light barriers for areas outside the alignment and support facilities.

Recommended Mitigation Measure 3 – Light Impact Reduction: To reduce artificial light output from Project activities and maintenance, consider use of motion sensor-based lighting systems, programmable lighting systems that operate on timers, and/or systems that have the potential to be shut down or tuned down in light intensity during critical times of the year such as migratory bird season or amphibian mating periods.

II. Mitigation Measure or Alternative and Related Impact Shortcoming

COMMENT 2: Bumble Bee Mitigation

Chapter 3 – Environmental Impact Analysis, Pages 3.4-32 – 3.4-33

Issue: Crotch's bumble bee (*Bombus crotchii*) and western bumble bee (*Bombus occidentalis*) are currently Candidate Endangered species under CESA. The proposed Project location is within Crotch's bumble bee and western bumble bee range (CDFW 2023). Construction activities could destroy ground nests of bumble bees and foraging resources in permanently and temporarily impacted Project areas.

Suitable Crotch's bumble bee habitat includes areas of grasslands and upland areas. Crotch's bumble bee primarily nest in late February through late October underground in abandoned small mammal burrows but may also nest under perennial bunch grasses or thatched annual grasses, under brush piles, in old bird nests, and in dead trees or hollow logs (Williams et al. 2014; Hatfield et al. 2015). Overwintering sites utilized by Crotch's bumble bee mated queens in self-excavated hibernacula include soft, disturbed soil, sand, well-drained or loose soils (Goulson 2010), or under leaf litter or other debris (Williams et al. 2014) with ground cover requirements such as barren areas, tree litter, bare patches within short grass in areas lacking dense vegetation.

Kevin Sheridan
Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority
June 24, 2024
Page 9

Therefore, potential ground disturbance and vegetation removal associated with Project implementation may significantly impact local bumble bee populations.

Evidence impact would be significant: Crotch's bumble bee was once common throughout most of central and southern California; however, it now appears to be absent from most of it, especially in the central portion of its historic range within California's Central Valley (Hatfield et al. 2014). Analyses by the Xerces Society et al. (2018) suggest there have been sharp declines in relative abundance by 98 percent and persistence by 80 percent over the last ten years. Bumblebees are critically important because they pollinate a wide range of plants over the lifecycles of their colonies, which typically live longer than most native solitary bee species. Crotch's bumble bees are candidate species under CESA (CEQA Guidelines, §15380, subds. (c)(1)). Unauthorized take of this species pursuant to CESA is a violation of California Fish and Game Code section 2080 et seq.

Recommendation: Recommendation: CDFW recommends that the following are incorporated into the Project draft SEIR:

Recommended Mitigation Measure 4 – Surveys. The draft SEIR states that habitat evaluation surveys shall be conducted. CDFW recommends following the guidance outlined in the California Bumble Bee Atlas Habitat surveys (<https://www.cabumblebeeatlas.org/habitat-surveys.html>) be incorporated into the draft SEIR.

The peak flying time for Crotch's bumblebee is March to August, but bees could be flying anytime between February 1 and October 31. Surveys between March and June are expected to have highest detection probability and are therefore the period recommended for pre-construction surveys. Surveys should include a minimum of 3 survey efforts, over a 3-day period within a temperature range of 15°C and 30°C although bumblebees can fly and forage at near freezing temperatures. If the surveyor suspects Crotch's bumble bee detection or occupancy, CDFW should be consulted immediately.

Goals of the surveys should be to potentially identify the bee species through non-take methods (close lens photography), foraging plants, and potential ground nest sites on site. Surveys should include examining flowering vegetation, any potential preferred nectar plants, small mammal burrows, bunch grasses, thatch, brush piles, old bird nests, dead trees, or hollow logs. Survey results, after the protocol was followed, would be good for one year (until the next flying period season) but a pre activity survey would still be needed prior to ground-disturbing activities.

Recommended Mitigation Measure 5 – 50-foot Buffer: CDFW recommends that all potential nest sites, such as small mammal burrows and thatched/bunch grasses be avoided by a minimum of 50 feet to avoid take and potentially significant impacts. If

Kevin Sheridan
Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority
June 24, 2024
Page 10

ground-disturbing activities will occur during the overwintering period (October through February), consultation with CDFW is warranted to discuss how to implement Project activities and avoid take.

Recommended Mitigation Measure 6 – Herbicide Application: To minimize impacts to bumble bees, avoid the bloom periods for herbicide application and mowing activities. If this is not possible, CDFW recommends that the Project obtain take authorization under an Incidental Take Permit (ITP), pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2081 subdivision (b).

Recommended Mitigation Measure 7 – Crotch’s Bumble Bee Avoidance or Take Authorization: If Crotch’s bumble bee is identified during habitat assessment or preconstruction surveys, a Crotch’s bumble bee avoidance plan should be developed and provided to CDFW for review prior to work activities involving ground disturbance or vegetation removal. If full take avoidance is not feasible, CDFW recommends that the draft SEIR state that the Project proponent will apply to CDFW for take authorization under an ITP, pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2081 subdivision (b).

