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Abstract
The Federal Bureau of Prisons (Bureau) has prepared this Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to evaluate the environmental impacts of site acquisition and development of the proposed United States Penitentiary (USP) and Federal Prison Camp (FPC) in Letcher County, Kentucky. The proposed action is to acquire the property and construct a new USP, FPC, ancillary facilities and access roads. The purpose of the proposed federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky, is to develop additional high-security and medium-security facilities to increase capacity for current inmate populations in the Mid-Atlantic Region based on an identified need for additional bedspace. The Bureau has determined that there is a need for additional high-security and medium-security facilities within this region to reduce the demonstrated overcrowding that compromises the mission of the Bureau. The Final EIS analyzes the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the No Action Alternative, two build alternatives, Alternative 1-Payne Gap and Alternative 2-Roxana, with regard to climate, topography, geology, soils, water, biological and cultural resources, air quality, noise, land use and zoning, socioeconomics, traffic and transportation, recreation, utilities, and hazardous substances.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Federal Bureau of Prisons (Bureau) is proposing to construct a new United States Penitentiary (USP), Federal Prison Camp (FPC) and associated ancillary facilities in Letcher County, Kentucky. The Bureau has prepared this Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to analyze the impacts associated with the construction and operation of the proposed action.

The USP is anticipated to be approximately 61,654 square meters (663,638 square foot) and will house approximately 960 inmates. The FPC is anticipated to be approximately 6,063 square meters (65,262 square foot) and house approximately 256 inmates. Ancillary buildings would include a central utility plant, firing range, outside warehouse, and staff training building. A non-lethal/lethal fence would be installed around the perimeter of the USP. Operation of the USP and FPC would employ approximately 300 full-time staff.

PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the proposed federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky, is to develop additional high-security and medium-security facilities to increase capacity for current inmate populations in the Mid-Atlantic Region based on an identified need for additional bedspace. The Bureau has determined that there is a need for additional high-security and medium-security facilities within this region to reduce the demonstrated overcrowding that compromises the mission of the Bureau.

PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed action being evaluated in this Final EIS is the acquisition of property and the construction and operation of a federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky. The Bureau proposes to acquire approximately 800 acres (324 hectares) to construct a USP (approximately 61,654 square meters or 663,638 square foot) and FPC (approximately 6,063 square meters or 65,262 square foot) in Letcher County. Inmates housed in the USP would be high-security male inmates and those housed in the FPC would be minimum-security male inmates. The proposed facilities would house approximately 1,216 total inmates (approximately 960 within the USP and approximately 256 within the FPC). In addition to the USP and FPC, several ancillary facilities necessary for the operation of the USP and FPC would be constructed. A non-lethal/lethal fence would also be installed around the perimeter of the USP. The non-lethal/lethal fence would be placed between two parallel, chain link and razor wire fences.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Three alternatives were analyzed in this Final EIS, the No Action Alternative and two build alternatives: Alternative 1-Payne Gap and Alternative 2-Roxana.

No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative does not meet the project purpose and need; however, it represents the existing conditions and is analyzed in the EIS as a baseline for comparing the proposed action. The purpose for this comparison is to allow the federal agency to assess the effects of taking no action versus implementing the proposed action. In some cases the No Action Alternative would result in impacts to
certain resources if the proposed action is not implemented. Therefore, the assessment of the No Action Alternative is an important component of all National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents.

**Alternative 1-Payne Gap**

Under Alternative 1, the Bureau would acquire approximately 753 acres (305 hectares) of land known as the Payne Gap site. The site is located in eastern Letcher County, approximately 7 miles northeast of Whitesburg, along the Kentucky and Virginia border (Figures 2-1 and 2-2). The Bureau would then construct and operate a USP and FPC on this site.

Alternative 1 would require extensive earthwork to prepare the site for development. Approximately 8,342,922 cubic meters (10,912,130 cubic yards) of excavation and 10,568,450 cubic meters (13,823,012 cubic yards) of fill would be required prior to the beginning of construction activities.

**Alternative 2-Roxana**

Under Alternative 2, the Bureau would acquire approximately 700 acres (283 hectares) of land known as the Roxana site. The site is located 7.5 miles west of Whitesburg, Kentucky (Figures 2-1 and 2-4). The Bureau would construct and operate a USP and FPC on this site.

Alternative 2 would also require extensive earthwork to prepare the site for development. Approximately 2,929,582 cubic meters (3,831,749 cubic yards) of material would need to be excavated from the site and approximately 3,282,234 cubic meters (4,293,001 cubic yards) of fill would be required to prepare the site for construction activities.

**PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

Alternative 2-Roxana is the preferred alternative because it best meets the project needs and reduces impacts to the human environment.

**PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

The Bureau published a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS on July 26, 2013. The Bureau held a 30-day scoping period between July 26 and August 26, 2013. A public scoping meeting was held during this scoping period. The meeting was held August 13, 2013 to inform the public about the proposed project and to explain NEPA and the associated environmental impact analysis. A total of 453 community members attended the public meeting and a total of 320 comments were received during the 45-day public comment period. Additionally, 169 letters of support were presented at the public meeting, as well as two petitions in support of the project with a total of 124 signatures. Of the 320 comments received, 317 comments were in support of the project and 3 were not in support of the project. Issues raised in the letters that did not support the project included: socioeconomics, previous mining activities, infrastructure, and alternatives. These resources and areas of concern were analyzed in the Draft EIS.

The Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS was published in the *Federal Register* on February 13, 2015. A Notice of Public Meeting for the Draft EIS was published in the *Federal Register* on February 10, 2015. A notice of the availability of the Draft EIS and public meeting was also published in the *Mountain Eagle* on February 11, 2015 and the *Lexington Herald* on February 8, 2015. The notice announced that the Draft EIS would be available for public review and comment between February 13 and March 30, 2015. The notice identified the local libraries where hard copies of the document could be reviewed, as
well as a project website, www.fbopletchercountyeis.com, where an electronic version of the document could be reviewed.

The public meeting was held on March 12, 2015 between 5:30 p.m. and 8:00 p.m. Approximately 350 members of the public attended the public meeting. Comments received during the public comment period included 158 comments received at the public meeting; 31 comments received via mail or email; 3 petitions in support of the project with 1,001 signatures, one petition in support of the project at the Roxana site with 155 signatures, and 1,005 letters of support. Of the comments received, 1,157 of the comments (not including the petitions in support of the project) were in support of the project and 12 comments were in opposition of the project. Twenty-four of the comments in support of the project favored the Payne Gap site and 44 of the comments in support of the project favored the Roxana site.

**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

Table ES-1 provides a summary of the potential environmental effects from the No Action Alternative and the two build alternatives: Alternative 1-Payne Gap and Alternative 2-Roxana. Potential mitigation and site preparation costs have also been provided in this table. These mitigation measures and costs are likely to change over the course of the project, coordination with various agencies, and formal development of mitigation measures with the agencies; however, this is the best available information at the time this EIS was drafted and serves to assist in the comparison of the alternatives.
## Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Area</th>
<th>Alternative 1 (Payne Gap)</th>
<th>Alternative 2 (Roxana)</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Zoning</td>
<td>• Compatibility issues with adjacent properties</td>
<td>• Compatibility issues with adjacent properties</td>
<td>• No compatibility issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography, Geology, and Soils</td>
<td>• Significant impacts to topography, geology, and soils</td>
<td>• Significant impacts to topography, geology, and soils</td>
<td>• No impacts to topography, geology, and soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice</td>
<td>• No significant adverse effects</td>
<td>• No significant adverse effects</td>
<td>• Opportunity for beneficial economic effects would not exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities and Services</td>
<td>• No adverse impacts</td>
<td>• No adverse impacts</td>
<td>• No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Traffic</td>
<td>• No adverse impacts to traffic and roadways; Minor roadway improvements would be required</td>
<td>• No adverse impacts to traffic; however, there would be potential adverse impacts to roadways</td>
<td>• No impacts to traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>• No significant impacts on the local or regional air quality</td>
<td>• No significant impacts on the local or regional air quality</td>
<td>• No increases in air emissions; therefore, no impacts to air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>• Short-term, temporary construction related impacts</td>
<td>• Short-term, temporary construction related impacts</td>
<td>• No construction or operation of a new facility; therefore, no impacts from increases in noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and Utilities</td>
<td>• Significant impacts to wastewater and natural gas infrastructure</td>
<td>• No significant impacts</td>
<td>• No construction or operation of a new facility; therefore, no increase in demand on infrastructure and utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>• No adverse impacts</td>
<td>• No adverse impacts</td>
<td>• No construction or operation of a new facility; therefore, no impacts to cultural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources</td>
<td>• 2.4 acres (0.97 hectares) of wetland impacts</td>
<td>• 2.5 acres (1.0 hectares) of wetland impacts</td>
<td>• No construction or operation of a new facility; therefore, no impacts to water resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>• 218 acres (88 hectares) of deforestation</td>
<td>• 93 (37 hectares) of deforestation</td>
<td>• No construction or operation of a new facility; therefore, no impacts to biological resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials and Waste</td>
<td>• No adverse impacts</td>
<td>• No adverse impacts</td>
<td>• No impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Known Mitigation and Associated Costs

| Infrastructure and Utilities           | $8,895,000                                      | $15,825,000                                      | No Cost                                               |
| Threatened and Endangered Species*    | $1,030,000 - $1,373,400                        | $732,375-$1,024,355                             | No Mitigation                                         |
| Excavation and Grading Costs          | $217,327,748                                   | $141,116,447                                   | No Cost                                               |

**Notes:** *Estimated costs are based on United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) cost per acre for impacts to Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat habitat for Payne Gap and Swarming P1/P2 habitat for Roxana. Cost was calculated based on total forest impacts for each site and time of year habitat is removed. Cost is based only on summer habitat impacts.
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## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ac</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>KRADD</td>
<td>Kentucky River Area Development District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEP</td>
<td>American Electric Power</td>
<td>KYLMI</td>
<td>Kentucky Labor Market Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMSL</td>
<td>above mean sea level</td>
<td>KYTC</td>
<td>Kentucky Transportation Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMU</td>
<td>Adjusted Mitigation Units</td>
<td>LCPC</td>
<td>Letcher County Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE</td>
<td>Area of Potential Effects</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARH</td>
<td>Appalachian Regional Healthcare</td>
<td>LWSD</td>
<td>Letcher County Water and Sewer District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTMI</td>
<td>American Society for Testing and Materials International</td>
<td>MBTA</td>
<td>Migratory Bird Treaty Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMPs</td>
<td>Best Management Practices</td>
<td>MSAT(s)</td>
<td>Mobile Source Air Toxic(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>Bureau of Prisons</td>
<td>MSL</td>
<td>mean sea level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA</td>
<td>Clean Air Act</td>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ</td>
<td>Council on Environmental Quality</td>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
<td>NHPA</td>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>methane</td>
<td>NO₂</td>
<td>nitrogen dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMOA</td>
<td>Conservation Memorandum of Agreement</td>
<td>NOₓ</td>
<td>nitrogen oxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>carbon monoxide</td>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td>Natural Resources Conservation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂e</td>
<td>carbon dioxide equivalent</td>
<td>NRHP</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>Clean Water Act</td>
<td>NWI</td>
<td>National Wetland Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dB</td>
<td>decibels</td>
<td>O₃</td>
<td>ozone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dBA</td>
<td>A-weighted decibels</td>
<td>PM₂.₅</td>
<td>particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>OSHA</td>
<td>Occupational Safety and Health Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement</td>
<td>PM₁₀</td>
<td>particulate matter with a diameter less than 10 microns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIU</td>
<td>Ecological Integrity Unit</td>
<td>ppb</td>
<td>parts per billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMTs</td>
<td>emergency medical technicians</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>parts per million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>psi</td>
<td>pounds per square inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;S</td>
<td>Erosion and Sedimentation</td>
<td>RCRA</td>
<td>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Endangered Species Act</td>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC</td>
<td>Federal Prison Camp</td>
<td>SO₂</td>
<td>sulphur dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPPA</td>
<td>Farmland Protection Policy Act</td>
<td>TCPs</td>
<td>Traditional Cultural Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHGs</td>
<td>greenhouse gases</td>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAP</td>
<td>hazardous air pollutants</td>
<td>SO₂</td>
<td>sulphur dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITE</td>
<td>Institute of Transportation Engineers</td>
<td>TRA</td>
<td>Toxics Release Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDEP</td>
<td>Kentucky Department of Environmental Protection</td>
<td>TSCA</td>
<td>Toxic Substances Control Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGS</td>
<td>Kentucky Geological Survey</td>
<td>TDML</td>
<td>Total Maximum Daily Load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHC</td>
<td>Kentucky Heritage Council</td>
<td>TPY</td>
<td>tons per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRADD</td>
<td>Kentucky River Area Development District</td>
<td>USP</td>
<td>United States Penitentiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYTC</td>
<td>Kentucky Transportation Cabinet</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWSD</td>
<td>Letcher County Water and Sewer District</td>
<td>MBTA</td>
<td>Migratory Bird Treaty Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE</td>
<td>Mean Level of Service</td>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSAT(s)</td>
<td>Mobile Source Air Toxic(s)</td>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSL</td>
<td>mean sea level</td>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPA</td>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act</td>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td>Natural Resources Conservation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWI</td>
<td>National Wetland Inventory</td>
<td>O₃</td>
<td>ozone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHA</td>
<td>Occupational Safety and Health Administration</td>
<td>PM₂.₅</td>
<td>particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀</td>
<td>particulate matter with a diameter less than 10 microns</td>
<td>ppb</td>
<td>parts per billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>parts per million</td>
<td>psi</td>
<td>pounds per square inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA</td>
<td>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act</td>
<td>SHA</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂</td>
<td>sulphur dioxide</td>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCPs</td>
<td>Traditional Cultural Properties</td>
<td>TRI</td>
<td>Toxics Release Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCA</td>
<td>Toxic Substances Control Act</td>
<td>USP</td>
<td>United States Penitentiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>U.S. Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEPA</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USP</td>
<td>U.S. Penitentiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>volatile organic compound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTP</td>
<td>wastewater treatment plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yd³</td>
<td>cubic yards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>µg/m³</td>
<td>micrograms per cubic meter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>µS</td>
<td>microseconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

The United States (U.S.) Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons (Bureau) has prepared this Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500-1508, and the Department of Justice procedures for implementing NEPA (28 CFR 61). The Bureau’s Final EIS evaluates the potential environmental consequences of the proposed construction and operation of a federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky. Two action alternatives and the No Action Alternative are assessed.

1.1 BACKGROUND

The Bureau was established in 1930 to provide more progressive and humane care for federal inmates, to professionalize the prison service, and to ensure consistent and centralized administration of federal prisons. The mission of the Bureau is to protect society by confining offenders in the controlled environments of prisons and community-based facilities that are safe, humane, cost efficient, and appropriately secure, and that provide work and other self-improvement opportunities to assist offenders in becoming law-abiding citizens.

1.2 SECURITY LEVELS

The Bureau accomplishes its mission through the appropriate use of the following types of community-correction, detention, and correctional facilities:

- Federally owned and operated
- Federally owned and non-federally operated
- Non-federally owned and operated

Regardless of facility ownership, the Bureau operates correction and detention facilities at various security levels. Each security level is characterized by the type of housing within the institution, internal security features, and staff-to-inmate ratio. Different security levels require particular features such as external patrols, guard towers, security barriers, or detection devices. The five categories of security levels are described as follows:

- **Minimum-Security** – Also known as Federal Prison Camps (FPCs) or satellite work camps. They are characterized by dormitory housing, a relatively low staff-to-inmate ratio, and are without fences. They are typically associated with a larger institution or military base where inmates can help serve labor needs of the institution or base.
- **Low-Security** – Federal Correctional Institutions with double fenced perimeters, primarily dormitory housing, and strong work and program components.
- **Medium-Security** – Federal Correctional Institutions with strengthened perimeters (e.g., double fences with electronic detection systems), cell-type housing, a wide variety of work and treatment programs, and an increased inmate-to-staff ratio to provide greater control.
- **High-Security** – Also known as United States Penitentiary (USP). These facilities have highly secure perimeters (e.g., walls or double fences with taut wire fencing, non-lethal/lethal fences), multiple single occupant cell housing, guard towers, close staff supervision, and movement controls.
• **Administrative** – Institutions that house offenders who require an uncommon level of security due to their serious records of institutional misconduct, involvement in violent or escape-related behavior, and/or who have unusual security needs based on the nature of their offense. These facilities have highly secured perimeters consisting of walled or double fenced enclosures with guard towers.

1.3 **Existing Federal Prison Population**

In 1981, the federal inmate population consisted of approximately 23,800 inmates. By 1986 the federal inmate population had increased to about 38,700: a 63 percent increase. Growth continued at a steady rate through the 1990s and in 1998 the federal inmate population had grown 280 percent, reaching 108,000 inmates. As of November 7, 2014, the Bureau inmate population reached 213,620; this includes 171,744 inmates being housed in 120 Bureau institutions, 27,627 being housed in privately-managed secure facilities, and 14,249 being housed in other contract care. Of the 171,744 inmates housed in Bureau institutions, 23,988 are high-security inmates. The Bureau houses these 23,988 high-security inmates in 19 USPs located throughout six regions within the U.S.: the Mid-Atlantic Region; North Central Region; Northeast Region; South Central Region; Southeast Region; and Western Region. Each region provides facilities for housing inmates at all security levels. The 19 USPs are rated for a total capacity of 14,274 high-security inmates. Therefore, the Bureau’s high-security institutions are currently 52 percent overcrowded and are operating at above rated capacity.

To meet the current and projected bedspace needs, the Bureau evaluates the bedspace needs of the regions using a geographically balanced program. When considering placement of an individual, the Bureau considers the origin of the inmate and attempts to place the inmate in an institution that is within the region of the inmate’s origin. Placing inmates within their region of origin provides greater opportunity for visitation with family, which aids in the rehabilitation process.

1.4 **Federal Bureau of Prisons Mid-Atlantic Region**

One of the regions identified by the Bureau as having an increasing need for additional high-security bedspace in order to reduce overcrowding in the Mid-Atlantic Region. Approximately 5,802 inmates, including those in special programs, are housed within the Mid-Atlantic Region. The current rated capacity for these institutions is 3,400. Therefore, the Bureau has determined that due to the overcrowding in the Mid-Atlantic Region, specifically within the USPs and FPCs, that construction of a new high-security facility would be warranted in the region.

There are currently 15 correctional facilities within the Bureau’s Mid-Atlantic Region. Of these, only four are USPs or high-security facilities: USP Hazelton located in Hazelton, West Virginia, USP Lee located in Jonesville, Virginia, USP Big Sandy located in Inez, Kentucky, and USP McCreary located in McCreary, Kentucky. **Table 1-1** depicts the current populations associated with each of the USPs in the Mid-Atlantic Region.
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1.5 Purpose and Need

The purpose of the proposed federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky, is to develop additional high-security and medium-security facilities to increase capacity for current inmate populations in the Mid-Atlantic Region. The need for the proposed facility is that the current inmate populations of the USPs in the Mid-Atlantic Region are exceeding their rated capacity and their associated FPCs are at or near capacity. The Bureau has determined that there is a need for additional high-security and medium-security facilities within this region to reduce the demonstrated overcrowding that compromises the mission of the Bureau. The Bureau’s mission is to protect society by confining offenders in the controlled environments of prisons and community-based facilities that are safe, humane, cost-efficient, and appropriately secured, and that provide work and other self-improvement opportunities to assist offenders in becoming law-abiding citizens.

1.6 Proposed Action

The proposed action being evaluated in this Final EIS is the acquisition of property and the construction and operation of a federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky. The Bureau proposes to acquire approximately 800 acres (324 hectares) to construct a USP (approximately 61,654 square meters [663,638 square foot]) and FPC (approximately 6,063 square meters [65,262 square foot]) in Letcher County. Inmates housed in the USP would be high-security male inmates and those housed in the FPC would be minimum-security male inmates. The proposed facilities would house approximately 1,216 total inmates (approximately 960 within the USP and approximately 256 within the FPC). In addition to the USP and FPC, several ancillary facilities necessary for the operation of the USP and FPC would be constructed. A non-lethal/lethal fence would also be installed around the perimeter of the USP. The non-lethal/lethal fence would be placed between two parallel, chain link and razor wire fences. The fence would be approximately 12 feet high. The ancillary facilities would include the following:

- Central Utility Plant-1,217 square meters (13,100 square foot)
- Firing Range-96 square meters (1,033 square foot)
- Outside Warehouse-3,279 square meters (35,295 square foot)
- Staff Training Building-910 square meters (9,795 square foot)
- Garage/Landscape Building-653 square meters (7,028 square foot)
- Access Roads

Operation of the USP and FPC would employ approximately 300 full-time staff.

### Table 1-1. Mid-Atlantic Region USP Inmate Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USP</th>
<th>Existing Inmate Population (does not include those in special programs)</th>
<th>Rated Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazelton</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Sandy</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCreary</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,802</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.6.1 General Design Features of the United States Penitentiary and Federal Prison Camp

The Bureau has standard design layouts for their correctional facilities that include similar design characteristics. General design features of a USP include:

- Single road for controlled access to each correctional facility,
- Parking lot located near the public entrance to each correctional facility for use by both employees and visitors,
- One- to four-story structures,
- Multipurpose activity spaces, and
- Buffer areas around the facility providing visual and physical setbacks from the site boundaries.

1.7 Environmental Review Process

1.7.1 National Environmental Policy Act

In 1969, Congress enacted the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), which requires consideration of environmental issues in federal agency planning and decision-making. Regulations for federal agency implementation of the act were established by the President’s CEQ. NEPA requires federal agencies to prepare an environmental assessment (EA) or environmental impact statement (EIS) for any federal action, except those actions that are determined to be “categorically excluded” from further analysis. An EIS is prepared for those federal actions that may significantly affect the quality of the human and natural environments or where the impacts are largely unknown or controversial. The EIS must disclose significant environmental impacts and inform decision makers and the public of the reasonable alternatives that would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment. The intent of this EIS is to document the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed action, acquisition of property and construction and operation of a USP and FPC. The Bureau is the decision-maker with regard to this proposed action. This document, together with its appendices and other documents incorporated by reference, constitutes the Final EIS pursuant to NEPA, the CEQ regulations, and the Department of Justice procedures for implementing NEPA.

The Final EIS evaluates environmental impacts to: land use and zoning; topography, geology, and soils; socioeconomics and environmental justice; community facilities and services (fire and police services, emergency services, health care facilities, etc.); transportation and traffic; air quality; noise; infrastructure and utilities; cultural resources (historic properties, archaeology); water resources; biological resources (threatened and endangered species, wetlands, vegetation, etc.); and hazardous materials and waste. The evaluation will determine the potential impacts of the proposed action and, if necessary, where impacts may be avoided or minimized, as well as if the impacts would require mitigation. The evaluation of the proposed sites will also determine which site would result in the least amount of impact to the environment.

1.7.2 Related Environmental Documents

In 2008, the Bureau conducted a site reconnaissance study in Letcher County, Kentucky. The site reconnaissance report identified several resources associated with potential sites that would require additional studies to determine if the sites were viable for the development of a federal correctional institution. Based on this 2008 study, a second study was conducted in 2010 to rank these sites and verify that the issues originally identified in 2008 had not changed. Based on the data collected from both the
2008 and 2010 studies, it was determined that a feasibility study to analyze the resources of concern would be conducted to further assess the viability of construction at each of the sites.

In 2012 a feasibility study was completed by the Bureau to evaluate four potential sites for the development of a USP and FPC in Letcher County, Kentucky (TEC, Inc. 2012). The purpose was to conduct additional studies, including wetland identification and delineation, cultural resource surveys, geotechnical studies, boundary surveys, and a utility assessment of the proposed sites to determine if there would be constraints associated with these resources and the development of the sites. The feasibility study evaluated the benefits, challenges, and potential risks associated with development of each site. Based on the results of the feasibility study and changes with the offers of sites, it was determined that two sites, Payne Gap and Roxana, would be carried forward for analysis in this Final EIS.

1.7.3 Agency Coordination

In addition to NEPA, other laws, regulations, permits and licenses may be applicable to the proposed action. Specifically, the proposed action may require:

- Informal consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) Service regarding the occurrence of threatened and endangered species within the sites;
- Concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Officer on cultural resource findings;
- Clean Water Act Section 404 permit if wetland impacts occur;
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination permit for non-point source discharge; and
- Erosion and sedimentation control plan for new construction.

1.7.4 Public Involvement

NEPA requires the public be informed and involved throughout the development of the EIS, beginning with public scoping. The public scoping meeting is an opportunity for the federal agency, in this case the Bureau, to introduce the project to the public and receive input on the scope of the issues to be addressed in the EIS. The local public has knowledge of the area where the proposed action may take place, and can provide insight into local resources, as well as to the concerns of the community. Public involvement in the NEPA process is required and is an extremely valuable tool in the successful completion of NEPA documents.

The official scoping period for this project began when the Bureau published a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS on July, 26, 2013, in the Federal Register, and lasted until August 26, 2013. A scoping meeting was held on August 13, 2013 to inform the public about the proposed project and to explain NEPA and the associated environmental impact analysis. A total of 453 people attended the public meeting and a total of 320 comments were received during the 30-day scoping period. Additionally, 169 letters of support were presented at the public meeting, as well as two petitions in support of the project with a total of 124 signatures. Of the 320 comments received, 317 comments were in support of the project and 3 were not in support of the project. Issues raised in the letters that did not support the project included: socioeconomics, previous mining activities, infrastructure, and alternatives. These resources and areas of concern raised during scoping were analyzed in the Draft EIS.

The Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS was published in the Federal Register on February 13, 2015. A Notice of Public Meeting for the Draft EIS was published in the Federal Register on February 10, 2015. The notice provided the date, time, and location of the public meeting to be held on March 12, 2015. A notice of the availability of the Draft EIS and public meeting was also published in the Mountain
Eagle on February 11, 2015 and the Lexington Herald on February 8, 2015. The notice announced that the Draft EIS would be available for public review and comment between February 13 and March 30, 2015. The notice identified the local libraries where hard copies of the document could be reviewed, as well as a project website, www.fbopletchercountyeis.com, where an electronic version of the document could be reviewed. The Bureau also sent out 60 hardcopies and 161 CDs containing the Draft EIS to federal, state, and local elected officials and regulatory agencies (USFWS, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Kentucky State Clearinghouse, etc.), other interested parties (planning commission, fire departments, police departments, etc.), and individuals who had requested a copy during scoping or at any other time prior to the release of the Draft EIS.

The public meeting was held on March 12, 2015 between 5:30 p.m. and 8:00 p.m. at the Letcher County Central High School. The meeting was conducted in an open house format and Bureau representatives were in attendance to answer questions and discuss the project with the attendees. Approximately 350 members of the public attended the public meeting. Attendees were able to provide written comments or give oral comments to a stenographer during the meeting. Attendees were also provided information for mailing their comments to the Bureau. Comments received during the public comment period included 158 comments received at the public meeting; 31 comments received via mail or email; three petitions in support of the project with 1,001 signatures, one petition in support of the project at the Roxana site with 155 signatures, and 1,005 letters of support. Of the comments received, 1,157 of the comments (not including the petitions in support of the project) were in support of the project and 12 comments were in opposition of the project. Twenty-four of the comments in support of the project favored the Payne Gap site and 44 of the comments in support of the project favored the Roxana site.
2.0 ALTERNATIVES

CEQ’s guidelines for implementing the procedural Provisions of the NEPA establish a number of policies for federal agencies, including “…using the NEPA process to identify and assess reasonable alternatives to the proposed action that will avoid or minimize adverse effects of these actions on the quality of the human environment” (40 CFR 1500.2[e]). The guidelines also require an analysis of alternatives based “on the information and analysis presented in the sections on the Affected Environment (§1502.15) and the Environmental Consequences (§1502.16).” The guidelines further state that the analysis “should present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice.” According to CEQ guidelines the alternatives analysis is also required to:

- “Include the alternative of no action”;
- “…explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated”;
- “Devote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail including the proposed action so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits”;
- “Include reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency’’;
- “Identify the agency’s preferred alternative or alternatives, if one or more exists, in the draft statement and identify such alternative in the final statement unless another law prohibits the expression of such a preference”; and
- “Include appropriate mitigation measures not already included in the proposed action or alternatives.”

The analysis of alternatives considered in this EIS was conducted under these guidelines to address the following:

- **No Action Alternative.** A decision not to proceed with the proposed action to develop a new USP and FPC.
- **Alternative Locations-Nationwide.** Locations other than the Letcher County, Kentucky area for implementation of the proposed action.
- **Alternative Locations.** Within the Geographic Area of Interest Warranting Consideration. Potential site(s) which meet minimum requirements for accommodating the proposed facility; are located with the geographic area of interest (Kentucky); and have been offered and are available for Bureau consideration.

A discussion of these alternatives follows. No reasonable alternatives outside the jurisdiction of the Bureau (the lead agency) have been identified or warrant inclusion in the EIS.

2.1 **NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

Under the No Action Alternative, the Bureau would not acquire property or construct and operate a new USP or FPC. Existing USPs would remain overcrowded and prevent the Bureau from meeting its mission. The No Action Alternative would avoid potential impacts associated with the development of a USP and FPC. The No Action Alternative does not meet the project purpose and need and is therefore, not considered a viable alternative. The No Action Alternative is discussed in this EIS because it serves as a baseline against which to compare the action alternatives.
2.2 **ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS-NATIONWIDE**

The locations of new federal correctional facilities are determined by the need for incarceration in various regions of the country and the resources available to meet that need. To meet these needs the Bureau routinely identifies and evaluates potential sites that may be appropriate for development of new federal correctional facilities. Under an ongoing Congressional mandate, consideration is given to surplus properties while other publicly- or privately-owned properties offered to the Bureau are also examined for possible use.

The initial steps in the planning process include the identification and evaluation of potential sites. Identification of a site that has the potential to house more than one federal correctional facility is a key factor in the evaluation of sites. Acquisition of property that has the potential for facility expansion provides the Bureau with the opportunity to expand as the inmate population grows. The Bureau also responds to initiatives from communities requesting consideration to host new federal correctional facilities. When approached by a community to host a facility, the Bureau’s first steps are to visit the sites offered and:

- Identify the interest and support of the community, including the support/opposition of elected and appointed officials, community leaders, stakeholders, and the general public in having a federal correctional facility within their community.
- Identify suitable locations for development of the federal correctional facility based on infrastructure conditions, environmental resources, land use and zoning, and other related criteria.
- Determine the on-site conditions including constructability of the site.
- Identify potential environmental issues that require consideration under NEPA (National Historic Preservation Act [NHPA], Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, etc.).
- Determine what further investigations and detailed studies may be warranted to obtain additional information about the potential sites.

After the initial screening process, those sites with favorable conditions are moved forward and evaluated under another set of criteria, including optimal infrastructure and environmental requirements. The criteria used to evaluate the sites are established by the Bureau; however, these general criteria can be supplemented if needed to assess issues or potential issues and make sure they are addressed adequately in the evaluation of the sites. The general criteria the Bureau uses to screen potential sites for development include:

- The site should have sufficient land area (300 to 350 acres minimum [121 to 142 hectares]) to accommodate the institution and ancillary facilities, provide a buffer zone between the facility and neighboring properties, and allow for future expansion.
- Proposed site should be relatively flat (less than 10 percent grade) to provide for minimal site preparation and proper drainage (this can be affected by geographic regions with mountainous terrain).
- Sites should avoid significant environmental resources (i.e., floodplains, wetlands, threatened and endangered species, cultural and historic resources, etc.).
- Sites should avoid potential incompatible land use conflicts.
- Emergency services, including police and fire protection, and utilities should be able to provide services to the prospective sites.
Site should be served by well-maintained state and county roadways to ensure safe commutes for employees, service vehicles, and visitors.

Support of key elected officials, community leaders, the public and owners of the sites.

Sites that the Bureau determines meet these general criteria, and are viable for the development of a federal correctional facility, are then evaluated in more detail in either an EA or EIS, in compliance with NEPA.

### 2.3 Alternatives Development

The Bureau has a priority need for additional facilities within the Bureau’s Mid-Atlantic Region, which includes the State of Kentucky. The Bureau was contacted by the Letcher County Planning Commission (LCPC) with an offer of potential sites for a new USP and FPC in Letcher County, Kentucky. Understanding the needs of the Bureau, the LCPC identified potential locations for development and brought these sites to the attention of the Bureau to determine if the Bureau had an interest in developing a new facility at one of the locations. The opportunity to provide additional bedspace in Letcher County would meet the need for additional capacity within the Mid-Atlantic Region, afford the Bureau continued management of inmates originating from the region, and allow those inmates to remain close to family and friends.

The process to identify potential sites for constructing a USP and FPC in Letcher County began in 2008 with site reconnaissance studies of four sites that had been offered to the Bureau by members of the community. The purpose of the site reconnaissance studies was to collect preliminary data on the sites and determine their suitability for development based on site conditions, infrastructure and utilities, and environmental resources. Based on this initial analysis, it was determined that the four sites evaluated should be studied in more detail in a feasibility study: Meadow Branch, Payne Gap, Roxana, and Van/Fields. The feasibility study provided an opportunity for more detailed analysis of each site and identified constraints that may eliminate a site from further consideration. In 2011, the Bureau completed a feasibility study that assessed cultural resources, wetlands, geologic conditions, and infrastructure. The feasibility study also included the production of aerial and topographic mapping, and a boundary survey.

During the initial phases of the feasibility study, the Meadow Branch site was removed from further consideration due to changes with the offeror, and the site no longer available for consideration by the Bureau; therefore, no detailed analysis of the site was included in the feasibility study. During the feasibility study for the remaining three sites, wetlands were delineated, archaeological and historic structures surveys were completed, and geotechnical studies were conducted. The feasibility study highlighted potential concerns with development of the sites, as well as estimated costs of infrastructure improvement and site preparation (excavation and/or fill at each site, and grading activities) on each site. The feasibility study determined that there were no constraints that would prevent development of the three sites (TEC, Inc. 2012). During the finalization of the feasibility study there were changes with the offeror of the Van/Fields site, and this site was removed from further consideration. The remaining two sites, Payne Gap and Roxana, were identified as alternatives to be carried forward for study in an EIS (Figure 2-1).
Figure 2-1. Payne Gap and Roxana Site Locations
2.4  ALTERNATIVE 1 – PAYNE GAP

Under Alternative 1, the Bureau would acquire approximately 753 acres (305 hectares) of land known as the Payne Gap (Payne Gap) site. The site is located in eastern Letcher County, approximately 7 miles northeast of Whitesburg, along the Kentucky and Virginia border (Figures 2-1 and 2-2). The Bureau would then construct and operate a USP and FPC on this site. The site is situated on a gently sloped to steeply sloped upland land form above the Kentucky River at its confluence with the Laurel Fork. U.S. Route 119 is located along the north end of the proposed site and would provide site access. The site is forested with secondary growth forests and the original topography of portions of the site have been altered by past surface mining and associated mining activities such as spoil piles, roads, and fill piles. Mining permit applications indicate surface and underground mining operations have occurred within the proposed project site since the 1950s. Figure 2-3 depicts the proposed conceptual layout of the facility at the Payne Gap site. To accommodate the USP, FPC, ancillary buildings, and roads as described in Section 1.6, Proposed Action, the site would require extensive excavation and fill material to level and prepare the site for construction. Excavation of the site would include the removal of mine spoil. No slurry ponds or coal mine waste facilities are located on or near the Payne Gap site (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [USEPA] 2015a, USEPA 2015b, and Sierra Club 2015). No active mining is occurring on site. The Bureau would require a minimum of 300 acres (121 hectares) for construction of the USP and FPC at this site. Table 2-1 depicts the site preparation quantities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spoil Excavation</td>
<td>2,794,660 yd³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Excavation</td>
<td>8,117,470 yd³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Fill</td>
<td>1,716,955 yd³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoil Fill</td>
<td>12,106,917 yd³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Mined Area</td>
<td>7 ac (3 ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Forest Area</td>
<td>211 ac (85 ha)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: yd³ = cubic yards, ac = acres, ha = hectares.
Figure 2-2. Payne Gap Project Location
Figure 2-3. Payne Gap USP and FPC Conceptual Layout
2.5 ALTERNATIVE 2 – ROXANA

Under Alternative 2, the Bureau would acquire approximately 700 acres (283 hectares) of land known as the Roxana site. The site is located 7.5 miles west of Whitesburg, Kentucky (Figures 2-1 and 2-4). The Bureau would construct and operate a USP and FPC on this site. Figure 2-5 depicts the proposed conceptual layout of the facility at the Roxana site. To accommodate the USP, FPC, ancillary buildings, and roads as described in Section 1.6, Proposed Action, the site would require extensive excavation of spoil material and lesser amounts of structural fill and spoil fill. Preparation of the site for construction activities would also require dynamic compaction, clear mined area, and forest clearing. Excavation of the site would include the removal of mine spoil. No slurry ponds or coal mine waste facilities are located on or near the Roxana site (USEPA 2015a, USEPA 2015b, and Sierra Club 2015). No active mining is occurring on site. The Bureau would require a minimum of 300 acres (121 hectares) for construction of the USP and FPC at this site. Table 2-2 depicts site preparation quantities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spoil Excavation</td>
<td>2,928,992 yd³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Excavation</td>
<td>902,757 yd³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Fill</td>
<td>2,087,607 yd³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoil Fill</td>
<td>2,205,394 yd³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Compaction</td>
<td>25 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Mined Area</td>
<td>82 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Forest Area</td>
<td>79 ac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Alternative 2-Roxana is the preferred alternative because it best meets the project needs and, on balance, would have fewer impacts to the human environment. Threatened and endangered species was also a factor in the identification of the preferred alternative. Studies identified both summer roosting habitat and winter hibernaculum at the Payne Gap site. Identification of the winter bat hibernaculum would require additional studies to determine the extent of winter hibernaculum and impacts to the hibernaculum. Additionally, the site would impact a significant amount of summer roosting habitat versus the amount that would be impacted at the Roxana site. The Payne Gap site would also have significant impacts to wastewater and natural gas infrastructure, while the Roxana site would have less than significant impacts to infrastructure and utilities. Based upon comparison of these and other potential environmental impacts applicable to each site, including wetlands and stream impacts and significantly greater site preparation required for the Payne Gap site, the Roxana site would have fewer natural resource and other environmental impacts. Therefore, the Roxana site has been determined to be the preferred alternative.
Figure 2-4. Roxana Project Location
Figure 2-5. Roxana USP and FPC Conceptual Layout
3.0 DEFINITION OF RESOURCE

3.1 LAND USE AND ZONING

Land use often refers to human modification of land for residential or economic purposes. Land use categories typically include agriculture (includes livestock production), forestry, residential, commercial, industrial, transportation, utilities, mining, recreation, and communication. Land uses are frequently regulated by management plans, land use plans, comprehensive plans, and local zoning and ordinances. These plans and regulations assist in identifying where future development can occur so it is compatible with surrounding land uses and, in protecting specially designated or environmentally sensitive uses.

