Gutierrez, Raul

From: Gutierrez, Raul
Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2014 11:26 AM
To: Breaux, Brian W MVN
Cc: Rick Hartman; Kelley Templet; Kyle Balkum; Holland, Patti
Subject: RE: FW: Ponderosa Ranch of Pointe Coupee Mitigation Bank- Revised As-built Report

Looks ok to me.

From: Holland, Patti [mailto:patti_holland@fws.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2014 4:44 PM
To: Breaux, Brian W MVN
Cc: Rick Hartman; Gutierrez, Raul; Kelley Templet; Kyle Balkum
Subject: Re: FW: Ponderosa Ranch of Pointe Coupee Mitigation Bank- Revised As-built Report

I'm good with the information they have provided. Thanks, patti

Patti Holland
Louisiana Ecological Services Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
337-291-3121

On Mon, Mar 3, 2014 at 8:36 AM, Breaux, Brian W MVN <Brian.W.Breaux@usace.army.mil> wrote:
ALL: Does the revised document satisfactorily address your comments/concerns?

Brian W. Breaux
CEMVN Regulatory Branch
Special Projects & Policy Team
(504) 862-1938
brian.w.breaux@usace.army.mil

-----Original Message-----
From: Daniel Bollich [mailto:daniel@deltaland-services.com]
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2014 5:44 PM
To: Breaux, Brian W MVN; George Guerin
Cc: Patti Holland; Gutierrez, Raul; 'Rick Hartman'; Kyle Balkum; 'Kelley Templet'
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Ponderosa Ranch of Pointe Coupee Mitigation Bank- Revised As-built Report

Brian: Thank you for providing us with the IRT and CEMVN comments. We have reviewed the comments and revised the As-built report where necessary in response. The attached document is the revised As-built (dated February 28, 2014). The following is a summary of changes made:

1. We have included a table with the total species and quantity (167,690). This was obtained from the logs utilized during the bare-root seedling mixing process described in Section III and the RPM delivery manifest. This is now Table 1 in the attached report therefore all other table numbers shifted accordingly with its

inclusion so there are nine tables as opposed to eight (i.e. previous table 1 is now table 2, previous table 2 is now table 3, etc.). Additionally, with the compilation of this list a correction was made to the first sentence of the first paragraph of Section III. Previously, the as-built reflected that 178,777 bare-root seedlings were purchased from various nurseries. Although this was the actual number of trees purchased, that number reflected the bare-root seedlings for the Ponderosa Mitigation Bank AND other sites which were planted this winter by DLS. The number of bare-root seedlings utilized specifically for the Ponderosa Mitigation Bank was 165,000. The number of RPM trees was correct (2,690). This has been corrected in the attached report.

2. The Crataegus species that was planted at the PRPCMB was not "Crataegus aestivalis" but was in fact "Crataegus opaca" as stated in the Mitigation Work Plan. The issue regarding the reporting of the species was an errant database entry within the field data collector utilized during the monitoring field effort. Specifically, the database reflected the species code for mayhaw as "Crataegus aestivalis" which is a mayhaw but a species not known to Louisiana according the USDA Plants Database. Given the results purported in the as-built were derived directly from the database, the report reflected "Crataegus aestivalis" when it should have been "Crataegus opaca". We have updated the as-built tables where appropriate as well as the database to correct this discrepancy. Therefore, removal of any species from the site should not be necessary. We do apologize for the error.

3. Regarding comment 1, the equilateral distance was in reference to the rows being constructed at a spacing for nine feet apart. The depth of each row was approximately 18 inches. We modified the questionable sentence in the As-built Report to provide the reader with greater clarity.

4. Regarding comments 3-11, we have adjusted the figures in question per the comments. These are in the attached report.

Given these changes, were respectfully request the release of credits and construction escrow funds per the February 6, 2014 request as the attached report should document that work has been completed in accordance with Section VI of the MWP. Regarding comments pertaining to future monitoring with regards to hydrology, we welcome the invitation to meet and discuss how this will progress given we are now entering the monitoring phase. We will touch base with you to work out scheduling. Thank you and have a great weekend.

