



State of California – Natural Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
North Central Region
1701 Nimbus Road, Suite A
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670-4599
916-358-2900
www.wildlife.ca.gov

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director



Governor's Office of Planning & Research

Feb 07 2022

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

February 7, 2022

Joelle Inman,
Environmental Coordinator Planning and Environmental Review
827 7th Street, Room 225, Sacramento, CA 95814
CEQA@saccounty.net.

Subject: COYOTE CREEK AGRIVOLTAIC RANCH- NOTICE OF PREPARATION
SCH# 2022010271

Dear Ms. Inman:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) received and reviewed the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) from Sacramento County for the Coyote Creek Agrivoltaic Ranch Project (Project) in Sacramento County pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) statute and guidelines.¹

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding those activities involved in the Project that may affect California fish, wildlife, plants and their habitats. Likewise, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments regarding those aspects of the Project that CDFW, by law, may need to exercise its own regulatory authority under the Fish and Game Code (Fish & G. Code).

CDFW ROLE

CDFW is California's Trustee Agency for fish and wildlife resources and holds those resources in trust by statute for all the people of the State (Fish & G. Code, §§ 711.7, subd. (a) & 1802; Pub. Resources Code, § 21070; CEQA Guidelines § 15386, subd. (a)). CDFW, in its trustee capacity, has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants, and habitat necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species (*Id.*, § 1802.). Similarly, for purposes of CEQA, CDFW provides, as available, biological expertise during public agency environmental review efforts, focusing specifically on projects and related activities that have the potential to adversely affect fish and wildlife resources.

CDFW may also act as a Responsible Agency under CEQA. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21069; CEQA Guidelines, § 15381.) CDFW expects that it may need to exercise regulatory authority as provided by the Fish and Game Code. As proposed, for example, the Project may be subject to CDFW's lake and streambed alteration

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.

Coyote Creek Agrivoltaic Ranch Project

Date

Page 2 of 15

regulatory authority. (Fish & G. Code, § 1600 et seq.) Likewise, to the extent implementation of the Project as proposed may result in “take” as defined by State law of any species protected under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.), the project proponent may seek related take authorization as provided by the Fish and Game Code.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Sacramento Valley Energy Center, LLC is requesting a use permit to construct and operate a 200-megawatt, alternating current, photovoltaic (PV) solar energy facility on parcels that total approximately 2,555 acres in the Cosumnes community of unincorporated Sacramento County. The project is generally located south of U.S. Route 50, northwest of Rancho Murieta, southeast of the Prairie City State Vehicle Recreation Area (PCSVRA), and south of White Rock Road in the Cosumnes community. Specifically, it is located on what is known as the “Barton Ranch” adjacent to 3830 Scott Road. A dedicated transmission line called a generation tie (gen-tie) line would extend approximately 1.3 miles west to provide an interconnection to the Sacramento Municipal Utility District 230 kilovolt powerline which runs through PCSVRA. The assessor parcel numbers for the gen-tie alignment are 072-3160-002, 072-0100-027, 072-0100-018, 072-0110-031, and 072-0110-068. The applicant is proposing to construct, operate, and at the end of the project’s life, decommission a solar generation and energy storage facility. The development area will include an on-site substation, inverters, fencing, roads, and supervisory control and data acquisition system. Energy storage facilities would be developed at a centralized location or distributed throughout the Project site.

The Project description should include the whole action as defined in the CEQA Guidelines § 15378 and should include appropriate detailed exhibits disclosing the Project area including temporary impacted areas such as equipment stage area, spoils areas, adjacent infrastructure development, staging areas and access and haul roads if applicable.