Land use is interrelated with other resource areas including noise, socioeconomics, biological resources, and cultural resources. The impact analysis in this EIS for land use focuses on those areas affected by proposed construction and operation of the USP and FPC.

3.2 TOPOGRAPHY, GEOLOGY, AND SOILS

Topography describes the physical surface of the land and includes elevation, slope, and other general surface features. Geologic factors influence soil stability, bedrock depth, and seismic properties. Soil is the unconsolidated material above bedrock. Soil is formed from the weathering of bedrock and other parent materials.

The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) (7 U.S. Code [USC] 4201 et seq.) was introduced to conserve farmland soil and discourage the conversion of prime farmland soil to a non-agricultural use. The FPPA considers prime farmland soils as those that have the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops, and are also available for these uses. It has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to economically produce sustained high yields of crops when treated and managed. Soils of statewide importance are those soils that are nearly prime farmland and that economically produce high yields of crops when treated and managed according to acceptable farming methods. The FPPA is based on the protection of prime farmland soils and not on whether the area is in agricultural use.

Topography, geology, and soil resources are analyzed in this EIS in terms of drainage, excavation and fill activities, erosion, and prime farmland. The analysis focuses on the area of soils that would be disturbed, the potential for erosion of soils from construction areas, and the potential for eroded soils to become pollutants in downstream surface water during storm events. Best Management Practices (BMPs) are identified to minimize soil impacts and prevent or control pollutant releases into stormwater.

3.3 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Socioeconomics describes the basic attributes and resources associated with the human environment, particularly population, employment, income, and housing. The affected area for socioeconomics is defined as the area where principal effects arising from the construction and operation of the proposed USP and FPC are likely to occur. The proposed action alternatives have the potential to cause socioeconomic impacts to the communities around the proposed sites through changes or relocation of Bureau personnel and construction expenditures.
Executive Order (EO) 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations* (Environmental Justice), was issued in 1994. It stipulates that each federal agency is to make achieving environmental justice a part of its mission by identifying and addressing disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations. A minority population is defined as either: 1) the minority population of the affected area exceeds 50 percent, or 2) the minority population percentage of the affected area is meaningfully greater than the minority population percentage in the appropriate community of comparison. Low-income populations are identified where a meaningfully greater portion of the population is living below the poverty level threshold as compared to the appropriate community of comparison (CEQ 1997). The environmental justice analysis in this EIS addresses the characteristics of race, ethnicity, and poverty status for populations residing in the immediate area of the proposed USP and FPC.

EO 13045, *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks* (Protection of Children) was issued in 1997 requiring federal agencies to identify and assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children. It also requires that each federal agency is to ensure that its policies, programs, activities, and standards address disproportionate risks to children that result from environmental health risks or safety risks. In this EIS, the protection of children analysis addresses the population under 18 residing in areas potentially affected by the construction and operation of the proposed USP and FPC.

This socioeconomic analysis focuses on impacts due to population changes and construction expenditures. Economic impacts are defined to include direct effects, such as changes to employment, payrolls, and expenditures that affect the flow of dollars into the local economy and secondary effects, which result from the “ripple effect” of spending and re-spending in response to the direct effects.

Socioeconomic impacts, particularly impacts such as those being evaluated in this EIS, are often mixed: beneficial in terms of gains in jobs, expenditures, tax revenues, etc., and adverse in terms of growth management issues such as demands for housing and community services.

This analysis in this EIS identifies potential environmental justice issues. Impacts to environmental justice populations are identified where high and adverse human health or environmental effects may disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations. Impacts to children would occur if there was an increased disproportionate environmental, health, or safety risk to children.

### 3.4 Community Facilities and Services

Community services include police protection, fire protection, healthcare services and schools. The potentially affected area includes the cities, towns, and county where the proposed sites are located and where Bureau employees associated with the proposed action would live and work.

The analysis in this EIS focuses on the existing conditions of community services within the adjacent communities in terms of capacity and availability. The anticipated demand for community services is described in relation to proposed population increases in inmates, Bureau personnel, and their families. Lastly, the analysis describes ability of community services to accommodate anticipated changes in the demand for those services resulting from the proposed action.
3.5 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Transportation and traffic refers to vehicle movement throughout a road and highway network. The study area for transportation and traffic includes the road and highway networks that surround and support the Payne Gap and Roxana sites. The American Association of Highway and Transportation Officials classify roadways as principal arterials, minor arterial streets, collector streets, and local streets. Principal arterials (i.e., arterial highways and interstates) serve to move traffic regionally and between population and activity centers with a minimal level of access to adjacent properties. Collector roadways (i.e., minor arterial and collector streets) serve to move traffic from population and activity centers and funnel them onto principal arterials with a moderate level of access to adjacent properties. Local roadways provide access to adjacent properties and move traffic onto collector and arterial roadways.

Average daily traffic and design capacity of the roadway represent two parameters to measure traffic (Transportation Research Board 2010). Using these two measures of traffic, each roadway segment receives a corresponding level of service (LOS). The LOS designation is a professional industry standard used to describe the operating conditions of a roadway segment or intersection. The LOS is defined on a scale of A to F that describes the range of operating conditions on a particular type of roadway facility. LOS A through LOS B indicates free flow travel. LOS C indicates stable traffic flow. LOS D indicates the beginning of traffic congestion. LOS E indicates the nearing of traffic breakdown conditions. LOS F indicates stop-and-go traffic conditions and represents unacceptable congestion and delay.

Impacts to transportation and traffic are analyzed in this Final EIS by considering the possible changes to existing traffic conditions and the capacity of area roadways from proposed increases in commuter and construction traffic. Traffic impact studies were performed and the results, together with proposed mitigation measures appropriate for each site are included in the Final EIS.

3.6 AIR QUALITY

Air quality is defined by ambient air concentrations of specific pollutants determined by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) to be of concern related to the health and welfare of the general public and the environment and are widespread across the U.S. The primary pollutants of concern, called “criteria pollutants,” include carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), ozone (O₃), suspended particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀), fine particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter (PM₂.₅), and lead. Under the Clean Air Act (CAA), the USEPA has established National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for these pollutants (40 CFR 50). The NAAQS represent the maximum levels of background pollution that are considered acceptable, with an adequate margin of safety, to protect public health and welfare. Short-term standards (1-, 3-, 8-and 24-hour periods) are established for pollutants contributing to acute health effects, while long-term standards (quarterly and annual averages) are established for pollutants contributing to chronic health effects. The Kentucky Department of Environmental Protection (KDEP) has adopted the NAAQS, which are presented in Table 3-1.
### Table 3-1. Ambient Air Quality Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>Primary Standard</th>
<th>Secondary Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8-hr</td>
<td>9 ppm 35 ppm</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-hr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Rolling 3-Month Average</td>
<td>0.15 µg/m³</td>
<td>Same as Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₂</td>
<td>Annual (arithmetic average)</td>
<td>53 ppb</td>
<td>Same as Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-hr</td>
<td>100 ppb</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀</td>
<td>24-hr</td>
<td>150 µg/m³</td>
<td>Same as Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₂·₅</td>
<td>Annual (arithmetic average)</td>
<td>12.0 µg/m³</td>
<td>15.0 µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-hr</td>
<td>35 µg/m³</td>
<td>Same as Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₃</td>
<td>8-hr</td>
<td>0.075 ppm</td>
<td>Same as Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂</td>
<td>1-hour</td>
<td>75 ppb</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-hour</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5 ppm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
atmospheric chemical reactions that are influenced by meteorology, ultraviolet light, and other atmospheric processes.

The study area for the air quality analysis includes the Appalachian Intrastate Air Quality Control Region, which is defined in 40 CFR 81.191, and comprises several counties in Kentucky, including Letcher County. Air quality in the study area is considered good, with the study area designated as unclassifiable, attainment, or better than national standards for all criteria pollutants. Because the study area is in attainment for all criteria pollutants, the CAA General Conformity Rule does not apply and is not addressed in this analysis. Although a conformity analysis is not required, impacts to air quality from emissions associated with construction and operations are addressed in Chapters 4 and 5.

3.7 NOISE

Sound is a physical phenomenon consisting of minute vibrations that travel through a medium, such as air or water, and are sensed by the human ear. The perception and evaluation of sound involves three basic physical characteristics:

- **Intensity** – the acoustic energy, which is expressed in terms of sound pressure, in decibels (dB).
- **Frequency** – the number of cycles per second the air vibrates, in Hertz.
- **Duration** – the length of time the sound can be detected.

Noise is defined as unwanted or annoying sound that interferes with or disrupts normal human activities. Although continuous and extended exposure to high noise levels (e.g., through occupational exposure) can cause hearing loss, the principal human response to noise is annoyance. The response of different individuals to similar noise events is diverse and is influenced by the type of noise, perceived importance of the noise, its appropriateness in the setting, time of day, type of activity during which the noise occurs, and sensitivity of the individual.

Levels of noise are measured in units called dB. However, a number of factors affect how the human ear perceives sound: the actual level of noise, frequency, period of exposure, and fluctuations in noise levels during exposure. The human ear cannot equally perceive all pitches or frequencies and noise measurements are therefore adjusted or weighted to compensate for the human lack of sensitivity to low- and high-pitched sounds. This adjusted unit is known as the A-weighted decibel, or dBA. The A-weighted metric, de-emphasizes very low and very high pitched sound and is most often applied to noise generated by motor vehicle traffic, small boats, and aircraft. Background, or ambient, noise levels are all sounds present in an environment and are dependent upon land use. Very rural areas with little human activity would be expected to have the lowest levels of background noise, typically on the order of 15 to 20 dBA (USEPA 1971). Noise increases with increased population, as demonstrated in Table 3-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Population Density (people per square mile)</th>
<th>Sound Level (dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural (undeveloped)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet suburban</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal suburban</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy urban</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very noisy urban</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: USEPA 1982.*
3.8 Infrastructure and Utilities

Infrastructure refers to the system of public works, such as utilities, that provides the underlying framework for a community. Infrastructure components and utilities discussed in this EIS include the water supply system, wastewater system, stormwater drainage system, electrical supply facilities, natural gas system, and solid waste management facilities. Transportation infrastructure, including roadway and street systems, the movement of vehicles, and mass transit, are discussed in Section 3.5, Transportation and Traffic.

Because infrastructure and utilities systems are directly related to activities within the communities from which they draw their services, the potentially affected area includes the county where they occur. The assessment of impacts is based on comparing existing use and conditions to anticipated changes in capacity associated with the utilities. The analysis compares current use with anticipated future demands to determine potential impacts.

3.9 Cultural Resources

Cultural resources are defined as prehistoric or historic sites, buildings, structures, objects, archaeological sites, districts, or other physical evidence of human activity that are considered important to a culture or community for scientific, traditional, or religious reasons. Cultural resources include prehistoric and historic archaeological resources, architectural resources, and TCPs.

- Archaeological resources – places where people changed the ground surface or left artifacts or other physical remains (e.g., arrowheads or bottles).
- Architectural resources – standing buildings, dams, canals, bridges, and other structures.
- Traditional cultural properties – resources associated with the cultural practices and beliefs of a living community that link that community to its past and help maintain its cultural identity. TCPs may include archaeological resources, locations of historic events, sacred areas, sources of raw materials for making tools, sacred objects, or traditional hunting and gathering areas.

Section 106 of the NHPA of 1966, as amended, and as implemented by 36 CFR 800, requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their actions on historic properties before undertaking a project that uses federal funds or is located on federal lands. A historic property is defined as any cultural resource that is included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The NRHP, administered by the National Park Service, is the official inventory of cultural resources that are significant in American history, prehistory, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. The NRHP also includes National Historic Landmarks. In consideration of 36 CFR 800, federal agencies are required to consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Indian Tribes, representatives of local governments, and the public in a manner appropriate to the agency planning process for the planned action (undertaking) and to the nature of the undertaking and its potential to cause effects on historic properties. The methodology for identifying, evaluating, and mitigating impacts to cultural resources has been established through federal laws and regulations including the NHPA, the Archaeological Resource Protection Act, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act.

The affected environment for cultural and traditional resources is also referred to as the area of potential effects (APE). The APE must be defined in order to assess the effects of a proposed action on a historic property. An APE is defined as the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or
indirectly cause changes in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist (36 CFR 800.16[d]).

The analysis in this EIS applies the criteria of adverse effect (36 CFR 800.5) to evaluate the effects of the proposed action on any historic properties located in the APE of each action alternative. A project affects a historic property when it alters the property’s characteristics (including relevant features of its environment or use) that qualify it as significant according to National Register criteria. Adverse effects may include the following: physical destruction, damage, or alteration of all or part of the resource; alteration of the character of the surrounding environment that contributes to the resource’s qualifications for the NRHP; introduction of visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are out of character with the resource or alter its setting; and neglect of the resource resulting in its deterioration or destruction. Impacts to traditional Native American tribal properties can be determined only through consultation with the affected Tribes. However, ground disturbance to prehistoric archaeological sites and graves has often been cited as an adverse impact.

Analysis of potential impacts to historic properties considers both direct and indirect impacts. Direct impacts may be the result of physically altering, damaging, or destroying all or part of a historic property, or neglecting the property to the extent that it deteriorates or is destroyed. Indirect impacts are those that may occur as a result of the completed project by altering characteristics of the surrounding environment through the introduction of visual or audible elements that are out of character for the period the property represents. An example of an indirect effect is increased vehicular or pedestrian traffic in the vicinity of the property.

3.10 WATER RESOURCES

Water resources include both surface and subsurface water. For the purposes of this EIS, water resources include the following topics: surface water, groundwater, water quality, wetlands, and floodplains.

3.10.1 Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1972, as amended (33 USC §§ 1251 et seq.), is the primary federal law that protects the nation’s waters, including lakes, rivers, and coastal areas. The primary objective of the CWA is to restore and maintain the integrity of the nation’s waters. The CWA prohibits all unpermitted discharge of any pollutant into any jurisdictional waters of the U.S. The USEPA is responsible for administering the water quality requirements of the CWA. To this end, the USEPA developed pollutant-specific water quality standards (referred to as total maximum daily load [TMDL]) to identify waters for which quality is sufficiently poor and for which effluent limits would be insufficient to meet water quality standards (KDEP 2013).

In addition to the effluent restrictions, the CWA Section 404 requires a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) issued permit for the dredging and/or filling of jurisdictional waters of the U.S. The USACE broadly defines jurisdictional waters to include navigable waters, intermittent streams, impoundments, tributary streams, and wetlands. Areas meeting the “waters of the U.S.” definition are under the jurisdiction of the USACE. Anyone proposing to conduct a project that requires a federal permit or involves dredge or fill activities that may result in a discharge to surface waters and/or waters of the U.S. is required to obtain a CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification, verifying that the project activities will comply with water quality standards.
3.10.2 Rivers and Harbors Act

Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, as amended (33 USC § 403) regulates structures or work that would affect navigable waters of the U.S. Structures include any pier, wharf, bulkhead, etc. Work includes dredging, filling, excavation, or other modifications to navigable waters of the U.S. The USACE issues permits for work or structures in navigable waters of the U.S.

3.10.3 Safe Drinking Water Act

Congress originally passed the Safe Drinking Water Act in 1974 (42 USC §§ 300 et seq.) to protect public health by regulating the nation's public drinking water supply. The law, amended in 1986 and 1996, requires the protection of drinking water and its sources.

3.10.4 Surface Water

Lakes, ponds, impoundments, rivers, and streams compose surface water resources that are important for economic, ecological, recreational, and human health reasons.

According to the USACE, streams are drainage features that may contain perennial streams (permanent flows), intermittent streams (flows during much of the year but drying seasonally), or ephemeral streams (flows only after storm events). Ponds are open water bodies (USACE 1987).

The U.S. is divided and sub-divided into successively smaller hydrologic units, which are classified into six levels: regions, sub-regions, basins, sub-basins, watersheds and sub-watersheds. The proposed sites lie in the Ohio Region (Hydrologic Unit Code [HUC] 05); Kentucky-Licking Subregion (HUC 0510); the Kentucky River Basin (HUC 051002); and the North Kentucky River Watershed (HUC 05100201) (USEPA 2013a). Both of the sites contain surface water features including headwater intermittent and perennial streams.

Pursuant to EO 11990, Protection of Wetlands, Section 404 of the CWA, and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, an investigation was conducted to identify potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. A May 2011 wetland delineation of both sites investigated the proposed project area, which included the areas of expected impact by the construction associated with the proposed action, excavation needed for construction, access roads (approximately 50 feet on either side of the existing access roads), and areas previously disturbed by past mining or gas line activities. Additional wetland delineation was conducted in 2014 based on the proposed conceptual layout. The 2011 and 2014 wetland delineations included Waters of the U.S., as well as wetlands which fall under the jurisdiction of the USACE and isolated wetlands which may be exempt from USACE jurisdiction but may be protected under Kentucky’s Department of Environmental Protection. These studies supplant the usage of the National Wetland Inventory (NWI) Wetland Mapper because it is believed they are significantly more accurate; however, NWI data was used for areas not delineated during fieldwork.

3.10.5 Wetlands and Floodplains

According to USACE regulations, wetlands are those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions.

EO 11990, Protection of Wetlands, directs federal agencies to take action to minimize the destruction, loss, or degradation of wetlands on their property and mandates review of proposed actions on wetlands through procedures established by NEPA. It requires that federal agencies establish and implement
procedures to minimize development in wetlands. Wetlands provide many functions and values such as flood flow alteration, groundwater recharge/discharge, and fish and wildlife habitat.

Site specific wetland data was collected through onsite field work, aerial photographs, topographic maps, National Wetland Inventory wetland maps, and Natural Resources Conservation Service soil surveys. Based on these resources wetlands are present on the sites.

EO 11988, Floodplain Management, defines floodplains as the lowland and relatively flat areas adjoining inland waters, including at a minimum, that area subject to a 1 percent or greater chance of flooding in any given year. The area subject to a 1 percent chance of flooding is referred to as the 100-year floodplain. EO 11988 directs federal agencies to avoid construction in floodplains and establishes a process for analysis and public notice if development is unavoidable. In this EIS, the analysis of floodplains considers if any new construction is proposed within a floodplain or may impede the functions of floodplains in conveying floodwaters.

3.11 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Biological resources include living, native, or naturalized plant and animal species and the habitats where they occur. Plant associations are referred to as vegetation and animal species are referred to as wildlife. Habitat can be defined as the resources and conditions present in an area that supports the existence of a plant or animal (Hall et al. 1997). Although the existence and preservation of biological resources are intrinsically valuable, these resources also provide aesthetic, recreational, and socioeconomic values to society. This analysis focuses on species or vegetation types that are important to the function of the ecosystem, of special societal importance, or are protected under federal or state law or statute.

For purposes of this EIS, these resources are divided into three major categories: vegetation, wildlife, and threatened and endangered species.

- **Vegetation** – includes terrestrial plant communities and the analysis will focus on vegetation types that are important to the function of the ecosystem or are protected under federal or state law.
- **Wildlife** – includes all vertebrate animals (i.e., mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, and fish) and sometimes invertebrate species or species groups such as mollusks or insects. Virtually all birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). The MBTA was designed to protect migratory birds (including their eggs, nests, and feathers) and their habitats. An activity has a significant adverse effect if, over a reasonable period of time, it diminishes the capacity of a population of a migratory bird species to maintain genetic diversity, to reproduce, and to function effectively in its native ecosystem.
- **Threatened and Endangered Species** – include plant and animal species that are listed or proposed for listing by the USFWS under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The federal ESA provides for the conservation of threatened and endangered species of plants and animals and the habitats where they are found. In addition, designated and proposed critical habitat for ESA-listed species will also be included in this EIS, as appropriate. This section will also address species that are listed by the State of Kentucky as threatened or endangered.
3.12 **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND WASTE**

The analysis of hazardous materials, hazardous waste, toxic substances, and contaminated sites focuses on the potential for these substances to be introduced into the environment from maintenance or during construction activities. Potentially affected areas consist of construction and operational maintenance areas. Factors considered in the analysis include the potential for increased human health risk or environmental exposure, as well as changes in the quantity and types of hazardous substances transported, stored, used, and disposed. The methodology for contaminated sites compares the proximity of proposed facility development to contaminated sites and considers the operational uses of the facilities to determine potential impacts to or from the sites.

3.12.1 **Hazardous Materials**

Hazardous materials are chemical substances that pose a substantial hazard to human health or the environment when improperly treated, handled, used, packaged, stored, transported or disposed. Hazardous materials are identified and regulated under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 USC 9601 et seq.); the Occupational Safety and Health Act (29 USC 651 et seq.); and the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (42 USC 11001 et seq.). Hazardous materials commonly used at Bureau facilities include petroleum and oil.

3.12.2 **Hazardous Waste**

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (40 CFR 240-280) and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (40 CFR 260) define hazardous waste as a solid waste, or combination of wastes that due to its quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical or infectious characteristics, may cause or significantly contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible or incapacitating reversible illness, or may pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or the environment when improperly treated, stored, disposed of, or otherwise managed. A solid waste is a hazardous waste if it is not excluded from regulation as a hazardous waste under 40 CFR 261.4(b) and if it exhibits identified characteristics of hazardous waste or meets other specified criteria [see 40 CFR 261.3(a)].

3.12.3 **Toxic Substances**

The Toxic Substance Control Act addresses those chemical substances and mixtures that may present unreasonable risk of personal injury or health of the environment from their manufacturing, processing, distribution, use, or disposal. The Toxic Substance Control Act Chemical Substances Inventory lists information on more than 62,000 chemicals and substances, such as asbestos, lead-based paint, and polychlorinated biphenyls. The sites under study in this EIS are undeveloped and do not include any structures; therefore, toxic substances are not discussed further in this EIS.

3.13 **CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS**

This section defines cumulative impacts and describes the approach taken in the analysis of cumulative impacts. Chapter 8, Cumulative Impacts, contains descriptions of other actions relevant to cumulative impacts, an analysis of the incremental interaction the proposed action may have with other actions, and an evaluation of the cumulative impacts potentially resulting from these interactions.

The approach taken in the analysis of cumulative impacts follows the objectives of NEPA, CEQ regulations, and CEQ guidance. Cumulative impacts are defined in 40 CFR 1508.7 as:
“the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or Non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions.”

Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time. A cumulative impact results from the additive effect of all projects in the same geographical area. Generally, an impact can be considered cumulative if: a) effects of several actions occur in the same locale, b) effects on a particular resource are the same in nature, and c) effects are long-term in nature. The common factor key to cumulative assessment is identifying any potential temporally and/or spatially overlapping or successive effects that may significantly affect resources in the analysis areas.

### 3.14 ASSESSING SIGNIFICANCE

Chapters 4 and 5 present the affected environment and analysis of the potential direct and indirect effects of each alternative for each resource area described in this chapter. Chapter 8 presents the analysis of the potential cumulative effects of each alternative for each resource area. The level of significance is assessed according to NEPA implementing regulations at 40 CFR 1508.27, which requires considerations of both context and intensity.
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4.0  ALTERNATIVE 1 – PAYNE GAP

4.1  LAND USE AND ZONING

Potential impacts to land use are assessed by comparing the existing land uses with the changes that would occur from implementation of the proposed action, including induced effects. Impacts to land use are evaluated for significance by determining the degree to which proposed development and uses conflict with existing land use and local plans and policies. Under the proposed action, potential short-term and long-term impacts to land use would occur from construction and operation of the USP and FPC.

Growth induced impacts to land use could result from spending wages and salaries by direct and indirect employees on items such as food, housing, transportation, and medical services. This spending creates induced employment in nearly all sectors of the economy; especially service sectors (see Section 4.3, Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice).

4.1.1  Affected Environment

Land use associated with the proposed location of Alternative 1 consists primarily of forested areas. The area was previously deep mined; however, mining activities no longer occur at the site. Land use surrounding the site is also primarily forested, with small single family residential homes adjacent to the site. There are no zoning ordinances or land use classifications identified for this area (DePriest 2013). Figure 4-1 depicts existing land use associated with Alternative 1.

4.1.2  Environmental Consequences

4.1.2.1  Construction

Construction of a USP and FPC would result in changes to on-site land use. Land use associated with the Payne Gap site would be converted from forested and former mining land uses to a government/institutional land use. However, a buffer area around the USP and FPC separating it from the adjacent properties would remain and would be compatible with the adjacent land uses. Due to the lack of zoning ordinances and land use classifications, construction of the proposed USP and FPC would not result in incompatible land uses from a regulatory perspective.

4.1.2.2  Operation

Once constructed, the operation of the USP and FPC would continue as a government/institutional on-site land use with a buffer area separating it from the adjacent properties that would be compatible with adjacent land uses.

4.1.3  No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the USP and FPC would not be constructed at the Payne Gap site and no potential land use compatibility issues with adjacent land uses would occur.
Figure 4-1. Payne Gap Land Use
4.1.4 Mitigation

Federal agencies are not subject to local/regional zoning or land use development regulations. However, the Bureau would take the following measures to help minimize potential adverse impacts to surrounding land uses:

- provide an open space and vegetative buffer between the USP and FPC to maintain visual compatibility with surrounding properties; and
- design and locate the facilities to reduce the visual presence of the facility from neighboring properties.

4.2 TOPOGRAPHY, GEOLOGY, AND SOILS

4.2.1 Affected Environment

The topography on the Payne Gap site is typified by the mountains valleys complex associated with western Appalachian Mountains. The topography at Payne Gap has been significantly affected by strip mining activities, which historically occurred on site. According to the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5 minute Jenkins West topographic quadrangle map, the elevation on site ranges from a low of 1,385 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) in the northwest corner of the site adjacent to the North Fork of the Kentucky River and a high of 2,965 feet AMSL on Pine Mountain in the southern portion of the site (University of Kentucky 2013a). The majority of slopes on site are very steep, well over 15 percent.

The Payne Gap site is underlain by the Breathitt Group which is composed of the Pikeville Formation and the Hyden Formation. The geology underlying the Payne Gap site is primarily Pikeville Formation (Kentucky Geological Survey [KGS] 2013).

The soils underlying the Payne Gap site are varied as a result of topography and mining disturbance, but none of the soils are listed as hydric by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). The three most common soils at the Payne Gap site are composed of the Cloverlick–Kimper–Highsplint complex (30-65 percent slopes), the Dekalb–Gilpin–Raye complex (25-65 percent slopes), and the Kaymine, Fairpoint, and Fiveblock soil series (2 to 70 percent slopes). To a lesser degree, the following soils underlie the site; Caneyville–Renox–Bledsoe complex (50 to 80 percent slopes), Shelotca–Highsplint complex (30-65 percent slopes), and Urban land Udorthents complex (0 to 15 percent slopes) (NRCS 2013). These soils have not been designated by NRCS as prime farmland soils.

4.2.2 Environmental Consequences

Implementation of the proposed action under Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts to topography, geology, and soils.

4.2.2.1 Construction

Development of the site would require significant excavation and fill activities to create a level pad for construction of the facilities and construction of access roads. A 2:1 fill slope and a 1:1 cut slope were used in the estimate adjacent to the building pads and roads to transition to the original topography at the Payne Gap site. More detail on the earthwork calculations can be found in Appendix B. As described in Section 2.4, Alternative 1 – Payne Gap, and Table 2-1, Estimated Site Preparation Quantities for Alternative 1 - Payne Gap, of this document, excavation activities (cut) would include 2,794,660 cubic yards (2,136,671 cubic meters) of soil material and 8,117,470 cubic yards (6,206,251 cubic meters) of
The excavated soil and rock would be filled into the valleys as spoil or compacted to create a structural fill in the building pads. The amount of structural fill was estimated to be 1,716,095 cubic yards (1,312,048 cubic meters) and the amount of spoil fill would be 12,106,917 cubic yards (9,256,402 cubic meters). All excavated materials would be used on-site for structural fill or placed as spoil fill. The maximum cut (excavation) at Payne Gap would be approximately 60 meters and the maximum fill would be approximately 80 meters. Removal of bedrock would require blasting activities. Impacts resulting from these activities would include loss of productive soil, erosion, and destabilization of slopes (as a result of the cuts and fills). As a result of the excavation and fill activities, the topography of the site would change at the maximum cut from 555 meters to 495 meters (mean sea level [MSL]) in the main building area and a maximum fill from 470 meters to 550 meters MSL in the prison camp area.

The project area does not contain prime farmland soils; therefore, prime farmland soils would not be impacted and the FPPA does not apply to this site and no further coordination would be required.

4.2.2.2 Operation

Once constructed, no further impacts to topography, geology or soils are anticipated from the operation of the USP and FPC.

4.2.3 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the USP and FPC would not be constructed. Therefore, significant excavation, fill, and grading activities would not occur. As a result, there would be no impacts to topography, geology, or soils.

4.2.4 Mitigation

A soil erosion and sedimentation (E&S) plan would be prepared and approved by Kentucky Division of Water prior to construction. The E&S plan would outline the requirements for controlling erosion and sedimentation on site including BMPs. BMPs may include placement of silt fencing adjacent to surface waters and wetlands to prevent the introduction of sediment; the use of hay bales to minimize the spread of sediment off the construction site; stabilization of steep slopes, use of tree clearing plans, and stormwater control plans to manage stormwater runoff and keep it on-site during construction. Additionally, construction could be phased so that construction of the USP, FPC and ancillary facilities occurred at different times resulting in the minimization of disturbed soil by clearing only the area necessary for the current phase of construction. Re-vegetation of disturbed areas following the completion of construction would also occur to minimize the erosion of exposed soil.

4.3 Socioeconomic and Environmental Justice

4.3.1 Affected Environment

This socioeconomic analysis focuses on impacts due to construction and operation of the proposed action. The assessment examines how the alternatives would affect population, employment, income, and housing characteristics in the study area. Economic impacts are defined to include direct effects, such as changes to employment and expenditures that affect the flow of dollars into the local economy and indirect effects, which result from the “ripple effect” of spending and re-spending in response to the direct effects.
Socioeconomic impacts, particularly impacts such as those being evaluated in this EIS, are often mixed: beneficial in terms of gains in jobs, expenditures, tax revenues, etc., and potentially adverse in terms of growth management issues such as demands for housing and community services.

This analysis also identifies potential environmental justice issues. Impacts to environmental justice populations are identified where high and adverse human health or environmental effects may disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations. Impacts to children would occur if there was an increased disproportionate environmental health or safety risk to children.

4.3.1.1 Population

The 2013 population of Letcher County was 24,025. Letcher County’s population decreased by approximately 3 percent between 2000 and 2010 (Table 4-1). The City of Whitesburg grew by approximately 34 percent from 2000 to 2010 and the City of Jenkins population decreased by 3 percent during the same time period. The decrease in population is likely the result of people who leave the area for better education and employment opportunities (Kentucky River Area Development District [KRADD] 2013). This trend is anticipated to continue within the county with the population decreasing by an additional 8 percent by the year 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whitesburg, Kentucky</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td>33.85</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins, Kentucky</td>
<td>2,273</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>-3.08</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letcher County, Kentucky</td>
<td>25,275</td>
<td>24,519</td>
<td>-2.99</td>
<td>22,655</td>
<td>-6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>4,041,769</td>
<td>4,339,357</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>4,699,880</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *2020 Projections only available for county and state.

4.3.1.2 Employment and Income

Letcher County’s 2013 employed civilian labor force was 7,103, out of a total civilian labor force of 8,201. Employment by industry in Letcher County is depicted in Table 4-2. The industries that employ the greatest number of people in Letcher County include educational services, and health care and social assistance (33.4 percent); agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining (13.0 percent); and retail trade (12.7 percent). In Kentucky, the largest industry employers are educational services, and health care and social assistance (24.5 percent); manufacturing (13.7 percent); and retail trade (11.8 percent) (U.S. Census Bureau 2014a).

Letcher County is part of the largest coal producing area in eastern Kentucky. While study area jobs in the coal mining industry have been declining, positions in the health care, retail, and the secondary wood industries have increased. However, these jobs typically pay less than coal mining jobs. The study area is part of a region characterized by high unemployment and poverty rates (KRADD 2013).
## Table 4-2. Study Area Employment, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Number Employed</th>
<th>Percent Employed</th>
<th>Number Employed</th>
<th>Percent Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>52,348</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>111,646</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>255,938</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>49,171</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>219,721</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing, and utilities</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>112,005</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>29,217</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental/leasing</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>102,380</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, management, and administrative and waste management services</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>144,589</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services, health care and social assistance</td>
<td>2,369</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>456,293</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>159,679</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services, except public administration</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>87,228</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>85,390</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,103</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,865,605</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2014a.*

While unemployment rates in Kentucky have decreased from a peak of 10.3 percent in 2009 to 6.5 percent in 2014, the unemployment rate in Letcher County increased dramatically from 10.6 percent in 2009 to 17.3 percent in 2013 (Table 4-3). The preliminary 2014 unemployment rate for Letcher County has decreased to 11.5 percent. The comparable rate for the U.S. was 6.3 percent (Kentucky Labor Market Information [KYLMI] 2014).

Unemployment rates in the study area are higher than the comparable rates for the state and the nation. Along with the “displaced worker,” the study area has a higher percentage of “discouraged” workers who no longer actively seek employment and are, therefore, not included in the official unemployment statistics. Therefore, the official unemployment rate in the study area is deceptively lower than actual unemployment (KRADD 2013).

## Table 4-3. Study Area Percent Unemployment Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letcher County, Kentucky</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: Unemployment rates are not seasonally adjusted. *August 2014, preliminary.

*Source: KYLMI 2014.*

Total personal income includes net earnings by place of residence; dividends, interest, and rent received; and benefits paid by federal, state, and local governments and businesses. A larger portion of personal income in Letcher County comes from government and business benefits than for Kentucky and the U.S (U.S. Department of Commerce 2014).
Total personal income in Letcher County decreased by almost 2 percent from 2010 to 2012, while over the same time period, personal income increased by approximately 10 percent in Kentucky (Table 4-4). Between 2010 and 2012, per capita income increased in Letcher County by less than 1 percent while per capita income in Kentucky increased by 8 percent. The national per capita income was $43,735 (U.S. Department of Commerce 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letcher County, Kentucky</td>
<td>$686,680</td>
<td>$674,369</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>$27,948</td>
<td>$28,155</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$143,210,961</td>
<td>$157,043,042</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>$32,947</td>
<td>$35,643</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Not adjusted for inflation.  

4.3.1.3 Housing

There were 11,519 housing units in Letcher County in 2013, with a total vacancy rate of approximately 19 percent (Table 4-5). The vacancy rate for owner-occupied units was 0.3 percent and vacancy rate for rental units was 1.9 percent. The comparable vacancy rates in Kentucky were higher, 12.4 percent, 2.1 percent, and 6.7 percent respectively (U.S. Census Bureau 2014b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Vacant Housing Units</th>
<th>Percent Vacant</th>
<th>Homeowner Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Rental Vacancy Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letcher County, Kentucky</td>
<td>11,519</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1,933,019</td>
<td>239,620</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2014b.

