

**From:** FOIA Exemption (b)(6) SAJ  
**To:** "LarryEvans@bcpeabody.com"  
**Cc:** "Daniel Pagan"; FOIA Exemption (b)(6) SAJ  
**Subject:** Via Verde: Recap of first 8 field visits on functional assessments. (UNCLASSIFIED)  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 15, 2011 1:50:00 PM  
**Attachments:** F-WetlandCrossingTypical.pdf

---

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED  
Caveats: NONE

Larry,

1. This is my synopsis of the results of my meeting with and questioning of FOIA Exemption (b)(6) and FOIA Exemption (b)(6) representing the team. Of the 8 sites the team visited, I mentally break them into the following groups.

a. VV12 is in a "corridor" between two Karst areas and only moderate coverage of Venezuela grass but also include other desirable species. Current condition scores 0.7. The "with project" (simply backfill and revegetate on its own) would be 0.4. Implementing additional on-site measures would return the score to 0.6 (these include, among others, preventing off-road traffic introducing rutting and trash and regrading the backfill to remove mound or depression), therefore will possibly be some need for off-site compensation. They are going re-look at this latter score since it apparently included a presumption of seeding the area and yet I asked whether that is sufficient to enable the desirables to outcompete the invasives.

b. VV17, VV18, VV19 are ecologically connected to Cano Tiburones) and dominated by desirable species, the range in scores driven by differences in exotics along the fringe and proximity/access to other agricultural uses. Existing condition scores run from 0.8 to nearly 0.9, in other words, about as best as can get. The "with project" anticipates invasive undesirables to intrude so scoring from 0.3 to 0.5, but this also creates a corridor/path that introduce exotics to the vicinity. I've asked whether post-construction management would have to be much more intense than described in VV12 to prevent this. We are going to look at potential mitigation measures including looking at previous permits with successful mitigation.

c. VV14 is an active cattle pasture, current score 0.6 because of excellent landscape context but anticipate the "with project" to come back same.

d. VV25 & VV26 are Venezuela grass dominated, current score 0.5-0.7 but implementation of the additional on-site measures are anticipated to will bring score close to the current condition.

e. VV16 is dominated by sugar cane, a normally undesirable species yet was observed during the visit to be rich in wildlife utilization. Active active on-site measures will bring the site back to the existing condition, however I've asked the group to re-look at if measures sufficient out of concern whether exotic undesirables will come back instead of the sugar cane.

2. Based on the questions above and also because the team will be visiting additional sites and adjusting earlier scores so cascade appropriately, I am disinclined to share the team's draft scoresheets until revisions applied. I will have periodic updates as the team progresses, including the recap meeting on the 24th, and anticipate the final set of scoresheets shortly after the conclusion the following week.

3. The team asked me for confirmation on the width of the temporary construction work area. The permit application shows 100ft (enclosed) as well as the current profile sheets. Is this the basis they should proceed?

4. Your representative on the site visits understood the 50ft post-construction area will be mowed. I understood from our meetings that herbaceous wetland species will be left to grow (understanding no deep-rooted vegetation could be allowed). Is this correct?

FOIA Exemption (b)(6)

Regulatory Division FOIA Exemption (b)(6)

Please assist us in better serving you!  
Please complete the customer survey by  
clicking on the following link:

<http://per2.nwp.usace.army.mil/survey.html>

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED  
Caveats: NONE

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED  
Caveats: NONE