Recommended Mitigation Measure 8 – Compensatory Mitigation: CDFW recommends that the draft SEIR include compensatory mitigation for the loss of Crotch’s bumble bee habitat. Bumble bee floral resources should be mitigated for permanent, ongoing, and temporary impacts. Floral resources should be replaced and permanently conserved as close to their original location as is feasible. If active Crotch’s bumble bee nests have been identified and floral resources cannot be replaced within 600 feet of their original location, floral resources should be planted in the most centrally available location relative to identified nests. This location should be no more than 4,900 feet (1.5-kilometer) from any identified nest. Replaced floral resources may be split into multiple patches to meet distance requirements for multiple nests. The draft SEIR should state that mitigation lands will be protected in perpetuity under a conservation easement with an endowment established for long-term management of the lands.

COMMENT 3: Loss of Oak Woodlands

Chapter 3 – Environmental Impact Analysis, Pages 3.4-8, 3.4-46, 3.4-47; MM-BIO-37 (Compensate for Tree Removal during Construction)

Issue: Table 3.4-1 (Regulated Trees by Jurisdiction) defines what defines protected trees in various jurisdictions such as counties and cities. The definition of a protected tree specifies tree size. The draft SEIR mitigation ratio for replacement trees is also determined by the size or species of protected trees and appears to focus on larger trees only. The issue is that given the substantial loss of historic oak woodlands across the state, even loss of oak woodland habitat composed of smaller or younger trees can be considered a significant impact. In addition, mitigation ratios for replacement and

Kevin Sheridan
Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority
June 24, 2024
Page 11

protection should be based on both the acreage of oak woodland habitat lost as well as time to maturity (i.e. the longer to replace the function or ecosystem services of the habitat lost, the greater increase in mitigation ratios of replacement habitat).

Evidence impact would be significant: Oak woodlands serve as essential habitat and cover for a wide variety of resident and migratory wildlife species. They support biodiversity, shade water sources for cooler instream temperatures, moderate temperature, and reduce soil erosion. CDFW is concerned about the long-term loss of oak woodlands. Fragmentation of oak habitats reduces their ability to provide the full range of ecological benefits, including maintenance of species diversity, as well as soil and watershed protection. Coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) and old-growth oak trees (native oak tree that is greater than 15 inches in diameter) are of particular importance due to increased biological values and the time required for a replacement tree to reach the same level of maturity or ecological function.

Given the approach that the draft SEIR focuses on trees regulated by a “jurisdiction”, the Project may still result in a significant impact through a net-loss of sensitive oak woodland habitat. Mitigation Measure Bio-37 does not reduce potential woodland impacts to a level that is less-than-significant. Where avoidance is infeasible, mitigation measures should consider the local, regional, and larger-scale environmental context in which the habitat loss or alteration is occurring. Mitigation required must be roughly proportional to the level of impact (including cumulative impacts) in accordance with the provisions of CEQA (Guidelines Sections 15126.4(a)(4)(B), 15064, 15065, and 15355).

Recommendation: To address loss of oak woodlands, associated trees and the acreages of impacted oak woodland should be replaced or compensated and protected in perpetuity.

Recommended Mitigation Measure 9 – Tree Replacement or Compensatory

Mitigation: Specific impacts to oak species and old-growth trees should be fully disclosed and mitigated. The draft SEIR should include within Mitigation Measure BIO-37 replacement or compensation of the loss of oak woodland trees 4 inches diameter at breast height (DBH) or larger at a mitigation ratio depending on the tree size (high mitigation ratios for larger trees, but higher than 2:1) and the acreages of oak woodlands impacted. Trees should be replaced on-site, preferably, with replacement habitat comprising ecological conditions similar or better than those provided by the habitat removed from the Project site. If that is not feasible, trees can be replaced at an alternate location as close to the Project site as possible in a location that historically supported oak woodland habitat, along the same watercourse, if applicable, or within the same watershed. Riparian/oak woodland habitats and associated trees serving as mitigation for the Project should be permanently protected by putting a conservation easement with an associated management plan and management and stewardship endowments in place. Alternately, oak woodland tree removals may be mitigated

Kevin Sheridan
Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority
June 24, 2024
Page 12

through purchase of mitigation bank credits at a CDFW-approved mitigation or conservation bank if available.

ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

CEQA requires that information developed in environmental impact reports and negative declarations be incorporated into a database which may be used to make subsequent or supplemental environmental determinations. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21003, subd. (e)). Accordingly, please report any special-status species and natural communities detected during Project surveys to the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). The CNDDDB field survey form can be filled out and submitted online at the following link: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Submitting-Data>. The types of information reported to CNDDDB can be found at the following link: <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Plants-and-Animals>.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT FILING FEES

The Project, as proposed, would have an impact on fish and/or wildlife, and assessment of environmental document filing fees is necessary. Fees are payable upon filing of the Notice of Determination by the Lead Agency and serve to help defray the cost of environmental review by CDFW. Payment of the environmental document filing fee is required in order for the underlying project approval to be operative, vested, and final. (See Cal. Code Regs, tit. 14, § 753.5; Fish & G. Code, § 711.4; Pub. Resources Code, § 21089.).

CONCLUSION

CDFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft SEIR to assist Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority in identifying and mitigating Project impacts on biological resources.

Questions regarding this letter or further coordination should be directed to Andrea Boertien, Environmental Scientist at (707) 317-0388 or Andrea.Boertien@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

Erin Chappell

B77E9A6211EF486...

Erin Chappell
Regional Manager
Bay Delta Region

ec: Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse (SCH No. 2018092027)

Kevin Sheridan
Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority
June 24, 2024
Page 13

REFERENCES

- Allan, J.D., and A.S. Flecker. 1993. Biodiversity Conservation in Running Waters. *BioScience* 43:32-43.
- Beiswenger, R. E. 1977. Diet patterns of aggregative behavior in tadpoles of *Bufo americanus*, in relation to light and temperature. *Ecology* 58:98–108.
- Crow, T.R., M.E. Baker, and B.V. Barnes. 2000. Diversity in riparian landscapes. Pages 43-66 in E.S. Verry, J.W. Hornbeck, and C.A. Dolloff (eds.) *Riparian Management in Forests of the Continental Eastern United States*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- Dahl, T.E. 2000. Status and trends of wetlands in the conterminous United States 1986-1997. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.
- Gauthreaux Jr., S.A., and C.G. Belser. 2006. Effects of artificial night lighting on migrating birds. In *Ecological Consequences of Artificial Night Lighting*, edited by C. Rich and T. Longcore, pp. 67-93. Washington D.C.: Island Press
- Gern, William. 1986. Melatonin: A discussion of Its Evolution and Actions in Vertebrates Longcore, T., and C. Rich. 2004. Ecological light pollution - Review. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 2:191–198.
- Goulson, D. 2010. *Bumblebees: behaviour, ecology, and conservation*. Oxford University Press, New York. 317pp.
- Hatfield, R, S. Colla, S. Jepsen, L. Richardson, R. Thorp, and S. Foltz Jordan. 2014. Draft IUCN Assessments for North American *Bombus* spp. for the North American IUCN Bumble Bee Specialist Group. The Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation, www.xerces.org, Portland, OR.
- Hatfield, R., Jepsen, S., Thorp, R., Richardson, L., Colla, S. & Foltz Jordan, S. 2015. *Bombus occidentalis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2015.
- La Sorte. February 2021. Seasonal Variation in the effects of artificial light at night on the occurrence of nocturnally migrating birds in urban areas. *Environmental Pollution*, Volume 270.
- McLaren, et. al. 2018. Artificial light at night confounds broad-scale habitat use by migrating birds.
- Miller, M. W. 2006. Apparent effects of light pollution on singing behavior of American

Kevin Sheridan
Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority
June 24, 2024
Page 14

robins. *The Condor* 108:130–139.

Naiman, R.J., H. Decamps, and M. Pollock. 1993. The role of riparian corridors in maintaining regional biodiversity. *Ecological Applications* 3:209-212.

Naiman, R.J., R.E. Bilby, and P.A. Bisson. 2000. Riparian ecology and management in the Pacific coastal rain forest. *BioScience* 50:996-1011.

Poot, H., B. J. Ens, H. de Vries, M. A. H. Donners, M. R. Wernand, and J. M. Marquenie. 2008. Green light for nocturnally migrating birds. *Ecology and Society* 13(2): 47.

Stone, E. L., G. Jones, and S. Harris. 2009. Street lighting disturbs commuting bats. *Current Biology* 19:1123–1127. Elsevier Ltd.

Van Doren, et. al. 2017. High Intensity Urban Light Installation Dramatically Alters Nocturnal Bird Migration.

Williams, P. H., R. W. Thorp, L. L. Richardson, and S.R. Colla. 2014. Bumble bees of North America: An Identification guide. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. 208pp.

Wise, Sharon. 2007. Studying the Ecological Impacts of Light Pollution on Wildlife: Amphibians As Models. Biology Department, Utica College, Utica, NY.

Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation, Defenders of Wildlife, and Center for Food Safety. 2018. A petition to the state of California fish and game commission to list the Crotch bumble bee (*Bombus crotchii*), Franklin's bumble bee (*Bombus franklini*), Suckley cuckoo bumble bee (*Bombus suckleyi*), and western bumble bee (*Bombus occidentalis occidentalis*) as Endangered under the California Endangered Species Act. October 2018.