4.3.1.4 Environmental Justice

For the purpose of this evaluation, minority refers to people who identified themselves in the census as Black or African American, Asian, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaskan Native, other non-White races, or as being of Hispanic or Latino origin. Persons of Hispanic and Latino origin may be of any race (CEQ 1997). The CEQ identifies these groups as minority populations when either (1) the minority population of the affected area exceeds 50 percent or (2) the minority population percentage in the affected area is meaningfully greater than the minority population percentage in the general population or the geographic region of comparison (most often the state in which the affected area is part). The geographical unit for comparison in this analysis is Kentucky.

U.S. Census Bureau data on the racial and ethnic composition of the study area in 2013 are summarized in Table 4-6. Overall, the majority of the study area is white. Letcher County has a smaller percentage of minority and Hispanic populations than Kentucky.
### Table 4-6. Study Area Percent Race and Ethnicity, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black/African American</th>
<th>American Indian/Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino Origin*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whitesburg, Kentucky</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins, Kentucky</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letcher County, Kentucky</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Data presented reflects most reported race and ethnicity categories; percentages may not add to 100 percent due to rounding. *Hispanic origin may be of any race.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2014c.

Table 4-7 presents data on low-income families and individuals in the study area. The percentages of low-income families and individuals in Letcher County with incomes below poverty level (based on family size and composition) are greater than for Kentucky. In the study area, the City of Jenkins has the highest percentages of families and individuals with incomes below the poverty level.

### Table 4-7. Study Area Percent Race and Ethnicity, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Families Below Poverty Level</th>
<th>Individuals Below Poverty Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whitesburg, Kentucky</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins, Kentucky</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letcher County, Kentucky</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2014a.

#### 4.3.1.5 Protection of Children

The percentage of children under the age of 18 is lower in Whitesburg, Jenkins, and Letcher County than for Kentucky (Table 4-8).

### Table 4-8. Study Area Percent Under the Age of 18, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>&lt;18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whitesburg, Kentucky</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins, Kentucky</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letcher County, Kentucky</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2014c.

#### 4.3.2 Environmental Consequences

##### 4.3.2.1 Population

Approximately 300 new employees would be needed to operate the proposed USP and FPC. It is anticipated that some of these employees would be existing Bureau of Prisons (BOP) employees who would relocate to the area and the rest would be hired locally. Under a maximum case scenario, all 300 new personnel are assumed to move to the study area.

The BOP personnel would likely be accompanied by their families or other household members. The U.S. Census Bureau has determined that the average household size for the U.S., which is assumed to be similar to the average household size of transfer employees, is 2.58 (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). Under this assumption, approximately 774 people would be added to the study area population. This would represent 3.2 percent of the Letcher County 2013 population. This gain would help to offset some of the...
recent and projected population losses in Letcher County. Alternative 1 would result in a minor beneficial impact to the study area’s short- and long-term population trends.

4.3.2.2 Employment and Income

The increase of 300 full-time positions would represent approximately 4 percent of the Letcher County 2013 civilian labor force. Study area personal income would also increase as a result of job growth. Some of the increased wage earnings would be paid to taxes, and some would be saved and invested, but most would be spent on consumer goods and services in the study area.

This spending would, in turn, “ripple” through the economy, generating additional indirect jobs and income and benefitting the study area economy. Given the rate of unemployment in the study area (11.5 percent), it would be expected that many of these indirect positions would be filled by unemployed local residents. In addition, inmates’ family members would be expected to visit, boosting visitor spending in hotels/motels and restaurants in the study area. No population in-migration to the study area would be expected as a result of indirect job growth.

The increase in construction spending would also generate direct construction jobs and indirect jobs, typically in food services and retail trade. Additional construction workers may move into the study area in response to the direct construction jobs, but these workers would most likely leave the area for other opportunities when the construction projects near completion. Further, given the study area unemployment rate, it would be expected that most of the indirect positions would be filled by unemployed study area workers. While there may be some population in-migration to the study area as a result of construction spending, it would not be expected to significantly affect population trends. Alternative 1 would result in beneficial employment and income impacts in the study area.

While the purchase of land by the Bureau for Alternative 1 would reduce property tax revenues, additional taxes would accrue to federal, state, and local governments as a result of the increase in payrolls, and operational and construction spending. It is anticipated that, on balance, the fiscal/economic impacts would be beneficial and there would be no significant adverse fiscal/economic impacts.

4.3.2.3 Housing

Alternative 1 would result in an increase of 300 full-time positions in the study area. Under a conservative scenario, all these personnel would seek housing in Letcher County at the same time. This would represent about 2.6 percent of Letcher County’s total housing units and approximately 14 percent of the vacant units. Some additional housing may be developed by the private market to support USP and FPC employees who choose to live in Letcher County. However, not all new personnel would live in Letcher County and the increase in personnel would occur over the construction period before the USP and FPC become operational, reducing any potential negative impacts to the study area’s housing market.

4.3.2.4 Environmental Justice

This EIS has identified no adverse environmental impacts that would have disproportionately high or adverse environmental effects on minority or low-income populations. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse impacts to environmental justice communities.
4.3.2.5 Protection of Children

This EIS had identified no adverse environmental impacts that would result in disproportionate health or safety risks to children. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse impacts to the health or safety of children.

4.3.3 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the USP and FPC would not be constructed. As a result, there would be no potential for beneficial socioeconomic impacts such as new jobs and potential growth of business within the region. This could result in the sustained poor economic climate in the region. The No Action Alternative would not result in adverse impacts to environmental justice communities or children.

4.3.4 Mitigation

No adverse impacts to socioeconomics, environmental justice populations, or children would be expected; therefore, no mitigation would be warranted. Beneficial impacts would be anticipated and the community is prepared to accommodate growth.

4.4 Community Facilities and Services

4.4.1 Affected Environment

4.4.1.1 Police

Law enforcement servicing the area around and including the Payne Gap site is serviced by the Fleming Neon Police Department, Jenkins Police Department, Letcher County Sheriff, and Kentucky State Police. The Fleming Neon Police Department has three full-time employees consisting of one police chief and two police officers, as well as one volunteer that operate out of a single station in Fleming Neon. The station has three squad cars and provides service 24-hours per day, seven days a week (Fleming Neon Police Department 2013).

The Jenkins Police Department has six full-time personnel consisting of one police chief, four police officers, and the Public Safety Director. The department is currently short staffed by one person. The police department operates out of one station in Jenkins. The station operates eight squad cars and provides 24-hour coverage (Jenkins Police Department 2013).

The Letcher County Sheriff’s office is comprised of 13 full-time employees including 10 deputies and 3 dispatchers. The office operates 10 squad cars and is headquartered in Whitesburg. The office provides 24-hour coverage, seven days per week (Letcher County Sheriff 2013).

The Kentucky State Police for Letcher County operates out of the Hazard Post and covers a total of five counties including Letcher County. The Hazard Post currently has 39 state troopers, 18 dispatchers, 3 clerks, 1 custodian, 1 criminal analyst, and 1 arson specialist. They operate 39 squad cars, and have 8-10 spare squad cars available in the event one is needed (Kentucky State Police 2013).

4.4.1.2 Fire

Fire departments that provide emergency services for the Payne Gap area include the Fleming Neon Fire Department, Jenkins Volunteer Fire Station, and Whitesburg Fire and Rescue. The Fleming Neon Fire Department has approximately 36 firefighters and emergency medical technicians (EMTs) at the Fleming Neon Volunteer Fire Station. Sixteen are paid, full-time employees and 20 are volunteers. The station has
seven paramedics and eight EMTs. The department has a single station in Fleming Neon and a substation in Whitesburg. The Fleming Neon Station has two fire engines, 10 ambulances, 1 tanker truck, 1 rescue truck, 1 dive trailer (for underwater rescue) and 1 all-terrain vehicle for search and rescue operations. Four ambulances run during the day and 1 run at night. Firefighters run 3 crews during the day and 1 crew at night. The station has mutual aid agreements with all the towns in Letcher County (Fleming Neon Fire Department 2013).

The Jenkins Volunteer Fire Station consists of between 25-28 firefighters and three administrative personnel with two stations in Jenkins. All firefighters are volunteers and 5 of the firefighters are also EMTs. Equipment associated with the stations includes 2 fire engines, an 85-foot tower truck, a 65-foot ladder truck, a 2,500 gallon tanker truck, 1 heavy rescue truck, and 1 vehicle for personnel transport. The Jenkins Volunteer Fire Station has mutual aid agreements with all other stations in Letcher County (Jenkins Volunteer Fire Station 2013).

4.4.1.3 Healthcare

Appalachian Regional Healthcare (ARH) serves over 350,000 residents in eastern Kentucky and southern West Virginia. Their operations in Letcher County, Kentucky include the Whitesburg ARH Hospital, ARH Clinic, Jenkins ARH Clinic, Neon ARH Clinic, ARH Cardiology Clinic and Home Health Agency. Whitesburg ARH completed an $11 million dollar renovation project in 2011 that included a 15,000 square foot addition to the facility that houses surgical, obstetric, and newborn patients. Renovations to the existing space included a complete remodel of the third floor to include six Intensive Care Unit beds and 20 private patient rooms. Whitesburg ARH Hospital provides 24-hour emergency service for both adult and pediatric patients and has an on-site heliport for receiving and transferring patients. Whitesburg ARH is an acute care hospital that covers internal medicine, family practice, pediatrics, general surgery, advanced laparoscopic surgery, obstetrics and gynecology, cardiology, pulmonology, radiology and emergency services.

Mountain Comprehensive Health Corporation located in Whitesburg, Kentucky offers dental, family and internal medicine, pediatrics, cardiology, pulmonology, and obstetrics and gynecological services, as well as a rehabilitation program. Mountain Comprehensive Health Corporation also has a full service laboratory.

4.4.1.4 Schools

The schools in Letcher County are administered by the Letcher County School District. There are five elementary schools, three middle schools, and one high school. Table 4-9 depicts the names of the schools, the grades they serve, the number of students enrolled for the 2014-2015 school year and the actual capacity of each school.
Table 4-9. Letcher County Schools Enrollment and Capacity for 2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlie Boggs Elementary</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowan Elementary</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming Neon Middle School</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letcher County Elementary</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letcher County Middle School</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letcher County Central High School</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Whitesburg Elementary School</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitesburg Middle School</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Jane Potter Elementary</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4.4.2 Environmental Consequences

4.4.2.1 Police

The law enforcement groups that have jurisdiction over the area where the Payne Gap site is located would be able to provide assistance in the event of an emergency situation at the USP that required assistance beyond the capabilities of the USP. The individual law enforcement agencies have stated they would be willing to discuss the development of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Bureau to provide these services. Law enforcement indicated this would not result in impacts to their services or require the hiring of additional staff; therefore, the proposed action would have no impact to law enforcement.

4.4.2.2 Fire

Fire departments that would provide emergency services for the area where the Payne Gap site is located would be able to provide assistance to the USP and FPC in the event there was an incident that was beyond the capabilities of the USP and FPC. The individual fire departments have indicated they would be willing to discuss the development of a MOU with the Bureau to provide these services. The fire departments indicated that this would not result in impacts to their services or require the hiring of additional staff; therefore, the proposed action would have no impact to emergency services.

4.4.2.3 Healthcare

Healthcare facilities are located within close proximity to the Payne Gap site and would be able to accommodate inmates at the proposed USP and FPC if needed. Discussions with ARH indicate they have staff familiar with accommodating inmates and the necessary security requirements that would need to be implemented to bring an inmate into a healthcare facility. ARH indicated this would not be a problem and they would be able to accommodate the facility if an inmate would require care outside of the USP or FPC. ARH also indicated they would be willing to work with the Bureau to develop a MOU (Sparkman 2014).

4.4.2.4 Schools

It is assumed that approximately 300 new employees would be needed to operate the proposed USP and FPC. It is anticipated that some of these employees would be existing Bureau employees that would relocate to the area. Bureau employees relocating to operate the facility may not all reside within the immediate area (Whitesburg, Jenkins, or Letcher County). It would be anticipated that some would reside
outside of the immediate area. With the exception of Martha Jane Potter Elementary school, all the schools within Letcher County School District have sufficient capacity to accept new students.

4.4.3 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the USP and FPC would not be constructed. Community facilities and services would continue to operate under existing conditions. Law enforcement, emergency services, and healthcare providers within the area would not be asked to support the facility in emergency situations; therefore, no impacts to these services would occur.

4.4.4 Mitigation

Impacts to community facilities and services would not occur; therefore, no mitigation would be warranted.

4.5 Transportation and Traffic

The analysis of transportation and traffic describes both personal and public vehicle movement throughout a road and highway network. The study area for transportation and traffic includes the road and highway networks that surround and provide access to the proposed site parcels.

Rural collector roads are divided into major and minor collector roads. Major collector roads are used for inter-county travel or for carrying vehicles to routes of higher classification (principal arterials and minor arterials) (Division of Planning 2011). Minor collector roads collect traffic from local roads and carry it to major collector roads, minor arterial roads, and/or principal arterials. Rural principal arterials are those roadways that have continuous routes that lend themselves to statewide or interstate travel and typically have limited access (Division of Planning 2011).

4.5.1 Affected Environment

The Payne Gap site is located approximately 7.5 miles to the east of Whitesburg, Kentucky. This project alternative would be constructed to the south of U.S. Route 119, to the east of Bottom Fork Road (KY 3406), and to the west of Talman Drive. In the project vicinity, U.S. Route 119 is designated as a rural principal arterial1 on the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet’s (KYTC’s) statewide map of roadway functional classifications (KYTC 2014a). KYTC traffic count station 272 is located on U.S. Route 119 approximately 0.5 miles west of the site. The year 2010 Annual Average Daily Traffic traffic volume at this location was 6,778 vehicles per day (KYTC 2014b). The site has several access options. These include driveways onto Bottom Fork Road, U.S. Route 119, Talman Drive, and a connection to Fork Drive, which is an existing roadway that extends southward from U.S. Route 119.

As defined by KYTC, rural principal arterials “comprise a system of continuous, connected, rural routes having trip length and density suitable for statewide or interstate travel. They provide for movement between all urban areas with a population of 50,000 or more and most urban areas with a population of at least 25,000” (KYTC 2014a).

A traffic impact study for the Payne Gap site was prepared and received concurrence from the KYTC Central Office on April 30, 2015 and from the KYTC District 12 Office on May 5, 2015. The study identified that U.S. Route 119 is currently operating at LOS A during both am and pm peak periods (7:00 a.m.-9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m. respectively) (Parsons 2015).
4.5.2 Environmental Consequences

4.5.2.1 Construction

Implementation of either action alternative would involve temporary traffic impacts resulting from construction activities. The following types of additional trips are expected to be added to the highway network:

- Construction worker commuting trips
- Trips involving the delivery and removal of construction equipment and materials
- Trips involving the removal of demolition debris and/or excess fill material

These trips would be temporary, and would not continue after the completion of project construction. Whereas construction worker commuter trips are expected to be concentrated during the traditional peak commuting periods, other trips would likely be dispersed throughout the typical working day. Trucks would be used to deliver/remove construction equipment and materials and to remove demolition debris and/or excess fill material during construction. Because of their size and weight, trucks have a relatively greater impact on street capacity and pavement conditions, as compared to passenger cars. Given the temporary nature of construction truck traffic, and given that trucks are not expected to be concentrated in peak commuting periods, the potential impact to roadway capacity would be less than significant. The potential impact to roadway wear and tear would be avoided or reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation described below in Section 4.5.4, Mitigation. With this measure, the addition of construction-related trips is not expected to result in a significant traffic-related impact.

4.5.2.2 Operation

Following construction, the proposed facility would add traffic to the surrounding street network on a recurring basis. This traffic increase would include employee commuting trips, plus additional trips (such as the transfer of inmates, inmate visitors, delivery of supplies and equipment, etc.) that would not necessarily coincide with peak commuting periods. As discussed in Section 1.6, Proposed Action, the proposed facility would have a staff of 300 full-time employees. The proposed action’s traffic generation was estimated using trip generation rates published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (ITE 2012). Table 4-10 presents peak hour traffic generation. As shown in this table, the proposed facility would add approximately 156 trips during the morning peak hour and 204 during the afternoon peak hour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-10. Estimated Peak Hour Trip Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak Hour Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak Hour Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Parsons 2015.

It is anticipated that a higher number of trips are expected to be generated in the p.m. peak period based on the previous studies performed and documented in the ITE Trip Generation Manual of traffic patterns associated with a federal correctional facility (Parsons 2015). Additional trips to/from the site are expected to occur during off-peak hour commuting periods. These off-peak trips may include the transfer of inmates, inmate visitors, and delivery of supplies and equipment. Based on the low volumes on KY 588, there is no anticipated impact associated with these off-peak trips.
The traffic impact analysis determined that with the additional peak hour trips U.S. Route 119 would continue to operate at a LOS A during both a.m. and p.m. peak periods. The study also found that the intersection of U.S. Route 119 and the entrance to the facility would operate at LOS A for westbound traffic during both a.m. and p.m. peak periods and LOS B for northbound traffic during the same peak periods. Appendix F contains the traffic impact study and Appendix A contains the email communications with KYTC regarding the traffic impact study.

These potential impacts would be avoided or reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation described below in Section 4.5.4, *Mitigation*.

### 4.5.3 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the USP and FPC would not be constructed and increases in traffic to area roadways would not occur. It is anticipated that traffic would remain close to existing conditions; therefore, no impacts to transportation or traffic would occur.

### 4.5.4 Mitigation

Although there are no significant impacts to traffic outlined in the traffic impact study, KYTC has recommended that consideration be given to constructing a left turn lane on U.S. Route 119 for vehicles traveling westbound. The left turn lane would minimize the potential for rear-end vehicle collisions.

### 4.6 Air Quality

#### 4.6.1 Affected Environment

The air quality analysis evaluates projected future emissions, including construction and operations. Air quality impacts would be significant if emissions associated with the proposed action would: 1) increase ambient air pollution concentrations above the NAAQS, 2) impair visibility within federally mandated Prevention of Significant Deterioration Class I areas, 3) result in the potential for any stationary source to be considered a major source of emissions if total emissions of any pollutant subject to regulation under the CAA is greater than 250 tons per year (TPY) for attainment areas, or 4) for mobile source emissions, result in an increase in emissions to exceed 250 TPY for any pollutant. The air quality assumptions and calculations are provided in Appendix C, *Air Emission Calculations*.

Pollutants considered in this analysis include the criteria pollutants. Airborne emissions of lead are not considered because there would be no sources of airborne lead associated with the proposed action with the exception of the firing range, which would be indoors.

For criteria pollutant emissions, 250 TPY per pollutant was used as a comparative analysis threshold. This value is used by the USEPA in their New Source Review standards as an indicator for impact analysis for listed new major stationary sources in attainment areas. No similar regulatory threshold is available for mobile source emissions, which are the primary sources for the construction phases, and also a component of operational emissions for the proposed action. Lacking any mobile source emissions thresholds, the 250 TPY major stationary source threshold was used to equitably assess and compare mobile source emissions.

Pollutants would be generated by numerous sources, including diesel exhaust from construction equipment, gasoline exhaust from the driving tracks and operations such as generators and boilers. In general, volatile organic compound (VOC), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrous oxides (NOₓ), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emissions would be primarily generated by diesel-fueled heavy equipment operating in
Air emissions were analyzed, where applicable, based on proposed construction activities and operational emissions that would occur during full operation.

Under the CAA, motor vehicles and construction equipment are exempt from air permitting requirements. Since the emissions from these sources associated with the proposed action would occur in areas that are in attainment of the NAAQS for all criteria pollutants, the General Conformity Rule is not applicable. Nonetheless, NEPA and its implementing regulations require analysis of the significance of air quality impacts from these sources as well as non-major stationary sources. However, neither NEPA nor its implementing regulations have established criteria for determining the significance of air quality impacts from such sources in CAA attainment areas.

As noted above, the General Conformity Rule is not applicable to these mobile sources and minor (i.e., non-major) stationary sources in attainment areas. Therefore, the analysis of construction and operational incremental emissions from these sources in attainment areas and the significance criteria selected (250 TPY) are solely for the purpose of informing the public and decision makers about the relative air quality impacts from the Proposed Action under NEPA requirements.

### 4.6.2 Environmental Consequences

The results of the air emissions analysis show that construction and operational emissions would remain well below the significance thresholds and would not have a significant impact on the local or regional air quality. A summary of the analysis is presented below and the complete analysis is provided in Appendix C, *Air Emission Calculations*.

#### 4.6.2.1 Construction

Direct impacts from emissions from construction would include combustion emissions from fossil fuel-powered equipment and fugitive dust emissions (PM\(_{10}\) and PM\(_{2.5}\)) during clearing, demolition activities, earth moving activities, and operation of equipment on bare soil. Table 4-11 presents estimates for the primary construction activities that would utilize heavy duty diesel equipment for the Payne Gap site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>VOC Tons</th>
<th>CO Tons</th>
<th>NO(_x) Tons</th>
<th>SO(_2) Tons</th>
<th>PM(_{10}) Tons</th>
<th>PM(_{2.5}) Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payne Gap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>32.35</td>
<td>108.53</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>217.59</td>
<td>27.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne Gap</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>32.35</td>
<td>108.53</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>147.09</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fugitive dust from land disturbance activities would be the primary source of emissions during construction, with most of the emissions occurring during Year 1. PM\(_{10}\) emissions are estimated using wetting and other typical reduction practices to reduce dust release by 50 percent. PM\(_{10}\) emissions are...
predicted to be greatest in Year 1 at the Payne Gap site, at 217.59 TPY. These emissions, however, would remain well below the significance threshold of 250 TPY. Construction emissions would not have direct or indirect significant impacts on the region’s air quality.

Direct impacts to air quality may also include emissions from the burning of construction debris, if such an activity were undertaken during construction. Vegetative debris and/or demolition and construction materials would be disposed in accordance with all laws and regulations. Should open burning be necessary, it would be conducted in accordance with Title 401 of the Kentucky Administrative Regulations, Section 63 (401 KAR 63:005) Open Burning.

4.6.2.2 Operations

Table 4-12 presents the annual emissions based on the site being fully operational. Operational emissions would be the same regardless of the location selected. Stationary sources operating onsite include two 2000-kilowatt diesel-powered emergency generators and three boilers to provide heat and hot water for the site. The boilers have been estimated at 15 MMBtu/hr. One of the boilers would serve as a backup, so air emission calculations evaluated use of two boilers. All of these stationary sources would require an air permit and be regulated by the KDEP, Division for Air Quality. Analysis of permit requirements based on the final stationary source(s) type and design would be performed as design requirements are more fully delineated. This would ensure regulatory permit compliance and that all requisite source registrations would be submitted.

In addition to stationary sources, the emissions from staff commuting to and from work have been estimated at 300 employees and working 365 days per year. The round trip was estimated at 40 miles because of the rural locations that have been selected for analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>VOC Tons/Year</th>
<th>CO Tons/year</th>
<th>NOx Tons/Year</th>
<th>SO2 Tons/Year</th>
<th>PM10 Tons/Year</th>
<th>PM2.5 Tons/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generators</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boilers</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Vehicles</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.36</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.16</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the criteria pollutant emissions remain well below the significance threshold of 250 TPY. Based on the emission estimates, operation of the BOP complex would not have direct or indirect significant impacts on the local or regional air quality.

4.6.3 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action alternative, the USP and FPC would not be constructed in Letcher County. The No Action Alternative would not result in emissions of any air pollutants. Therefore, there would be no impact to regional air quality.

4.6.4 Mitigation

Best management practices would be implemented to reduce air emissions. They may include, but are not limited to:
- Impacts to air quality (PM$_{10}$ emissions) from fugitive dust would be minimized by periodic
  wetting during construction activities when clearing, excavation, filling and grading activities
  would occur.
- Utilization of alternatively fueled equipment.
- Utilization of other emission controls that are applicable to the equipment being used on-site.
- Reduction of idling time of equipment and construction vehicles.

4.7 **NOISE**

4.7.1 **Affected Environment**

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulates noise impacts to workers and sets
forth thresholds for a safe work environment. OSHA has set permissible noise exposure limits (codified
in 29 CFR 1910.95[b]). Based on these limits, an employee should not be subjected to continuous noise
exceeding 90 dBA for durations lasting more than 8 hours per day (Table 4-13). As the level increases,
the allowed duration of noise decreases. The maximum limit is 115 dBA for duration of 15 minutes or
less. OSHA standards are the best documented requirements in regards to long-term human noise
exposure. In addition, OSHA standards state that exposure to impulsive or impact noise (loud, short
duration sounds) is not to exceed 140 dB peak sound pressure level (OSHA 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-13. OSHA Permissible Noise Exposures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration per Day (hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25 or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* 29 CFR 1910.95(b).

The Payne Gap site is located in a rural area with minimal noise. Areas of the site located immediately
adjacent to U.S. Route 119 would experience some noise from traffic traveling through the area. There is
nothing located on the site that currently generates noise.

4.7.2 **Environmental Consequences**

4.7.2.1 **Construction**

Construction activities associated with the proposed action would result in temporary, short-term
increases in noise levels. Noise associated with construction equipment and vehicles, as well as blasting
activities to remove bedrock, would occur during site preparation and construction.

As stated in Section 3.6.1, *Affected Environment*, OSHA standards (29 CFR 1910.95) state that
employees should not be subjected to continuous noise exceeding 90 dBA for durations lasting more than
8 hours per day. For the purposes of this analysis, noise at a sensitive receptor above the level for a
residential district, 55 dBA, is noted for impacts, and noise emissions exceeding 90 dBA for more than 8
hours per day at a sensitive receptor location would be considered to have significant adverse impacts.
A noise sensitive receptor is defined as a location or facility where people involved in indoor or outdoor activities may be subject to stress or considerable interference from noise. Such locations or facilities often include residential dwellings, hospitals, nursing homes, educational facilities, and libraries. Sensitive noise receptors may also include supporting habitat for certain wildlife species or noise sensitive cultural practices.

The proposed action would generate noise during the construction phases of the USP and FPC. Phases of construction that would generate noise include: land clearing and excavations, pile driving, foundation and capping, erection of structural materials, and construction of exterior walls. Construction activities that would impact noise levels include noise from construction equipment operating at the site, construction/delivery vehicles traveling to and from the site, and pile driving activities required for placement of deep pile foundations. Noise levels at a given receptor location would depend on the type and number of pieces of construction equipment being operated and the receptor’s distance from the construction site. Construction related noise emissions are listed in Table 4-14 and can range from 74 to 101 dBA when measured 50 feet from the respective piece of equipment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Description</th>
<th>Actual Measured L_{max} at 50 feet (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat Bed Truck</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder/Torch</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Lift</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump Truck</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressor (air)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixer Truck</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drill Rig Truck</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End Loader</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivet Buster/Chipping Gun</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilation Fan</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drum Mixer</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Concrete Mixer</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Pump Truck</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumps</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring Jack Power Unit</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning Horn</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auger Drill Rig</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraper</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum Excavator</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrating Hopper</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Saw</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mounted Impact Hammer (hoe ram)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheers (on backhoe)</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Pile Driver</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Pile Driver</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Federal Highway Administration 2006.
Small increases in noise levels would be expected as a result of the operation of delivery trucks and other construction vehicles. However, larger increases in noise levels would result if pile driving activities are necessary. Increased noise levels would be greatest during the early stages of each construction phase, although these periods would be of relatively short duration. However, under the worst case scenario during pile driving, there would be periods during construction when noise would range from 101 dBA at 50 feet from the equipment to 89 dBA at 200 feet from the equipment. The 200-foot radius from the equipment would encompass primarily rural undeveloped areas, depending on the location of the pile driving equipment at any given time on the Payne Gap site. When compared to the existing noise conditions at the Payne Gap site (35 dBA) and the OSHA noise thresholds for workers, the pile driving activities would result in significant short-term impacts to noise receptors located within 200 feet of the pile driving equipment location at the construction site, which would vary as the foundation piles would be driven throughout the foundation footprint. Moderate noise impacts would extend up to 1.5 miles from the construction site, as this is the distance at which noise levels would attenuate down to 55–60 dBA.

In conclusion, temporary and short-term noise disturbance would occur during construction; however, implementation of noise attenuation measures described below would reduce potential disturbance from noise. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 1 would have no significant impacts to sensitive noise receptors from noise.

4.7.2.2 Operation

The operation of the proposed USP and FPC, once construction is completed, is not expected to significantly increase ambient noise levels.

4.7.3 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the USP and FPC would not be constructed and no increases in noise as a result of construction or operation would occur. It is anticipated that the site would remain undeveloped; therefore, no increases in noise that may present impacts to nearby noise receptors would occur.

4.7.4 Mitigation

To minimize the impact to noise receptors during the operation of the pile driving equipment, a variety of measures could be taken, including but not limited to:

- Using noise bellows systems to provide further noise attenuation.
- Performing the work during daytime hours.
- Scheduling the louder construction activities for less intrusive times (mid-morning to mid-afternoon).

4.8 INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES

4.8.1 Affected Environment

4.8.1.1 Potable Water

Letcher County Water and Sewer District (LWSD) would provide service to the Payne Gap site. LWSD has been extending service in the area which includes an area along U.S. Route 119, adjacent to the Payne Gap site. The water main at this location is 8 inches in diameter and has water pressure near the connection point of approximately 110 pounds per square inch (psi). Potable water would be provided by
LWSD via a connection approximately 3.5 miles away from the Payne Gap site (Cardno 2014a). The existing permitted capacity for water is 4,000,000 gallons per day with 2,000,000 gallons per day currently being used.

4.8.1.2 Waste Water

Sanitary sewer service would be provided by the City of Jenkins and treated at the Jenkins Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP). The nearest connection point is located at the Gateway Industrial Park in Jenkins, approximately 1.5 miles east of the Payne Gap site (Figure 4-2). The facility was designed to treat approximately 600,000 gallons per day and currently treats approximately 400,000 gallons per day (KRADD 2013).

4.8.1.3 Natural Gas

There is one gas well on site, located in the northeast corner of the property. In addition there is an above ground 16-inch high pressure transmission line running directly through the property. The gas well and transmission line are both owned by EQT (Cardno 2014a).

4.8.1.4 Electricity

American Electric Power (AEP) lines extend along U.S. Route 119 in the vicinity of the Payne Gap site and would be able to provide electricity to the Payne Gap site (Cardno 2014a).

4.8.1.5 Telecommunications

Windstream provides telecommunications service in the area of Payne Gap with fiber and copper cables in the vicinity of U.S. Route 119. Windstream has sufficient capacity in this area to provide adequate service to the proposed Bureau facility (Cardno 2014a).
Figure 4-2. Payne Gap Existing Utilities
4.8.1.6 Solid Waste

Solid waste generated within Letcher County is disposed of at the Laurel Ridge Landfill in London, Kentucky, approximately 90 miles west of Whitesburg, Kentucky (Crouch 2014). The Laurel Ridge Landfill has a maximum annual limit of 350,000 tons. The landfill currently receives approximately 320,000 tons annually. Based on their current capacity, the landfill has a 30-year life expectancy.

4.8.2 Environmental Consequences

4.8.2.1 Potable Water

The USP and FPC are anticipated to require 214 gallons per day per inmate. Based on an anticipated inmate population of 1,200 a total of 258,000 gallons per day would be required under the proposed action. Additionally, the utility plant, warehouses, and training building would require approximately 6,160 gallons per day. Based on the available permitted capacity of 4,000,000 gallons per day and current usage of approximately 2,000,000 gallons per day the additional usage by the USP, FPC and ancillary facilities would not result in impacts to the water supply.

4.8.2.2 Waste Water

Average waste water generated by the USP, FPC and ancillary facilities is anticipated to be 224,000 gallons per day. This would result in the City of Jenkins WWTP exceeding their design capacity of 600,000 gallons per day by approximately 24,000 gallons per day. As a result, the proposed action would result in significant impacts to the City of Jenkins WWTP.

4.8.2.3 Natural Gas

Implementation of the proposed action at the Payne Gap site would result in the closure and abandonment of a gas well and relocation of an above ground natural gas pipeline. Closure of the gas well would result in lost natural gas production and profit to the owner of the well, EQT. Additionally, the relocation of the natural gas pipeline would result in a loss of transmission and resulting profit to EQT during the relocation process. EQT would also have expend resources to relocate the gas line, as well as acquire right-of-way and permits to complete the relocation. Due to the location of the Jefferson National Forest to the south, the relocation of the line is limited to moving it to the north of its current location. As a result of the implementation of the proposed action at Payne Gap, significant impacts to natural gas infrastructure would occur.

4.8.2.4 Electricity

Coordination with the service provider, AEP, has indicated they have ample capacity to provide service to the facility. AEP would extend overhead lines to a pre-determined handoff point to the secure facility and the Bureau would extend the service on-site to the needed facilities (Cardno 2014a). There would be no charge to extend the overhead lines to the handoff point and no issues with capacity; therefore, no adverse impacts to electrical capacity would occur as a result of the proposed action.

4.8.2.5 Telecommunications

Windstream has indicated that they have sufficient capacity to meet the needs of the proposed USP, FPC, and ancillary facilities at the Payne Gap site. The Bureau would be responsible for connecting the fiber cables at a splice location adjacent to the Payne Gap site, as well as connection of copper cables at the Gateway Industrial Park in Jenkins. Connection costs would be approximately $35,000.
4.8.2.6 Solid Waste

It is anticipated that inmates would generate 4 pounds of solid waste per day or 1,460 pounds per year. With an estimated 1,200 inmates that would result in 4,800 pounds per day or 1,752,000 pounds per year (876 tons per year). Under the proposed action, the solid waste generated at the facility would increase the current tons per year taken to the Laurel Ridge Landfill from 320,000 to 320,876 tons per year. This increase would not result in the landfill going over their current yearly maximum intake of solid waste; therefore, there would be no adverse impacts to the Laurel Ridge Landfill.

4.8.3 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the USP and FPC would not be constructed and the Payne Gap site is anticipated to remain undeveloped. If the Payne Gap site is not developed, there would be no requirement for additional utilities; therefore, it is anticipated that utility usage would remain similar to existing usage.

4.8.4 Mitigation

Mitigation for impacts to wastewater treatment as a result of the implementation of the proposed action at the Payne Gap site would require either the upgrade of the existing City of Jenkins WWTP or the construction of a new WWTP closer to the Payne Gap site. Coordination with the City of Jenkins indicates there are two options to provide waste water treatment to the Payne Gap site (Cardno 2014a). The Bureau would have to pay for these mitigation measures which would be approximately $3,800,000.

Mitigation of impacts to natural gas infrastructure at the Payne Gap site would require the Bureau to pay for the closure of the gas well and relocation of the natural gas pipeline. The gas well would require closure at a cost of $850,000. Additionally, the above ground gas line would require relocation off-site. It is anticipated that 9,000 linear feet of gas line would need to be relocated at a cost of $455 per linear foot (Cardno 2014a). This would result in a total cost for relocation of approximately $4,095,000. The Bureau would also have to pay for a connection fee of $110,000. In addition to the relocation costs, it would take a minimum of 2-years to design, permit and install this pressure main. The Bureau would also be required to assess the impacts of both the removal of the gas line and the relocation of the gas line, which could result in additional studies and mitigation (i.e., wetland delineation, cultural resource studies, threatened and endangered species).

4.9 Cultural Resources

An APE was defined to take into consideration both potential direct and indirect effects to cultural resources from implementation of the proposed action. The APE for Alternative 1 includes the 753-acre (305-hectare) Payne Gap site and adjacent areas to the north (Figure 4-3). The APE extends beyond the north boundary of the Payne Gap site because of the potential for visual effects to any historic properties that may be present within the viewseshed of the proposed federal correctional facility’s one- to four-story buildings. Effects to archaeological resources, however, would be limited to the 300-acre (121-hectare) area within the APE where construction (direct ground disturbance) would occur.
Figure 4-3. Payne Gap Architectural Resources
4.9.1 Affected Environment

4.9.1.1 Archaeological Resources

The Payne Gap site has been subject to previous mining activities; however, the mining activities did not appear to extend to the entire site. Therefore, a Phase I Archaeological Survey was conducted in August 2011 and an additional Phase I archaeological investigation was conducted in August 2014. The surveys conducted pedestrian traversal of transects across areas that were not too steep, surface survey in areas of high ground surface visibility, search of rocky outcrops for rockshelters and other cultural features, and limited subsurface testing of flatter ridgetop, ridgeline, and slope terraces. In addition, background research indicated that no previously identified archaeological sites were present at the proposed Payne Gap site.