As required by § 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR should include an appropriate range of reasonable and feasible alternatives that would attain most of the basic Project objectives and avoid or minimize significant impacts to resources under CDFW's jurisdiction.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CDFW offers the comments and recommendations presented below to assist Sacramento County in adequately identifying and/or mitigating the Project’s significant, or potentially significant, impacts on biological resources. The comments and recommendations are also offered to enable CDFW to adequately review and comment on the proposed Project with respect to impacts on biological resources. CDFW recommends that the forthcoming EIR address the following:

Coyote Creek Agrivoltaic Ranch Project

Date

Page 3 of 15

Assessment of Biological Resources

Section 15125(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states that knowledge of the regional setting of a project is critical to the assessment of environmental impacts and that special emphasis should be placed on environmental resources that are rare or unique to the region. To enable CDFW staff to adequately review and comment on the Project, the EIR should include a complete assessment of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to the Project footprint, with emphasis on identifying rare, threatened, endangered, and other sensitive species and their associated habitats. CDFW recommends that the EIR specifically include:

1. An assessment of all habitat types located within the Project footprint, and a map that identifies the location of each habitat type. CDFW recommends that floristic, alliance- and/or association-based mapping and assessment be completed following *The Manual of California Vegetation*, second edition (Sawyer 2009). Adjoining habitat areas should also be included in this assessment where site activities could lead to direct or indirect impacts offsite. Habitat mapping at the alliance level will help establish baseline vegetation conditions.
2. A general biological inventory of the fish, amphibian, reptile, bird, and mammal species that are present or have the potential to be present within each habitat type onsite and within adjacent areas that could be affected by the Project. CDFW recommends that the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), as well as previous studies performed in the area, be consulted to assess the potential presence of sensitive species and habitats. A nine United States Geologic Survey 7.5-minute quadrangle search is recommended to determine what may occur in the region, larger if the Project area extends past one quad (see *Data Use Guidelines* on the Department webpage www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Maps-and-Data). Please review the webpage for information on how to access the database to obtain current information on any previously reported sensitive species and habitat, including Significant Natural Areas identified under Chapter 12 of the Fish and Game Code, in the vicinity of the Project. CDFW recommends that CNDDDB Field Survey Forms be completed and submitted to CNDDDB to document survey results. Online forms can be obtained and submitted at: <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Submitting-Data>.

Please note that CDFW's CNDDDB is not exhaustive in terms of the data it houses, nor is it an absence database. CDFW recommends that it be used as a starting point in gathering information about the *potential presence* of species within the general area of the Project site. Other sources for identification of species and habitats near or adjacent to the Project area should include, but may not be limited to, State and federal resource agency lists, California Wildlife Habitat Relationship System, California Native Plant Society Inventory, agency contacts, environmental documents for other projects in the vicinity, academics, and professional or scientific organizations.

Coyote Creek Agrivoltaic Ranch Project

Date

Page 4 of 15

3. A complete and recent inventory of rare, threatened, endangered, and other sensitive species located within the Project footprint and within offsite areas with the potential to be affected, including California Species of Special Concern and California Fully Protected Species (Fish & G. Code § 3511). Species to be addressed should include all those which meet the CEQA definition (CEQA Guidelines § 15380). The inventory should address seasonal variations in use of the Project area and should not be limited to resident species. The EIR should include the results of focused species-specific surveys, completed by a qualified biologist and conducted at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable. Species-specific surveys should be conducted in order to ascertain the presence of species with the potential to be directly, indirectly, on or within a reasonable distance of the Project activities. CDFW recommends the lead agency rely on survey and monitoring protocols and guidelines available at: www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Survey-Protocols. Alternative survey protocols may be warranted; justification should be provided to substantiate why an alternative protocol is necessary. Acceptable species-specific survey procedures should be developed in consultation with CDFW and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), where necessary. Some aspects of the Project may warrant periodic updated surveys for certain sensitive taxa, particularly if the Project is proposed to occur over a protracted time frame, or in phases, or if surveys are completed during periods of drought or deluge.
4. A thorough, recent (within the last two years), floristic-based assessment of special-status plants and natural communities, following CDFW's *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities* (see www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Plants).
5. Information on the regional setting that is critical to an assessment of environmental impacts, with special emphasis on resources that are rare or unique to the region (CEQA Guidelines § 15125[c]).

Analysis of Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources

The EIR should provide a thorough discussion of the Project's potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on biological resources. To ensure that Project impacts on biological resources are fully analyzed, the following information should be included in the EIR:

1. The EIR should define the threshold of significance for each impact and describe the criteria used to determine whether the impacts are significant (CEQA Guidelines, § 15064, subd. (f)). The EIR must demonstrate that the significant environmental impacts of the Project were adequately investigated and discussed and it must permit the significant effects of the Project to be considered in the full environmental context.

