

Wayland, Joshua

From: Keller, Kevin <Kevin.Keller@hdrinc.com>
Sent: Monday, May 06, 2019 6:35 PM
To: Wayland, Joshua
Cc: Perkins, Michael; Nichols, Karen; 10145616_7CountyCoalitionUBR TO1; Hemphill, Mark; mmckee; Brian Barton; Jenna Jorgensen
Subject: RE: UBRY - biological resources methodology- revised---USE THIS VERSION
Attachments: UBRYBiological Resources Methodology revised 0503019.docx

Hi Josh,

Attached is our revised biological resources methodology (in track changes mode) in response to your comments below. Please let us know if you need anything else. We'll submit a "final" version of this to you if acceptable.

Kevin

Kevin Keller, PG
 D 816.347.1183 M 913.638.2571

hdrinc.com/follow-us

From: Wayland, Joshua [mailto:Joshua.Wayland@stb.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 2, 2019 9:10 AM
To: Keller, Kevin <Kevin.Keller@hdrinc.com>
Subject: RE: UBRY - biological resources methodology- revised---USE THIS VERSION

Kevin,

We are generally comfortable with the revised biological resources methodology. However, as we noted in the previous draft, we are requesting that you provide a specific definition of "other special status species" as used in the document. Can you please confirm whether other special status species include all Wildlife Species of Concern listed by the State of Utah and all BLM-listed sensitive species, or a subset of those lists? We would also like clarification on whether Bald and Golden eagles are included in that term.

Also, the revised document states on page that biological resource characterization would be based on NWI and waterbody data, among other data. Please revise this language to clarify what the specific datasets the referenced waterbody data could include.

Thank you, Kevin. Please feel free to reach out to me with any questions or concerns.

Best,
 Josh

Joshua Wayland, PhD
 Environmental Protection Specialist
 Office of Environmental Analysis
 Surface Transportation Board
 202.245.0330

From: Keller, Kevin <Kevin.Keller@hdrinc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2019 7:45 AM
To: Wayland, Joshua <Joshua.Wayland@stb.gov>
Cc: Klaumann, Anthony <Anthony.Klaumann@hdrinc.com>; 10145616_7CountyCoalitionUBR TO1 <10145616_7CountyCoalitionUBRTO1@hdrinc.com>; Coalition UBRY <coalition_UBRY@jonesanddemille.com>; Hemphill, Mark <Mark.Hemphill@hdrinc.com>; Floyd, Kathryn K. <KKFloyd@Venable.com>; mmckee <mmckee@7county.utah.gov>; Jenna Jorgensen <jenna.j@jonesanddemille.com>; Nichols, Karen <Karen.Nichols@hdrinc.com>; Perkins, Michael <Michael.Perkins@hdrinc.com>
Subject: UBRY - biological resources methodology- revised---USE THIS VERSION

Josh,

Attached is the revised biological resources methodology. Let us know if you have any questions.

Kevin

Kevin Keller, PG
D 816.347.1183 M 913.638.2571

hdrinc.com/follow-us



Uinta Basin Railway: Proposed ~~Draft~~ Reconnaissance-Level Biological Resources Field Methodology

Background

This plan outlines the proposed methodology for the collection of the baseline (existing condition) biological resources reconnaissance data for the three proposed railway routes (Indian Canyon, Wells Draw, and Craig) identified by Seven County Infrastructure Coalition (Coalition) for the proposed Uinta Basin Railway.

The Surface Transportation Board (STB) will be the lead agency to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The reconnaissance work that would be conducted under this plan will support additional biological surveys for the three proposed routes and any additional alternative identified during the NEPA scoping process, if required, for the analysis in the EIS.

HDR plans to conduct reconnaissance-level field surveys for biological resources along the three proposed routes, see Figure 1, within the 2000-foot route corridor. In consultation with the STB, HDR and the Coalition determined that the proposed routes would occur within a 2000-foot corridor, designated as 1000-feet on each side of the nominal centerline of the railway, and that width would be appropriate at this time due to the current level of engineering analysis. As more detailed engineering analyses (including aerial photogrammetry, geotechnical investigations and tunnel evaluations) occur, it is anticipated the railway route centerline may shift within this designated 2000-foot wide corridor. If for some reason, the more detailed engineering design requires placing the railway route centerline inclusive of its permanent embankment, cut, drainage structures or other permanent features, outside of the 2000-foot wide corridor, then additional field resources will be mobilized to study the added route corridor width.