A total of 40 shovel test pits were excavated within the APE during both Phase I surveys. No artifacts and no prehistoric or historic archaeological sites eligible for listing on the NRHP were discovered. As a result of both surveys, no further work was recommended at the proposed Payne Gap site. Concurrence on the 2011 survey recommendation was received from the SHPO on January 24, 2012, and concurrence on the 2014 survey recommendation was received on December 22, 2014 (Appendix A, Agency Coordination).

4.9.1.2 Traditional Cultural Properties

Under Section 106 of the NHPA, a federal agency is required to give consideration to issues of traditional religious or cultural areas concerning Native American groups. No TCPs have been identified within the project APE based on there being no federally recognized tribes within Kentucky.

4.9.1.3 Architectural Resources

Architectural surveys were conducted to identify historic properties in the Payne Gap site APE. The initial reconnaissance survey of the APE was conducted in May 2011. The survey recommended four architectural resources for further investigation to determine their eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP. Other architectural resources located in the APE were not associated with significant historical or architectural contexts of Letcher County and/or were in poor condition; therefore, they were not recommended for further work (TEC, Inc. 2011a). The Kentucky Heritage Council (KHC), the Kentucky SHPO, concurred with the reconnaissance survey recommendations (KHC 2011).

An intensive level survey of the four architectural resources recommended for further investigation as a result of the reconnaissance survey was conducted in August 2013. The resources consist of: two cemeteries (LR149 and LR150); a late-nineteenth century vernacular T-plan house (LR151); and an early-twentieth century vernacular central passage, double pile house (LR188) (Figure 4-3; Table 4-15).

Archival and historical research and detailed field survey were undertaken to evaluate the NRHP eligibility of each property. Based on the field and research data, the survey concluded that none of the resources are eligible because they do not meet the NRHP criteria for eligibility (Cardno 2014b). The KHC concurred that the resources are not eligible for the NRHP (KHC 2014) (Appendix A, Agency Coordination).
Table 4-15. Architectural Resources in the Payne Gap Site APE Evaluated for NRHP Eligibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NRHP Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LR149</td>
<td>Laurel Fork Cemetery</td>
<td>1918–present</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR150</td>
<td>Wright Cemetery</td>
<td>1863–1961</td>
<td>Private, family cemetery</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR151</td>
<td>Samuel J. Wright House</td>
<td>Ca. 1885</td>
<td>Vernacular T-plan residence</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR188</td>
<td>Holbrook-Craft House</td>
<td>Ca. 1903–1914</td>
<td>Vernacular central passage, double pile house</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9.2 Environmental Consequences

The cultural resources surveys for the proposed action did not identify any archaeological sites or architectural resources eligible for inclusion in the NRHP in the APE for the Payne Gap site. Therefore, Alternative 1 would have no effect on NRHP-listed or eligible cultural resources.

4.9.3 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the USP and FPC would not be constructed and the site would remain undeveloped and no potential impacts to cultural resources would occur.

4.9.4 Mitigation

Alternative 1 would have no impact to NRHP-listed or eligible cultural resources; therefore, no mitigation is required.

4.10 WATER RESOURCES

4.10.1 Affected Environment

The Payne Gap site has two domestic single household wells located on the northern portion of the site. One well is at an elevation of 1,500 feet with water found at 60 feet below the surface. The second well is located at an elevation of 1,480 feet with water found at an elevation of 40 feet below the surface (KGS 2013). There are no groundwater wells on the Roxana site but there is a domestic single household well located north of the site at an elevation of 1,200 feet with a depth to water of 80 feet. Groundwater flow tends to follow the slope topography. Variations in groundwater conditions are expected based on location and elevation across the site, seasonal conditions, and weather patterns. Both sites are underlain by the Breathitt Group which is comprised of the Pikeville Formation and the Hyden Formation at both sites; however, only the Roxana site is also underlain by the Four Corners Formation. The Breathitt Group yields more than 500 gallons per day in more than three-quarters of the wells drilled in valley bottoms, more than 500 gallons per day in about three-quarters of the wells on hillsides, and more than 100 gallons per day to nearly all wells on ridges within Letcher County (KGS 2013). There are no sole source aquifers underlying either site (USEPA 2013b).

The quality of the groundwater in Letcher County ranges from moderately hard in most of the county to moderately soft south of Pine Mountain. Naturally occurring contaminants present in the groundwater consist of sulfate, salt (sodium chloride), iron, and manganese (University of Kentucky 2013b).

According to the Kentucky Division of Water, Groundwater Branch, Letcher County has areas of moderate and high sensitivity to groundwater pollution. The hydrogeologic sensitivity reflects the ease and speed with which a contaminant can move into and within a groundwater system. The hydrogeologic sensitivity of Letcher County has been given a value of three out of five, with five being the most
susceptible to groundwater pollution and one being the least susceptible. The region is given a three due to subcutaneous drain and enlarged fractures influence groundwater recharge, fissure networks influence flow, and bidirectional dispersal patterns influence overall dispersion (KDEP 1994).

4.10.1.1 Water Quality

Water Quality refers to the suitability of water for a particular use based on selected physical, chemical, and biological characteristics. Potential uses considered include potable water, irrigation, and water able to support life. For the purposes of this EIS, water quality is considered with the statutory requirements regarding water quality conditions.

Water Quality is regulated under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by the CWA. The CWA prohibits spills, leaks, or other discharges of oil or hazardous substances into the waters of the U.S. in quantities that may be harmful. Direct discharges of effluents are regulated under the CWA through National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit program administered by the USEPA or under state National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System programs approved by the USEPA. The CWA also requires each state to establish water quality standards for its surface waters derived from the amount of pollutants that can be assimilated by a body of water without deterioration of a designated use. Waters not meeting the water quality standards may require the establishment of a TMDL for the waterbody. Impaired waters requiring a TMDL are called 303 (d) listed waters (KDEP 2013).

According to Environmental Protection Agency data none of the streams on either site have been assessed. Subsequently there are no identified impaired waters or TMDLs for either of the sites (USEPA 2013a). The closest assessed water body to the Payne Gap site is Fish Pond, located north of the site, on the opposite side of Kona Cut Road (U.S. Route 119). Fish Pond was determined to be good for secondary contact recreation water, warm water aquatic habitat, and cold water aquatic habitat. The closest assessed water body to the Roxana site is the North Fork of the Kentucky River, located north of the site on the opposite side of Route 588/160. The North Fork of the Kentucky River was assessed for primary contact recreation and was determined to be impaired as a result of elevated levels of fecal coliform. The elevated levels of fecal coliform were believed to be the result of point source discharges from sewage or packaging plants (USEPA 2013a).

4.10.1.2 Floodplains

EO 11988, Floodplain Management, sets forth the responsibilities of federal agencies for reducing the risk of flood loss or damage to personal property, minimizing the impacts of flood loss, and restoring the natural and beneficial functions of floodplains. This order was issued in furtherance of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973.

4.10.1.3 Wetlands and Waters of the U.S.

Wetland delineations were conducted in May 2011 and August 2014. Hydrology at the site has been highly disturbed as a result of historic mining activities. The delineation included the identification of wetlands and Waters of the U.S.

During delineations approximately 2.84 acres (1.15 hectares) of wetlands were identified within the proposed project area on the Payne Gap site. The majority of the wetlands are located immediately adjacent to an existing or historic road which has impacted water movement in the area. NWI does not depict any wetlands onsite, within or outside of the proposed project area. In addition, several
intermittent, perennial and ephemeral streams were delineated on site (TEC, Inc. 2011b, TEC, Inc. 2011c, and Cardno 2014c).

Hydrology supporting the wetlands is a result of both groundwater and surface water; runoff and direct precipitation. Dominant vegetation within the wetlands identified at the Payne Gap site consists of *Eleocharis obtusa*, *Juncus effuses*, *Typha latifolia*, and *Carex lurida*.

Figure 4-4 depicts the wetlands and streams delineated within the Payne Gap site and Table 4-16 lists the acreages of wetland by type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wetland and Streams Delineated at Payne Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feature Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wetlands</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine Emergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine Scrub-Shrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine Forested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Riverine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional Stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Jurisdictional Stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N/A = Not Applicable.*

Based on Federal Emergency Management Agency floodplain mapping, there are no 100-year floodplains at the Payne Gap site (Marshall Miller 2012a).

4.10.2 Environmental Consequences

Implementation of the proposed action is not anticipated to affect groundwater, as excavation and construction activities are anticipated to occur at elevations well above the groundwater table.

It is not anticipated that water quality of nearby streams and wetlands would be adversely impacted by on site construction. BMPs would be implemented based on an approved erosion and sediment control plan that would minimize sediment and pollutants from the construction site being carried into nearby water courses.

Implementation of the proposed action at the Payne Gap site would result in approximately 10,512 linear feet of stream impacts, 0.43 acres (0.17 hectares) of impacts to palustrine emergent wetlands, 0.76 acres (0.31 hectares) of impact to palustrine forested wetlands, and 1.2 acres (0.48 hectares) of impacts to palustrine scrub-shrub wetlands. These impacts would be to the streams and wetlands delineated in 2011 and 2014 (refer to Table 4-16) and would result primarily from the excavation and grading activities that would be required to prepare the site for the development of the USP, FPC, ancillary buildings, and roads.

No floodplains are present on the Payne Gap site; therefore no impacts to floodplains would occur.

4.10.3 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the Payne Gap site would not be developed and no impacts to surface waters or wetlands would occur.

4.10.4 Mitigation

The Bureau met with the USACE on May 19, 2015 to discuss mitigation related to wetland and stream impacts. Since the Payne Gap site is not the preferred alternative no mitigation would be warranted for the site at this time.
Figure 4-4. Payne Gap Wetlands and Waters of the U.S.
4.11 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

4.11.1 Affected Environment

Biological resources include living, native, or naturalized plant and animal species and the habitats where they occur. Habitat can be defined as the resources and conditions present in an area that supports the existence of a plant or animal (Hall et al. 1997). Although the existence and preservation of biological resources are intrinsically valuable, these resources also provide aesthetic, recreational, and socioeconomic values to society.

This analysis focuses on species and vegetation types that are important to the function of the ecosystem, of special societal importance, or are protected under Federal or state law or statute. For the purposes of this EIS, these resources are divided into three major categories: vegetation, wildlife, and special-status species.

Vegetation includes terrestrial plant communities and the analysis focuses on vegetation types that are important to the function of the ecosystem or are protected under Federal or State law.

Wildlife includes all common animal species, with the exception of those identified as special-status species (see below). The wildlife category includes invertebrates, fish, amphibians, reptiles, mammals, and birds, including native bird species protected under the MBTA.

Special-status species includes plant and animal species that are listed or proposed for listing by USFWS as threatened and endangered or are candidate species under the ESA. ESA candidate species are plant or animal species for which USFWS has sufficient information on file regarding biological vulnerability and threats to support a proposal that would list them as endangered or threatened under the ESA, based on the most recent candidate review. In addition, designated and proposed critical habitat for ESA-listed species are also included in this EIS, as appropriate. Critical habitat is a specific geographic area(s) that contains features essential for the conservation of a threatened or endangered species and that may require special management and protection. This section also addresses species that are listed by the State of Kentucky as threatened or endangered.

4.11.1.1 Vegetation

The Payne Gap site is primarily covered in mature hardwood forest with herbaceous and scrub shrub vegetation dominating areas previously disturbed by historic strip mining activities and along the shoulders of the site access roads. Site observations indicate upland vegetation on the Payne Gap site includes, American beech (Fagus grandifolia), tuliptree (Liriodendron tulipifera), northern red oak (Quercus rubra), sourwood (Oxydendrum arboreum), American elm (Ulmus americana), Allegheny blackberry (Rubus allegheniensis), autumn olive (Elaeagnus umbellata), white clover (Trifolium repens), sericea lespedeza (Lespedeza cuneata), multiflora rose (Rosa multiflora), Kentucky bluegrass (Poa pratensis), and summer grape (Vitis aestivalis). Wetland vegetation includes American sycamore (Platanus occidentalis), black willow (Salix nigra), green ash (Fraxinus pennsylvanica), jewelweed (Impatiens capensis), common rush (Juncus effusus), broadleaf cattail (Typha latifolia), fowl mannagrass (Glyceria striata), sallow sedge (Carex lurida), and woolgrass (Scirpus cyperinus).

4.11.1.2 Wildlife

Due to relative proximity wildlife on both sites are believed to be similar; however, during a site visit a herd of eastern elk (Cervus elaphus) was observed on the Payne Gap site. Species likely to be found on
both sites includes red-winged blackbirds (*Agelaius phoeniceus*), tufted titmouses (*Baeolophus bicolor*), red-tailed hawks (*Buteo jamaicensis*), coyotes (*Canis latrans*), Virginia opossums (*Dipelphis virginiana*), American black bears (*Ursus americanus*), eastern gray squirrels (*Sciurus carolinensis*), green frogs (*Rana clamitans melanota*), American toads (*Bufo americanus*), black rat snakes (*Elaphe obsoleta obsolete*), southern flying squirrels (*Glaucomyys volans*), eastern spotted skunks (*Spilogale putorius*), copperheads (*Agkistrodon contortrix*), eastern hognose snakes (*Heterodon platirhinos*), fence lizards (*Sceloporus undulates*), wild turkeys (*Meleagris gallopavo*), and white tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) (Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources 2013).

The MBTA is the primary legislation established to conserve migratory birds. The act prohibits taking, killing, or possessing migratory birds unless permitted by regulation.

### 4.11.1.3 Federally Threatened and Endangered and State Listed Special Status Species

Due to the number of state listed species listed by Kentucky as potentially occurring in Letcher County and subsequently on the two proposed sites the following section will focus on federal listed species. A full list of special status species and their status is included in Table 4-17.

| Table 4-17. State and Federal Report of Endangered, Threatened, and Special Concern Plants, Animals, and Natural Communities of Letcher County, Kentucky |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Scientific Name** | **Common Name** | **Status (State/Federal)** |
| **Liverworts** | | |
| Plagiochila caduciloba | Gorge Leafy Liverwort | E/N |
| **Mosses** | | |
| Anomodon rugelii | None | T/N |
| Brachythecium populeum | Matted Feather Moss | E/N |
| Cirripodium piliferum | None | T/N |
| Dicranodontium asperulum | None | E/N |
| Entodon brevisetum | None | E/N |
| Neckera pennata | None | T/N |
| Oncophorus rau | None | E/N |
| Polytrichum pallidisetum | A Hair Cap Moss | T/N |
| Polytrichum strictum | None | E/N |
| Sphagnum quinquefarium | Five-ranked Bogmoss | E/N |
| **Vascular Plants** | | |
| Adlumia fungosa | Allegheny-vine | H/N |
| Angelica triquinita | Filmy Angelica | E/N |
| Baptisia tinctoria | Yellow Wild Indigo | T/N |
| Botrychium matricariifolium | Matricary Grape-fern | E/N |
| Boykinia aconitifolia | Brook Saxifrage | E/N |
| Carex aestivalis | Summer Sedge | E/N |
| Carex appalachi | Appalachian Sedge | T/N |
| Castanea pumila | Allegheny Chinkapin | T/N |
| Circaea alpine | Small Enchanter's Nightshade | S/N |
| Corydalis sempervirens | Rock Harlequin | S/N |
| Cymophyllus fraserianus | Fraser's Sedge | E/N |
| Cyripedium parviflorum | Small Yellow Lady's-slipper | T/N |
| Eupatorium steelei | Steele's Joe-pye-weed | T/N |
| Gentiana decora | Showy Gentian | S/N |
| Hexastylis contracta | Southern Heartleaf | E/SOMC |
| Houstonia serpyllifolia | Michaux's Bluets | E/N |
| Hydrophyllum virginianum | Eastern Waterleaf | T/N |
Table 4-17. State and Federal Report of Endangered, Threatened, and Special Concern Plants, Animals, and Natural Communities of Letcher County, Kentucky

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status (State/Federal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juglans cinerea</td>
<td>White Walnut</td>
<td>T/SOMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leucothoe recure</td>
<td>Red-twist Doghobble</td>
<td>E/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium superbum</td>
<td>Turk's Cap Lily</td>
<td>T/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listera smallii</td>
<td>Kidney-leaf Twayblade</td>
<td>T/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monotropis odorata</td>
<td>Sweet Pinesap</td>
<td>T/SOMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oenothera oakesiana</td>
<td>Evening Primrose</td>
<td>H/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oenothera perennis</td>
<td>Small Sundrops</td>
<td>E/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orontium aquaticum</td>
<td>Golden Club</td>
<td>T/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pogonia ophioglossoides</td>
<td>Rose Pogonia</td>
<td>E/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosartes maculate</td>
<td>Nodding Mandarin</td>
<td>S/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanguisorba Canadensis</td>
<td>Canada Burnet</td>
<td>E/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxifraga michauxii</td>
<td>Michaux's Saxifrage</td>
<td>T/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxifraga micranthidifolia</td>
<td>Lettuce-leaf Saxifrage</td>
<td>E/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidago curtisi</td>
<td>Curtis' Goldenrod</td>
<td>S/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trillium undulatum</td>
<td>Painted Trillium</td>
<td>T/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terrestrial Snails</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glyphaulinia rhoadsi</td>
<td>Sculpted Glyph</td>
<td>T/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neohelix dentifera</td>
<td>Big-tooth Whelip</td>
<td>T/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patera panselenus</td>
<td>Virginia Bladetooth</td>
<td>S/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crustaceans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambarus bunting</td>
<td>Longclaw Crayfish</td>
<td>S/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambarus parvoculus</td>
<td>Mountain Midget Crayfish</td>
<td>T/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphiagrion saucium</td>
<td>Eastern Red Damsel</td>
<td>E/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calephelis borealis</td>
<td>Northern Metalmark T</td>
<td>T/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erora laeta</td>
<td>Early Hairstreak</td>
<td>T/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liothoransa recurvata</td>
<td>A Burrowing Mayfly</td>
<td>S/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papaiopterya speciosissima</td>
<td>Osmunda Borer Moth</td>
<td>E/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyciodes batesii</td>
<td>Tawny Crescent</td>
<td>H/SOMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylurus notatus</td>
<td>Elusive Clubtail</td>
<td>E/SOMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylurus scudder</td>
<td>Zebra Clubtail</td>
<td>E/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fishs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrosomus cumberlandensis</td>
<td>Blackside Dace</td>
<td>T/LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etheostoma sagittata</td>
<td>Cumberland Arrow Darter</td>
<td>S/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amphibians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptobranchus alleganiensis</td>
<td>Eastern Hellbender</td>
<td>E/SOMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptobranchus alleganiensis</td>
<td>Eastern Hellbender</td>
<td>E/SOMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plectodon wehrlei</td>
<td>Wehrle's Salamander</td>
<td>E/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breeding Birds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accipiter striatus</td>
<td>Sharp-shinned Hawk</td>
<td>S/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corvus corax</td>
<td>Common Raven</td>
<td>T/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheucticus ludovicianus</td>
<td>Rose-breasted Grosbeak</td>
<td>S/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyto alba</td>
<td>Barn Owl</td>
<td>S/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermivora chrysoptera</td>
<td>Golden-winged Warbler</td>
<td>T/SOMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mammals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clethrionomys gapperi maurus</td>
<td>Kentucky Red-backed Vole</td>
<td>S/SOMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corynorhinus rafinesquii</td>
<td>Rafinesque's Big-eared Bat</td>
<td>S/SOMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustela nivalis</td>
<td>Least Weasel</td>
<td>S/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myotis leibii</td>
<td>Eastern Small-footed Myotis</td>
<td>T/SOMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myotis sodalis</td>
<td>Indiana Bat</td>
<td>E/LE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The gray bat (*Myotis grisescens*) is federally listed as endangered and listed by Kentucky as threatened. The gray bat roosts in caves throughout the year although suitable caves are rare. For winter hibernacula the bats require vertical caves with domed halls. The winter caves must also have a temperature of between 6 and 11 degrees Celsius. Forested areas along the banks of streams and lakes provide important protection for adults and young. Summer caves are always within 1 km of a river or reservoir where the bats forage. Forests provide important feeding areas for young bats, which will not forage in areas where the forests have been cleared (Natureserve 2013a).

The Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) is federally listed as endangered and is listed by Kentucky as endangered. The Indiana bat hibernates in caves; however, maternity sites are generally behind loose bark of dead or dying trees or in tree cavities. They forage in riparian areas, upland forests, ponds, and fields, but forested landscapes are the most important habitat. They typically hibernate in the coldest area of a cave to ensure a low enough metabolic rate in order to conserve fat reserves throughout the winter; however they will move away from areas that dip below freezing. Known roost tree species include elm, oak, beech, hickory, maple, ash, sassafras, birch, sycamore, locust, aspen, cottonwood, pine, and hemlock with a preference for trees with exfoliating bark (Natureserve 2013b).

According to the USFWS there is no federally designated Critical Habitat on either site (USFWS 2013).

Based on coordination with USFWS the Payne Gap site is considered to have the potential for Indiana bat as well as gray bat. A Phase I survey conducted in December 2014 confirmed the presence of both winter and summer habitat (Copperhead Environmental Consulting 2015). In addition, one mine opening contained a torpid Indiana bat at its entrance. USFWS concurred with the findings of the Phase I survey and indicated additional studies at the Payne Gap site would be required if this site were moved forward for development (Appendix A). The Bureau met with USFWS on May 20, 2015 to discuss additional studies and mitigation requirements (Appendix A).

In addition, the Kentucky arrow darter is known to exist in the upper Kentucky River basin. Habitat for the species consists of pools and transitional areas between riffles and pools in moderate to high gradient streams. The streams within the project area are primarily small channels that do not contain riffle and pool complexes (USFWS 2013).

### 4.11.2 Environmental Consequences

#### 4.11.2.1 Vegetation

Approximately 218 acres (88 hectares) of forested area would be impacted by the proposed action. These impacts would be the result of excavation and grading activities required to prepare the site for development.
4.11.2.2 Wildlife

Wildlife species found on the sites would likely be displaced during construction activities due to the loss of habitat and increases in noise. However, over 535 acres (217 hectares) of the site itself would remain undisturbed and continue to provide habitat, including breeding and foraging areas, for wildlife species found on-site. Additionally, the site is surrounded by similar habitat that could accommodate species that are displaced by construction activities. Based on the available habitat that will remain on site and habitat adjacent to the site (Jefferson National Forest), it is anticipated that these impacts would not adversely affect wildlife species that are currently present on-site.

Use of the non-lethal/lethal fence has the potential to result in adverse impacts to small animals and avian species, should they pass through the outer fences and into the area of the non-lethal/lethal fence.

4.11.2.3 Federally Threatened and Endangered and State Listed Special Status Species

Implementation of the proposed action at the Payne Gap site has the potential to impact Indiana bats, northern long-eared bats and gray bats. Approximately 218 acres (88 hectares) of summer roosting habitat would be impacted at the Payne Gap site. Additionally, based on the presence of mine openings and an Indiana bat, USFWS requested additional studies be conducted at the Payne Gap site to further assess impacts if the proposed action were to be implemented at the site. These studies would include conducting spring or fall portal surveys on all suitable mine openings that may be either directly or indirectly impacted by the proposed action. Based on the Phase I survey and coordination with USFWS there is the potential for significant impacts to both summer roosting habitat and winter hibernaculum. Indirect impacts may come from the noise from the proposed outdoor firing range. The range would be used approximately once a month for small arms training and maintenance.

It is not anticipated that the Kentucky arrow darter would be impacted by the project. The streams within the project site are small channels and do not contain riffle pool complexes. Additionally, conductivity measurements were taken within streams on the project site. Conductivity measurements ranged from 562 microseconds (µS) to 1,970 µS. Studies have demonstrated that Kentucky arrow darters are not likely to be present when conductivity levels exceed approximately 250 µS; therefore, no impacts to Kentucky arrow darter are anticipated (USFWS 2010).

4.11.3 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the Payne Gap site would not be developed and there would be no impacts to vegetation, wildlife, or threatened and endangered species.

4.11.4 Mitigation

Mitigation measures for construction impacts to vegetation and wildlife would be to minimize disturbance of existing vegetation to the greatest extent possible. An open area with a direct line of site is required for the areas surrounding the USP and FPC; however, upon completion of construction, disturbed areas would be re-vegetated to the maximum extent possible while maintaining the Bureau’s site requirements.

The Bureau met with USFWS on May 20, 2015 to discuss the Payne Gap site and potential additional studies and mitigation. If the site were to be developed additional studies of winter hibernaculum to further assess impacts and potential mitigation would be required. USFWS currently has a Conservation Memorandum of Agreement (CMOA) for impacts to summer habitat of 100 acres (40 hectares) or less. This site would not be covered under the CMOA; therefore, formal Section 7 consultation with USFWS
would be required for development of the Payne Gap site. Additional studies of summer and winter habitat
and the preparation of a biological assessment also would be required. USFWS would then render a
biological opinion on the findings of the biological assessment and determine if a take can be authorized.
The biological assessment would be required to cover both summer roosting habitat and winter
hibernaculum. Based on discussions with USFWS, since this is not the preferred alternative and
development of this site is not anticipated, no additional studies or coordination are required at this time
(Appendix A). Should this change in the future, the Bureau would be required to notify USFWS, conduct
any required studies, and initiate formal Section 7 consultation, if necessary, prior to any development of
the site.

The Bureau has conducted prior EAs regarding the installation of non-lethal/lethal fences for potential
impacts, especially to avian and small mammal species. These prior assessments have found less than
significant adverse impacts and less than significant impacts are anticipated with the non-lethal/lethal
fence to be installed as part of this proposed action. However, following activation of the non-lethal/lethal
fence, the Bureau would monitor the fence line to determine if wildlife, particularly avian species are being
adversely effected. The Bureau would collect data regarding these occurrences including identification of
species and photographs. The data collected would be used to document and analyze emerging trends. If
adverse effects were identified through the analysis of data collected the Bureau would contact USFWS
and appropriate state wildlife agencies to determine if changes to the operation of the fence are warranted.

4.12 Hazardous Materials and Waste

4.12.1 Affected Environment

4.12.1.1 Hazardous Materials

The proposed USP and FPC construction site is located in a relatively undeveloped area. No hazardous
materials are known to be in storage or in use in this area. According the USEPA “Cleanups In My
Community” mapping tool, there are no Brownfield, Superfund or Resource Conservation and Recovery
Act (RCRA) Corrective Action sites in the vicinity of the proposed project area. No sites in the town of
Payne Gap were listed in USEPA’s Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), Toxics Release Inventory
(TRI), or RCRA databases. No hazardous materials or evidence of their presence (i.e., stressed vegetation,
stained soils, drums) on the site were observed during site visits conducted by Cardno in 2011, 2013, and
2014.

4.12.1.2 Hazardous Wastes

The proposed USP and FPC construction site is located in a relatively undeveloped area. No hazardous
wastes are known to be in storage or generated in this area. According the USEPA Cleanups In My
Community mapping tool, there are no Brownfield, Superfund or RCRA Corrective Action sites in the
vicinity of the proposed project area. No sites in the town of Payne Gap were listed in USEPAs TSCA,
TRI or RCRA databases. No hazardous wastes or evidence of their presence (i.e., stressed vegetation,
stained soils, drums, batteries) on the site and no evidence of acid mine drainage was observed during site

4.12.1.3 Radon

Radon is a naturally occurring, colorless, odorless, radioactive gas produced by the decay of uranium in
rock and soil. Radon is a known carcinogen, responsible for increasing the risk of lung cancer when
inhaled. Electrically charged radon atoms can attach to indoor air dust particles. Subsequently these dust particles may be inhaled and adhere to the lining of the lungs. The deposited atoms decay by emitting radiation that has the potential to cause cellular damage. Typically outside air contains very low levels of radon (USEPA 2015c), but tends to accumulate in enclosed indoor spaces. When present, radon gas would typically concentrate in relatively airtight buildings with little outside air exchange. The USEPA classifies Letcher County as having a moderate potential for radon intrusion (Zone 2). Zone 2 counties have a predicted average indoor radon screening level between 2 and 4 pCi/L. The USEPA action level for radon is 4 pCi/L.

4.12.2 Environmental Consequences

4.12.2.1 Hazardous Materials

Construction activities would require the use of hazardous materials. The majority of the hazardous materials expected to be used are common to construction and include diesel fuel, gasoline, and propane to fuel the construction equipment; hydraulic fluids, oils, and lubricants; and batteries. The transport and use of hazardous materials would have the potential to result in accidental spills that could adversely impact soil and groundwater on and adjacent to the construction site or along transportation routes. Hazardous materials associated with construction activities would be delivered and stored in a manner that would prevent these materials from leaking, spilling, and potentially polluting soils or groundwater, and in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local environmental and public and occupational health and safety regulations. With the implementation of appropriate handling and management procedures, hazardous materials used during construction would have no significant impacts to the environment.

4.12.2.2 Hazardous Wastes

Hazardous waste would be generated during construction activities and would include but not be limited to empty containers, spent solvents, waste oil, spill cleanup materials (if used), and lead-acid batteries from construction equipment. Construction contractors would be responsible for safely removing these construction-generated wastes from the construction site and for arranging for recycling or disposal in accordance with applicable regulations. The total monthly generation of hazardous waste during construction is anticipated to be less than 100 kilograms during a calendar month. The construction contractor would be responsible for determining their regulatory status regarding hazardous waste generation during construction, and obtaining and maintaining compliance in accordance with federal and state laws. Hazardous wastes associated with construction activities would be handled and stored in a manner that would minimize human exposure to these materials and prevent these materials from polluting soils or groundwater, and in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local environmental and human health and safety regulations. Adherence to these policies, procedures, and regulations would minimize the potential impacts from exposure and accidental releases during revetment construction. In the event of an accidental release, contaminated media would be treated on-site or would be promptly removed and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal and state regulations. With the implementation of appropriate handling and management procedures, hazardous wastes generated during construction would have no significant impacts to the environment.

Operation of the UPC and FPC would require the use of small amounts of hazardous materials such as petroleum, oils and lubricants for lawn maintenance equipment, pesticides and paints. These materials would be acquired as needed and large volumes would not be stored on site. Those volumes that are stored
on site would be stored, used and disposed in accordance with applicable regulations and would have no significant impacts on the environment.

Expended lead and brass from firing range operations would be recovered and recycled as part of general range maintenance activities and would have no significant impacts to the environment.

4.12.2.3 Radon

Structures intended for human occupancy may be equipped with radon detectors or may incorporate best management practices for radon control into their design to ensure there are no impacts from radon.

4.12.3 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the Payne Gap site would not be developed and there would be no impacts associated with hazardous materials and waste.

4.12.4 Mitigation

Alternative 1 would have no significant impacts to hazardous materials and wastes; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Although there are no federal regulations that mandate an acceptable level of radon exposure, the USEPA recommends the voluntary radon action level developed and issued by the American Society for Testing and Materials International (ASTMI), Standard Practice for Installing Radon Mitigation Systems in Existing Low-Rise Residential Buildings, ASTM E-2121. Radon resistant construction techniques may be used to mitigate potential impacts from radon. In addition, periodic testing of the facility may be conducted to verify that no unacceptable radon gas buildup occurs. Installation of radon mitigation systems may also occur, as appropriate.
5.0 ALTERNATIVE 2 – ROXANA

5.1 LAND USE AND ZONING

5.1.1 Affected Environment

Land use associated with the proposed location of Alternative 2 consists primarily of forest, residential area, strip mines, oil and gas wells and a small model airplane airstrip. The area was previously deep mined; however mining activities no longer occur at the site. Land use surrounding the site is also primarily forested, with small single family residential homes in the area. There are also several state parks and nature preserves within the area. They include Bad Branch Falls State Nature Preserve, Kingdom Come State Park, and Pine Mountain Wildlife Management Area. There are no zoning ordinances or land use classifications identified for this area (DePriest 2013). Land use associated with the Roxana site is depicted in Figure 5-1.

5.1.2 Environmental Consequences

Changes to land use would occur on the 800-acre (324-hectare) Roxana site. The site would be converted from an undeveloped open space containing a mix of grass and scrub-shrub vegetation to a government institution consisting of several facilities, parking lots, etc. Additionally, the model airplane strip would be removed. The oil and gas wells would require closure and these impacts are further discussed in Section 5.8, Infrastructure and Utilities.

5.1.3 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would be the same as that described in Section 4.1.3.

5.1.4 Mitigation

Mitigation for Alternative 2 would be the same as that described for Alternative 1 in Section 4.1.4.

5.2 TOPOGRAPHY, GEOLOGY AND SOILS

5.2.1 Affected Environment

The topography at the Roxana site has been significantly impacted by mountaintop removal coal mining. A plateau resulting from mining has replaced a mountain ridge in the central portion of the site. This change has not been accounted for on USGS topographic maps; however, the highest point and lowest points of the site remain unchanged. The highest elevation is located in the south eastern portion of the site at an elevation of approximately 1,850 feet AMSL. The lowest elevation on site is approximately 1,035 feet AMSL, located in the north western portion of the site adjacent to the North Fork of the Kentucky River.

The Roxana site underlain by the Breathitt Group which is comprised of the Pikeville Formation and the Hyden Formation; however, the Roxana site is also underlain by the Four Corners Formation. The geology underlying the Roxana site is primarily the Hyden Formation (KGS 2013).
Figure 5-1. Roxana Land Use
The three most common soils on the Roxana site are the Cloverlick-Kimper-Highsplint complex, (30 to 65 percent slopes), the Kaymine, Fairpoint and Fiveblock soils map unit (2 to 70 percent slopes), and the Shelocta-Highsplint (30 to 65 percent slopes). To a lesser degree the following soils underlie the site; Allegheny Loam (2 to 25 percent slopes), Dekalb-Gilpin-Rayne complex (25 to 65 percent slopes), Fiveblock and Kaymine soils (0 to 30 percent slopes), Gilpin-Shelocta complex (12 to 25 percent), Grigsby sandy loam (occasionally flooded), Grigsby-Urban land complex (0 to 6 percent slopes), Urban land-Udorthents complex (0 to 15 percent slopes), and Urban land-Udorthents-Grigsby complex (0 to 6 percent slopes) (NRCS 2013).

The Roxana site contains a small area of soils designated as farmland of statewide importance (NRCS 2013). The soil is Allegheny Loam and is located in the floodplain of the North Fork of the Kentucky River in the northernmost portion of the site. None of the soils associated with the Roxana site are listed as hydric by NRCS.

5.2.2 Environmental Consequences

Development of the site would require significant excavation and fill activities to create a level pad for construction of the facilities or to build a road. A 2:1 fill slope and a 1:1 cut slope were used in the estimate adjacent to the pads and roads to transition to the original topography at the Roxanna site. More detail on the earthwork calculations can be found in Appendix B. As described in Section 2.5, Alternative 2 – Roxana, and Table 2-2, Estimated Site Preparation Quantities for Alternative 2 – Roxana, of this document, excavation activities (cut) would include 2,928,992 cubic yards (2,239,375 cubic meters) of spoil material and 902,757 cubic yards (690,207 cubic meters) of rock. The excavated soil and rock would be compacted to create a structural fill in the building pads and the valleys. The amount of structural fill was estimated to be 2,087,607 cubic yards (1,596,090 cubic meters) and the spoil fill was estimated to be 2,205,394 cubic yards (1,686,115 cubic meters). All excavated materials would be used on-site for structural fill. The maximum cut (excavation) at Roxanna would be approximately 20 meters and the maximum fill would be approximately 65 meters. Removal of bedrock would require blasting activities. Impacts resulting from these activities would include loss of productive soil, erosion, and destabilization of slopes (as a result of cuts and fills). As a result of the excavation and fill activities, the topography of the site would change at the maximum cut from 465 meters to 445 meters MSL in the main building area and a maximum fill from 380 meters to 445 meters MSL in the main building area.

5.2.3 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would be the same as that described in Section 4.2.3.

5.2.4 Mitigation

Mitigation for Alternative 2 would be the same as the mitigation and BMPs described for Alternative 1 in Section 4.2.4.

5.3 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice

5.3.1 Affected Environment

Under Alternative 2, the Bureau would acquire approximately 700 acres (283 hectares) of land known as the Roxana site. The site is located 7.5 miles west of Whitesburg in Letcher County, Kentucky (Figure 2-4). The affected environment of the socioeconomics and environmental justice study area for Alternative 2 would be the same as described for Alternative 1.
5.3.2 Environmental Consequences
The socioeconomic and environmental justice impacts of Alternative 2 would be the same as described for Alternative 1 because construction costs and operation expenditures of the proposed USP and FPC would be essentially the same. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 2 would have beneficial impacts to socioeconomics and no impacts to environmental justice populations or to children.

5.3.3 No Action Alternative
The No Action Alternative would be the same as that described in Section 4.3.3.

5.3.4 Mitigation
Mitigation for Alternative 2 would be the same as that described for Alternative 1 in Section 4.3.4.

5.4 COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

5.4.1 Affected Environment
Community facilities and services are similar for the Roxana site are similar to those described for the Payne Gap site in Section 4.4, with the exception of the local police and fire departments, as described below.