Coyote Creek Agrivoltaic Ranch Project

Date

Page 5 of 15

2. A discussion of potential impacts from lighting, noise, human activity, and wildlife-human interactions created by Project activities especially those adjacent to natural areas, exotic and/or invasive species occurrences, and drainages. The EIR should address Project-related changes to drainage patterns and water quality within, upstream, and downstream of the Project site, including: volume, velocity, and frequency of existing and post-Project surface flows; polluted runoff; soil erosion and/or sedimentation in streams and water bodies; and post-Project fate of runoff from the Project site.
3. A discussion of potential indirect Project impacts on biological resources, including resources in areas adjacent to the Project footprint, such as nearby public lands (e.g. National Forests, State Parks, etc.), open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, wildlife corridors, and any designated and/or proposed reserve or mitigation lands (e.g., preserved lands associated with a Conservation or Recovery Plan, or other conserved lands).
4. A cumulative effects analysis developed as described under CEQA Guidelines section 15130. The EIR should discuss the Project's cumulative impacts to natural resources and determine if that contribution would result in a significant impact. The EIR should include a list of present, past, and probable future projects producing related impacts to biological resources or shall include a summary of the projections contained in an adopted local, regional, or statewide plan, that consider conditions contributing to a cumulative effect. The cumulative analysis shall include impact analysis of vegetation and habitat reductions within the area and their potential cumulative effects. Please include all potential direct and indirect Project-related impacts to riparian areas, wetlands, wildlife corridors or wildlife movement areas, aquatic habitats, sensitive species and/or special-status species, open space, and adjacent natural habitats in the cumulative effects analysis.

Mitigation Measures for Project Impacts to Biological Resources

The EIR should include appropriate and adequate avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures for all direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that are expected to occur as a result of the construction and long-term operation and maintenance of the Project. CDFW also recommends that the environmental documentation provide scientifically supported discussion regarding adequate avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures to address the Project's significant impacts upon fish and wildlife and their habitat. For individual projects, mitigation must be roughly proportional to the level of impacts, including cumulative impacts, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA (Guidelines § § 15126.4(a)(4)(B), 15064, 15065, and 16355). In order for mitigation measures to be effective, they must be specific, enforceable, and feasible actions that will improve environmental conditions. When proposing measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts, CDFW recommends consideration of the following:

1. *Fully Protected Species*: Several Fully Protected Species (Fish & G. Code § 3511) have the potential to occur within or adjacent to the Project area, including,

Coyote Creek Agrivoltaic Ranch Project

Date

Page 6 of 15

but not limited to: white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*). Fully protected species may not be taken or possessed at any time. Project activities described in the EIR should be designed to completely avoid any fully protected species that have the potential to be present within or adjacent to the Project area. CDFW also recommends that the EIR fully analyze potential adverse impacts to fully protected species due to habitat modification, loss of foraging habitat, and/or interruption of migratory and breeding behaviors. CDFW recommends that the Lead Agency include in the analysis how appropriate avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures will reduce indirect impacts to fully protected species.

2. *Sensitive Plant Communities*: CDFW considers sensitive plant communities to be imperiled habitats having both local and regional significance. Plant communities, alliances, and associations with a statewide ranking of S-1, S-2, S-3, and S-4 should be considered sensitive and declining at the local and regional level. These ranks can be obtained by querying the CNDDDB and are included in *The Manual of California Vegetation* (Sawyer 2009). The EIR should include measures to fully avoid and otherwise protect sensitive plant communities from Project-related direct and indirect impacts.
3. *Mitigation*: CDFW considers adverse Project-related impacts to sensitive species and habitats to be significant to both local and regional ecosystems, and the EIR should include mitigation measures for adverse Project-related impacts to these resources. Mitigation measures should emphasize avoidance and reduction of Project impacts. For unavoidable impacts, onsite habitat restoration, enhancement, or permanent protection should be evaluated and discussed in detail. If onsite mitigation is not feasible or would not be biologically viable and therefore not adequately mitigate the loss of biological functions and values, offsite mitigation through habitat creation and/or acquisition and preservation in perpetuity should be addressed.

The EIR should include measures to perpetually protect the targeted habitat values within mitigation areas from direct and indirect adverse impacts in order to meet mitigation objectives to offset Project-induced qualitative and quantitative losses of biological values. Specific issues that should be addressed include restrictions on access, proposed land dedications, long-term monitoring and management programs, control of illegal dumping, water pollution, increased human intrusion, etc.

4. *Habitat Revegetation/Restoration Plans*: Plans for restoration and revegetation should be prepared by persons with expertise in the regional ecosystems and native plant restoration techniques. Plans should identify the assumptions used to develop the proposed restoration strategy. Each plan should include, at a minimum: (a) the location of restoration sites and assessment of appropriate reference sites; (b) the plant species to be used, sources of local propagules, container sizes, and seeding rates; (c) a schematic depicting the mitigation area; (d) a local seed and cuttings and planting schedule; (e) a description of the

Coyote Creek Agrivoltaic Ranch Project

Date

Page 7 of 15

irrigation methodology; (f) measures to control exotic vegetation on site; (g) specific success criteria; (h) a detailed monitoring program; (i) contingency measures should the success criteria not be met; and (j) identification of the party responsible for meeting the success criteria and providing for conservation of the mitigation site in perpetuity. Monitoring of restoration areas should extend across a sufficient time frame to ensure that the new habitat is established, self-sustaining, and capable of surviving drought.

CDFW recommends that local onsite propagules from the Project area and nearby vicinity be collected and used for restoration purposes. Onsite seed collection should be appropriately timed to ensure the viability of the seeds when planted. Onsite vegetation mapping at the alliance and/or association level should be used to develop appropriate restoration goals and local plant palettes. Reference areas should be identified to help guide restoration efforts. Specific restoration plans should be developed for various Project components as appropriate. Restoration objectives should include protecting special habitat elements or re-creating them in areas affected by the Project. Examples may include retention of woody material, logs, snags, rocks, and brush piles. Fish and Game Code sections 1002, 1002.5 and 1003 authorize CDFW to issue permits for the take or possession of plants and wildlife for scientific, educational, and propagation purposes. Please see our website for more information on Scientific Collecting Permits at www.wildlife.ca.gov/Licensing/Scientific-Collecting#53949678-regulations.

5. *Nesting Birds*: Please note that it is the Project proponent's responsibility to comply with all applicable laws related to nesting birds and birds of prey. Migratory non-game native bird species are protected by international treaty under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918, as amended (16 U.S.C. 703 *et seq.*). CDFW implemented the MBTA by adopting the Fish and Game Code section 3513. Fish and Game Code sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3800 provide additional protection to nongame birds, birds of prey, their nests and eggs. Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the Fish and Game Code afford protective measures as follows: section 3503 states that it is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, except as otherwise provided by the Fish and Game Code or any regulation made pursuant thereto; section 3503.5 states that it is unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any birds in the orders Falconiformes or Strigiformes (birds-of-prey) or to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird except as otherwise provided by the Fish and Game Code or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto; and section 3513 states that it is unlawful to take or possess any migratory nongame bird as designated in the MBTA or any part of such migratory nongame bird except as provided by rules and regulations adopted by the Secretary of the Interior under provisions of the MBTA.

Potential habitat for nesting birds and birds of prey is present within the Project area. The Project should disclose all potential activities that may incur a direct or indirect take to nongame nesting birds within the Project footprint and its vicinity.

Coyote Creek Agrivoltaic Ranch Project

Date

Page 8 of 15

Appropriate avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures to avoid take must be included in the EIR.

CDFW recommends that the EIR include specific avoidance and minimization measures to ensure that impacts to nesting birds or their nests do not occur. Project-specific avoidance and minimization measures may include, but not be limited to: Project phasing and timing, monitoring of Project-related noise (where applicable), sound walls, and buffers, where appropriate. The EIR should also include specific avoidance and minimization measures that will be implemented should a nest be located within the Project site. In addition to larger, protocol level survey efforts (e.g. Swainson's hawk surveys) and scientific assessments, CDFW recommends a final preconstruction survey be required no more than three (3) days prior to vegetation clearing or ground disturbance activities, as instances of nesting could be missed if surveys are conducted earlier.