Based on the February 15, 2019, railway routes developed by the Coalition, the total route mileage for all three proposed routes is about 370 miles; however, there is an estimated 310 unique miles, after deducting overlapping route segments and deducting for potential reuse of the existing DPR rail corridor on one or more of the routes. Current engineering analysis indicates the new railway would tie directly to and use the existing DPR railroad infrastructure, with no modifications to the DPR railroad embankment or waterway crossings required.

The reconnaissance-level field surveys for biological resources will be conducted concurrently with surveys to delineate wetlands and other aquatic resources. Review of available data, coordination with resource agencies and Federal land managers, and scoping comments from the EIS will help guide biological surveys for the project. Available data sources include:

- GAP/LANDFIRE National Terrestrial Ecosystems data set
- NatureServe
- eBird
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service


Commented [PM1]: Do we want to update this based on date of updated route corridors?



- o Environmental Conservation Online System-Information, Planning, and Conservation System (ECOS-IPaC)
- o Endangered Species Database
- o Utah Field Office Website
- Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
- Colorado Parks and Wildlife
- Utah Natural Heritage Program
- Colorado Natural Heritage Program

The data collected under this methodology is not intended to ~~sufficiently identify or evaluate suitable habitat for federal and non-federal~~ special status species ~~suitable habitat~~. ~~In this document, special status species refer to species federally classified threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species, bald and golden eagles, and other special status species identified for the project through the scoping process. Other special status species that might be identified through the scoping process may include a subset of Wildlife Species of Concern listed by the State of Utah and BLM-listed sensitive species.~~ ~~In this document, special status species refer to species federally classified threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species, and other special status species identified for the project.~~ ~~As~~ ~~As federal and non-federal~~ special status species are identified through the scoping process, ~~separate~~ habitat suitability surveys ~~and species protocol surveys~~, ~~in coordination and cooperation with the resource agencies~~, will be developed and implemented ~~as determined applicable and in coordination and cooperation with the resource agencies~~.

Figure 1. Proposed Route Alignments



Reconnaissance-level Methodology for Biological Resources

HDR proposes to conduct field work to characterize biological resources for the three proposed routes, as shown in Figure 1, above, pending property access permissions. If property access is not granted, biological resource characterization will be based on existing available GAP/Landfire National Terrestrial Ecosystems data, NWI data, -and-waterbody-National Hydrography Dataset, data- and aerial imagery.-The field work entails reconnaissance-level surveys to characterize general vegetation communities. The results of these surveys are not intended to sufficiently identify or evaluate suitable habitat for special status species, but in some instances they may be helpful for -and-to-help-assess-habitat-suitability-for special-status species assessmentsin the route survey corridors. In this document, special-status species refer to species federally classified threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species, and other special status species identified for the project.

Reconnaissance-level Survey Methods

Reconnaissance-level surveys to characterize general vegetation communities ~~and assess habitat suitability for special status species identified in the project corridors~~ will occur in concert with efforts to delineate wetlands and other aquatic resources in the project corridors.

Biologists will survey the project corridors stopping every 300 meters to take site photos in the four cardinal directions and recording vegetation at the site, noting the percentages of the dominant plant species. Biologists may map the boundaries of distinct vegetation communities along the route and will stop to take photos and record vegetation communities if there is noticeable change between the 300 meter intervals. If a given interval location is inaccessible, a nearby representative location will be selected. A combination of desktop and on-site mapping will be used to generate general vegetation community maps for the project corridors.

Biologists will also record wildlife observation points for species that could be identified as special status species for the project through the scoping process. Similarly, biologists will record evaluate whether habitat observation points if portions of the project corridors are identified as areas that might provide suitable habitat for potential special ~~-status~~. Potential special status species considered for these observations will be -species identified- through available data review and agency coordination. Available data sources include:

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
 - o Environmental Conservation Online System-Information, Planning, and Conservation System (ECOS-IPaC)
 - o Endangered Species Database
 - o Utah Field Office Website
- Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
- U.S. Forest Service
- Bureau of Land Management
- Colorado Parks and Wildlife
- Utah Natural Heritage Program
- Colorado Natural Heritage Program

~~Through desktop review including GIS analysis, HDR will preliminarily identify areas within project corridors that might provide suitable habitat for special status species.~~ Table 1 provides a summary of federally threatened, endangered, or candidate species identified by ECOS-IPaC website as federally listed species that could possibly occurring in project corridors or otherwise be affected by the project.