5.4.1.1 Police
The Whitesburg Police Department is comprised of six police officers, one chief of police, one second in command, and one secretary. They are currently short staffed one police officer. The department has eight squad cars and provides 24-hour coverage (Whitesburg Police Department 2013).

5.4.1.2 Fire
The Letcher County Fire and Rescue provide fire response to the area of the Roxana site. Letcher County Fire and Rescue is comprised of 32 firefighters (20 paid and 12 volunteer). Fifteen of the personnel are EMTs. Letcher County Fire and Rescue has three stations: Jeremiah, Blackey, and Hallie and services the southern portion of Letcher County. Fire rescue equipment includes five ambulances, two tanker trucks and three engines (Letcher County Fire and Rescue 2013).

Whitesburg Fire and Rescue consists of 30 firefighters (25 volunteer and 5 paid). Five of the firefighters are EMTs. The station has five engines and a boom truck with a snorkel. Whitesburg Fire and Rescue has mutual aid agreements with the rest of Letcher County and are able to assist with emergencies throughout the county if dispatched (Whitesburg Fire and Rescue 2013).

The Kings Creek Volunteer Fire Department is located on KY 60 approximately 1.5 miles from the Roxana site. The fire department has 23 volunteers, 1 pumper truck, and 2 large tanker trucks. The Kings Creek Volunteer Fire Department has relationships with other local volunteer fire departments and through a local paging system, can request assistance from these departments (Meade 2015).

5.4.1.3 Healthcare
Existing healthcare services are the same as those described for the Payne Gap site in Section 4.4.

5.4.1.4 Schools
Existing school conditions are the same as those described for the Payne Gap site in Section 4.4.
5.4.2 Environmental Consequences

5.4.2.1 Police

The law enforcement groups that have jurisdiction over the area where the Roxana site is located would be able to provide assistance in the event of an emergency situation at the USP that required assistance beyond the capabilities of the USP. The individual law enforcement agencies have stated they would be willing to discuss the development of a MOU with the Bureau to provide these services. With the exception of the Whitesburg Police Department, law enforcement indicated this would not result in impacts to their services or require the hiring of additional staff; therefore, the proposed action would have no impact to law enforcement. The Whitesburg Police Department may be impacted due to the need for an additional officer and the potential need for additional equipment.

5.4.2.2 Fire

Fire departments that would provide emergency services for the area where the Roxana site is located would be able to provide assistance to the USP and FPC in the event there was an incident that was beyond the capabilities of the USP and FPC. The individual fire departments have indicated they would be willing to discuss the development of a MOU with the Bureau to provide these services. The fire departments indicated that this would not result in impacts to their services or require the hiring of additional staff; therefore, the proposed action would have no impact to emergency services.

5.4.2.3 Healthcare

Impacts to healthcare would be the same as those described for Payne Gap in Section 4.4.

5.4.2.4 Schools

Impacts to schools would be the same as those described for Payne Gap in Section 4.4.

5.4.3 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would be the same as that described in Section 4.4.3.

5.4.4 Mitigation

With the exception of the potential for an adverse impact to the Whitesburg Police Department, no impacts to community facilities and services would occur; therefore, no mitigation would be warranted. With respect to the Whitesburg Police Department, the Bureau would discuss the development of a MOU with the chief of police and the Mayor of Whitesburg and determine the department’s status and what steps may be taken to off-set those impacts.

5.5 Transportation and Traffic

5.5.1 Affected Environment

The Roxana site is located approximately 6.1 miles to the west of Whitesburg, Kentucky, and would be constructed to the south of KY 588 and to the west of KY 160. Proximate to the proposed facility, KY 588 is a two-lane roadway designated as a Class II highway. Class II highways have lower speed collector roads and are primarily designed to provide access, while KY 160 is classified as a rural major collector (KYTC 2014a). In terms truck weight, both KY 588 and KY 160 are Class “A” roadways that can accommodate trucks having a gross vehicle weight of up to 44,000 pounds (KYTC 2014c). Potential access points include a connection to the north to KY 588, a connection to the east to KY 160, and/or a
connection to the west to an existing roadway that is traverses north/south between KY 588 and Lilly Cornett Branch Road.

A traffic impact study was conducted for the proposed action in April 2015. Based on the analysis in the traffic impact study, current Annual Average Daily Traffic associated with KY 160 are 550 per day and 330 per day associated with KY 588 (Parsons 2015). KY 588 a.m. and p.m. peak periods both function at an LOS A.

### 5.5.2 Environmental Consequences

The transportation network associated with the Roxana site is primarily two-lane unstripped rural roadways. The infrastructure would not be able to support construction equipment and vehicles traveling to the site.

As defined by KYTC, rural minor collectors “provide service to…smaller communities, link locally important traffic generators to larger towns, and collect traffic from local roads. They should be spaced at intervals consistent with population density to bring all developed areas within a reasonable distance of a collector road” (KYTC 2014a).

Per KYTC, rural major collectors “provide service to county seats, larger towns, and other traffic generators of intracounty importance, which are not directly served by a higher system and link them to larger towns or routes with higher classifications. Examples of traffic generators for this classification include schools, shipping points, county parks, and important mining and agricultural areas” (KYTC 2014a).

For the purposes of this analysis it was assumed the most likely access to the site would be from KY 588.

#### 5.5.2.1 Construction

This alternative would involve the same types of construction activity as Alternative 1, and would temporarily increase traffic volumes during the construction period. As discussed above in Section 4.5, trucks would be used to deliver/remove construction materials and equipment, and to haul excess fill material and/or construction debris. Because traffic volumes are relatively low on roadways that provide access to the site, the temporary increase in truck traffic is not expected to have a significant effect on street capacity. However, particularly heavy trucks could exceed the maximum weight limit of certain bridges located near the proposed action. This potential impact would be avoided or reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation described below in Section 5.5.4, Mitigation. With the implementation of this measure, the addition of construction related trips is not expected to result in a significant traffic-related impact. Additionally, impacts to area KY 588 are anticipated due truck traffic transporting construction equipment and materials to the proposed site. KY 588 has narrow lane widths and pavement design that is not at a level for a national or state truck route (Parsons 2015).

#### 5.5.2.2 Operation

The Roxana Alternative would involve the same types of activities and the same number of employees as the Payne Gap Alternative. Therefore, the traffic generation previously presented in Table 4-10 would also apply to this action alternative. Accordingly, Alternative 2’s operations traffic has the potential to incrementally increase congestion on the surrounding roadway network. Potential effects include increased delay at intersections and/or reduced travel speed on roadway segments. These potential
impacts would be avoided or reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation described below in Section 5.5.4, Mitigation.

**Table 5-1** depicts estimated trips in and out of the facility during a.m. and p.m. peak periods. Due to the same number of staff, these numbers are the same as those used for the Payne Gap alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM Peak Hour Trips</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Source:* Parsons 2015.

Based on the trip generation and existing conditions, the traffic impact analysis determined that KY 588 in the vicinity of the Roxana site would function at LOS B. Additionally, the traffic impact analysis determined that the intersection of KY 588 and the proposed access to the Roxana site would function at LOS A during a.m. and p.m. peak periods for both northbound and westbound traffic.

Based on the traffic impact analysis, there would be no significant impact to traffic.

### 5.5.3 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would be the same as that described in Section 4.5.3.

### 5.5.4 Mitigation

Mitigation measures should include a requirement that the selected construction contractor perform an assessment of the routing of construction traffic to the site. The contractor would also be required to:

- Route construction vehicles so that gross vehicle weight does not exceed the maximum weight limitations established by the KYTC.
- Construction contractor would bond the roads where limitations may be exceeded and repair the roads upon completion of construction.
- Develop and implement a maintenance of traffic plan to maintain traffic flow when construction equipment is being transported to the site.

### 5.6 Air Quality

#### 5.6.1 Affected Environment

The affected environment for Alternative 2 would be the same as the affected environment described for Alternative 1 as the sites are both in the Appalachian Intrastate Air Quality Control Region.

#### 5.6.2 Environmental Consequences

The results of the air emissions analysis show that construction and operational emissions would remain well below the significance thresholds and would not have a significant impact on the local or regional air quality. A summary of the analysis is presented below and the complete analysis is provided in Appendix C, *Air Emission Calculations*.

#### 5.6.2.1 Construction

Direct impacts from emissions from construction would include combustion emissions from fossil fuel-powered equipment and fugitive dust emissions (PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$) during clearing, demolition activities,
earth moving activities, and operation of equipment on bare soil. Table 5-2 presents estimates for the primary construction activities that would utilize heavy duty diesel equipment for the Roxana site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>VOC Tons</th>
<th>CO Tons</th>
<th>NO\textsubscript{x} Tons</th>
<th>SO\textsubscript{2} Tons</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{10} Tons</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{2.5} Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roxana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>42.32</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>158.71</td>
<td>18.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>42.32</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>106.64</td>
<td>12.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fugitive dust from land disturbance activities would be the primary source of emissions during construction, with most of the emissions occurring during Year 1. PM\textsubscript{10} emissions are estimated using wetting and other typical reduction practices to reduce dust release by 50 percent. PM\textsubscript{10} emissions are predicted to be greatest in Year 1 at the Roxana site, at 158 TPY. These emissions, however, would remain well below the significance threshold of 250 TPY. Construction emissions would not have direct or indirect significant impacts on the region’s air quality.

Direct impacts to air quality may also include emissions from the burning of construction debris, if such an activity were undertaken during construction. Vegetative debris and/or demolition and construction materials would be disposed in accordance with all laws and regulations. Should open burning be necessary, it would be conducted in accordance with Title 401 of the Kentucky Administrative Regulations, Section 63 (401 KAR 63:005) Open Burning.

5.6.2.2 Operations

Impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be similar to those described for Alternative 1.

5.6.3 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, construction of the USP and FPC would not occur. The No Action Alternative would not result in emissions of any air pollutants. Therefore, there would be no impact to regional air quality.

5.6.4 Mitigation

Mitigation for Alternative 2 would be the same as that described for Alternative 1 in Section 4.6.4.

5.7 NOISE

5.7.1 Affected Environment

The affected noise environment at the Roxana site would be the same as those conditions described for the Payne Gap site in Section 4.7.1.

5.7.2 Environmental Consequences

The environmental consequences associated with the Roxanna site would be the same as those described for the Payne Gap site in Section 4.7.2. The residences adjacent to the Roxana site are well over 200 feet from the majority of construction areas. Increases in noise would be short-term and only occur during daytime hours.

5.7.3 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would be the same as that described in Section 4.7.3.
5.7.4 Mitigation
Mitigation and minimization measures would be the same as those described Alternative 1 in Section 4.7.3.

5.8 INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES

5.8.1 Affected Environment

5.8.1.1 Potable Water
LWSD would provide service to the Roxana site. LWSD is currently in the process of extending their water system to the eastern property boundary of the proposed Roxana site. The water main at this location is 8 inches in diameter and has water pressure near the connection point of approximately 110 psi. Potable water would be provided by LWSD via this connection at the eastern property boundary (Cardno 2014a). LWSD is capable of providing 4 million gallons per day to the region.

5.8.1.2 Wastewater
LWSD would provide sanitary sewer service to the proposed Roxana site. As with the water service, LWSD is currently extending their wastewater collection service in the area of the Roxana site. The closest existing connection is approximately 2.75 miles from the Roxana site (Figure 5-2). LWSD does not currently have plans to extend the sanitary sewer service to the property boundary of the Roxana site (Cardno 2014a). LWSD has a permitted capacity of 600,000 gallons per day and currently treats approximately 300,000 gallons per day.

5.8.1.3 Natural Gas
The Roxana site contains multiple gas wells and gas transmission lines. There are fourteen Hayden Harper gas wells and one EQT gas well within the Roxana site (Cardno 2014a). Gas transmission lines are also adjacent to the Roxana site.

5.8.1.4 Electricity
The affected environment for Alternative 2 is the same as that as described for Alternative 1.

5.8.1.5 Telecommunications
Birch Communications provides telecommunications services to the area where the Roxana site is located (Cardno 2014a). Birch Communications has the capacity to provide telecommunications service to the Roxana site.
Figure 5-2. Roxana Existing Utilities
5.8.1.6 Solid Waste
Solid waste for Alternative 2 is the same as that described for Alternative 1.

5.8.2 Environmental Consequence

5.8.2.1 Potable Water
Impacts to potable water associated with Alternative 2 would be the same as those described for Alternative 1.

5.8.2.2 Wastewater
Implementation of the proposed action under Alternative 2 would result in an increase of approximately 224,000 gallons per day. This would increase wastewater treatment at LWSD to 524,000 gallons per day, which would not result in LWSD exceeding their permitted capacity of 600,000 gallons per day; therefore, no adverse impacts to wastewater would occur.

5.8.2.3 Natural Gas
Implementation of the proposed action under Alternative 2 would require the closure of fifteen gas wells that are located within the site the Bureau would acquire for development of the proposed USP and FPC. It would take approximately six months to close these wells. Closure of the fifteen gas wells would result in significant impacts to Hayden Harper and EQT, the owners of the gas wells. The Bureau would be able to connect to the natural gas distribution system located adjacent to the Roxana property for the cost of the meter and tap. Costs for the meter and tap are estimated to be $110,000. There is sufficient natural gas available and use of natural gas at the USP and FPC would not impact natural gas availability

5.8.2.4 Electricity
Alternative 2 impacts would be the same as those described for Alternative 1.

5.8.2.5 Telecommunications
Implementation of the proposed action under Alternative 2 would not result in impacts to the available capacity of Birch Communications; however, in order to provide the service a new remote terminal would need to be constructed, as well as the installation of approximately 4 miles of fiber optic cables and 0.5 miles of copper cable. Construction of the terminal and cables would be the responsibility of the Bureau (Cardno 2014a). Costs to complete construction and install the cables would be approximately $190,000.

5.8.2.6 Solid Waste
Impacts to solid waste under Alternative 2 would be the same as those described for Alternative 1.

5.8.3 No Action Alternative
The No Action Alternative would be the same as that described in Section 4.8.3.

5.8.4 Mitigation
Impacts to the gas wells associated with the Roxana site would require the Bureau to pay the owners of the wells (Hayden Harper and EQT) for the costs associated with closure and abandonment of the wells. The anticipated cost ranges between $300,000 to $1,000,000 per well based on the remaining production of each well. The anticipated cost to close all 15 wells is $12.75 million. No other mitigation would be required.
5.9 Cultural Resources

An APE was defined to take into consideration both potential direct and indirect effects to cultural resources from implementation of the proposed action. The APE for Alternative 2 includes the 700-acre (283-hectare) Roxana site and adjacent areas to the north (Figure 5-3). The APE extends beyond the north boundary of the Roxana site because of the potential for visual effects to any historic properties that may be present within the viewshed of the proposed federal correctional facility’s one- to four-story buildings. Effects to archaeological resources, however, would be limited to the 300-acre (121-hectare) area within the APE where construction (direct ground disturbance) would occur.

5.9.1 Affected Environment

5.9.1.1 Archaeological Resources

Mapping, aerial photos, and a pedestrian reconnaissance in August 2011 and August 2014 indicated that the Roxana Farm Site had been completely disturbed by former surface mining activities. Photodocumentation was conducted at the site; however, no subsurface testing was completed. In addition, background research indicated that no previously identified archaeological sites were present at the proposed Roxana Farm Site. No archaeological resources eligible for listing on the NRHP are present and no further work was recommended at the Roxana site as a result of the 2011 and 2014 archaeological surveys. Concurrence was received from the SHPO on January 24, 2012 and on December 22, 2014 (Appendix A, Agency Coordination).

5.9.1.2 Traditional Cultural Properties

Under Section 106 of the NHPA, a federal agency is required to give consideration to issues of traditional religious or cultural areas concerning Native American groups. No TCPs have been identified within the project APE.

5.9.1.3 Architectural Resources

The 2011 reconnaissance survey of the Roxana site APE identified two architectural resources for further investigation; the other architectural resources in the APE were not recommended for further work because they were not associated with significant historical or architectural contexts of Letcher County and/or were in poor condition (TEC, Inc. 2011a). An intensive-level survey of two mid-twentieth century square-plan pyramidal houses (LR152 and LR153) was conducted in 2013 to determine the NRHP eligibility of the properties (Table 5-3, Figure 5-3). One of the houses (LR153) also included several domestic and agricultural outbuildings. Both properties were recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP because they do not meet the NRHP criteria for eligibility (Cardno 2014b). The KHC concurred that both properties are not eligible (KHC 2014) (Appendix A, Agency Coordination).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NRHP Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LR152</td>
<td>Pearl Whitaker House</td>
<td>Ca. 1940</td>
<td>Square-plan pyramidal house</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR153</td>
<td>George Whitaker House</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Square-plan pyramidal house and nine outbuildings</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5-3. Roxana Architectural Resources
5.9.2 Environmental Consequences

The cultural resources surveys for the proposed action did not identify any archaeological sites or architectural resources eligible for inclusion in the NRHP in the APE for the Roxana site. Therefore, Alternative 2 would have no effect on NRHP-listed or eligible cultural resources.

5.9.3 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would be the same as that described in Section 4.9.3.

5.9.4 Mitigation

Alternative 2 would have no impact to NRHP-listed or eligible cultural resources; therefore, no mitigation is required.

5.10 Water Resources

5.10.1 Affected Environment

The affected environment for the Roxana site is similar to that described in Section 4.10.1 for Payne Gap with respect to ground water, water quality, and floodplains.

The Roxana site is situated on top of a plateau which is the result of mining of a portion of the mountain. As a result of the mining onsite the hydrology of the site has been greatly disturbed. There are several ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial unnamed, small streams identified and mapped within proposed project area. Additionally, an open water wetland (pond) comprising approximately 0.41 acres (0.17 hectares) is located along the eastern boundary, north of Rise Branch.

Site specific wetland data was collected through onsite field work, aerial photographs, topographic maps, National Wetland Inventory wetland maps, and Natural Resources Conservation Service soil surveys. Based on these resources wetlands are present on the sites.

Wetlands associated with the Roxana receive their hydrology from surface runoff from the surrounding lands, groundwater and direct precipitation. Dominant vegetation within the wetland identified on site is typified by Typha latifolia, Salix nigra, Lindera benzoin, Microstegium vimineum, Osmunda cinnamomea, and Scirpus cyperinus.

Table 5-4 summarizes the wetland types and acreages, as well as streams and linear feet, identified within the Roxana site. Figure 5-4 depicts wetlands and streams delineated within the Roxana site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5-4. Wetland and Streams Delineated at Roxana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feature Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine Emergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine Scrub-Shrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine Forested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine Upland Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional Stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Jurisdictional Stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N/A = Not Applicable.
Figure 5-4. Roxana Wetlands and Waters of the U.S.
5.10.2 Environmental Consequences

Implementation of the proposed action at the Roxana Site would result in permanent impacts to approximately 4,117 linear feet of stream, 0.37 acres (0.15 hectares) of forested wetlands, 0.7 acres (0.28 hectares) of emergent wetlands, and 1.38 acres (0.56 hectares) of scrub-shrub wetlands due to site excavation and development. These impacts would be to the streams and wetlands delineated in 2011 and 2014 (Table 5-4) and would result primarily from the excavation and grading activities that would be required to prepare the site for the development of the USP, FPC, ancillary buildings, and roads.

5.10.3 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would be the same as that described in Section 4.10.3.

5.10.4 Mitigation

The Bureau met with the USACE on May 19, 2015 to discuss mitigation for the Roxana site. Wetland mitigation would be paid into an in-lieu fee fund. Wetland impact mitigation is calculated by adding total acreage of wetlands to be impacted and multiplying by 2. Wetland impacts on the Roxana site total 2.43 acres X 2 = 4.86 AMUs (Adjusted Mitigation Units) to be purchased. To determine the cost associated with wetland mitigation, the Bureau would contact the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources to determine the cost of AMUs at the time of purchase. The last recent quote was $43,000 per AMU, which would equate to $208,980 for wetland impact mitigation at the Roxana Site. These rates may increase depending on when the Section 404 permit is acquired. Stream mitigation would be based on Ecological Integrity Units (EIU). The EIU is calculated based on the stream rating (assessed using the USEPA’s Rapid Bioassessment Protocol Sheets). To account for cumulative and temporary impacts the EIU is multiplied by 1.2 (20 percent cumulative and temporary impacts); the result is a total of 1,414 EIUs. The current In Lieu Fee Credits are $755 per credit (EIU). Therefore the total for stream mitigation would be $1,067,570 at current 2015 rates. When construction funding becomes available the Section 404 permit would be applied for and mitigation costs would be updated according to the current mitigation rates and permit requirements. Mitigation In Lieu Fees for stream and wetland mitigation combined, using 2015 In Lieu Fee rates would total $1,276,550.

5.11 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

5.11.1 Affected Environment

5.11.1.1 Vegetation

A large portion of the Roxana site has been disturbed by historic mining activities which created a relatively level area on the mountaintop. A site visit indicated a level portion of the site is farmed and portions not under agriculture are routinely bushhoggred or are dominated by scrub shrub vegetation (e.g., autumn olive, multiflora rose, etc.). The mountain slopes are primarily forested with the exception of slopes created by fill from mining which are dominated by invasive species such as autumn olive and paradise tree (*Ailanthus altissima*). Upland vegetation includes northern red oak, eastern red cedar (*Juniperus virginiana*), sericea lespedeza, paradise tree, Allegheny blackberry, Virginia pine (*Pinus virginiana*), bluestem broomsedge (*Andropogon virginicus*), tuliptree, American beech, Virginia creeper (*Parthenocissus quinquefolia*), Ohio buckeye (*Aesculus glabra*), red maple (*Acer rubrum*), stinging nettle (*Urtica dioica*), and Christmas fern (*Polystichum acrostichoides*). Wetland vegetation at the Roxana site includes American sycamore, woolgrass, black willow, spicebush (*Lindera benzoin*), Nepalese browntop
(Microstegium vimineum), small spike falsenettle (Boehmeria cylindrica), and cinnamon fern (Osmunda cinnamomea).

5.11.1.2 Wildlife
Wildlife associated with the Roxana site is the same as described for Alternative 1-Payne Gap wildlife in Chapter 3.11.1.

5.11.1.3 Federal Listed Threatened and Endangered Species and State Listed Threatened and Endangered Species
Federal and State listed threatened and endangered species is the same as described for Alternative 1-Payne Gap in Chapter 3.11.1. Coordination with USFWS indicates the Roxana site is in known P1/P2 swarming habitat for the Indiana bat.

5.11.2 Environmental Consequences
5.11.2.1 Vegetation
Approximately 118 acres (48 hectares) of forested area would be impacted by the proposed action. These impacts would be the result of excavation and grading activities required to prepare the site for development.

5.11.2.2 Wildlife
Wildlife species found on the sites would likely be displaced during construction activities due to the loss of habitat and increases in noise. However, over 582 acres (236 hectares) of the site itself would remain undisturbed and continue to provide habitat, including breeding and foraging areas, for wildlife species found on-site. Additionally, the site is surrounded by similar habitat that could accommodate species that are displaced by construction activities. Based on the available habitat that will remain on site and habitat adjacent to the site (Jefferson National Forest), it is anticipated that these impacts would not adversely affect wildlife species that are currently present on-site.

5.11.2.3 Federally Threatened and Endangered and State Listed Special Status Species
Implementation of the proposed action at the Roxana site has the potential to impact Indiana bats and northern long-eared bats. Phase I bat habitat surveys were conducted for Indiana and northern long-eared bats. Based on the conceptual design, the proposed action would impact approximately 93 acres (38 hectares) of summer roosting habitat. The Bureau met with USFWS on May 20, 2015 to discuss additional studies and mitigation (Appendix A).

Impact assessment would include the potential noise from the proposed outdoor firing range. The range would be used approximately once a month for small arms training and maintenance.

It is not anticipated that the Kentucky arrow darter would be impacted by the project. The streams within the project site are small channels and do not contain riffle pool complexes. Additionally conductivity measurements were taken within streams on the project site. Conductivity measurements were taken within one stream that contained flow and the result was a conductivity of 332 µS. Studies have demonstrated that Kentucky arrow darters are not likely to be present when conductivity levels exceed approximately 250 µS; therefore no impacts to the Kentucky arrow darter are anticipated (USFWS 2010).
5.11.3 No Action Alternative
The No Action Alternative would be the same as that described in Section 4.11.3.

5.11.4 Mitigation
Mitigation measures for vegetation and wildlife would be the same as those described for Alternative 1 in Section 4.11.4.

BOP will mitigate for take of Indiana bats and northern long-eared bats through a Conservation Memorandum of Agreement (CMOA) following the guidance provided in the USFWS's April 2015 Conservation Strategy for Forest Dwelling Bats in the Commonwealth of Kentucky (Conservation Strategy). The Biological Opinion that supports the Conservation Strategy concludes with a “non-jeopardy” determination for adverse effects to the Indiana bat and the northern long-eared bat and exempts the take resulting from the habitat removal specified in the CMOA (the CMOA does not cover tree removal in June and July). Once the CMOA has been completed, BOP will be in compliance for these species for this project.

Under the CMOA, BOP would pay into the Imperiled Bat Conservation Fund for summer roosting habitat impacted by the proposed action. Payment into the fund would be based on the time of year habitat is removed. Based on 2015 mitigation rates, mitigation costs would range from $732,375 to $1,024,325. The Imperiled Bat Conservation Fund would then provide the mitigation fees to the Kentucky Natural Lands Trust to purchase and protect important bat habitat.

5.12 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND WASTE

5.12.1 Affected Environment
The proposed USP and FPC construction site is located in a relatively undeveloped area. No hazardous materials are known to be in storage or in use in this area. According the USEPA “Cleanups In My Community” mapping tool, there are no Brownfield, Superfund or RCRA Corrective Action sites in the vicinity of the proposed project area. No sites in the town of Roxana were listed in the USEPA’s TSCA or TRI databases. Three sites were listed in the USEPA RCRA database, Coastal Coal Company LLC, Enterprise Mining Company LLC and Roxana BP. All three sites are located to the east of the proposed project site and are unlikely to impact site conditions based on the topography and inferred hydrology of the area. Site visits conducted in 2011, 2013, and 2014 did not observe any hazardous materials or evidence of their presence (i.e., stressed vegetation, stained soils, drums) on the site.

5.12.1.1 Hazardous Wastes
The proposed USP and FPC construction site is located in a relatively undeveloped area. No hazardous wastes are known to be in storage or generated in this area. According the USEPA Cleanups In My Community mapping tool, there are no Brownfield, Superfund or RCRA Corrective Action sites in the vicinity of the proposed project area. No sites in the town of Roxana were listed in USEPAs TSCA, TRI or RCRA databases. Site visits conducted in 2011, 2013, and 2014 did not observe any hazardous wastes or evidence of their presence (i.e., stressed vegetation, stained soils, drums, batteries) on the site and no evidence of acid mine drainage was observed.
5.12.1.2 Radon

The USEPA classifies Letcher County as having a moderate potential for radon intrusion (Zone 2). Zone 2 counties have a predicted average indoor radon screening level between 2 and 4 pCi/L. The USEPA action level for radon is 4 pCi/L.

5.12.2 Environmental Consequences

Environmental consequences identified for Alternative 2 would be the same as those described for Alternative 1.

5.12.3 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would be the same as that described in Section 4.12.3.

5.12.4 Mitigation

Mitigation identified for Alternative 2 would be the same as that described for Alternative 1 in Section 4.12.4.
6.0 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USE OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

Regulations for the preparation of Environmental Impact Statements require they address the relationship between short-term use of the environment and the maintenance of long-term productivity.

Construction of proposed facilities on the site would last an estimated 30 months following ground-breaking. Construction would involve clearing and grubbing, excavating and filling, paving, erecting structures, installation of lighting and signage, and landscaping. There would also be temporary disruptions to traffic associated with construction vehicles and equipment utilizing area roadways. It is anticipated that disruptions would be temporary and that construction and operation of the proposed USP and FPC would generate economic productivity in terms of new construction jobs, new payrolls, induced personal income, purchasing of materials, supplies, and services, and potential purchasing of new homes by Bureau staff once the facility opens.

The economic viability of the Letcher County, Kentucky region would experience long-term benefits by virtue of the approximately 300 new permanent jobs that would need to be filled at the USP and FPC.
7.0 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

Regulations for the preparation of EISs also require they address irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources associated with the proposed action. Construction and operation of the proposed USP and FPC would result in both direct and indirect commitments of resources. In some cases, resources committed would be recovered in a relatively short period of time. In other cases resources would be irreversibly or irretrievably committed by virtue of being consumed or by the apparent limitlessness of the period of their commitment to a specific use. Irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources can sometimes be compensated for by the provision of similar resources with substantially the same use or value.

Under the proposed action only a portion of the site would be required for the actual construction of the USP and FPC. Resources consumed as a result of the development of the correctional facility would be offset by the creation of the facility and the resulting societal benefits. The use of the developed portion of the land could be considered irretrievably committed. The proposed action would also require the commitment of various construction materials, including cement, aggregate, steel, asphalt, and lumber. There is the potential, however, that these materials could be recycled at some point in the future; therefore, they may not be an irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources.

The proposed action would also require the consumption of fossil fuels and electrical energy during both the construction and operation of the facility and would be considered an irretrievable commitment of these resources.

Costs associated with roadway and utility improvements to serve the site are not precisely known at this time; however, these costs would be offset by the direct economic benefits of the total project-related expenditures and the annual operating budget. Over the long term, construction of the proposed facility could result in an increase in the pace of development within Letcher County than would occur if the project were not constructed. Although the nature of such development can be controlled through the application of land use regulations, any induced land development is for all practical purposes, an irreversible and irretrievable commitment of land and materials.
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8.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

This chapter (1) describes past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions relevant to cumulative impacts, (2) analyzes the incremental interaction Alternative 1 may have with other actions, and, (3) evaluates cumulative impacts potentially resulting from these interactions. The definition of cumulative impacts was discussed in Section 3.13.

8.1 PAST, PRESENT, AND REASONABLY FORESEEABLE FUTURE ACTION

This section identifies past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions not related to Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 that have the potential to cumulatively impact the resources in the affected environment for proposed action and its regionally affected area. Geographic distribution, intensity, duration, and historical effects of similar activities were considered when determining whether a particular activity may contribute cumulatively and significantly to the impacts of Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 on the resources identified in the EIS. Based on discussions with the economic development leaders for Letcher County development within the county has not been strong and there are very few past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions that when combined with the proposed action would result in cumulative impacts to the resources evaluated in this EIS (DePriest 2013). Future projects identified include a new regional airport and Gateway Regional Business Park. In addition to these projects, there are infrastructure and utility projects associated with the proposed action that have the potential to result in cumulative impacts.

8.1.1 Letcher County Airport Project

The airport board has applied to be included in the FAA’s National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems Program and the project qualifies for FAA funding. The Kentucky Department of Aviation funded a Site Selection Study and based on the study a site was identified for development of the airport. The airport board is currently working with landowners to purchase the site. Once the acquisition of property has occurred the airport board would apply to FAA to fund the development of an airport layout plan and environmental assessment. Potential impacts resulting from the project could include land use, topography, geology, and soils, air quality, noise, socioeconomics, traffic, infrastructure and utilities, natural resources and cultural resources. Siting of the airport may have impacts to land use compatibility with adjacent land uses. Excavation and grading activities to prepare the site for development may result in changes and impacts to topography, geology, and soils. Both short- and long-term impacts to air quality could occur as the result of construction and operation activities of the airport. Development of the airport has the potential to result in short-term and long-term impacts to traffic as a result of construction vehicles accessing the site during construction and long-term impacts as a result of increased traffic to area roadways once the airport is operational. Short-term and long-term impacts due to increases in noise would likely result from construction activities and the operation of aircraft. It is anticipated that infrastructure and utilities would have increased demands placed on them during construction as well as operation of the airport. Other impacts that could result due to construction of the airport include cultural and natural resources. Beneficial impacts would be anticipated to the economy of the region due to new jobs and potential tax base.
8.1.2 Gateway Regional Business Park

The Gateway Regional Business Park is approximately 261 acres (106 hectares) located just north of Payne Gap. Development of the site would have potential impacts to land use, air quality, noise, infrastructure and utilities, and transportation and traffic. The Gateway Regional Business Park has the potential to be incompatible with surrounding land uses; however, Letcher County does not have any zoning ordinances that would regulate development and compatibility. The project also has the potential to have short-term temporary impacts to air quality and noise as a result of construction activities. Infrastructure and utilities would also have the potential to be impacted due to increased demands on potable water, waste water treatment, and solid waste. Additionally, development of the business park would likely increase traffic on U.S. Route 119 and may contribute to impacts to congestion on area roadways.

8.1.3 Infrastructure and Utility Projects

Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 would both require utility companies to upgrade facilities, extend cable, and construct new facilities to provide service to the proposed USP, FPC, and ancillary facilities. These projects would be dependent on the preferred alternative and conducted by the individual utility company. Impacts associated with these projects have the potential to include land use, air quality, noise, soils, natural resources, and cultural resources. The projects have the potential to be incompatible with surrounding land use, result in temporary increases to air emissions and temporary air quality impacts, temporary noise impacts due to construction activities, disturbance of soils that could result in erosion and sedimentation issues, as well as impacts to natural and cultural resources depending on the type and location of the upgrade or new construction, and placement of cable.

8.1.4 Proposed Action

The proposed action would result in conversion of land uses and contribute to incompatibility with adjacent land uses. The proposed action would also contribute to short-term temporary increases to noise and increase local air emissions, as well as have an overall contribution to greenhouse gases (GHGs). The proposed action has the potential to impact transportation and traffic. The proposed action is not anticipated to have impacts to infrastructure and utilities.

As stated in Sections 4.6 and 5.6, there are small emission increases anticipated for all criteria pollutants; however, all increases are considered to be minor adverse impacts. As a result, this cumulative impacts analysis focuses on GHGs. Since individual sources of GHG emissions are not large enough to have an appreciable effect on climate change and the potential effects of proposed GHG emissions on climate change are global by nature, the study area for this aspect is not defined.

GHGs are gases in the Earth’s atmosphere that prevent heat from escaping into space, resulting in climate change as the Earth's surface temperature increases above past levels. GHGs result primarily from the combustion of fossil fuels, and include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). EO 13514, Federal Leadership in Environmental, Energy, and Economic Performance, requires federal agencies to inventory and report direct and indirect emissions of GHGs, including those associated with fuel consumption and the purchase of electricity. In addition, facilities with stationary combustion sources must determine applicability of the USEPA’s Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program, as promulgated in 40 CFR Part 98, which requires reporting from facilities that emit 25,000 metric tons CO₂ equivalent (CO₂e) or more per
year from stationary source fuel combustion. Emission sources evaluated in this EIS are associated with construction and site operations. The primary GHG emission associated with these sources is CO₂, and to a lesser extent, CH₄ and N₂O. Emissions of these GHGs are carried forward in the analysis.

GHGs are produced from the burning of fossil fuels, as well as through industrial and biological processes. There are no published NEPA thresholds of significance for GHG emissions resulting from a proposed action and formulation of thresholds is difficult when attempting to identify what level of emissions would substantially contribute to global climate change. The cumulative effects for GHG emissions were evaluated for the proposed construction and subsequent operation activities.

Table 8-1 compares the GHG emissions associated with the proposed construction activities at the Payne Gap site to the U.S. 2011 GHG emissions. The estimated GHG emissions from the proposed construction activities are less than a thousandth of 1 percent of the total GHG emissions generated by the United States in 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CO₂e (metric tons per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹U.S. 2011 GHG Emissions 6,708.3 x 10⁶
Percent of U.S. 2011 GHG Emissions .00032

Source: USEPA 2013c.

Table 8-2 compares the GHG emissions associated with the proposed construction activities at the Roxana site to the U.S. 2011 GHG emissions. The estimated GHG emissions from the proposed construction activities are less than a thousandth of 1 percent of the total GHG emissions generated by the U.S. in 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CO₂e (metric tons per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹U.S. 2011 GHG Emissions 6,708.3 x 10⁶
Percent of U.S. 2011 GHG Emissions .00012

Source: USEPA 2013c.

Table 8-3 compares the GHG emissions associated with the proposed operation of stationary sources (boilers and emergency generators) and staff commuter emissions once the facilities are operational. The estimated GHG emissions from the proposed operations are less than ten thousandth of 1 percent of the total GHG emissions generated by the U.S. in 2011.
Individual sources of anthropogenic GHG emissions are not large enough to have an appreciable effect on climate change. For this reason, emissions of GHGs from the proposed action alone would not cause appreciable global warming that would lead to climate change. These emissions would increase the atmosphere’s concentration of GHGs, and, in combination with past and future emissions from all other sources, contribute incrementally to the global warming that produces the adverse effects of climate change. Therefore, an appreciable impact on global climate change would, if current predictions are accurate, only occur when proposed GHG emissions combine with other GHG emissions from other man-made activities on a global scale.