6. *Moving out of Harm's Way*: The Project is anticipated to result in the clearing of natural habitats that support native species. To avoid direct mortality, the lead agency may condition the EIR to require that a qualified biologist with the proper permits be retained to be onsite prior to and during all ground- and habitat-disturbing activities. The qualified biologist with the proper permits may move out of harm's way special-status species or other wildlife of low or limited mobility that would otherwise be injured or killed from Project-related activities. Movement of wildlife out of harm's way should be limited to only those individuals that would otherwise be injured or killed, and individuals should be moved only as far as necessary to ensure their safety (i.e., CDFW does not recommend relocation to other areas). It should be noted that the temporary relocation of onsite wildlife does not constitute effective mitigation for habitat loss.
7. *Translocation of Species*: CDFW generally does not support the use of relocation, salvage, and/or transplantation as the sole mitigation for impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered species as these efforts are generally experimental in nature and largely unsuccessful.

The EIR should incorporate mitigation performance standards that would ensure that impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures proposed in the EIR should be made a condition of approval of the Project. Please note that obtaining a permit from CDFW by itself with no other mitigation proposal may constitute mitigation deferral. CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4, subdivision (a)(1)(B) states that formulation of mitigation measures should not be deferred until some future time. To avoid deferring mitigation in this way, the EIR should describe avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures that would be implemented should the impact occur.

California Endangered Species Act

CDFW is responsible for ensuring appropriate conservation of fish and wildlife resources including threatened, endangered, and/or candidate plant and animal species, pursuant to the CESA. CDFW recommends that a CESA Incidental Take

Coyote Creek Agrivoltaic Ranch Project

Date

Page 9 of 15

Permit (ITP) be obtained if the Project has the potential to result in “take” (Fish & G. Code § 86 defines “take” as “hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill”) of State-listed CESA species, either through construction or over the life of the Project.

CESA-listed species with the potential to occur in the area include but are not limited to: Swainson’s hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) and tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*).

The EIR should disclose the potential of the Project to take CESA-listed species and how the impacts will be avoided, minimized, and mitigated. Please note that mitigation measures that are adequate to reduce impacts to a less-than significant level to meet CEQA requirements may not be enough for the issuance of an ITP. To issue an ITP, CDFW must demonstrate that the impacts of the authorized take will be minimized and fully mitigated (Fish & G. Code §2081 (b)). To facilitate the issuance of an ITP, if applicable, CDFW recommends the EIR include measures to minimize and fully mitigate the impacts to any State-listed species the Project has potential to take. CDFW encourages early consultation with staff to determine appropriate measures to facilitate future permitting processes and to engage with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and/or National Marine Fisheries Service to coordinate specific measures if both state and federally listed species may be present within the Project vicinity.

South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP)

The Project is within the boundaries of the SSCHP. CEQA Guidelines section 15125(d) states that EIRs must discuss any inconsistencies between projects and applicable plans (including habitat conservation plans/natural community conservation plans). Because the SSHCP is currently in implementation, CDFW recommends that the EIR include a discussion of each Project alternative’s consistency with the SSHCP and how Sacramento County will ensure that implementation of the Project alternatives do not impede the SSHCP’s ability to meet its permit conditions and biological goals and measurable objectives. Particular focus in the EIR’s analysis should be directed to:

- Analysis of all SSHCP Covered Species.
- Assessment of habitat types identified in the SSCHP.
- Identification of applicable SSHCP avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures.
- Analysis of any impacts to land commitments of the SSHCP.
- Discussion of any inconsistencies between the Project and the SSHCP.

To identify any potential inconsistencies with the SSHCP and provide special emphasis on rare or unique resources in compliance with CEQA, CDFW recommends that the EIR also address the following:

- Persistence of the SSCHP Covered Species with the SSHCP boundaries.
- Impacts to established or future reserve land managed under South Sacramento Conservation Agency (SSCA).

Coyote Creek Agrivoltaic Ranch Project

Date

Page 10 of 15

- Reduction of available reserve land in the SSHCP (with appropriate buffers and setbacks as detailed in the SSHCP).
- Financial impacts to SSCA and fee payers under the SSHCP.

Native Plant Protection Act

The Native Plant Protection Act (Fish & G. Code §1900 *et seq.*) prohibits the take or possession of State-listed rare and endangered plants, including any part or product thereof, unless authorized by CDFW or in certain limited circumstances. Take of State-listed rare and/or endangered plants due to Project activities may only be permitted through an ITP or other authorization issued by CDFW pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 14, section 786.9 subdivision (b).

Lake and Streambed Alteration Program

The EIR should identify all perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral rivers, streams, lakes, other hydrologically connected aquatic features, and any associated biological resources/habitats present within the entire Project footprint (including utilities, access and staging areas). The environmental document should analyze all potential temporary, permanent, direct, indirect and/or cumulative impacts to the above-mentioned features and associated biological resources/habitats that may occur because of the Project. If it is determined the Project will result in significant impacts to these resources the EIR shall propose appropriate avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code requires an entity to notify CDFW prior to commencing any activity that may do one or more of the following: substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of any river, stream or lake; substantially change or use any material from the bed, channel or bank of any river, stream, or lake; or deposit debris, waste or other materials that could pass into any river, stream or lake. Please note that "any river, stream or lake" includes those that are episodic (i.e., those that are dry for periods of time) as well as those that are perennial (i.e., those that flow year-round). This includes ephemeral streams and watercourses with a subsurface flow. It may also apply to work undertaken within the flood plain of a body of water.

If CDFW determines that the Project activities may substantially adversely affect an existing fish or wildlife resource, a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement will be issued which will include reasonable measures necessary to protect the resource. CDFW's issuance of an LSA Agreement is a "project" subject to CEQA (see Pub. Resources Code 21065). To facilitate issuance of an LSA Agreement, if one is necessary, the EIR should fully identify the potential impacts to the lake, stream, or riparian resources, and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, and monitoring and reporting commitments. Early consultation with CDFW is recommended, since modification of the Project may avoid or reduce impacts to fish and wildlife resources. To submit an LSA Notification package, please go to

<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Environmental-Review/LSA>.

Coyote Creek Agrivoltaic Ranch Project

Date

Page 11 of 15

Please note that other agencies may use specific methods and definitions to determine impacts to areas subject to their authorities. These methods and definitions often do not include all needed information for CDFW to determine the extent of fish and wildlife resources affected by activities subject to Notification under Fish and Game Code section 1602. Therefore, CDFW does not recommend relying solely on methods developed specifically for delineating areas subject to other agencies' jurisdiction (such as United States Army Corps of Engineers) when mapping lakes, streams, wetlands, floodplains, riparian areas, etc. in preparation for submitting a Notification of an LSA.

CDFW relies on the lead agency environmental document analysis when acting as a responsible agency issuing an LSA Agreement. CDFW recommends lead agencies coordinate with us as early as possible, since potential modification of the proposed Project may avoid or reduce impacts to fish and wildlife resources and expedite the Project approval process.

The following information will be required for the processing of an LSA Notification and CDFW recommends incorporating this information into any forthcoming CEQA document(s) to avoid subsequent documentation and Project delays:

1. Mapping and quantification of lakes, streams, and associated fish and wildlife habitat (e.g., riparian habitat, freshwater wetlands, etc.) that will be temporarily and/or permanently impacted by the Project, including impacts from access and staging areas. Please include an estimate of impact to each habitat type.
2. Discussion of specific avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures to reduce Project impacts to fish and wildlife resources to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to section 15370 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Based on review of Project materials, aerial photography and observation of the site from public roadways, the Project site supports unnamed tributaries to the Cosumnes River and its associated riparian habitat. CDFW recommends that the EIR fully identify the Project's potential impacts to the stream and/or its associated vegetation and wetlands.