Daniel Bollich, CWB, PWS, CF
Ecological Program Director
Delta Land Services, LLC
1090 Cinclare Dr.
Port Allen, LA 70767
Office: 225-388-5146
Mobile: 225-907-5903
Fax: 225-388-5212
Email: daniel@deltaland-services.com
www.deltaland-services.com

All information in this Communication, including attachments, is strictly confidential and intended solely for delivery to and authorized use by the addressee(s) identified above, and may contain privileged, confidential, proprietary and/or trade secret information entitled to protection and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, please take notice that any use, distribution or copying of this Communication, and/or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance upon it, is unauthorized and may be unlawful. If you have received this Communication in error, please notify the sender and delete this Communication from your computer.

-----Original Message-----
From: Breaux, Brian W MVN [mailto:Brian.W.Breaux@usace.army.mil]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 2:09 PM
To: Daniel Bollich; George Guerin
Cc: Patti Holland; Gutierrez, Raul; 'Rick Hartman'; Kyle Balkum; 'Kelley Templet'
Subject: Ponderosa Ranch: as-buit/request for credit and escrow release

Daniel:

We have reviewed the 'as-built' report (and request for credit and escrow release) provided by e-mail Feb 6, 2014. The information was provided to the principal IRT members (USFWS, EPA, LDWF) associated with the Ponderosa Ranch of Pointe Coupee Mitigation Bank for their consideration. Below are comments received in response:

USFWS: I have read through the document and everything appears to progressing along well. The plot data is good, but one thing that I did note is that they couldn't ID many of the oak species. That's understandable, but I'd like to have the actual numbers of tree composition that was planted as part of the report so that we can see what was put out there.

EPA: I have reviewed the Monitoring Report and have one comment. It seems as if they planted Crataegus aestivalis, which is not native to Louisiana and was not included on the list of proposed species in the final MBI, instead of the native and approved Crataegus opaca. As such, the EPA recommends that these be removed from the site. Until then, the EPA cannot support the granting of additional credit for this bank.

Additionally, we make the following comments and/or request clarification of certain aspects of the report:

1) Sec II. Was the "equilateral distance" referenced for the subsoiling at 9-foot intervals as implied in the sentence that followed?
2) Sec IV. We note that monitoring wells and piezometers were installed for data collection. We suggest that a meeting be scheduled sometime in the next several months to discuss the overall purpose and plan of this monitoring. As you are aware, we remain concerned regarding the degree of wetland hydrologic restoration that your proposed restoration plan can effectively accomplish. Additionally, we must consider the potential consequences that evapotranspiration will have on the long-term goals of forested wetland restoration/rehabilitation; forested systems are much more efficient at removing/displacing water than pasture.
3) Figure 8: Cross-sections E-F. The term 'proposed' is used in the drawing Legend key. If the work has been performed, then this term should be removed from the Legend key.
4) Figure 9: Cross-sections G-H. The pre- and post- sections are mislabeled as Cross-Section E-F; the legend shows a colored (green) cross-hatching not applied in the cross-section, and the term 'proposed' is used in the legend key.
5) Figure 10: Cross-sections I-J. The pre- and post- sections are mislabeled as Cross-Section E-F; and the term 'proposed' is used in the legend key.
6) Figure 11: Cross-sections K-L. The term 'proposed' is used in the legend key.
7) Figure 12: Cross-sections M-M'. The cross-section should include a key in the legend to denote the fill area and be applied to the section. If the work is completed, the "Note" should be rewritten to reflect this situation and not that the work 'will be' performed at some point 'after construction'.
8) Figure 13: Cross-sections N-N'. The cross-section should include a key in the legend to denote the fill area and be applied to the section.
9) Figure 14: Cross-sections O-O'. The cross-section should include a key in the legend to denote the fill area and be applied to the section.
10) Figure 15: Cross-sections P-P'. The cross-section should include a key in the legend to denote the fill area

and be applied to the section.
11) An "excavation" key should be included in the legend on all applicable cross-sections to denote the source of fill material and applied on the cross-section(s).

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Brian W. Breaux
CEMVN Regulatory Branch
Special Projects & Policy Team
(504) 862-1938
brian.w.breaux@usace.army.mil