### 8.1.5 Potential Cumulative Impacts

When combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, the proposed action would likely contribute to permanent impacts to land use and transportation, as well as temporary impacts to air quality and noise. However, under the proposed action, land use compatibility issues with adjacent properties would be minimized through the siting of the facility and use of buffer areas to reduce potential incompatibility issues with surround residences and forested/undeveloped areas.

Under the proposed action, the potential impact to traffic would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation outlined in the Traffic Impact Study. Therefore, while the proposed action may contribute to cumulative impacts, mitigation measures would be in place and the cumulative impact would be considered less than significant.
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Ms. Bridgette Lyles, Site Selection Specialist  
Capacity Planning and Site Selection Branch  
Federal Bureau of Prisons  
320 First Street, NW  
Washington, DC, 20534

Re: Phase I Archaeological Survey for the Federal Bureau of Prisons Feasibility Study at Three Proposed Sites in Letcher County, Kentucky 
By Kimberly M. Sebestyen and Steven W. Brann, TEC Inc.

Dear Ms. Lyles:

Thank you for your letter concerning the above referenced report. This project entailed pedestrian survey and screened shovel testing of three proposed sites totaling approximately 240 acres. No new historic or prehistoric archaeological sites were recorded as a result of this survey, and the authors recommend no further investigations of two of the three proposed sites (the Roxana/Meade Farm Site and the Payne Gap/Lawson Site). The authors identify an area of the third proposed site (the Van/Fields Site) that has not been previously surveyed and could not be accessed at the time of the fieldwork. Should this site be chosen for construction, the authors recommend that the ridgeline remnant be surveyed for archaeological resources. I concur with the authors’ findings and recommendations. However, should the project plans change, or should additional information become available regarding cultural resources or citizens’ concerns regarding impacts to cultural resources, please submit that information to our office as additional consultation may be warranted.

Should you have any questions, feel free to contact Nick Laracuente of my staff at 502.564.7005, extension 151.

Sincerely,

Lindy Casebier,  
Acting Executive Director and  
State Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Jonathan P. Kerr (CRA)
April 24, 2014

Issac Gaston
United States Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Capacity Planning and Site Selection Branch
320 First St. NW
Washington, DC 20534

Re: Historic Architectural Resources Survey for Proposed Federal Correctional Facility, Letcher County, Kentucky

Dear Mr. Gaston:

On March 27, we received the above referenced report for review and comment. Six historic resources (LR-149 through 153 and LR-188) were evaluated. None of the sites are considered eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, and the consultant recommends no further work. We concur with the results of the survey.

If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact Jill Howe of my staff at 502-564-7005, ext. 121.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Potts
Executive Director and
State Historic Preservation Officer
Ms. Deborah Henson
Cardno Tec
18 S. George Street, Suite 400
York, PA 17401

Re: FWS 2013-B-0627; Federal Bureau of Prisons; proposed federal penitentiary; located in Letcher County, Kentucky

Dear Ms. Henson:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the above-referenced project. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has reviewed this proposed project and offers the following comments in accordance with the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.). This is not a concurrence letter. Please read carefully, as further consultation with the Service may be required.

In accordance with the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, the Service has reviewed the project with regards to the effects the proposed actions may have on wetlands and/or other jurisdictional waters. We recommend that project plans be developed to avoid impacting wetland areas and/or streams, and reserve the right to review any required federal or state permits at the time of public notice issuance. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers should be contacted to assist you in determining if wetlands or other jurisdictional waters are present or if a permit is required.

In accordance to section 7 of the ESA, the Service must evaluate the potential for all the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of a proposed project on federally listed species. This includes effects of any “interrelated actions” that are part of a larger action and depend on the larger action for their justification and “interdependent actions” that have no independent utility apart from the action under consideration. Please include information about all of the potential impacts associated with the proposed project, including those from interrelated or interdependent actions (e.g.; utilities, etc.) and future actions that are reasonably certain to occur as a result of the proposed project.

In order to assist you in determining if the proposed project has the potential to impact protected species we have searched our records for occurrences of listed species within the vicinity of the proposed project. Based upon the information provided to us and according to our databases, we believe that the following federally listed species have the potential to occur within the project vicinity:
We must advise you that collection records available to the Service may not be all-inclusive. Our database is a compilation of collection records made available by various individuals and resource agencies. This information is seldom based on comprehensive surveys of all potential habitats and thus does not necessarily provide conclusive evidence that protected species are present or absent at a specific locality.

**Indiana bat**
The entire state of Kentucky is within the range of the Indiana bat; (1) caves, rockshelters, and abandoned underground mines provide suitable wintering habitat for the Indiana bat; and (2) forested areas provide suitable summer roosting and foraging habitat for the Indiana bat. In order to address the concerns and be in compliance with the ESA, we have the following recommendations relative to potential direct and/or indirect effects as a result of impacts to the habitats listed above:

1. During hibernation, the Indiana bat prefers limestone caves, sandstone rockshelters, and abandoned underground mines with stable temperatures of 39 to 46 degrees F and humidity above 74 percent but below saturation. Prior to hibernation, Indiana bats utilize the forest habitat up to five miles from the hibernacula to feed and roost until temperatures drop to a point that forces them into hibernation. This “swarming” period is dependent upon weather conditions and lasts from about September 15 to about November 15. This is a critical time for Indiana bats, since they are acquiring additional fat reserves and mating prior to hibernation.

   Based on the presence of numerous caves, rock shelters, and underground mines in Kentucky, we believe that it is reasonable to assume that other caves, rock shelters, and/or abandoned underground mines may occur within the project area, and, if they occur, they could provide winter habitat for Indiana bats. Therefore, we recommend that the project proponent conduct a phase 1 winter hibernacula habitat assessment following the March 15, 2014 “Supplemental Indiana bat survey guidance for Kentucky.” This assessment should identify any caves, rock shelters, and underground mines and assess their potential as suitable Indiana bat hibernacula. Depending on the results of the habitat assessment, subsequent bat presence/absence surveys may be necessary to determine if the species is using a feature as a hibernaculum. These presence/absence surveys must be conducted between September 1 and October 31 or April 1 and April 21 following the protocol found in the guidance document cited above.

2. The Indiana bat utilizes a wide array of forested habitats, including riparian forests, bottomlands, and uplands for both summer foraging and roosting habitat. Indiana bats typically roost under exfoliating bark, in cavities of dead and live trees, and in snags (i.e., dead trees or dead portions of live trees). Trees in excess of 16 inches diameter at breast...
height (DBH) are considered optimal for maternity colony roosts, but trees in excess of 9 inches DBH appear to provide suitable maternity roosting habitat. Male Indiana bats have been observed roosting in trees as small as 5 inches DBH.

We recommend that the project proponent design or modify the proposed project to eliminate or reduce impacts to suitable Indiana bat habitat, thus avoiding impacts. A habitat assessment may be useful in determining if suitable Indiana bat summer roosting or foraging habitat is present in the action area of the proposed project. If suitable habitat removal cannot be avoided, the following are the typical options available to address potential impacts to the species:

- The project proponent survey the project site to determine the presence or likely absence of Indiana bats within the project area in an effort to determine if potential effects are likely. A qualified biologist who holds the appropriate collection permits for the Indiana bat must undertake such surveys in accordance with our most current survey guidance. If any Indiana bats are identified, we would request written notification of such occurrence(s) and further coordination and consultation.

- The project proponent can request formal section 7 consultation through the lead federal action agency associated with the proposed project. To request formal consultation, the project proponent would need to submit a Biological Assessment that describes the action and evaluates the effects of the action on the listed species in the project area. After formal consultation is initiated, the Service has 135 days to prepare a Biological Opinion that analyzes the effects of the action on the listed species and recommends strategies to minimize those effects.

- The project proponent may provide the Service with additional information through the informal consultation process, prepared by a qualified biologist, that includes site-specific habitat information and a thorough effects analysis (direct, indirect, and cumulative) to support a "not likely to adversely affect" determination. The Service will review this and decide if there is enough supporting information to concur with the determination.

- The project proponent may choose to assume presence of the species in the project area and enter into a Conservation Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Service to account for the incidental take of Indiana bats. By entering into a Conservation MOA with the Service, Cooperators gain flexibility with regard to the removal of suitable Indiana bat habitat. In exchange for this flexibility, the Cooperator provides recovery-focused conservation benefits to the Indiana bat through the implementation of minimization and mitigation measures that are described in the Indiana Bat Mitigation Guidance for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. For additional information about this option, please notify our office.

The Payne Gap / Lawson site is in potential Indiana bat habitat; all of the options listed above are appropriate for addressing potential impacts to the species at this site. Because the Roxana site is in known “P1/P2 swarming” habitat, we already know that the species is present in the proposed project area, and, therefore, further surveys are not necessary. Impacts to the species at the Roxana site should be addressed by using one of the last three bullet points listed above.
**Gray bat**

Gray bats roost, breed, rear young, and hibernate in caves year round. They migrate between summer and winter caves and will use transient or stopover caves along the way. Gray bats eat a variety of flying aquatic and terrestrial insects present along streams, rivers, and lakes. Low-flow streams produce an abundance of insects and are especially valuable to the gray bat as foraging habitat. For hibernation, the roost site must have an average temperature of 42 to 52 degrees F. Most of the caves used by gray bats for hibernation have deep vertical passages with large rooms that function as cold air traps. Summer caves must be warm, between 57 and 77 degrees F, or have small rooms or domes that can trap the body heat of roosting bats. Summer caves are normally located close to rivers or lakes where the bats feed. Gray bats have been known to fly as far as 12 miles from their colony to feed.

Because we have concerns relating to the gray bat on this project and due to the lack of occurrence information available on this species relative to the proposed project area, we have the following recommendations relative to gray bats.

- Based on the presence of numerous caves, rock shelters, and underground mines in Kentucky, we believe that it is reasonable to assume that other caves, rock shelters, and/or abandoned underground mines may occur within the project area, and, if they occur, they could provide winter/summer habitat for gray bats. Therefore, we would recommend that the project proponent survey the project area for caves, rock shelters, and underground mines. Additional evaluation and/or surveys may be necessary if suitable gray bat hibernacula and/or roosting habitat exists in the action area of the proposed project.

- Sediment Best Management Practices (BMPs) should be utilized and maintained to minimize siltation of the streams located within and in the vicinity of the project area, as these streams represent potential foraging habitat for the gray bat.

**Northern long-eared bat**

The northern long-eared bat was proposed for federal listing under the ESA on October 2, 2013. The Service has extended the deadline for the final determination to April 2, 2015. Both proposed project sites are located in “known summer” northern-long-eared bat habitat. During the summer, northern long-eared bats typically roost singly or in colonies in a wide-variety of forested habitats, where they seek shelter during daylight hours underneath bark or in cavities/crevices of both live trees and snags, including relatively small trees and snags that are less than 5 inches in diameter at breast height (DBH). Northern long-eared bats have also been documented roosting in man-made structures (i.e., buildings, barns, etc.) during the summer. According to current winter occurrence data, northern long-eared bats predominately winter in hibernacula that include caves, tunnels, and underground mine passages.

Although species proposed for listing are not afforded protection under the ESA, when a species is listed, the prohibitions against jeopardizing its continued existence and unauthorized take are effective immediately, **regardless of an action’s stage of completion**. Therefore, to avoid significant project delays, we recommend that the project proponent evaluate and address potential impacts to northern long-eared bat summer habitat and winter habitat that is present in the action area of the proposed project.
Kentucky Arrow Darter

The Kentucky arrow darter is a rather large, brightly colored darter that is restricted to the upper Kentucky River basin in eastern Kentucky. The species' preferred habitat consists of pools or transitional areas between riffles and pools (runs and glides) in moderate to high gradient streams with bedrock, boulder, and cobble substrates. The species' habitat and range have been severely degraded and limited by water pollution from surface coal mining and gas-exploration activities; removal of riparian vegetation; stream channelization; increased siltation associated with poor mining, logging, and agricultural practices; and deforestation of watersheds. A habitat assessment and/or survey may be necessary to determine if impacts to these species are likely as a result of the proposed project.

As a federal candidate species, the Service sufficient information on the biological status and threats of the species to propose it as endangered or threatened under the ESA, but development of a proposed listing regulation is precluded by other higher priority listing activities. Candidate species receive no statutory protection under the ESA. The Service encourages cooperative conservation efforts for these species because they are, by definition, species that may warrant future protection under the ESA. Addressing the needs of Kentucky arrow darter before the regulatory requirements associated with a listed threatened or endangered species come into play, would allow future developers, landowners, and other entities greater management flexibility to stabilize or restore the species and its habitat for future projects. In addition, as such threats are reduced and populations are increased or stabilized, priority for listing can be shifted to those species in greatest need of the ESA’s protective measures. Ideally, sufficient threats can be removed to eliminate the need for listing.

Presence/absence surveys would provide additional information regarding the likelihood that the proposed project would impact Kentucky arrow darter. Surveys would not be necessary if habitat assessments, especially specific conductivity measurements, supported that suitable habitat does not exist in the action area of the proposed project.

Thank you again for your request. Your concern for the protection of endangered and threatened species is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions regarding the information that we have provided, please contact Jessi Miller at (502) 695-0468 extension 104.

Sincerely,

Virgil Lee Andrews, Jr.
Field Supervisor
December 22, 2014

Mr. Issac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street NW
Washington, DC 20534


Dear Mr. Gaston:

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the above referenced report for an archaeological survey conducted in Letcher County, Kentucky for the proposed United States Penitentiary and Federal Prison Camp project. The survey found no evidence of cultural resources. Therefore, the author concluded that the project will have no adverse effect on cultural resources that are potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. I concur with the author’s findings. Therefore, in accordance with 36CFR Part 800.4 (d) of the Advisory Council’s revised regulations our finding is that there are No Historic Properties Present within the undertaking’s area of potential impact. Therefore, we have no further comments and responsibility to consult with the Kentucky State Historic Preservation Officer under the Section 106 review process on this project is fulfilled.

Should you have any questions, feel free to contact Yvonne Sherrick of my staff at 564-7005, ext. 113.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Potts
Executive Director and
State Historic Preservation Officer

CP:43104
cc. George Crothers, Johnathan Kerr (CRA)
Deb,

Thank you for sending the summary. As mentioned previously, I hope to get out and take a look at those streams when I get a break in the schedule. However, I was reviewing some previously authorized projects in the Roxana area and there was a recent project issued on a gas line project near the old Consol haulroad that we traveled. I believe that the consultant could very well have the scores that you need for the project. Considering my limited time to be out in the field, I'm unsure when I'll be able to check the streams. If you would want to contact the consultant and ask them about their data, I'd be more than glad to pass their contact information along to you. The data is valid because I have already concurred with it. If this is an option for you, just let me know and I'll give you the contact information. If not, then I'll try and schedule a visit over that way when I get a chance.

Justin Branham
Team Leader / Regulatory Specialist
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - Louisville District
Eastern Kentucky Regulatory Office
845 Sassafras Creek Road
Sassafras, KY 41759
Phone: 606-642-3208
Email: Justin.L.Branham@usace.army.mil

Comments on our Regulatory Services are invited:
http://corpsmapu.usace.army.mil/cm_apex/f?p=regulatory_survey

-----Original Message-----
From: Henson, Deborah [mailto:Deborah.Henson@cardno-gs.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2015 9:27 AM
To: Branham, Justin L LRL
Cc: Scheuerman, Clint; igaston@bop.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] BOP Letcher County EIS

Hi Justin,

Thanks again for taking the time to meet with us on May 19th. We appreciate your input and help with this project. The following is a summary of our meeting:

1) The Bureau is requesting a preliminary JD of the Roxana site based on the findings of the site visit conducted on May 18, 2015, the 2011 Roxana Wetland Report, and the 2014 Wetland Report.

2) The Bureau will conduct mitigation for wetlands at a 2:1 ratio. Currently, there are approximately 2 acres of wetland impacts anticipated which would result in roughly 4 acres of mitigation, which is anticipated to be covered by the in-lieu fee program. Currently, the in-lieu fee program is $45,000 per acre which would result in payment, at existing costs, of approximately $190,000. The Bureau understands that this cost may increase before the project is ready to obtain permits and begin construction activities.
3) Stream mitigation will be covered at a cost per linear foot based on Ecological Integrity Unit Scores (which range from 0.1 to 1.0) for the impacted streams. The Ecological Integrity Unit Score for each stream impacted is multiplied by the linear feet of impact to that stream and then multiplied by $750.00.

4) Based on our discussion, the USACOE will take some data from the streams to assist the Bureau in obtaining the Ecological Integrity Unit Scores for the impacted streams. USACOE asks that a map with the streams labeled be forwarded to aid in this task (map is attached).

5) The project may qualify for a Nationwide Permit 39, if the District Engineer waives the linear feet/acreage threshold.

6) The Bureau will continue coordination with USACOE throughout the course of the project to ensure all permit requirements and mitigation measures are implemented.

If you have any comments or edits to this summary, please let me know and I will revise.

Deborah Henson
PROJECT MANAGER
GOVERNMENT SERVICES DIVISION
CARDNO

Office (+1) 717-547-6278  Mobile (+1) 717-433-7550  Fax (+1) 717-547-6357
Address 145 Limekiln Road, Suite 100, New Cumberland, PA 17070
Email deborah.henson@cardno-gs.com  Web www.cardno.com


This email and its attachments may contain confidential and/or privileged information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). All electronically supplied data must be checked against an applicable hardcopy version which shall be the only document which Cardno warrants accuracy. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, distribution or copying of the information contained in this email and its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please email the sender by replying to this message and immediately delete and destroy any copies of this email and any attachments. The views or opinions expressed are the author's own and may not reflect the views or opinions of Cardno.

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE
No. That would be it. I will be working up the JD request and getting you a JD letter back to you. It won't really affect the EIS at all but it will verify your delineation.

Justin Branham
Team Leader / Regulatory Specialist
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - Louisville District
Eastern Kentucky Regulatory Office
845 Sassafras Creek Road
Sassafras, KY 41759
Phone: 606-642-3208
Email: Justin.L.Branham@usace.army.mil

I just received the stream data and mitigation calculations from James. We will be submitting those ASAP. I have included the mitigation in the Final EIS. The Bureau will be reviewing the Draft FEIS over the next two weeks, so if you have any comments on the mitigation please let me know and we will include in the Final EIS before it goes out for public review. At this point is there anything else you need prior to the release of the Final EIS?

Thanks,

Deb
Thanks Jessi. I will make sure that is clear in the mitigation section of the FEIS.

Deborah Henson
PROJECT MANAGER
GOVERNMENT SERVICES DIVISION
CARDNO

Office (+1) 717-547-6278  Mobile (+1) 717-433-7550  Fax (+1) 717-547-6357
Address 145 Limekiln Road, Suite 100, New Cumberland, PA 17070
Email deborah.henson@cardno-gs.com  Web www.cardno.com

That looks good, Deb. The only other thing that comes to mind is that tree removal during June and July is not covered under the CMOA.

Jessi

On Fri, Jun 26, 2015 at 9:22 AM, Deborah Henson <Deborah.Henson@cardno-gs.com> wrote:
Hi Jessi,

I just wanted to follow up on the below email and make sure there is nothing else you need prior to us moving forward with publication of the Final EIS?

Thanks,
Deb
From: Henson, Deborah  
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2015 9:32 AM  
To: Jessica Miller (jessica_miller@fws.gov)  
Cc: igaston@bop.gov  
Subject: Letcher County Indiana and Northern Long-Eared Bat Mitigation

Good morning Jessi,

Just a follow up to our May 20, 2015 meeting to discuss mitigation for the Indiana and northern long-eared bat at the Roxana site. Below is the summary of that meeting and subsequent discussions we have had regarding the Roxana site and mitigation.

1) During the May 20 meeting we discussed that approximately 105 acres of summer habitat for the Indian bat and northern long-eared bat would be impacted at the Roxana site. To be covered under the MOA the impacts must be under 100 acres. Subsequently, the impact areas were re-evaluated and impacts will be approximately 92.5 acres. Based on coordination with you on June 11, 2015 you reviewed the map detailing the impact areas and agree that based on this impact assessment, the Roxana site can be covered through the Conservation Memorandum Agreement (CMOA) following the guidance provided in the USFWS's April 2015 Conservation Strategy for Forest Dwelling Bats in the Commonwealth of Kentucky (Conservation Strategy).

2) The CMOA will be put in place between the USFWS and the Bureau when construction funds become available. Mitigation will be in place prior to any disturbance to the site would occur.

3) Mitigation identified in the CMOA would include payment to the Kentucky Natural Lands Trust which would be placed in the Imperiled Bat Conservation Fund. The mitigation payment would be used to acquire, protect, and manage bat habitat in Kentucky. Based on 2015 rates mitigation would range from approximately $930,00.00 to $1.3 million. Mitigation payment will depend on the time of year the habitat is impacted and rates may change prior to construction funding becoming available.

4) Once construction funding is available, the Bureau will meet with USFWS to ensure the CMOA is in place and mitigation requirements are fulfilled prior to any disturbance at the site (excavation, grading, timber removal, etc.).

5) Sediment Best Management Practices would be implemented to minimize sediment being carried to streams on site which may be potential foraging habitat for the gray bat.

6) At this time, based on the Preferred Alternative (Roxana), no formal Section 7 consultation is required for the Letcher County EIS project. Should anything change during the development of the final design site plans, the Bureau will notify USFWS to discuss any changes and how they may effect additional studies and mitigation.

Please let me know if you concur with this summary or have any additions or questions.

Thanks,

Deb
Celebrating 70 Years of Shaping the Future – 1945 - 2015

This email and its attachments may contain confidential and/or privileged information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). All electronically supplied data must be checked against an applicable hardcopy version which shall be the only document which Cardno warrants accuracy. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, distribution or copying of the information contained in this email and its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please email the sender by replying to this message and immediately delete and destroy any copies of this email and any attachments. The views or opinions expressed are the author's own and may not reflect the views or opinions of Cardno.

--
Jessica Blackwood Miller
Fish & Wildlife Biologist
Kentucky Field Office
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
330 W. Broadway, Suite 265
Frankfort, KY 40601
Ph: (502) 695-0468 ext. 104
Fax: (502) 695-1024
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>3/6/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>10:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Type and Location:</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded by:</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Names and organizations:</td>
<td>Luke DuPont, Cardno TEC; Bruce Crouch Laurel Ridge Landfill Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Information:</td>
<td>Mr. Crouch Office: 606-864-7996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion Points:**

Luke DuPont called the Laurel Ridge Landfill, which has a transfer station located in Letcher County and spoke with the Laurel Ridge Manager (Bruce Crouch)

Mr. Crouch indicated the Laurel Ridge landfill, which the Letcher County transfer station delivers to, is permitted for an additional 34 years. He further indicated he expects the landfill to take at least that long to reach capacity.

He also indicated there is potential for expansion of the existing landfill and they may be able to get an additional 20 years of use from an expansion.

Currently the landfill receives approximately 40-50 tons of refuse per day.

**Action Items or Resolutions:**

None
ENVIRONMENTAL MEETING/TELEPHONE LOG

Date: 9/4/13
Time: 10:30
Meeting Type and Location: Phone Call
Recorded by: NA
Participant Names and organizations: Luke DuPont, Cardno TEC; Mr. Scott Collins, Paramedic and Captain at the Fleming Neon Fire Department
Contact Information: 606-855-7303

Discussion Points:

Luke DuPont called the Fleming Neon fire department to ask to ask questions regarding their personnel, jurisdiction, and equipment. He spoke with Mr. Scott Collins, a Captain at the fire department.

Mr. Collins indicated the following:

There are a total of between 36 firefighters and EMTs at the Fleming Neon Volunteer Fire Station. Sixteen of which are paid full time employees and twenty are volunteers. The station has seven paramedics and eight EMTs.

They only have a single station in Fleming Neon and a substation in Whitesburg.

Fleming Neon has two fire engines, 10 ambulances, one tanker truck, one rescue truck, one dive trailer for underwater rescue, one ATV for search and rescue. The run four ambulances during the day and two at night. The firefighters run three crews during the day and one at night.

The station has with all of the towns in Letcher County. He indicated the Payne Gap site has hydrants or hydrants in close proximity.

Spoke with Charles Polly regarding additional questions. Mr. Polly, a firefighter and EMT at Fleming Neon indicated they would be open to discussing an MOU and in the event they were to assist with a fire it would not impact operations. He indicated they are close enough to cover Payne Gap; however, Roxana is a 25 minute drive and they would likely be called in under the overarching mutual aid agreement which covers all of Letcher County. Under the mutual aid agreement all fire departments help out when requested.

Action Items or Resolutions:
None
**ENVIRONMENTAL MEETING/TELEPHONE LOG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>9/4/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>11:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Type and Location:</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded by:</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Names and organizations:</td>
<td>Luke DuPont, Cardno TEC; Mr. Mike Dingus, Chief of Police at the Fleming Neon Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Information:</td>
<td>606-855-7900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion Points:**

Luke DuPont called the Fleming Neon Police Department to ask questions regarding their personnel, jurisdiction, and equipment. He spoke with Mr. Mike Dingus, the Chief of Police for the Fleming Neon Police Department.

Mr. Dingus indicated the following:

Fleming Neon has three fulltime employees comprised of one police chief and two police officers. In addition they have one volunteer. They have a ratio of citizen to police of 262:1.

They would be able to assist the Payne Gap site if required. They are approximately 6 miles from Payne Gap.

They provide service 24 hours a day seven days a week, although may have to be dispatched from home.

They have a single station in Fleming Neon, three squad cars (one of which is an SUV).

They have county wide jurisdiction

**Action Items or Resolutions:**

None
## ENVIRONMENTAL MEETING/TELEPHONE LOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>9/4/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>10:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Type and Location:</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded by:</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Names and organizations:</td>
<td>Luke DuPont, Cardno TEC; Todd Depriest Public Safety Director for the City of Jenkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Information:</td>
<td>City Hall (606) 832 4411 Mr. Depriest Cell (606)-634-6958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion Points:

Luke DuPont called the Jenkins City Hall to inquire about personnel, equipment, and jurisdiction of the Jenkins’ Police Department and Fire and Rescue and was given Mr. Todd Depriest’s cell phone number. Mr. Depriest is the Public Safety Director for the Town of Jenkins.

Mr Depriest indicated the following:

**Jenkins’ Fire Department**

There is an average of between 25-28 firefighters at the Jenkins Volunteer Fire Station. In addition, the station has three administrative personnel. All of the firefighters are volunteers and five of them are EMTs.

They have 2 stations in Jenkins.

The station has 2 fire engines, an 85-foot tower truck, a 65-foot ladder truck, a 2,500 gallon tanker truck, one heavy rescue truck, and an expedition for personnel transport.

The station has mutual aid agreements with all other stations in Letcher County and will cover down at another town’s station or assist in firefighting activities. He also indicated that Payne Gap would fall within their jurisdiction.

**Jenkins’ Police**

Mr. Depriest also was also knowledgeable about the Jenkins’ police department. He indicated the following:

Jenkins has six full time personnel working for the police in Jenkins. Four of them are the actual police, one is the police chief, and the Public Safety Director for the town, Mr. Depriest. He further indicated they are short staffed one person. The ratio of citizens to police officers is approximately 400:1.

There is one police station present in Jenkins.
The station has 8 squad cars.

They have 24 hour coverage with the police officers they have on staff.

The Jenkins police have county wide jurisdiction in Letcher County, but are seldom asked by the Sheriff Department of the Kentucky State Police to respond to incidents outside of Jenkins.

Mr. DePriest believes the Jenkins Police and Fire Departments would be interested in discussing an MOU with the BOP; however, he would have to defer to the Mayor of Jenkins. Additionally, Mr. DePriest does not believe assisting BOP would result in impacts to current operations.

**Action Items or Resolutions:**

None
## ENVIRONMENTAL MEETING/TELEPHONE LOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>9/4/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>12:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Type and Location:</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded by:</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Names and organizations:</td>
<td>Luke DuPont, Cardno TEC; Claude Little, Investigative Lieutenant, Kentucky State Police-Hazard Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Information:</td>
<td>606-435-6069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Points:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Luke DuPont called Mr. Claude Little, an Investigative Lieutenant for the Kentucky State Police, to inquire about personnel, equipment, and jurisdiction for the Kentucky State Police in the vicinity of the BOP proposed action.

Mr. Little indicated the following:

The Hazard Post covers the southeastern portion of Kentucky and includes five counties to include Letcher County.

He indicated that unless called upon by the State Police or the Sheriff’s Office, the local community law enforcement would not assist the state police outside of their respective communities.

Due to budget constraints the State Police laid off five officers at the Hazard Post and are subsequently short staffed five officers. They currently have 39 state troopers, 18 dispatchers, three clerks, one custodian, one criminal analyst, and one arson specialist.

The SWAT team is not based out of Hazard County.

The state police have 39 squad cars, with between 8-10 spares in the event a squad car goes down.

They typically do not have anyone on the road between 4 AM to 6 AM.

When asked about interest in discussing a possible MOU Mr. Little indicated the State Police would be interested. Additionally, Mr. Little did not believe assisting BOP would impact their operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items or Resolutions:</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**ENVIRONMENTAL MEETING/TELEPHONE LOG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>9/7/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>2:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Type and Location:</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded by:</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Names and organizations:</td>
<td>Luke DuPont, Cardno TEC; John Amburgey, EMS Lieutenant, Letcher County Fire and Rescue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Information:</td>
<td>606-633-8058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion Points:**

Luke DuPont called Mr. John Amburgey, an EMS Lieutenant for Letcher County Fire and Rescue, to inquire about personnel, equipment, and jurisdiction of the Letcher County Fire and Rescue Service.

Mr. Amburgey indicated the following:

They have 32 firefighters, comprised of 20 paid firefighters and 12 volunteer firefighters. Their jurisdiction is comprised of the southern side of Letcher County. Fifteen of their personnel are EMTs.

They have three stations; Jeremiah, Blackey, and Hallie,

They have five ambulances, two tanker trucks, and three engines.

Roxana is within their jurisdiction.

Gary Rodgers, Director of Fire and Ambulance for the Letcher County Fire and Rescue, answered additional questions regarding potential discussion with BOP for an MOU and potential impacts on operations. Mr. Rodgers indicated they would be interested in discussing an MOU and their operations would not be impacted if they needed to assist BOP.

**Action Items or Resolutions:**

NA
**Discussion Points:**

Luke DuPont called Mr. Benny Bentley at the Whitesburg Fire and Rescue Service to ask questions about their personnel, equipment, and jurisdiction.

Mr. Bentley indicated the following:

The fire department has 30 firefighters, 25 volunteer and five paid. In addition they have three administrative personnel. Five of the firefighters are also EMTs.

The station has five engines, a boom truck with a snorkel.

The station has mutual aid agreements with the rest of the county and would be able to help out on anything in the county if dispatched.

Gary Mullins, the Fire Chief, answered additional questions regarding interest in an MOU with the BOP and potential impacts to operation. Mr. Mullins indicated Whitesburg Fire and Rescue would be interested in discussing an MOU and indicated their support of BOP would not impact their operations.

**Action Items or Resolutions:**

NA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Discussion Points:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke DuPont called the Ms. Garnet Sexton, the City Clerk and Treasurer for the City of Whitesburg to inquire about personnel, equipment, and jurisdiction for the Whitesburg Police Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sexton indicates the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are nine fulltime employees comprised of six police officers, one chief of police, one second in command, and one secretary. They have a citizen to officer ration of 270:1. They are short staffed one police officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department has eight squad cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department has one police station in Whitesburg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They provide 24 hour coverage seven days a week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department’s jurisdiction is limited to the county but could assist at both sites if asked to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sexton further indicated that she believe the Whitesburg Police Department would be open to an MOU but the Mayor and Chief of Police of Whitesburg would have the final word. Furthermore, she indicated operations may be impacted in the event they needed to assist. She is concerned there may not be enough proper equipment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Action Items or Resolutions:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Type and Location:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recorded by:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant Names and organizations:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Information:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion Points:**
Mr. Meade discussed with Ms. Henson the ability and willingness of the Kings Creek Volunteer Fire Department to work with the Bureau to develop and MOU to assist the proposed facility if it were constructed at the Roxana site. Mr. Meade indicated the fire department is 1.5 miles from the site. Mr. Meade stated that the fire department has 23 volunteers, one pumper truck and two large tanker trucks. In addition to the 23 volunteers the department has relationships with other local volunteer fire departments and has an agreement among these departments to assist one another. A local paging system allows the numerous volunteer fire departments to request assistance from one another. Mr. Meade indicated that participating in an MOU and providing assistance to the facility in the event of an emergency would not impact the Kings Creek Volunteer Fire Department.

**Action Items or Resolutions:**
NA
APPENDIX B
EXCAVATION AND GRADING CALCULATIONS
October 24, 2014

Mr. Deborah Henson, Project Manager
Cardno Government Services Division
145 Limekiln Road, Suite 100
New Cumberland, Pennsylvania 17070

Subject: Revised Earthwork Quantities and Construction Costs; Proposed Federal Correction Facility • Payne Gap and Roxana Sites
Cardno MM&A Project No. CARD003

Dear Ms. Henson:

Per your request, Cardno MM&A (Cardno) is providing revised earthwork quantities and construction costs for the “Proposed Federal Correction Facility (FCF)” in Letcher County, Kentucky. The original document was prepared for the Payne Gap and Roxana sites and published in a report by Marshall Miller & Associates, Inc. (now Cardno MM&A) titled “Geotechnical Feasibility Report dated June 2012.”

Earthwork quantities and construction costs were presented in the 2012 report for both of these sites. The United States Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) provided a conceptual plan for the supporting facilities and access roads for the FCF at both the Payne Gap and Roxana sites.

The proposed “cut shading” on the BOP drawing for the Payne Gap site differed from the proposed cut shading in the Cardno 2012 report. There were no adjustments made in the earthwork quantities provided in this letter report related to this difference. The fill slopes for the supporting facilities at Payne Gap and Roxana were designed at 2:1. “Cut” slopes were designed for the two sites at 1:1. Additional geotechnical studies may indicate the cut slopes can be constructed at ½:1 or steeper. Select fill slopes for the access roads at Payne Gap were steeper than 2:1 to accommodate the existing topography. Slopes steeper than 2:1 may require stabilization which was not estimated for this revision.

Cardno determined the best fit for the access roads and supporting facilities relative to the topography present at the two sites.
The unit costs for the construction quantities were based on “RSMeans Cost Data”¹ and updated to reflect 2014 costs.

The earthwork quantities were determined for the supporting facilities and added to the quantities previously determined for the Payne Gap FCF. A 25% swell factor was used for all fill at the site. A site plan depicting the facilities along with the earthwork cut and fills is attached to this letter report as Map No. PG-4 (Revised). The additional parking area and additional spoil fill area shown on the site plan for the Payne Gap site were added to the main building area.

### Payne Gap Earthwork Quantities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit Cost /Cubic Meters</th>
<th>Unit Cost /Cubic Yards</th>
<th>Units Cubic Meters</th>
<th>Units Cubic Yards</th>
<th>Cost $ Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil Excavation</td>
<td>$13.08</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>2,136,67</td>
<td>2,794,660</td>
<td>$27,947,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Excavation</td>
<td>$27.47</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>6,206,251</td>
<td>8,117,470</td>
<td>$170,485,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Fill</td>
<td>$3.92</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>1,312,049</td>
<td>1,716,095</td>
<td>$5,143,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoil Fill</td>
<td>$1.31</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>9,256,402</td>
<td>12,106,917</td>
<td>$12,125,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Mined Area</td>
<td>$740</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Forest Area</td>
<td>$19,030</td>
<td>$7,700</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>$1,623,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$217,327,748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The earthwork quantities were determined for the supporting facilities and added to the quantities previously determined for the Roxana FCF. Due to space limitations at the site and for cut/fill balancing purposes, all material cut will have to be placed as a structural fill. The swell factor for the rock excavation was 25% and the mine spoil was reduced by 10% for the structural fill. The rock elevations at the prison camp were inferred from borings to the south. The actual rock elevations should be confirmed. Constructing the prison camp at different levels could reduce the amount of rock excavation. A site plan depicting the facilities along with the earthwork cut and fills is attached to this letter report as Map No. RX-4 (Revised). Two locations shown as cut in the main building area will require further investigation.