General Avian, Bat, and other Wildlife Impacts

The EIR should evaluate the cumulative effects of loss of habitat as an indirect cause of avian mortality for grassland birds. Breeding Bird Surveys (BBS) conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey Biological Resources Division and volunteers throughout the country show that grassland birds, as a group, have declined more than other groups, such as forest and wetland birds (Brennan and Kuvlesky 2005; NRCS 1999). The BBS shows that in California, grassland birds such as the western meadowlark (*Sturnella neglecta*), and State Species of Special Concern the burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), have shown population declines since 1966 (Sauer et al., 2019). CDFW recommends at a minimum an equal amount of land with primary purpose of habitat conservation should be enhanced and conserved elsewhere to offset the loss of habitat for grassland birds.

Coyote Creek Agrivoltaic Ranch Project

Date

Page 12 of 15

In addition, the EIR should evaluate threats to bird from collisions and electrocutions with solar infrastructure. Collisions with PV equipment can include direct collisions into panels, guy wires, or transmission lines. Injuries from collisions with collectors/reflectors may result in acute and direct take (Kagan et al. 2014), or stranding. Stranding can occur when an individual is injured by collision impact and is unable to take off or when they require a running start on the water's surface. The EIR should include measures to reduce the risks of avian collisions such as adding special patterns to the PV panels. Linear features such as generator-tie lines, collector lines, and interior and perimeter fences all present collision hazards for birds, and electric lines present a potential electrocution hazard (Huso, et al. 2016). All aboveground lines should be fitted with bird flight diverters or visibility enhancement devices. When lines, or other related infrastructure with the potential to cause take, cannot be placed underground, appropriate avian protection designs should be employed. As a minimum requirement, the collection system should conform with the most current edition of the Avian Power Line Interaction Committee guidelines to prevent electrocutions, found at: <https://www.aplic.org/mission>.

The EIR should include a requirement for weekly or twice-weekly avian mortality surveys to meet the following objectives:

- Estimate the total number of birds and bats killed at the Project site within a specified time period.
- Determine whether there are spatial or temporal/seasonal patterns of total bird fatality.
- Evaluate species composition and which taxonomic groups may be at risk.
- Provide results that allow comparisons with other solar sites and to evaluate changes in fatality due to adaptive management.

The EIR should include a requirement to develop an Avian and Bat Protection Plan or Bird and Bat Conservation Strategy (BBCS) in coordination with the USFWS and CDFW. The purpose of the BBCS is to:

- Describe baseline conditions for bird and bat species present within the Project site, and adjacent areas where influenced by the Project, including results of site-specific surveys.
- Assess potential risk to birds and bats based on the proposed activities.
- Specify conservation measures that will be employed to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate any potential adverse effects to these species.
- Describe the incidental monitoring and reporting that will take place during construction.
- Provide details for post-construction monitoring.
- Specify the adaptive management process that will be used to address potential adverse effects on avian and bat species.

Coyote Creek Agrivoltaic Ranch Project

Date

Page 13 of 15

Permanent Fencing

CDFW recommends the EIR discuss and analyze impacts to wildlife associated with permanent fencing which may be installed around the solar facility. For example, a fence can obstruct the natural migration and daily movements of wildlife such as deer and the consequences of disrupting these movements should be considered in fencing design (VerCauteren *et al.* 2006). In addition, deer occasionally become entangled in fences or collide with them when attempting to pass over, through, or under (Goddard *et al.* 2001). Some fences, especially wire mesh, can be a complete barrier to fawns, even if adults can still jump over. This can lead to fawns becoming separated from their mothers and the herd resulting in the fawns killed by predators, vehicle collisions, or starvation (Hanophy 2009).

Birds can also collide with fences, breaking wings and tangling in wires. Large, low-flying birds such as ducks, geese, hawks, and owls are especially vulnerable to collisions with fencing. For example, the American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*) and low-flying hawks and owls may collide with fences when swooping in on prey (Bryant *et al.* 1993). Fencing can be made more visible to birds by attaching reflective or colorful weather-resistant flagging materials (e.g., aluminum or plastic strips) to the wire.

Fences made of chain-link material may exclude small mammals, amphibians, and reptiles. Providing a small gap between the fencing and the ground can allow animals to pass through without being blocked from entry into the solar arrays.

