

Kenny, Ann

From: Abbasi, Ed
Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2001 1:14 PM
To: Kenny, Ann
Subject: RE: Processed Materials

Ann;
I reviewed these materials and, as we spoke earlier, I believe in case of the Top Soil if the supplier can certify its products as it meets the state requirements of 401 permit, that must be good enough. The port must, however, submit a copy of that certificate with their report. For Backfill Material and Fill Borrow Material, they may need to have some sort of QA/QC to insure that the material meets the criteria. I don't think the intent is to sample and test 100%, however, if they can come up with a reasonable statistical based sampling and QA/QC plan to insure meeting the criteria, with a reasonable certainty, that should be adequate. About the rest, like gravel and etc....., I don't think they need do anything, except if these materials are delivered by multiple suppliers. In that case we may require some screening among suppliers, and may be we can have them issue a certificate to identify quality, quantity, and point of origin of these materials. I hope this is adequate for you to respond to them.

About meeting and quick review of 401 permit, next week Tuesdays and Thursdays are looking good for me. Please let me know if these days work for you.

Thank you very much.

Ed Abbasi.

-----Original Message-----

From: Kenny, Ann
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2001 2:15 PM
To: Fitzpatrick, Kevin; Drabek, John; Abbasi, Ed
Cc: Hellwig, Raymond; Marchioro, Joan (ATG); Young, Tom (ATG)
Subject: FW: Processed Materials

For your evaluation from the Port re fill criteria.

Please review and get back to me with your comments and then we should set up a meeting with them to discuss.

Thanks.

Ann

-----Original Message-----

From: Leavitt, Elizabeth [mailto:leavitt.e@portseattle.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2001 2:00 PM
To: Kenny, Ann; Hellwig, Raymond
Cc: Clark, Beth; Agid, Paul; Walsh, Dave; Tom Walsh (E-mail); Thomson, Jim
Subject: FW: Processed Materials

Ann- This e-mail follows up the meeting we had a few weeks ago to begin discussions on which projects and types of materials the "fill criteria" condition of the 401 might apply to. As promised, attached are the specifications for the various types of fill that are commonly used, and

Ex. #449

will be spec'd for the embankment. We are proposing, for your consideration, that topsoil, utility backfill and base course not be subject to fill criteria, and that the bulk of the soils used, general embankment material, would be subject to testing/the condition. Generally speaking, the first three types of material are highly processed and graded as to size and shape (eg: have sharp angles that allow for important physical properties) , have a higher percentage of gravel and rock, and are used in far lesser quantity than the general embankment materials. The first three are also used in certain zones of the fill rather than overall in the embankment.

After you and your team have had a chance to review this, we can meet and advance the discussion further. Thanks

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Clark, Beth
> Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2001 12:05 PM
> To: Leavitt, Elizabeth
> Cc: Agid, Paul; Walsh, Dave
> Subject: Processed Materials

> Elizabeth,

> Attached are relevant portions of the specifications for various materials

> that do not clearly fall under Condition E of the 401. These include:

1)
> topsoil; (2) utility backfill; and (3) base course. Reviewing the specifications you see that these materials must meet very specific physical requirements for grain size, shape, strength, etc. These materials are typically purchased from commercial sites that have the capabilities to process the materials to the required specifications, and are used in much smaller volumes than the general embankment fill material. I have also included the general embankment fill borrow material specifications. These are the materials that will be used to construct the bulk of the Third Runway Embankment. These materials

are and will be reviewed for environmental suitability under the 401 certification. I should also note that these discussions regarding the utility backfill will in no way negate the proposed BMP requirements for utility corridors under Condition F.1.

> If it would be useful I would be glad to provide you with the complete copy of the specifications. Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

> Beth Clark

> <<TopSoilSpecifications.doc>> <<BaseCourseSpecifications.doc>>
> <<SpecificationsUtilities.doc>>
> <<GeneralEmbankmentSpecifications.doc>>

AR 022827