Gutierrez, Raul

From: Holland, Patti <patti_holland@fws.gov>
Sent: Friday, May 10, 2013 3:45 PM
To: Breaux, Brian W MVN; Gutierrez, Raul; Kyle Balkum
Subject: Ponderosa Ranch Final

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Brian,

I reviewed the Final MBI and I see that Daniel has added some more twists and turns.

There are two significant revisions that perhaps warrant an IRT phone discussion.

Those are:

1. Revision to omit the drop pipes and go with taller trees in the swales - This will provide them with more upfront credit in that they will not have to wait until the pipes are removed to get the hydrology benefits. Personally, I'm okay with omitting the structures, but it places more risk for seedling survival. My experience with RPM trees has not been good. They are not drought tolerant, and at the VKD Black Bayou Bank we had 100% mortality with RPMs. That said, drought may not be an issue if they are in the low end of the swales. My thoughts are to let them do this revision, but to monitor the site to see if they should get credit if the seedlings don't survive in the swales. They could always put the pipes in later if needed and we can adjust credit.

2. Spilt the site into two halves based on the ability to achieve benefits to hydrology - I can agree with Daniel's thinking to some degree, but would like to discuss this with the group so that we are all on the same page on this issue. If we do accept this proposal, he will need to revise Figure MWP-C1 to categorize the two areas as A and B because currently he has Areas 1-4 in Area 1. Too much overlap.

Another comment I have pertains to monitoring hydrology. The plan calls for piezometers, but doesn't state how many or where they would be located. I recommend that they place them at the sites identified as NRCS soil data points on Figure 10. There is already data for those sites, so it makes since to put them at those locations.

Other than these issues, I'm okay with the MBI.

Have a great weekend everyone. Patti