

From: Amy Dempsey <[REDACTED]>
To: "jeffrey E." <jeevacation@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: GSJ Permit
Date: Thu, 22 Dec 2016 14:55:40 +0000

Agreed.

Amy Claire Dempsey, M.A.
President, Bioimpact, Inc.
P.O. Box 132 Kingshill
St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands 00851

[REDACTED] Fax [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], [REDACTED]

On Thu, Dec 22, 2016 at 10:05 AM, jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:
xmas cove is for staff and guests and deliveries. trucks fuel. mainentence . security. cant protect this side without it.

On Thu, Dec 22, 2016 at 9:02 AM, Amy Dempsey <[REDACTED]> wrote:
First:

The barge landing proposed has almost negligible impact and the federal agencies really liked it.

As to the Chrstmas Cove dock, it is the most protected of all the docks far more so than the LSJ site as far as most common wave approach. It is protected by STT, Cow and Calf, the small off shore cay and all the other rocks out there. JP has not taken a lot of time to look at it and probably was just shooting from hip. I have attached a drawing showing the only wave approach that would directly effect the site. And we can pull the HINDCAST buoy data and show how infrequently it occurs.

I should sit down with JP and go through all the proposed locations and the impacts and designs of each and why they are the way they are to address impacts. The federal agencies liked all the locations chosen. Theyre concern was as his, why two access docks.

Amy Claire Dempsey, M.A.
President, Bioimpact, Inc.
[REDACTED] Box 132 Kingshill
St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands 00851

[REDACTED] Fax [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], [REDACTED]

On Wed, Dec 21, 2016 at 10:13 PM, John P. Woods <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Good Evening,

I met with J.P. Oriol yesterday to discuss the drawings that we will be submitting to in essence replace the unexecuted permit that will ultimately serve as a "master plan" for the island. We discussed what needs to be included in the drawings and I came away with the following points:

1. A helipad, by VI Code Title 29 Section 226, paragraph (h) requires a helipad to be approved by DPNR, Public Works, VI Port Authority, and the VI Legislature. It is my understanding we are not asking for a helipad, but a concrete pad/terrace that may be used as a landing site. J.P. feels we should apply for this

site separately as it could hold up the rest of the scope. What I feel we need to do is state clearly in the description of the pad it is not a helipad. We should further state that in the future it may be used as a landing site, at which time we will apply for all "necessary" permits. Of course we don't believe any other special permit is required other than a determination that a rook is not within 1000 feet of the site. I strongly recommend Amy do that study now to make that determination.

2. Access on to the island is important to define now. J.P. seems to feel the existing dock site should remain and supplement it with the dock across from LSJ. He has concerns about the dock in Christmas Cove and the temporary barge landing regarding their ability to withstand Winter swells on the Western side of the island. He also feels the barge landing should be incorporated into one of the dock sites as it is on LSJ. Amy has already said the ACOE does not like the existing dock site, so that is out. The marine facilities on the western side will need to evaluate wave activity throughout the year to validate the western sites. We don't have to show these access points at this stage, but they should be seriously considered as it relates to where we are placing structures like storage and maintenance sheds.

3. DPNR will likely stand by their interpretation of the height of the flagpoles. We will need to apply for a variance from BLUA to try and get the height waived. Erika, let's work on that. I think the basis should be the inconsistency I referenced in my earlier correspondence to the Commissioner.

4. I have defined the work scope into two phases. The first phase deals with cleanup, stabilization of existing driveways, landscaping, flagpoles, concrete pads, and new driveways. Phase 2 consists of structures such as residential cottages, pools, and storage buildings. We are doing that separation because we don't have enough definition on the buildings to get them fully permitted. We would also need complete plans, elevations, and sections. We can, however, get them approved conceptually with special conditions that will require us to submit more complete drawings when we are ready to construct those buildings.

5. We can request this new scope replace the scope of the unexecuted permit. This will save a lot of time, if they accept it. The inclusion of new driveways will be the impetus to request modifying the limitations on types of equipment that can be used.

I intend to make the submission over the next days, depending upon the VI Gov. holiday schedule. Once approved, modifications and additions to the scope will be easier to receive and take less time than acquiring multiple CZM permits.

JPW

Sent from my iPhone

--

please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of

JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com, and

destroy this communication and all copies thereof,
including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved