

UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

ROBERT BRACE,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.) Docket No.: 98-897L
)
 UNITED STATES,)
)
 Defendant,)

Pages: 600 through 897
Place: Washington, D.C.
Date: January 13, 2005

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Official Reporters
1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005-4018
(202) 628-4888
hrc@concentric.net



LAPP - DIRECT

610

1 out of the wetland area and discharge that into
2 unnamed tributary B.

3 And so what we had was you could put in a
4 plug in it. Basically they are no longer taking the
5 surface water out of that wetland system.

6 Q Now, what was the goal of this restoration
7 plan?

8 A The goal of this restoration plan was to
9 restore the hydrologic drive back to this wetland
10 system, and we used a target date of 1984. So it was
11 to remedy those activities which had occurred from
12 1984 onward.

13 Q And why back to 1984?

14 A The information, if I recall at the time
15 that the enforcement coordinator had was that the
16 activities had occurred in 1985 forward, and also
17 usually what we do is when we look for remedies is
18 like we use a five-year limit that we go back to and
19 try to get remedy for.

20 Q And in terms of the goal of the restoration
21 plan, what area of the property was intended to be
22 impacted, or in your opinion, would be impacted by the
23 restoration?

24 A The intent and in my opinion the extent of
25 impact of this restoration was solely on the 30-acre

LAPP - DIRECT

611

1 wetland tract.

2 Q Would it be possible for Mr. Brace to
3 approach the agency concerning modifying this
4 restoration plan?

5 A Certainly.

6 Q And under what circumstances or how would
7 that be likely to occur?

8 A If maybe there was need for relief in other
9 areas of the parcel or something like that outside
10 this 30 acres, you know, that would have been
11 something that we would work with Mr. Brace, you know,
12 to try to correct.

13 Q And does that remain true to this day?

14 In other words, if Mr. Brace felt that the
15 restoration was impacting more than the 30 acres,
16 could he approach the agency about modifying the
17 restoration plan?

18 A Certainly.

19 Q Now I want to talk for a moment about some
20 of the exemptions to the Clean Water Act, and in a
21 slightly different context than we have before.

22 But looking again at the Attachment A
23 restoration plan attached to the consent decree, I
24 notice a amoebic-like blank area in the center of the
25 Murphy farm parcel that does not contain hatch marks.

Heritage Reporting Corporation
(202) 628-4888