The EIR should analyze the potential impacts to birds and mammals caused by the proposed fencing and describe alternative wildlife-friendly designs that will be implemented. The EIR should also include effective minimization and mitigation measures to offset any impacts of fencing to wildlife species that cannot feasibly be completely avoided.

CHEMICAL USE

Rodenticides that control small mammal populations would also reduce available burrows, making the habitat no longer suitable for burrowing owl and other sensitive wildlife species. Lack of underground refugia could result in increase exposure to predators, heat, and other elements. As such, CDFW recommends the project avoid use of chemical rodenticides.

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 CNDDDB. The CNDDDB field survey form can be found at the following link:

<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Submitting-Data>. The completed form can be

Coyote Creek Agrivoltaic Ranch Project

Date

Page 14 of 15

submitted online or mailed electronically to CNDDDB at the following email address:

CNDDDB@wildlife.ca.gov.

FILING FEES

The Project, as proposed, would have an effect on fish and wildlife, and assessment of 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 fee is required in order for the underlying project approval to be operative, vested, and final. (Cal. Code Regs, tit. 14, § 753.5; Fish & G. Code § 711.4; Pub. Resources Code, § 21089.)

CONCLUSION

Pursuant to Public Resources Code sections 21092 and 21092.2, CDFW requests written notification of proposed actions and pending decisions regarding the Project. Written notifications shall be directed to: California Department of Fish and Wildlife North Central Region, 1701 Nimbus Road, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670.

CDFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation of the EIR for the Coyote Creek Agrivoltaic Ranch Project and recommends that Sacramento County address CDFW's comments and concerns in the forthcoming EIR. CDFW personnel are available for consultation regarding biological resources and strategies to minimize impacts.

If you have any questions regarding the comments provided in this letter or wish to schedule a meeting and/or site visit, please contact Dylan Wood, Environmental Scientist at (916) 358-2384 or dylan.a.wood@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

FB2E6AEEDBDE458...

Kelley Barker
Environmental Program Manager

ec: Tanya Sheya, Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisory)
Dylan Wood, Environmental Scientist
CEQACommentLetters
Department of Fish and Wildlife

Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse, Sacramento

Coyote Creek Agrivoltaic Ranch Project

Date

Page 15 of 15

Literature Cited

- Brennan, L., & Kuvlesky, W. (2005). North American grassland birds: an unfolding conservation crisis? *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 69(1), 1-13.
- Bryant, L. D., J. W. Thomas, and M. M. Rowland. 1993. Techniques to construct New Zealand elk-proof fence. United States Department of Agriculture, General Technical Report PNW-GTR-313, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, Oregon, USA.
- Hanophy, W. 2009. Fencing with Wildlife in Mind. Colorado Division of Wildlife, Denver, CO
- Huso, M., Dietsch, T., & Nicolai, C. (2016). *Mortality monitoring design for utility-scale solar power facilities* (No. 2016-1087). US Geological Survey.
- Kagan, R., Viner, T., Trail, P., & Espinoza, E. (2014). Avian mortality at solar energy facilities in southern California: a preliminary analysis. *National Fish and Wildlife Forensics Laboratory*, 28, 1-28.
- Laredo, I., D. Van Vuren, and M. L. Morrison. 1996. Habitat use and migration behavior of the California tiger salamander. *Journal of Herpetology* 30:282–285.
- NRCS. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Natural Resources Conservation Service. October 1999. Grassland Nesting Birds. Fish and Wildlife Habitat Management Leaflet Number 8.
- Sauer, J., Niven, D., Hines, J., Ziolkowski, D., Pardieck, K., Fallon, J., & Link, W. (2019). The North American breeding bird survey, results and analysis 1966–2019. Version 2.07. 2019. *US Geological Survey Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Laurel, Maryland, USA.*
- Sawyer, J. O., T. Keeler-Wolf, and J. M. Evens. 2009. A Manual of California Vegetation, 2nd ed. California Native Plant Society Press, Sacramento, California. <http://vegetation.cnps.org/>
- VerCauteren, Kurt C.; Lavelle, Michael J.; and Hygnstrom, Scott, "Fences and Deer-Damage Management: A Review of Designs and Efficacy" (2006). USDA National Wildlife Research Center - Staff Publications. 99. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/icwdm_usdanwrc/99