Roxana Earthwork Quantities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit Cost /Cubic Meters</th>
<th>Unit Cost /Cubic Yards</th>
<th>Units Cubic Meters</th>
<th>Units Cubic Yards</th>
<th>Cost $ Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spoil Excavation</td>
<td>$13.08</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>7,037,223</td>
<td>9,204,340</td>
<td>92,046,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Excavation</td>
<td>$27.47</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>728,809</td>
<td>953,246</td>
<td>20,020,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Fill</td>
<td>$3.92</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>7,188,790</td>
<td>9,402,582</td>
<td>28,180,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Mined Area</td>
<td>$740</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>24,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Forest Area</td>
<td>$19,030</td>
<td>$7,700</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>844,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$141,116,447</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The revised earthwork quantities and construction costs are based on the provided conceptual plan and the analysis of same, as well as published data and information collected during the 2012 Geotechnical Feasibility Study. Additional geotechnical studies should be conducted to confirm that the earthwork volumes estimated are adequate to meet the quantified material required for structural fills in the final design.

The earthwork quantities were itemized by facility and are presented on the **Tables PG-1A** and **RX-1A** attached to this letter report.

We reserve the right to amend our computations, if any additional information becomes available. This revision is furnished as privileged and confidential to the addressee. Release to any other company, concern, or individual is solely the responsibility of the addressee. We appreciate the opportunity to have assisted you with this project.

Sincerely,

W. Dale Nicholson, P.E., P.L.S.
Senior Forensic Engineer
for Cardno MM&A
Direct Line 859-977-8865
Email: Dale.Nicholson@cardno.com

WDN/cfn

Attachments
- Map PG-4 (Revised) – “Site Grading – Payne Gap Study Area”
- Map RX-4 (Revised) – “Site Grading – Roxana Study Area”
- Tables PG-1A and RX-1A

Bird, File/Card003
File: Revised Earthwork.docx
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (Cubic Meters)</th>
<th>Main Building</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Training Center</th>
<th>Utility Plant</th>
<th>Prison Camp</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spoil Excavation</td>
<td>1,266,966</td>
<td>95,830</td>
<td>356,105</td>
<td>140,405</td>
<td>277,365</td>
<td>2,136,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Excavation</td>
<td>5,005,811</td>
<td>19,850</td>
<td>587,430</td>
<td>185,610</td>
<td>407,550</td>
<td>6,206,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Fill</td>
<td>883,064</td>
<td>14,920</td>
<td>249,150</td>
<td>30,890</td>
<td>134,025</td>
<td>1,312,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoil Fill</td>
<td>8,096,932</td>
<td>40,050</td>
<td>414,805</td>
<td>704,615</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,256,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Elevation</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cardno Government Services Division
Payne Gap/Lawson Site
Table PG-1A
## Volumes by Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (Cubic Meters)</th>
<th>Main Building</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Training Center</th>
<th>Utility Plant</th>
<th>Prison Camp</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spoil Excavation</td>
<td>4,881,322</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,507,283</td>
<td>648,618</td>
<td>7,037,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Excavation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>169,438</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>559,371</td>
<td>728,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Fill</td>
<td>3,322,628</td>
<td>3,742</td>
<td>3,862,420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,188,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Elevation</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>7,188,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cardno Government Services Division
Roxana/Meade Farm Site
Table RX-1A
APPENDIX C
AIR EMISSION CALCULATIONS
### Alternative 1: Payne Gap/Larson Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO\textsubscript{2}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>31.38</td>
<td>104.89</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>217.39</td>
<td>26.86</td>
<td>10,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>31.38</td>
<td>104.89</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>146.89</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>10,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1,271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternative 1: Roxana Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO\textsubscript{2}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>38.68</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>158.52</td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>4,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>38.68</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>106.45</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>4,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1,271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tab B. Construction Emissions

#### Alternative 1 - Payne Gap/Larson

**Table 1.1 Clearing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-road Equipment</th>
<th>Hours of Operation</th>
<th>Engine HP</th>
<th>Load Factor</th>
<th>VOC g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO g/hp-hr</th>
<th>NOx g/hp-hr</th>
<th>SO2 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM10 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM2.5 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO2 g/hp-hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loader/Backhoe</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Backhoe</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.2 Site Prep**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-road Equipment</th>
<th>Hours of Operation</th>
<th>Engine HP</th>
<th>Speed (mph)</th>
<th>VOC g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO g/hp-hr</th>
<th>NOx g/hp-hr</th>
<th>SO2 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM10 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM2.5 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO2 g/hp-hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>85,869</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skid Steer Loader</td>
<td>103,043</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozer (Rubber Tired)</td>
<td>93,336</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactor</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grader</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.3 Gravel Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-road Equipment</th>
<th>Hours of Operation</th>
<th>Engine HP</th>
<th>Load Factor</th>
<th>VOC g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO g/hp-hr</th>
<th>NOx g/hp-hr</th>
<th>SO2 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM10 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM2.5 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO2 g/hp-hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheel Loader for Spreading</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactor</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.4 Site Prep Grand Total in Tons**

12.14 + 14.81 + 16.38 + 3.11 = 44.24 + 22.92 + 39.46 + 9.42 = 115.43 + 175.15 = 290.58 + 18.096 = 290.58 + 18.096 = 298.676

**Table 1.3 Gravel Work Subtotal in lbs**


**Table 1.3 Gravel Work Site Prep Grand Total in Metric Tons**

8,844 CY

8,844 CY
Gravel Work Grand Total in Tons 0.02 0.11 0.44 0.00 0.02 0.02
Gravel Work Grand Total in Metric Tons 42

Table 1.4 Concrete Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-road Equipment</th>
<th>Hours of Operation</th>
<th>Engine HP</th>
<th>Load Factor</th>
<th>VOC g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO g/hp-hr</th>
<th>NOx g/hp-hr</th>
<th>SO2 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM10 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM2.5 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO2 g/hp-hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixer</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Truck</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-road Equipment</th>
<th>VOC lb</th>
<th>CO lb</th>
<th>NOx lb</th>
<th>SO2 lb</th>
<th>PM lb</th>
<th>PM2.5 lb</th>
<th>CO2 lb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixer</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Truck</td>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>168.36</td>
<td>596.22</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>25.91</td>
<td>25.14</td>
<td>51,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (lbs):</td>
<td>37.47</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>32.58</td>
<td>32.76</td>
<td>51,834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concrete Work Grand Total in Metric Tons 24

Table 1.5 Building Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-road Equipment</th>
<th>Hours of Operation</th>
<th>Engine HP</th>
<th>Load Factor</th>
<th>VOC g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO g/hp-hr</th>
<th>NOx g/hp-hr</th>
<th>SO2 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM10 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM2.5 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO2 g/hp-hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Truck</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Generator</td>
<td>3,212</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telehandler</td>
<td>8,029</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scissors Lift</td>
<td>6,423</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skid Steer Loader</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Driver</td>
<td>9,295</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Terrain Forklift</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-road Equipment</th>
<th>VOC lb/mile</th>
<th>CO lb/mile</th>
<th>NOx lb/mile</th>
<th>SO2 lb/mile</th>
<th>PM lb/mile</th>
<th>PM2.5 lb/mile</th>
<th>CO2 lb/mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>416.23</td>
<td>2065.88</td>
<td>8910.25</td>
<td>193.24</td>
<td>351.89</td>
<td>341.17</td>
<td>898,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Truck</td>
<td>214.20</td>
<td>1560.73</td>
<td>4933.15</td>
<td>131.71</td>
<td>239.84</td>
<td>232.65</td>
<td>612,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Generator</td>
<td>31.97</td>
<td>171.58</td>
<td>427.25</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>28.24</td>
<td>27.39</td>
<td>65,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telehandler</td>
<td>526.84</td>
<td>4073.46</td>
<td>5096.29</td>
<td>132.25</td>
<td>358.81</td>
<td>352.64</td>
<td>614,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scissors Lift</td>
<td>353.35</td>
<td>2732.10</td>
<td>3418.12</td>
<td>88.70</td>
<td>361.38</td>
<td>350.54</td>
<td>412,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skid Steer Loader</td>
<td>592.11</td>
<td>2787.66</td>
<td>2343.40</td>
<td>51.99</td>
<td>416.05</td>
<td>403.57</td>
<td>241,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Driver</td>
<td>1063.00</td>
<td>3555.00</td>
<td>13520.50</td>
<td>260.50</td>
<td>719.00</td>
<td>697.00</td>
<td>1,213,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Terrain Forklift</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>69.13</td>
<td>86.48</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>10,433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Construction Grand Total in Tons 2.26 12.04 35.01 0.44 1.98 1.92
Building Construction Grand Total in Metric Tons 3,198

Table 1.6 Paving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-road Equipment</th>
<th>Hours of Operation</th>
<th>Engine HP</th>
<th>Load Factor</th>
<th>VOC g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO g/hp-hr</th>
<th>NOx g/hp-hr</th>
<th>SO2 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM10 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM2.5 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO2 g/hp-hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grader</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving Machine</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Curbing Machine</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (lbs):</td>
<td>4,526</td>
<td>24,089</td>
<td>70,014</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>3,969</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>7,050,288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paving - HMA 117,087 CF
Building Construction Grand Total in Tons 3,198
### Table 1.7. Fugitive Dust Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PM10 tons/acre/mo</th>
<th>acres</th>
<th>days of disturbance</th>
<th>PM2.5 Total</th>
<th>PM2.5 Ratio</th>
<th>PM10 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>65.40</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>211.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>43.60</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1.8. Total Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>VOC Tons</th>
<th>CO Tons</th>
<th>NOx Tons</th>
<th>SO2 Tons</th>
<th>PM10 Tons</th>
<th>PM2.5 Tons</th>
<th>CO2 Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>31.38</td>
<td>104.89</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>217.39</td>
<td>26.86</td>
<td>10,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>31.38</td>
<td>104.89</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>146.89</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>10,913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternative 2 - Roxana

#### Table 2.1. Clearing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-road Equipment</th>
<th>Hours of Operation</th>
<th>Engine HP</th>
<th>Load Factor</th>
<th>VOC g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO g/hp-hr</th>
<th>NOx g/hp-hr</th>
<th>SO2 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM10 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM2.5 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO2 g/hp-hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loader/Backhoe</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Backhoe</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### On-road Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-road Equipment</th>
<th>Hours of Operation</th>
<th>Engine HP</th>
<th>Speed (mph)</th>
<th>VOC g/hp-mile</th>
<th>CO g/hp-mile</th>
<th>NOx g/hp-mile</th>
<th>SO2 g/hp-mile</th>
<th>PM10 g/hp-mile</th>
<th>PM2.5 g/hp-mile</th>
<th>CO2 g/hp-mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.0080</td>
<td>0.0361</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>3.4385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Clearing Grand Total in Metric Tons

144.3

### Table 2.2. Site Prep

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-road Equipment</th>
<th>Hours of Operation</th>
<th>Engine HP</th>
<th>Load Factor</th>
<th>VOC g/hp-mile</th>
<th>CO g/hp-mile</th>
<th>NOx g/hp-mile</th>
<th>SO2 g/hp-mile</th>
<th>PM10 g/hp-mile</th>
<th>PM2.5 g/hp-mile</th>
<th>CO2 g/hp-mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>27,082</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skid Steer Loader</td>
<td>32,499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozer (Rubber Tired)</td>
<td>29,437</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactor</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grader</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VOC CO NOx SO2 PM PM2.5 CO2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Engine HP</th>
<th>Load Factor</th>
<th>CO lb/mile</th>
<th>NOx lb/mile</th>
<th>SO2 lb/mile</th>
<th>PM10 lb/mile</th>
<th>PM2.5 lb/mile</th>
<th>CO2 lb/mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>2,943.97</td>
<td>10,351.16</td>
<td>34,493.08</td>
<td>986.58</td>
<td>1,907.24</td>
<td>1,850.02</td>
<td>4,586,419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skid Steer Loader</td>
<td>1,010.50</td>
<td>3,875.59</td>
<td>11,438.76</td>
<td>303.81</td>
<td>805.19</td>
<td>781.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozer (Rubber Tired)</td>
<td>2,091.18</td>
<td>7,852.42</td>
<td>23,171.51</td>
<td>639.77</td>
<td>1,643.34</td>
<td>1,594.04</td>
<td>2,974,180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactor</td>
<td>49.86</td>
<td>198.17</td>
<td>576.19</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>40.27</td>
<td>39.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grader</td>
<td>34.67</td>
<td>121.81</td>
<td>410.44</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>22.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal in lb:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,336</td>
<td>23,488</td>
<td>74,974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Prep Grand Total</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>37.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in Tons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.3 Gravel Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Engine HP</th>
<th>Load Factor</th>
<th>CO lb/mile</th>
<th>NOx lb/mile</th>
<th>SO2 lb/mile</th>
<th>PM10 lb/mile</th>
<th>PM2.5 lb/mile</th>
<th>CO2 lb/mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheel Loader for Spreading</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactor</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (lbs):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Work Grand Total in Tons</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.4 Concrete Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Hours of Operation</th>
<th>Engine HP</th>
<th>Load Factor</th>
<th>CO lb/mile</th>
<th>NOx lb/mile</th>
<th>SO2 lb/mile</th>
<th>PM10 lb/mile</th>
<th>PM2.5 lb/mile</th>
<th>CO2 lb/mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixer</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Truck</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (lbs):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Work Grand Total in Tons</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.5 Building Construction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Hours of Operation</th>
<th>Engine HP</th>
<th>Load Factor</th>
<th>CO lb/mile</th>
<th>NOx lb/mile</th>
<th>SO2 lb/mile</th>
<th>PM10 lb/mile</th>
<th>PM2.5 lb/mile</th>
<th>CO2 lb/mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Truck</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Generator</td>
<td>3,212</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telehandler</td>
<td>8,029</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sissors Lift</td>
<td>6,423</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skid Steer Loader</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Driver</td>
<td>9,295</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Terrain Forklift</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.6 On-road Equipment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Engine HP</th>
<th>Load Factor</th>
<th>CO lb/mile</th>
<th>NOx lb/mile</th>
<th>SO2 lb/mile</th>
<th>PM10 lb/mile</th>
<th>PM2.5 lb/mile</th>
<th>CO2 lb/mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dump Truck (14 CY)</td>
<td>27,082</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.0080</td>
<td>0.0361</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>3.4385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump Truck (12 CY)</td>
<td>206.00</td>
<td>1,088.97</td>
<td>4,884.29</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>203.72</td>
<td>197.40</td>
<td>465,617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.7 Off-road Equipment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Engine HP</th>
<th>Load Factor</th>
<th>CO lb/mile</th>
<th>NOx lb/mile</th>
<th>SO2 lb/mile</th>
<th>PM10 lb/mile</th>
<th>PM2.5 lb/mile</th>
<th>CO2 lb/mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixer</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Truck</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.8 Annual Emissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>CO lb/mile</th>
<th>NOx lb/mile</th>
<th>SO2 lb/mile</th>
<th>PM10 lb/mile</th>
<th>PM2.5 lb/mile</th>
<th>CO2 lb/mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixer</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Truck</td>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>168.36</td>
<td>596.22</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>25.91</td>
<td>25.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (lbs):</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Work Grand Total in Tons</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.6: Paving - Surface Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Hours of Operation</th>
<th>Engine HP</th>
<th>Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Load Factor</th>
<th>CO g/hp-hr</th>
<th>NOx g/hp-hr</th>
<th>SO2 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM2.5 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO2 g/hp-hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grader</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving Machine</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Curbing Machine</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2.7: Fugitive Dust Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PM10 tons/acre/mo</th>
<th>PM2.5 Total</th>
<th>PM2.5 Ratio</th>
<th>PM2.5 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>156.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2.8: Total Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>VOC Tons</th>
<th>CO Tons</th>
<th>NOx Tons</th>
<th>SO2 Tons</th>
<th>PM10 Tons</th>
<th>PM2.5 Tons</th>
<th>CO2 Metric Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>38.68</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>158.52</td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>4,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>38.68</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>106.45</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>4,006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TAB C. OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS

Factory-fabricated and assembled water-tube flexible tube boilers, dual fired natural gas and fuel oil.
Two diesel Emergency Generators - 2 megawatts each or 2682 HP each.

Table 1. Operational Emissions - Emergency Generators

Assume the IC engines are typically operated 0.5 hours per week for testing and maintenance = 26 hr/yr
Assume additional five 24-hour periods for total power outages per year = 120 hr/yr
146 Total Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generator kW</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>4,307</td>
<td>10,181</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tons/yr</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metric tons/yr</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pollutant Emission Factors

- Diesel Fuel
- > 447 kW

- CO: 0.0055 lb/hp-hr
- NOx: 0.013 lb/yr
- PM: 0.0013 lb/yr
- SO2: 0.00809 S
- S: 0.0015 lb/yr
- VOC: 0.000642 lb/yr
- CO2: 1.16 lb/yr

Emission factors from U.S. EPA. Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors - Volume I (AP-42), Section 3.4, 5th Edition; factors based upon power output.

- The variable S in the emissions factor equals the sulfur content of the fuel expressed as percent weight.
- VOC = TOC - methane (9%)
- SO2 factor was assumed to equal 0.0015 for diesel fuel.

Table 2. Operational Parameters - Boilers

Example boiler that is < 100 MM Btu/hr:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heat Input (MMBtu/hr)</th>
<th>Fuel Type</th>
<th>Annual Hours of Operation</th>
<th>Est. Qty Oil consumed Annually (gal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>759,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>759,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total est. quantity of oil consumed annually 1,519,800 gal

140,000 btu/gal fuel oil: 149 gal/hour fuel consumption @ 80 % efficiency

Assume heat 10/15 to 4/14

Emission Factor

- CO: 5 lb/10^3 gal
- NOx: 20
- PM10: 1
- PM2.5: 0.25
- SO2: 0.213
- VOC: 0.34
- CO2: 22,300
- N2O: 0.26
- CH4: 0.216

0.0015 Percent Sulfur content in fuel
182 heating days

183 non heating days

Table 3. Annual Emissions for Boilers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Source</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
<th>CO2</th>
<th>N2O</th>
<th>CH4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boiler 1</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>15198</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiler 2</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>15198</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total in Tons/yr: 0.26  3.80  15.20  0.16  0.76  0.19  3.80  0.20  0.16

CO2e = 62 metric tons/yr

Table 4. Total Annual Emissions for All Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stationary Source</th>
<th>VOC t/yr</th>
<th>CO t/yr</th>
<th>NOx t/yr</th>
<th>SO2 t/yr</th>
<th>PM10 t/yr</th>
<th>PM2.5 t/yr</th>
<th>CO2e MT/yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generators</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boilers</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 0.51  5.95  20.29  0.17  1.03  0.46  474

Table 5. Commuting Staff 300 per day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicled</th>
<th># vehicles</th>
<th># days</th>
<th>4mi/day</th>
<th>VOCs</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM15</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>passenger vehicles</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.593E-05</td>
<td>1.067E-02</td>
<td>4.873E-04</td>
<td>7.357E-06</td>
<td>5.68927E-05</td>
<td>5.19227E-05</td>
<td>182.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOCs</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM15</th>
<th>CO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lb</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376.36</td>
<td>46755.73</td>
<td>2134.28</td>
<td>32.23</td>
<td>249.19</td>
<td>227.42</td>
<td>797,160,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tons per Year: 0.19  23.38  1.07  0.02  0.12  0.11

Metric Tons per Year: 797

CO2e in metric tons/year: 797

Table 6. Total Annual Operating Emissions from Stationary Sources and Commuters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Emissions</th>
<th>VOC t/yr</th>
<th>CO t/yr</th>
<th>NOx t/yr</th>
<th>SO2 t/yr</th>
<th>PM10 t/yr</th>
<th>PM2.5 t/yr</th>
<th>CO2e MT/yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boiler 1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiler 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO2e in metric tons/year: 1,271

---


<sup>5</sup> Emission factors based on burning fuel oil with a heating value of 140 MMBtu/10³ gal.
## TAB D. CONSTRUCTION ASSUMPTIONS

### Buildings Common to both alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Clearing (AC)</th>
<th>Grading (SY)</th>
<th>Site Prep - Excavate/Fill (CY)</th>
<th>Building Construction - Total Size (sm)</th>
<th>Building Construction - Total Size (sf)</th>
<th>Foundation footprint (sm)</th>
<th>Foundation footprint (sf)</th>
<th># Stories</th>
<th>Paving (CY)</th>
<th>Gravel Work (CY)</th>
<th>Concrete Work - sidewalks, etc (CY)</th>
<th>Concrete Work - foundation (CY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Utility Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firing Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Warehouse</td>
<td>3,279</td>
<td>35,295</td>
<td>3,279</td>
<td>35,295</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICOR Warehouse</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Training Bldg</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>9,795</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>9,795</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penitentiary</td>
<td>61,654</td>
<td>663,637</td>
<td>20,551</td>
<td>221,212</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,097</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>4,097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Camp</td>
<td>6,063</td>
<td>65,262</td>
<td>6,063</td>
<td>65,262</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/Parking - Payne Gap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,337</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill/Excavate - Payne Gap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,760,829</td>
<td>25,760,829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading - Payne Gap</td>
<td>1,055,120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,117,470</td>
<td>8,117,470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearing Payne Gap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,307,902</td>
<td>13,307,902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne Gap Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1,055,120</td>
<td>25,760,829</td>
<td>74,594</td>
<td>33,491</td>
<td>360,497</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,337</td>
<td>8,844</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>6,676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/Parking - Roxana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill/Excavate - Roxana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,124,680</td>
<td>8,124,680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading - Roxana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>779,240</td>
<td>779,240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearing Roxana</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>779,240</td>
<td></td>
<td>779,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxana Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>779,240</td>
<td>8,124,680</td>
<td>74,594</td>
<td>33,491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>8,571</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>6,676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

300 full-time staff

### Alternative 1. Payne Gap/Larson

- 753 acres
  - 218 acres cleared
  - 2,794,660 CY soil excavation
  - 10,912,130 CY total excavation
  - Total excavation + fill= 25,760,829
  - 8,117,470 CY rock excavation
  - 1,540,797 CY structural fill
  - 14,848,699 CY total fill
  - 13,307,902 CY spoil fill

**Road Estimates**
- Assume road width of 18 feet
- Entry road/to warehouses 900 m, 2,953 ft
USP access 600 m 1,969 ft
Camp access 2000 m 6,562 ft
11,483 ft total
206,693 SF total

Parking/paved areas Require parking for 100 vehicles per shift; overlap; visitors; deliveries
27,480 sf total

Alternative 2 Roxana

700 acres
161 acres cleared
2,928,922 CY soil excavated 3,831,679 CY total excavation
902,757 CY rock excavated
2,087,607 CY structural fill 4,293,001 CY total fill
2,205,394 CY spoil fill
25 ac dynamic compaction

Road Estimates Assume road width of 18 feet
Total length 3000 m
9,843 ft total
177,165 SF total

Parking/paved areas Require parking for 100 vehicles per shift; overlap; visitors; deliveries
27,480 sf total
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2011, Cardno (formerly TEC Inc.) was retained by the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) to conduct a Feasibility Study for the development of a 1,800-bed federal correctional facility to be located at one of three identified sites located near the town of Whitesburg in Letcher County, Kentucky (KY). As part of the Feasibility Study, a Utility Investigation Report was prepared in order to assess the viability and costs associated with providing utilities to each site. The purpose of the utility report was to assess the availability of water, sanitary sewer, natural gas, electricity, and telecommunications for each of the proposed locations.

The results of the Feasibility Study have allowed the project to proceed into the next phase, which includes the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). At the conclusion of the Feasibility Study, it was determined that one of the three potential sites is not a viable option for constructing a new BOP correctional facility and therefore the EIS includes the assessment of only two sites. Also, since the conclusion of the Feasibility Study, the size of the facility has been reduced to a 1,200-bed correctional facility. To address this change and account for any other possible changes to the utilities over the past three years, the EIS includes the preparation of this Enhanced Utility Investigation Report. This “enhanced” report replaces the initial Utility Study. All information presented in the original report has been updated to reflect the changes associated with the various utility systems. All pertinent utility information is incorporated into this Enhanced Utility Investigation Report.

It is assumed that the on-site utility requirements would be comparable for both sites and that the factors determining the most viable and cost effective option would be related to connecting each of the potential sites to the existing utility infrastructure. Therefore, on-site utilities have not been included in this assessment. The two sites included in this report are Roxana/Meade Farm and Payne Gap, both of which are located within 10 miles of the town of Whitesburg. To determine viability of bringing the utilities to both identified sites, the capacity of the existing utility systems and the distance from the proposed connection points were assessed and cost estimates were prepared.

For both sites, water service has been extended or is in the process of being extended to the property lines and the wastewater utility providers have indicated that they intend to extend their existing systems to the proposed sites at no cost to BOP; however, it is likely that BOP will need to provide some cost sharing for the sanitary sewer extension to the Roxana site, if it is selected. Conversations with American Electric Power (AEP), the power provider for both sites, indicate that the existing system has ample capacity to handle the facility at either of the potential locations and there would be no costs to BOP associated with the AEP connection, assuming overhead connections. The telecommunications lines also have adequate capacity to provide service to both sites, but BOP will be responsible for the cost of the necessary infrastructure to connect to the existing telecommunications systems. For the natural gas connection, both sites would require the installation of a meter and tap, which would be the responsibility of BOP. This cost would be comparable at both sites. At the Roxana/Meade Farm site there are multiple gas wells that would need to be closed and abandoned and lines that need to be relocated. This would require a BOP investment of approximately $12.8 million. Similarly there is a well at the Payne Gap site that would need to be abandoned and a 16-inch natural gas line that would need to be relocated around the perimeter of the site. These costs are estimated at $5 million.

With respect to capital investment for all utilities, the Roxana site is more costly by nearly $7 million. However, the time associated with abandoning the wells is about six months, compared to a minimum of
two years to relocate the 16-inch gas line at Payne Gap. These cost and schedule factors associated with the natural gas components are critical to the site selection recommendation as it pertains to the utilities. All other utility costs and scheduling factors are relatively comparable and have negligible impacts on site selection.

In addition to identifying the most viable location for the construction of a new BOP federal correctional facility, this study identifies some potential options for implementing alternative energy and sustainability practices at the new facility. Kentucky does not lie within a prime area of the country that supports the implementation of a primary wind, solar, or geothermal alternative energy system. However, solar and geothermal systems could be further evaluated for supplementing the power systems at the new facility. This evaluation would be needed after site selection is complete and detailed design planning commences. Additionally, the implementation of practices such as gray water disposal, water reduction efforts, and installation of green roof technology should also be considered during design to help meet sustainability goals.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Cardno has been retained by the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the development of a 1,200-bed federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky (KY). Two potential sites located near the town of Whitesburg are currently being considered for the construction of the new facility, as illustrated in Figure 1-1.

The two potential sites are identified as Roxana/Meade Farm and Payne Gap. As depicted in Figure 1, the Roxana/Meade Farm site is located less than 10 miles to the west of Whitesburg and the Payne Gap site is located on the Kentucky-Virginia border, less than 10 miles to the east of Whitesburg. This report is being prepared in coordination with the EIS and is designed to investigate the availability, cost, and feasibility of providing utilities to both of the potential sites, identify the pros and cons for each of the sites, and develop recommendations for potential development.

Figure 1-1 - Potential BOP Federal Correctional Facility Locations
2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This “Enhanced” Utility Investigation Report is an enhancement to the Utility Investigation Report prepared for BOP in 2011. In 2011, Cardno (formerly TEC Inc.) was retained by BOP to prepare the initial Utility Investigation Report, in which three sites were considered. In addition to the two sites that remain under consideration, the third site included the Van Fields Site, just north of Whitesburg, on Route 15.

Prior to the initial Utility Investigation Report, several studies had previously been performed in support of the potential construction of a new federal correctional facility at the three potential sites. These studies include:

- *Site Reconnaissance Study* prepared by the Louis Berger Group (November 2008)
- *Mine History Reports* (each site) prepared by Summit Engineering (August 2010)
- *Site Investigation Trip Memo* prepared by KCI Technologies (October 2010)

Information from each of these studies was utilized in developing background information, baseline data starting points, initial contact information, and additional evaluation criteria.

The *Site Investigation Trip memo* (KCI 2010) provided ranking criteria for the potential sites. Based on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being the highest), the average utilities rank for the three sites ranged from 2.25 to 3.25, indicating the results of the initial utility assessment were fairly comparable for the three potential sites. However, based on other concerns associated with past mining, accessibility, and excavation requirements, KCI recommended that the Payne Gap site be removed from consideration. Since the purpose of this report is to further assess the utilities, the BOP decided to continue to include the Payne Gap site in this study, as it is still a feasible option.

Several other studies were performed concurrently with the initial Utility Investigation Report. One such study was a Topographical and Boundary survey performed by Marshall Miller and Associates (MMA). This survey has allowed realistic layouts of the facilities to be developed within the property boundaries. The layouts along with the elevations at the site will be imperative for infrastructure design, most importantly for establishing requirements for water distribution and sanitary sewer lift stations.
3.0 DESIGN CRITERIA

This section describes the utility needs for the proposed BOP federal correctional facility and the utility design criteria to meet those needs. The initial basis for utility design criteria was outlined in the Site Reconnaissance Study prepared by the Louis Berger Group in November 2008. The criteria outlined in the Site Reconnaissance Study were based on a 1,400 bed facility. This was utilized as an initial starting point for discussions with the local utility providers to determine if the required minimum demand was available, and if not, what would be required to provide utilities to the potential sites. In addition to the minimum criteria, the potential for increased capacity due to future expansions and plans was investigated. The initial population of 1,400 beds for the proposed BOP facility, as discussed in the Site Reconnaissance Study, was initially increased to a 1,800 bed facility in the initial Utility Investigation Report, but has been decreased to a 1,200 bed facility in this final study.

3.1 Utility Systems

The design criteria used to assess the utilities in this report are based on providing utilities to the US Penitentiary (USP) and Federal Prison Camp (FPC) facilities. The total capacity for these two facilities is 1,200 inmates and it is estimated that approximately 300 full-time staff would be required to operate the two facilities as well as the ancillary support facilities listed below. The utility usage estimated in this section is based on providing utilities to similar types and sizes of facilities.

**USP and FPC Support Facilities**
- Central Utility Plant 1,217 square feet
- Firing Range 96 square feet
- Outside Warehouse 3,279 square feet
- UNICOR Warehouse 1,375 square feet
- Staff Training Building 910 square feet

**3.1.1 Water**
- Average Water Demand:
  - USP and FPC Facilities: 215 gallons per day (gpd) per bed x 1,200 beds = 258,000 gpd
  - Utility Plant: 2,000 gpd per acre x 0.03 acres = 60 gpd
  - Warehouses: 1,000 gpd per acre x 0.1 acres = 100 gpd
  - Training Building: 20 gpd per person x 300 people = 6,000 gpd

  Total Average Water Demand = 264,160 gpd or approximately 185 gallons per minute (gpm)

- Peak Water Demand:
  - 4 times average water demand
  - 185 gpm x 4 = 740 gpm
- Fire Flow Requirement: 2,000 gpm for four hours
- Minimum Water Pressure: 40 pounds per square inch (psi)
- Preferred Water Pressure: 80 psi
- Water Storage Capacity: 500,000 gallons

  [The utility provider must be able to meet peak demands and fire flow requirements during select periods when the tank is taken off-line for maintenance and repairs]
3.1.2 **Sanitary Sewer**
- Average Wastewater Flow:
  - 85% of Average Water Demand
  - $264,160 \text{ gpd} \times 0.85 \sim 225,000 \text{ gpd}$
  - 156 gpm
- Peak Wastewater Flow:
  - 3.5 times average wastewater flow
  - $156 \text{ gpm} \times 3.5 = 546 \text{ gpm}$

3.1.3 **Natural Gas**
- Usage based on typical correctional facility:
  - Annual Energy Usage: 50 – 70 million cubic feet (mcf)
  - Maximum Hourly Usage: 25,000 – 28,000 cubic feet per hour (cfph)
  - Maximum Daily Usage: 250,000 – 280,000 cubic feet (cf)

3.1.4 **Electric**
- Usage based on typical correctional facility:
  - System Requirements: 12–15 kilovolt (kV) system with 3-phases and 4-wire components
  - Average Energy Usage: 18 – 19 million kilowatt hours (kWh)
  - Demand Load: 4,500 – 5,000 kilowatts (kW)
  - On-site Transformer Requirements: 5,000 kilovolt ampere (kVa)

3.1.5 **Telecommunications**
Telecommunications service also includes internet and security connections for communications with outside correctional officials and facilities. The minimum requirements for new construction, generally coordinated through the local telecommunications company, include:
- Primary Rate Interface (PRI) T1 for the Federal Telecommunications System
- Integrated Services Digital Network (ISDN) T1 for local calls
- 200 pair copper
- 400 continuous Direct Inward Dialing (D.I.D.) numbers
4.0 UTILITY PROVIDERS

The information regarding utility providers for the five utility systems listed in Section 3.0 was gathered through phone conversations, email communications, and on-site meetings held with the individual utility providers for each of the sites during the preparation of the initial Utility Investigation Report.

The Letcher County Water and Sewer District (LWSD) provides sanitary sewer service to the Roxana/Meade Farm site through the Whitesburg Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). The Whitesburg WWTP was recently upgraded in anticipation of the proposed BOP federal correctional facility to a capacity of 600,000 gpd with an average load of 300,000 gpd. The facility was built with the ability to phase-in upgrades as necessary to handle additional flows.

The LWSD is in the process of upgrading and connecting all of the county’s water systems in order to provide redundancy in the system. These plans have included connections between all the existing water systems, and new connections in the city of Jenkins and Fleming Neon. Water service has been or is in the process of being extended to both potential BOP sites.

American Electric Power (AEP) provides electricity in the vicinity of both sites. AEP recently constructed a 4 megawatt facility in the vicinity of the Roxana site for a gas co-generation plant. The plant was never constructed; therefore, there is ample capacity in the existing system to handle the additional load from a new BOP facility, regardless of site selection.

Telecommunication and natural gas lines are provided by various utility providers. The providers are listed in Table 4-1, and the systems adjacent to the Roxana/Meade Farm and Payne Gap sites are discussed further in Sections 4.1 and 4.2, respectively. In addition, a brief discussion is provided for each site, which includes estimates of probable connection costs, summaries of the advantages and disadvantages associated with utility connections to each site, a map of each site, and the locations of the existing utility infrastructure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Wastewater</th>
<th>Natural Gas</th>
<th>Electric</th>
<th>Telecommunication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roxana/Meade Farm</td>
<td>LWSD</td>
<td>LWSD</td>
<td>Equitable Gas (EQT) &amp; Clean Gas Inc./Hayden Harper</td>
<td>AEP</td>
<td>Birch Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne Gap</td>
<td>LWSD</td>
<td>City of Jenkins</td>
<td>EQT</td>
<td>AEP</td>
<td>Windstream</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Roxana/Meade Farm

The Roxana/Meade Farm property is located southwest of Whitesburg, with existing access from Route 160 east of the intersection with State Highway 588. As described in Summit Engineering’s (2010) Mine History Report, the property has past mountaintop mining with approximately 30 feet of spoils and has a level top. There are multiple gas lines and wells throughout the area of interest.

**Water Service:** Public water would be provided by the LWSD. LWSD is in the process of extending their water system to the eastern property boundary of the proposed Roxana site. Therefore, to bring water to the new BOP federal correctional facility, the connection would be limited to a tap on the existing system near the property boundary and the installation of on-site infrastructure. The new line being run to the site is an 8-inch pipeline and should be adequate to meet the 80 psi pressure requested for the BOP facilities. This water system is capable of providing 4 million gallons per day to the region, which is ample capacity to meet the needs of the new BOP facilities.

**Sanitary Sewer Service:** LWSD would also be providing sanitary sewer service to the proposed Roxana site. As with the water service, LWSD is also extending their wastewater collection service, but the extension has not yet been completed as far as the proposed Roxana site. Currently, the connection point is approximately 2.75 miles from the proposed site. To connect to the existing system, construction of a lift station would be required as well as the installation of approximately 2.75 miles of a new collection system. Although the initial intention of LWSD was to construct the required extension all the way to the proposed site at no cost to the BOP, LWSD would likely need some funding assistance to complete the extension of the collection system to the proposed site. This assistance may need to be provided by or be facilitated by BOP. For the purposes of this report, it is assumed that LWSD would require 50% contribution from BOP for this extension.

**Natural Gas:** The site consists of multiple gas wells and gas transmission lines. Currently there are 14 Hayden Harper gas wells and 1 EQT gas well within the Roxana/Meade Farm property. Since the BOP does not own or operate gas wells and does not become involved in mineral rights, all wells within the property boundary would need to be closed and abandoned, regardless of proximity to proposed facilities. It would take up to six months to close and abandon these wells. The cost associated with closure and abandonment of wells can range from $300,000 to $1,000,000. Due to the large production potential of many of the wells at this site, it is estimated that each closure would cost approximately $850,000. To abandon all 15 wells, the associated costs would be approximately $12.75 million. There would also be a connection fee for BOP to connect to the natural gas distribution system. Since the system is in close proximity to the site, the connection would be limited to the cost of the meter and tap, which is estimated at $110,000.