Table 1. Federal Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate Species Possibly Occurring in Project Corridors

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	Project Corridor		
			Indian Canyon	Craig	Wells Draw
Birds					
Mexican Spotted Owl	<i>Strix occidentalis lucida</i>	Threatened	X	X	X
Western yellow-billed cuckoo	<i>Coccyzus americanus</i>	Threatened	X	X	X
Fish					
Bonytail Chub	<i>Gila elegans</i>	Endangered	X	X	X
Colorado Pikeminnow	<i>Ptychocheilus lucius</i>	Endangered	X	X	X
Humpback Chub	<i>Gila cypha</i>	Endangered	X	X	X
June Sucker	<i>Chasmistes liorus</i>	Endangered	X		X
Razorback Sucker	<i>Xyrauchen texanus</i>	Endangered	X	X	X
Mammals					
Black-footed Ferret	<i>Mustela nigripes</i>	Experimental		X	
Canada lynx	<i>Lynx canadensis</i>	Threatened	X	X	X
Plants					
Barneby Ridge-cress	<i>Lepidium barnebyanum</i>	Endangered	X		X
Clay Phacelia	<i>Phacelia argillacea</i>	Endangered	X		X
Jones Cycladenia	<i>Cycladenia humilis</i> var. <i>jonesii</i>	Threatened	X		X
Pariette Cactus	<i>Sclerocactus brevispinus</i>	Threatened	X	X	X
Uinta Basin Hookless Cactus	<i>Sclerocactus wetlandicus</i>	Threatened	X	X	X
Ute ladies'-tresses	<i>Spiranthes diluvialis</i>	Threatened	X	X	X

Source: USFWS ECOS-IPaC website, accessed 4/2/19

Certain species may be eliminated from further consideration without reconnaissance-level surveys because ECOS-IPaC queries and other data sources generally list species for each county. For example, June sucker is included by ECOS-IPaC for the Indian Canyon and Wells Draw project corridors because portions of these project corridors are located within Utah County. However, June sucker is endemic to Utah Lake, which is located over 40 miles west of the western terminus of the Indian Canyon route corridor and it does not share any drainage basins with project corridors. However, suitable habitat boundaries for special-status species will not be evaluated in the field, under this methodology, because special status species distribution have not been evaluated and determined by resource agencies. Biologists will evaluate and document vegetation communities during field surveys for future reference.



Biologists will also record the location of observations such as potential raptor nests and special status species.

Based on the planned schedule to begin reconnaissance-level surveys with delineation fieldwork in April 2019, HDR recognizes that additional information might be provided after surveys begin, including agency comments and guidance pertaining to special status species considerations for the project. Portions of project corridors affected by such changes would likely need to be revisited by biologists to complete habitat suitability evaluations.

Field Data Collection

Biologists will collect field data during reconnaissance-level surveys using an iPad that is linked to a global positioning system (GPS) unit with sub-meter accuracy. A customized application will enable review of base maps, habitat and vegetation community layers, and collection of points, lines, and polygons integrated with site photos. The following data dictionary will be employed for data collection points:

- 300-meter interval
 - o Interval ID
 - o Vegetation community based on GAP/Landfire National Terrestrial Ecosystems data set
 - o Confirm / Revise community polygon
 - o Select dominant species
 - Select cover categories
 - o Photos (four cardinal directions)
 - o Notes
- Additional Vegetation Community Point
 - o Select vegetation community
 - o Confirm / Revise community polygon
 - o Select dominant species
 - Select cover categories
 - o Photos
 - o Notes
- Habitat Suitability (potential special status species)
 - o Select species
 - Review suitability criteria
 - o Site suitable? (Yes/No)
 - o Photos
 - o Notes
 - explain why/why not suitable
 - describe extent / map edits