

From: LarryEvans@bcpeabody.com
To: FOIA Exemption (b)(6) SAJ
Cc: jcoll@caribe.net; yousevgr@yahoo.com; andrewgoetz@bcpeabody.com; johannawillis@bcpeabody.com; johnhall@bcpeabody.com; KenCaraccia@bcpeabody.com; Daniel Pagan; FOIA Exemption (b)(6) SAJ
Subject: re: Via Verde: Recap of first 8 field visits on functional assessments. (UNCLASSIFIED)
Date: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 2:35:20 PM
Importance: High

Thank you FOIA Exe!

1 a. We will agree to take those measures we discussed with you to prevent most, if not all, of the secondary impacts, i.e. fenced/locked gates at intersections, etc.

b. Understand and we look forward to your final assessment and an opportunity to discuss measures we can take to minimize secondary impacts.

c - e. It appears from your email that post construction actions should bring conditions back to pre-construction so, perhaps, no offsite mitigation may be required

2. Understand

3. In wetland areas it is PREPA's position that the temporary construction corridor will be 60-foot wide. This corridor would incorporate the width of the trench, the width of the two temporary spoil piles (one being the upper, hydric soil and the second being the lower, parent material that will be put back into the trench first). It is PREPA's intent to ensure a minimum of 1-foot of hydric soil is placed back into the upper zone of the backfilled trench. All remaining, displaced material will be removed and disposed of in an approved upland location. Pre-construction elevations/contours will be restored within this 60-foot construction zone. It is possible, based on contractors assessment of safety requirements for workers, that some vehicular traffic may take place immediately outside of this construction zone but this traffic will NOT involve the placement of fill. We anticipate equipment to be used will incorporate ballooned-tires and/or mats so equipment can operate on the existing substrate if necessary. The intent is to stay within the 60-foot zone at wherever possible. I will confirm with Yousev that the construction alignment drawings depict the proper width of this zone in the wetland areas (similar to those areas in uplands where PREPA has agreed to incorporate a narrower zone, i.e. the Manati-northern karst areas).

4. You are correct, PREPA does not intend to conduct post construction maintenance of surface vegetation within the wetland areas. Once the pipe is in place, the wetland vegetation will be re-established and allowed to grow back to its original condition (height, etc.) The 50-foot maintenance RoW in upland areas is meant to prevent the return of large, deep rooted trees as a safety measure for pipe integrity.

Lawrence C. Evans
503.781.7930 (cell)
larryevans@bcpeabody.com
iyutka53@aol.com

From: FOIA Exemption (b)(6) SAJ" FOIA Exemption (b)(6)@usace.army.mil>
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 1:50 PM
To: LarryEvans@bcpeabody.com
Subject: Via Verde: Recap of first 8 field visits on functional assessments. (UNCLASSIFIED)

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?

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