**Electric Power:** As indicated in Section 4.0, AEP has sufficient capacity in the immediate vicinity to supply power to the proposed BOP facility. With the projected load and revenue from the proposed BOP facility, AEP has indicated that the connection to the handoff point for the secure perimeter would be provided at no cost to the BOP. The service would be provided via overhead lines directly to the handoff point to the proposed BOP facility with no on-site facilities needed. If underground connections (conduit) are required for service to the proposed BOP facility, the cost of the conduit and running of lines would be the responsibility of the BOP and would be calculated as part of the site development costs.

**Telecommunications:** Birch Communications, the telecommunications company serving the area, has the capability to meet the minimum requirements of the proposed BOP facility. There is a remote
terminal located in close proximity. However approximately 2 miles of fiber optic cables and 4 miles of copper cables would be required to bring service to the edge of the property. At this time, it should be assumed that the costs to install these cables would be the responsibility of BOP. However, during the design phase, Birch Communications should be contacted to discuss potential cost-sharing options.

**Opinion of Probable Costs:** The costs to provide adequate utility service to the Roxana/Meade Farm site are presented in Table 4-2. The estimates are based on the information provided through the utility provider interviews and based on the engineering reports listed in Section 2. These costs are intended as an indicator of the general order of magnitude for the activities outlined. These costs should be used for site cost comparison purposes only. More detailed studies will be required to identify all factors associated with the actual costs required for extending the utility infrastructure and making the connections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-2 – Roxana/Meade Farm Utility Service Opinion of Probable Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sanitary Sewer | - Gravity Main Force Main  
- Manholes  
- Lift Station(s)  
- 15% Construction Contingency  
- 30% Design/Admin/ROW/Legal/Permitting | $1.4 million | $1.4 million |
| | LWSD to provide May require some assistance from BOP (50% assumed) |
| Natural Gas | Meter and Tap (incl. connection fees) | $110,000 | $0 |
| | Well Closure: $850,000 x 15 | $12,750,000 |
| Electrical | N/A (assumes no underground conduit required) | $0 | $0 |
| Telecommunications | - Construction of Local Remote Terminal  
- Installation of fiber optic cables  
- Installation of copper cable  
- Local electronics | $165,000 | $0 |
| **UTILITY CONNECTION FEES** | $14,425,000 | $1,400,000 |
| **TOTAL** | **$15,825,000** |

1. Fee responsibility breakdown assumes the utility provider would contribute the portion of the costs listed above. If conditions change, BOP could potentially be responsible for all or portions of the “Others” fees.
Advantages:

• Proposed site is relatively level
• Water transmission main has already been brought to the site
• LWSD already has plans underway to extend the wastewater collection system to the site
• Sufficient capacity available to supply electric power to the site at no cost to BOP

Disadvantages:

• Multiple gas wells and lines on the property would need to be closed and abandoned and/or relocated off the site at the expense (costly) of BOP
• Extension of the wastewater collection system would likely require some funding assistance from BOP
• There is no telecommunication remote terminal in the vicinity of the proposed Roxana/Meade Farm site, requiring the construction of a new remote terminal

A map of the existing utilities in the vicinity of the Roxana/Meade Farm site is included in Figure 4-1.
Figure 4-1 - Existing Utilities at Roxana/Meade Farm Site
4.2 Payne Gap

The Payne Gap property is located east of Whitesburg along the south side of Highway 119, between Routes 805 and 23. The property has deep mines and would need to be excavated and filled in order to create a level surface for construction. This location offers the most direct access to major highways.

The *Site Investigation Trip* memo (KCI 2010) recommended that the Payne Gap site be removed from consideration due to “significant concerns with its locations, past mining, and excavation.” However the BOP feels that the site should remain under consideration because of its accessibility and proximity to alternative utility suppliers not associated with the Roxana/Meade Farm site.

**Water Service:** Public water would be provided to the Payne Gap site by the LWSD. As described previously, LWSD has recently been extending its service area. In addition to extending the service to Roxana, the service has already been extended along Highway 119, adjacent to the proposed Payne Gap property. An 8-inch diameter watermain is in the vicinity of the Payne Gap site, and the water pressure near the connection point is approximately 110 psi. This is more than adequate to meet the 80 psi pressure requirements of the BOP facilities. Currently, the system in the vicinity of Payne Gap is being upgraded to ensure the average and peak water demands at the new facilities would be met. As with the Roxana site, the costs to BOP to provide water to its facilities would be limited to tapping the existing watermain and installing the necessary on-site water distribution infrastructure. All other water system upgrades are being provided by LWSD.

**Sanitary Sewer Service:** Sanitary sewer services would be provided by the City of Jenkins and handled at the Jenkins WWTP. The nearest connection point to the Payne Gap site is located in close proximity to the Gateway Industrial Park in Jenkins. The connection point is an 8-inch gravity line, which would provide sufficient capacity for the estimated flow from the proposed BOP federal correctional facility. In order to reach the proposed connection point, construction of a lift station would be required. According to City officials and their representative engineering firm, Nesbitt Engineering, the WWTP has sufficient capacity to handle the proposed volume from the proposed BOP Facility. The City of Jenkins intends to provide construction of the sanitary sewer services to the proposed BOP facility at no cost to the BOP.

**Natural Gas:** There is one gas well on-site, as well as a transmission line running directly through the property. The transmission line is a 16-inch high pressure main, owned and operated by EQT. The well is also owned and operated by EQT. The cost to relocate the gas line would be approximately $455 per linear foot (lf) and there would be a fee of approximately $110,000 for the connection and installation of a meter. Due to its proximity to the Jefferson National Forest, it would be necessary to reroute the new transmission line to the north and along Highway 119. This would require approximately 9,000 feet of a new pressure main. It is anticipated that it would take a minimum of two years to design, permit, and install this pressure main. In addition to the transmission line relocation, the EQT well would need to be abandoned and plugged. This would require an additional investment of approximately $850,000 from the BOP.

**Electric Power:** As indicated previously, AEP has sufficient capacity in the immediate vicinity to supply power to the proposed facility. With the projected load and revenue from the BOP facility, AEP has indicated that the connection to the handoff point for the secure perimeter would be provided at no cost to the BOP. The service would be provided via overhead lines directly to the handoff point to the secure facility with no on-site facilities needed. If underground connections (conduit) are required for service to
the proposed BOP facility, the cost of the conduit and running of lines would be the responsibility of the BOP and would be considered part of the site development costs.

**Telecommunications:** Windstream, the telecommunications company serving the area, has the capability to meet the minimum requirements of the proposed BOP facility. However, the connection to the existing infrastructure would be the responsibility of BOP. This would include the connection to the fiber cables at a splice location adjacent to the site and the connection to the copper cables at the Gateway Industrial Park in Jenkins.

**Opinion of Probable Costs:** The costs to provide adequate utility service to the Payne Gap site are presented in Table 4-3. The estimates are based on the information provided through the utility provider interviews and based on the engineering reports listed in Section 2. These costs are intended as an indicator of the general order of magnitude for the activities outlined. These costs should be used for site cost comparison purposes only. More detailed studies will be required to identify all factors associated with the actual costs required for extending the utility infrastructure and making the connections.

**Table 4-3 – Payne Gap Utility Service Opinion of Probable Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Items Included</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td>Costs associated with bringing water to the site will be associated with installation of on-site infrastructure - TBD during design</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Sanitary Sewer** | - Gravity Main / Force Main  
- Manholes  
- Lift Station(s)  
- 15% Construction Contingency  
- 30% Design/Admin/ROW/Legal/Permitting | $3.8 million [City of Jenkins] |
| **Natural Gas**  | Meter and Tap (incl. connection fees)                                         | $110,000           |
|                  | 16-inch main relocation (9,000 ft @ $455/lf)                                  | $4,100,000         |
|                  | Well closure                                                                  | $850,000           |
| **Electrical**   | N/A (assumes no underground conduit required)                                 | $0                 |
| **Telecommunications** | Installation of fiber optic cables  
Installation of copper cables | $35,000            |

| **UTILITY CONNECTION FEES** | **$5,095,000** | **$3,800,000** |

**TOTAL** $8,895,000

1. Fee responsibility breakdown assumes the utility provider would contribute the portion of the costs listed above. If conditions change, BOP could potentially be responsible for all or portions of the “Others” fees.
Advantages:

• Water service has already been extended to the site with adequate pressure and modifications to the water supply are currently underway to meet the estimated BOP water demand

• The City of Jenkins to provide a connection to the existing sanitary sewer collection system at no cost to BOP

• Sufficient capacity available to supply electric power to the site at no cost to BOP

• Existing telecommunications service is adequate to meet minimum requirements of the proposed BOP facility, with minimal distance to the connection location

Disadvantages:

• Excavation and fill required to level property

• The existing 16-inch natural gas transmission line currently running through the proposed site would need to be relocated at the expense of BOP. Although the current pipeline is approximately 4,000 feet, it would require more than twice that distance to reroute the transmission line around the property. It would require at least two years to design, permit and construct the new line.

• There are two EQT gas wells on site that need to be relocated

A map of the existing utilities in the vicinity of the Payne Gap site is included in Figure 4-2.
Figure 4-2 - Existing Utilities at Payne Gap Site
5.0 ALTERNATIVE ENERGY AND SUSTAINABILITY

Part of Executive Order 13514, *Federal Leadership in Environmental, Energy, and Economic Performance*, requires Federal agencies to increase energy efficiency, conserve water, reduce waste, support sustainable communities, and leverage Federal purchasing power to promote environmentally responsible products and technologies. This reduction of demand from the natural environment and load back to the natural environment would benefit not only the local community, but also the proposed BOP federal correctional facility itself by reducing operating costs.

Without a detailed design for the proposed BOP facility, specific alternative energy designs and sustainability practices consistent with a new facility are difficult to identify at this time. However, some general practices aimed at the implementation of alternative energy sources and sustainability goals are discussed in this section, along with limitations associated with the sites. It is unlikely that the feasibility of specific practices would vary at the different proposed BOP facility sites that have been assessed. The viability and limitations are primarily associated with the entire region and any space constraints, which are comparable at both sites.

5.1 Alternative Energy

Use of alternate or renewable sources of energy supports the Executive Order 13514 initiative by utilizing energy generated from natural resources that can be replenished naturally, without depleting the source. The two most widely recognized sources of renewable energy are related to solar and wind power. However, there are other sources of renewable energy such as biomass energy and geothermal systems that are gaining in popularity.

The National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) is focused on the advancement of our nation’s energy goals, through the research and development of renewable energy and implementation of energy efficient systems. Through their research, NREL has performed numerous studies on the efficacy of different types of renewable energy sources. This section provides a discussion on available renewable energy sources, as well as the results of NREL’s research on their effectiveness in various parts of the country, and an assessment of potential use at the proposed BOP facility.

The renewable energy sources discussed in this assessment include:

- Wind Energy
- Photovoltaics/Solar Power
- Geothermal Systems
- Biomass Energy
5.1.1 Wind Energy

Wind energy is harnessed through catching naturally occurring wind with wind turbines and converting the wind’s energy into electricity. Turbines are typically installed on towers over 100 feet tall in order to harness higher wind speeds. Wind turbines can be installed individually, or in large groups, depending on their intended application, which can range from supplementing small portions of a facility’s energy consumption to providing the primary source of electricity.

In order for wind turbines to harness and convert wind into electricity there needs to be a consistent and sufficient amount of wind. NREL, in coordination with the Department of Energy’s Wind Program, published a wind resource map for the state of Kentucky. The wind resource map shows the predicted mean annual wind speeds at an 80-meter (m) [262.5-ft] height. Areas with annual average wind speeds of 6.5 meters per second and greater at an 80-m height are generally considered to be suitable for wind development. Figure 5-1 shows the wind resource potential at 80-m heights for Kentucky.

Figure 5-1 - Kentucky Wind Map


Letcher County’s average annual wind speed falls below the 5.0 meters per second at the 80-m height. While the map is a nationally produced map and specific localized data was not gathered, it is generally accepted that wind power is an unlikely source for alternative energy for this part of the country.
5.1.2 Photovoltaics

Solar power is an ever developing trend, with advances in the industry occurring regularly. Photovoltaics (PV) use semiconductor materials to convert sunlight energy into electricity. There are several types of collectors available for collecting the sun’s rays in different ways; some collect only direct rays and others collect both direct rays and reflected light. NREL has published a map of photovoltaic solar resources across the country. As seen in Figure 5-2, eastern Kentucky lies in a more moderate solar resource region. This does not necessarily indicate that PV is not a viable option for the new facility. There are a number of effective PV systems being utilized throughout the state of Kentucky.

Figure 5-2 - Photovoltaic Solar Resource of the U.S.

In discussion with a representative of the Kentucky Solar Partnership, solar power in eastern Kentucky can be a feasible option for supplementing power supply. While the energy generated from the solar panels would probably not be cost effective for the entire proposed BOP facility, solar panels could easily be utilized for providing power to the hot water tanks and smaller, energy-hungry appliances that would be utilized at the proposed BOP facility. Additionally, there are incentives and net metering alternatives to help reduce the demand from the energy provider. Therefore, it is recommended that PV systems be further investigated during the design of the new facility as a supplemental source of power.
5.1.3 Geothermal Systems

Geothermal systems use the temperature of the earth to heat and cool buildings. By installing a series of looped pipes deep into the ground, and pumping fluid through the system of pipes, geothermal systems utilize the relatively constant temperature of the earth to absorb and transfer heat to or from a building. Typically, the upper 10 feet of the Earth’s surface maintains a temperature of between 50° and 60°F (10° and 16°C). Geothermal heat pump systems include the system of pipes, a heat pump, and an air duct system. In the winter, the system pumps the heat into the buildings and in the summer the process is reversed to remove the heat from the building.

NREL has published a map of known hydrothermal sites and areas most conducive to the installation of geothermal systems. As seen in Figure 5-3, most geothermal reservoirs of hot water are located in the western states, as are the most favorable conditions for geothermal systems.

Although Eastern Kentucky is located in a “Least Favorable” zone, it does not preclude the BOP from implementing a supplemental geothermal system at the proposed correctional facility. These systems are relatively inexpensive to install and maintain, and are available in a wide range of capacities. This type of system would not be viable for providing all the heating and cooling needs of the proposed BOP facility, but such a system could supplement the building’s heating and cooling needs and should be considered during the design of the facility.

![Figure 5-3 - Geothermal Resource of the U.S.](http://www.nrel.gov/gis/images/geothermal_resource2009-final.jpg)

5.1.4 Biomass Energy

Biomass energy is the conversion of plant matter into either electricity or liquid or gaseous fuels. Common sources of biomass are grasses, agricultural crops, and forestry residues. The viability of using biomass energy as an alternative energy source is typically associated with the proximity of the source (plant material) to the point of use. NREL has published a map estimating the range of biomass resources available throughout the country. As seen below in Figure 5-4, the resources available in eastern Kentucky are minimal.

Figure 5-4 - Biomass Resources Available in the U.S.

![Biomass Resources of the United States](http://www.nrel.gov/gis/images/map_biomass_total_us_new.jpg)

Although the map does not indicate that Kentucky has a wide supply of resources available to support a biomass energy system, a small system to supplement an existing gas supply system could be plausible, if there is a source within close proximity of the selected site. This option could be considered further during the design of the proposed BOP facility as a supplemental power source.
5.2 Sustainability

The concept of sustainability is often considered synonymous with environmental stewardship. Although green practices are integral to sustainability, the broader principle of sustainability implements the concept that development that meets the needs of the present should not compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The concept of the “triple bottom line” (TBL) states that success is measured not only by financial performance, but by balanced achievements in environmental stewardship, economic growth and social responsibility. The TBL is achieved when an integrated solution is found that simultaneously achieves excellence in these components, as opposed to finding tradeoffs among these areas.

The Environmental Stewardship component of the TBL focuses on practices such as reducing waste, minimizing carbon and water footprints, preventing pollution and conserving natural resources. However, to be truly “sustainable” as opposed to just “green,” it is important to also incorporate economic growth and social responsibility practices. Economic growth concepts focus on practices such as the use of local contractors and supplies, and creating and strengthening markets such as alternative energy. Social responsibility concepts focus on practices such as implementing fair labor practices or educating surrounding communities.

To implement these concepts of sustainability with respect to the construction of a new BOP federal correctional facility, there are some components that should be focused on during design and construction. Other practices can be implemented after facility construction and maintained as part of the facility’s standard operating procedures. During construction, recycled building materials should be utilized when available. Also, materials and labor should be selected from local vendors and suppliers, as applicable. As BOP begins to operate the facility, participation in programs promoting waste reduction, recycling, reuse and composting should be coordinated with the local Public Works and Public Health organizations. Some sustainability concepts that could be implemented with respect to reducing utility demands at the new site include:

1. Gray Water Disposal - The Letcher County Environmental Health Department indicated that there is availability to utilize gray water disposals for a portion of the sanitary sewer load. The gray water beds would be connected to the washing machine outfall only and could significantly reduce the amount of flow to the Whitesburg WWTP.

2. Water Reduction – To reduce the water demand at the new facility, the installation of water saving appliances such as low-flow toilets and high-efficiency clothes washers should be considered. Other considerations should be given when selecting landscaping alternatives. Xeriscaping refers to the selection of plants based on their drought tolerance and their ability to thrive without regular maintenance. Xeriscapes offer a viable alternative for attractive exterior space planning without consuming dwindling water resources and creating excessive cuttings or plant waste.

3. Green Roof - The inclusion of a “green” roof on top of the facility has the potential to improve the energy efficiency of the building by providing additional insulation and reducing electricity costs. Additionally, green roofs protect the roof membrane, which can result in a longer roof lifespan.
6.0 CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this Enhanced Utility Investigation Report was to assess the viability of providing utilities to the Roxana and Payne Gap sites for the proposed BOP federal correctional facility. Since many of the factors associated with the site work necessary to install the utility infrastructure are comparable at both sites, this comparison focuses on the cost to the BOP for bringing the utility connections to the edge of the properties. Potable water service has already been (or in the process of being) extended to both sites and the LWSD and the City of Jenkins are both amenable to providing wastewater collection lines to both sites. While the intention is to extend wastewater collection service to the sites at no cost to the BOP, it is likely that the Roxana site would require some cost sharing by BOP. Electric and telecommunications services are both readily available at both potential sites with some system extension and connection fees required for telecommunications services.

The one utility with significant impact on the costs associated with site development is natural gas. BOP does not want any wells or gas lines located on their property and therefore the construction of a new facility would require abandoning and closing a number of natural gas wells at Roxana or relocating an existing gas line around the property line at Payne Gap. The costs associated with these factors are significant and represent the primary utility cost difference associated with site selection. As seen in Table 6-1, the estimated cost to BOP for the connection at the Payne Gap site is significantly lower than the costs associated with Roxana. However, the relocation of the existing gas line will take approximately two years compared to the six months required to abandon the wells at Roxana.

Table 6-1 – Utility Connection - Probable Cost Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Utility Connection Costs (in millions)</th>
<th>BOP</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roxana/Meade Farm</td>
<td>$14.4</td>
<td>$1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne Gap</td>
<td>$5.1</td>
<td>$3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two important factors associated with bringing utilities to the sites include cost to BOP and the time associated with constructing the infrastructure necessary to make the connections to the various services. As discussed previously the costs and time associated with bringing all of the utilities, with the exception of natural gas, to the site are relatively comparable. The exception would be if BOP is required to provide some cost sharing for the extension of the wastewater collection system to Roxana. This could require approximately $1.4 million in BOP funding. The primary difference in cost is the natural gas modifications. As depicted in Table 6.1, the Roxana well closures are much more costly than the Payne Gap gas line relocation. However, with respect to time requirements, the relocation would require at least two years, while abandoning the wells would take about six months. These are the two key factors associated with the utilities that need to be considered during site selection.

After site selection is finalized, the BOP would have the opportunity to assess their options for implementing alternate energy systems and sustainability practices. These options and opportunities would need to be assessed in more detail during the design and operation and maintenance phases of this project. Although, it is not practical to install an alternative energy system to power the proposed BOP facility in its entirety, there are numerous systems that could potentially supplement the power provided to the site, and should be considered. Additionally, sustainability practices should be planned and coordinated with the local regulators to allow BOP to meet the goals set forth in Executive Order 13514 to increase energy efficiency, conserve water, reduce waste, and promote environmentally responsible products and technologies.
APPENDIX 1 – FIELD PHOTOGRAPHS

[Includes pictures at all identified sites prior to eliminating non-viable locations]
Photo #1 – Entrance Drive to Roxana Site

Photo #2 – Roxana Field
Photo #3 – Roxana Field looking West

Photo #4 – Buildings on Roxana Site
Photo #5 – Edge of Roxana Plateau

Photo #6 – Overview of Roxana Property
Photo #7 – Cell Tower on Van Fields Property

Photo #8 – Van Fields plateau
Photo #9 – Van Fields property looking northeast

Photo #10 – View of lower field at Van Fields
Photo #11 – Meadow Branch Entrance Drive

Photo #12 – Meadow Branch logging road
Photo #13 – Results of logging activity at Meadow Branch

Photo #14 – Logging Truck leaving Meadow Branch site
Photo #15 – Entrance drive to Payne Gap in heavy rain

Photo #16 – Entrance drive to Payne Gap in heavy rain
APPENDIX 2 – SITE INVESTIGATION UTILITY MEETINGS MEMO
This memo covers the Utility Investigation Meetings held in Whitesburg Kentucky, week of May 2 – May 5. The utility investigation is one phase of the feasibility study for the four locations identified during the Reconnaissance Report by Louis Berger in 2008. The four sites identified are:

1. Roxana / Meade farm (ROX)
2. Van / Fields (VF)
3. Payne Gap (PG)
4. Meadow Branch (MB)

Attendees:
The following personnel were present at each of the site visits and utility meetings:

- Elwood Cornett – Letcher Co. Planning Commission (LCPC)
- Jim Jones – LCPC consultant
- Bridgette Lyles – Bureau of Prisons (BOP)
- Parke Ransom – BOP
- Shaym Sharma – BOP
- Deborah Henson – TEC Inc.
- Curtis Lipsey – TEC Inc.

Site Visits: Site visits to the four potential sites were conducted on Tuesday, May 3, 2011. In addition to the above listed attendees, Jim Ward - County Judge / Executive and Joe DePriest – LCPC. The field visit to the Payne Gap site was conducted from inside the vehicles due to heavy rains; a short site walk was conducted at the remainder of the three sites.

Utility Meetings: The memo is divided into the discussions held for each utility type and provides a brief overview of the capacities, responsibilities, availability, and preliminary cost assumptions. Each meeting was attended by Mr. Elwood Cornett and Mr. Jim Jones, whom also provided input during several of the meetings.
WATER/SEWER:

Meeting Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee</th>
<th>ROX</th>
<th>VF</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Ward – County Judge / Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benny Hamilton – KRADD</td>
<td>W/S</td>
<td>W/S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Noe – Bell Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Letcher Co Water / Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Curtis – Nesbitt Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor G.C. Kinder – City of Jenkins</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd DePriest – City of Jenkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Howard - Summit Engineering</td>
<td>W/S</td>
<td>W/S</td>
<td>W/S</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Fisher – Summit Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor James Wylie – Whitesburg</td>
<td>W/S</td>
<td>W/S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- MB will be served by the Town of Pound VA, whom was unreachable for the meetings.
- Judge Ward and the Director of Letcher Co Water and Sewer stated several times that water and sewer service would be extended to ROX/VF/PG at no cost to the BOP if one of those sites was selected.
- ROX: Existing water lines are located within 5 miles of the site.
- VF: Existing water lines are located adjacent to the site.
- ROX/VF/PG: Regardless of whether the BOP facility is established, Letcher County is planning on upgrading and connecting the county’s water system with neighboring counties and utility providers for consistency of service.
- ROX/VF/PG: Bell Engineering will perform an engineering estimate based on the estimated elevation of the facility to determine location and quantity of booster pumps to service the facility and elevated storage tanks.
- ROX/VF/PG: Bell Engineering to provide pdf maps of proposed county water systems.
- ROX/VF/PG: Upgrades of nearby tanks and lines may be required in order to provide service to the facility during times the elevated storage tank is off line for maintenance.
- ROX: Sanitary Sewer is located approximately 9 miles of the site entrance by the Parkway Inn.
- VF: Sanitary sewer is located approximately 2.5 miles from the site entrance by the Parkway Inn.
• ROX: The Whitesburg WWTP is located approximately 10 miles from the site entrance.
• VF: The Whitesburg WWTP is located approximately 4 miles from the site entrance.
• ROX / VF: The Whitesburg WWTP was recently upgraded, partly in anticipation of the BOP project, to handle 630,000 gpd and is currently receiving approximately half of the capacity. The plant was designed to be upgraded with additional modules to nearly 1,000,000 gpd.
• ROX / VF: The County is considering providing a dedicated sanitary line and system for the facility.
• Letcher County would prefer to know which site is preferred so they could focus their effort towards that location.
• The county does not have commercial rates, only residential, the connection fees are minimal and may be waived for the project.
• Mayor Wylie reiterated the planning commissions and Judge wards sentiments regarding provision of service to the selected site.
LETCHER COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee</th>
<th>ROX</th>
<th>VF</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Nichols – Letcher Co Health</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- On-site wells for water service are no longer a feasible option in Letcher Co.
- On-site sewer disposal (underground leech fields) would be significant in construction and cost.
- Basic calculations performed by Kevin Nichols resulted in the following numbers:
  - 210,000 gal tank
  - 41,800 lf – 12-ft wide chamber beds
  - Based on 1400 bed facility
- On-site WWTP would be permitted through the State Division of Water, Letcher Co representative located in Hazard, KY – Damon White.
- On-site WWTP would require discharge to a blue line stream – def.: water running in stream all year long.
- State Division of Water also responsible for spray irrigation option, common in Kentucky.
- Graywater beds for washing machine discharge – 28,340 lf of 2-ft wide by 2-ft deep beds.
  - Cross section of bed – 6-in stone / 4-in pipe / 6-in stone / 4-inch straw / topsoil
NATURAL GAS SERVICE

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee</th>
<th>ROX</th>
<th>VF</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Goble – Troublesome Creek</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jed Weinberg – Clean Gas Inc. (CG)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Royster – EQT</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darryl Smith – EQT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each representative stated that most gas contracts regarding the wells and transmission lines have a clause that the gas company will relocate the transmission lines one time at no cost to the property owner. As long as the move is a property development action. Each representative was checking into the applicable properties for clarification.
- ROX: In addition to Troublesome Creek and Clean Gas, Kinzer Drilling (KD) also owns wells within the site. Kinzer has since been contacted and a conference call is being established.
- ROX: There are several wells (TC/CG/KD) and underground lines within the proposed site location. These wells would be located within the property of the future BOP facility and would either need to be capped and abandoned (at a cost) or agreements with the BOP made to continue operation. The lines will have to be adjusted to avoid the BOP facilities.
- VF: EQT has one gas well shown on the mining report map by Summit Engineering. EQT is preparing a cost estimate to abandon the well, including compensation for the well. TC has several wells located just outside of the proposed BOP property limits as estimated by Summit Engineering.
- PG: There are no wells located within the proposed property limits of the BOP facility.
- PG: EQT has a 16-inch gas main located through the center of the site that will need to be relocated. EQT is researching cost to relocate the gas main as well as legal responsibility.
- MG: EQT has a 4-inch gas line running through the proposed site location that will need to be relocated. EQT is researching cost to relocate the gas main as well as legal responsibility.
- MB: According to the Mining Report map produced by Summit Engineering, There are three wells by Columbia Natural Resources Inc./Triana Energy (CNR) within the proposed property limits. CNR has been contacted and we are waiting on return calls.
- According to Don Goble (TC) a small building for monitoring equipment would be located on-site near the meter and tap.
• TC gas wells and transmission lines (4-in) carry 1.23 BTU, zero to low sulfur, and can be routed directly into facility with no treatment processes.

• The wells in the ROX area have an estimated 20-25 year life.

• Approximate cost to abandon wells - $40,000 construction and $60,000-$80,000 compensation for lost revenues.

• CG: Jed Weinberg will pull comparable costs to the wells in the ROX site for cost estimating of abandoning the wells. Typical costs could run between $300,000 and $1,000,000 per well.
ELECTRICITY

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee</th>
<th>ROX</th>
<th>VF</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Abner – Cumberland Valley Elec. (CVE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Laslo – Appalachia Electric (AEP)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike L. – AEP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **MB:** New transmission lines (69-kV) would need to be run to site.
  - Approx. 2-year construction time
  - Temporary service could be provided today.
  - Would locate a substation on site, 1-acre compound.
  - Sole Source to BOP facility
  - Would provide cable to master meter, up to BOP to provide conduit and connect facility to master meter.

- **ROX / VF / PG:** No on-site facilities would be required.

- **AEP:** Has 12 kV line adjacent to PG site
  - Has 34 kV line adjacent to ROX /VF sites.

- **ROX / VF / PG:** Transmission lines would be run above ground
- **ROX / VF / PG:** 2 month estimated bill deposit required.

- **AEP:** Willing to give discounts for facility providing own “sustainable” power but would not buy back power.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee</th>
<th>ROX</th>
<th>VF</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frank Dawahare – SouthEast Telephone (SE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Harlow – Intermountain Cable (IC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny Samons – TVS Cable</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **SE:** Provision of services to all four sites is not an issue. Service cost will depend on required bandwidth.
  - T-1 lines are easily run, cost depends on whether T-1 is constant / dynamic / symmetrical / bonded?
- Depending on bandwidth, upgrades to system (signal boosters) may be required. Cost for installation shared amongst SE and BOP.
- Concern with service is reliability of upload speed.
- Roy Harlow @ intermountain Cable did not show for his meeting but called to apologize and stated we could work via phone and email.
- TVS: Can easily service the VF/PG sites but has questionable service to the ROX site.
  - PG site can be provided with fiber optic and coax.
- TVS – suggested checking with ATT for service to ROX site.
APPENDIX E
RESPONSES TO COMMENTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal/State/Local Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US EPA Region 4 (Heinz Mueller)</td>
<td>E-7 to E-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary (Joyce Stanley)</td>
<td>E-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY Department for Environmental Protection (Ronald Price)</td>
<td>E-28 to E-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal/State/Local Elected Officials</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Beshear (Governor of Kentucky)</td>
<td>E-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Jenkins</td>
<td>E-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizations and Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights Defense Center</td>
<td>E-33 to E-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bereans for Michael Brown (Quentin Savage)</td>
<td>E-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Comprehensive Health Corporation (Mike Caudill)</td>
<td>E-55 to E-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer Engineering (Kevin Damron)</td>
<td>E-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Highlands Investment Corporation (Jerry Rickett)</td>
<td>E-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Bowen-Watko (Whitesburg City Council)</td>
<td>E-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ison</td>
<td>E-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Fleming</td>
<td>E-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Napier</td>
<td>E-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Short</td>
<td>E-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleen Breeding</td>
<td>E-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Pigman</td>
<td>E-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Bates</td>
<td>E-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Cornett</td>
<td>E-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer Pigman</td>
<td>E-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toby Breeding</td>
<td>E-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Williams</td>
<td>E-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Clark (Appalachian Real Estate Group)</td>
<td>E-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene Walters</td>
<td>E-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Honeycutt</td>
<td>E-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alecia Pratt</td>
<td>E-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Lewis</td>
<td>E-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Fields</td>
<td>E-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Thomas</td>
<td>E-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim McAuley (Letcher County Conservation District)</td>
<td>E-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Grason</td>
<td>E-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Hall</td>
<td>E-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Watts</td>
<td>E-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Hogg</td>
<td>E-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Page Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Pratt (Whitaker Bank, Inc.)</td>
<td>E-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freddie Bowling (Jenkins Independent Schools, Superintendent)</td>
<td>E-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Narramore (Letcher Co. Tourism)</td>
<td>E-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Narramore</td>
<td>E-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld (Jenkins Independent Schools)</td>
<td>E-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld (Jenkins Independent Schools)</td>
<td>E-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld (Jenkins Independent Schools)</td>
<td>E-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld (Jenkins Independent Schools)</td>
<td>E-101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennie McCall (City of Jenkins, City Administrator)</td>
<td>E-102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Ingram (Hazard Community and Technical College)</td>
<td>E-103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonell Watts</td>
<td>E-104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Smith</td>
<td>E-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovell Sexton</td>
<td>E-108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlene William (Whitesburg City Council)</td>
<td>E-111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauphus Day</td>
<td>E-112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim and Carol Breeding</td>
<td>E-114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Fields (Little Zion Baptist Church, Pastor)</td>
<td>E-115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Reedy</td>
<td>E-116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld (Letcher County Public Schools)</td>
<td>E-117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Banks</td>
<td>E-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Adams (County Magistrate)</td>
<td>E-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld (Whitesburg Appalachian Regional Hospital)</td>
<td>E-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland Brown</td>
<td>E-121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Day</td>
<td>E-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Pratt</td>
<td>E-123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delena Miller</td>
<td>E-124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Griffin (MCHC)</td>
<td>E-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Caudill</td>
<td>E-126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita Collier Spangler (Letcher County Teachers Organization)</td>
<td>E-127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Brockley (Whitesburg ARH)</td>
<td>E-128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Campbell</td>
<td>E-129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld (Letcher County Board of Education)</td>
<td>E-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Lyle (GRW)</td>
<td>E-131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Wright (Mitchell Wright Recycling)</td>
<td>E-132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cain II</td>
<td>E-133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Wright</td>
<td>E-134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randi McCall</td>
<td>E-135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Fleming</td>
<td>E-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Whitaker</td>
<td>E-138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delana Banks</td>
<td>E-139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Page Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Kincaid</td>
<td>E-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Caudill (Mountain Comprehensive Health Corporation)</td>
<td>E-141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Holcomb</td>
<td>E-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Whitaker</td>
<td>E-143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Whitaker</td>
<td>E-144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricky Whitaker</td>
<td>E-145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacie Collie</td>
<td>E-146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld (Lewis Electric Security Systems)</td>
<td>E-147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Collie</td>
<td>E-148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Kincer</td>
<td>E-149 to E-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Sexton (Charles Sexton Trucking Inc.)</td>
<td>E-151 to E-152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Jones</td>
<td>E-153 to E-154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld (Letcher County Chamber of Commerce)</td>
<td>E-155 to E-156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ruth Wright</td>
<td>E-157 to E-158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy Isaac (Letcher County Schools)</td>
<td>E-159 to E-160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Ison (Cowan Community Action Group, Inc.)</td>
<td>E-161 to E-162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Perry (FBOP USP Lee)</td>
<td>E-163 to E-164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Adams</td>
<td>E-165 to E-166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-167 to E-168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherie Caudill (WARH)</td>
<td>E-169 to E-170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hettie Adams (Letcher County Fiscal Court)</td>
<td>E-171 to E-172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristine Bolling (Letcher County Fiscal Court)</td>
<td>E-173 to E-174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Perry</td>
<td>E-175 to E-176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Frazier (Letcher County Fiscal Court)</td>
<td>E-177 to E-178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Meade (Kings Creek Volunteer Fire Department, Chief)</td>
<td>E-179 to E-180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Hart</td>
<td>E-181 to E-182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-183 to E-184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-185 to E-186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Blankenbeckley (Whitaker Bank)</td>
<td>E-187 to E-188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Bentley (Community Trust Bank)</td>
<td>E-189 to E-190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Bailey (Letcher County Soil Conservation Supervisor)</td>
<td>E-191 to E-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Blair</td>
<td>E-193 to E-194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Damron</td>
<td>E-195 to E-196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-197 to E-198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld (Kentucky Works Program/Big Sandy Area Development Dist.)</td>
<td>E-199 to E-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-201 to E-202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Frazier (Tom Short Ford, General Manager)</td>
<td>E-203 to E-204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbetina Genty</td>
<td>E-205 to E-206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-207 to E-208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-209 to E-210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Craft (City of Whitesburg, Mayor)</td>
<td>E-211 to E-212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Lewis</td>
<td>E-213 to E-214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Watts</td>
<td>E-215 to E-216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-217 to E-218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld (Letcher County Board of Education)</td>
<td>E-219 to E-220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Watts</td>
<td>E-221 to E-222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Lewis</td>
<td>E-223 to E-225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Wright-Rose</td>
<td>E-225 to E-226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Page Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld (Jenkins Independent School Board)</td>
<td>E-227 to E-228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-229 to E-230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alita Vogel (Letcher County Public Library)</td>
<td>E-231 to E-232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld (Letcher County Schools)</td>
<td>E-233 to E-234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina Brown (Letcher County Schools)</td>
<td>E-235 to E-236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolinda Wright</td>
<td>E-237 to E-238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Cassell (Jenkins Middle High School)</td>
<td>E-239 to E-240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld (Letcher County Schools)</td>
<td>E-241 to E-242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld (Whitaker Bank)</td>
<td>E-243 to E-244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Smith (Knott County Water and Sewer)</td>
<td>E-245 to E-246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Smith</td>
<td>E-247 to E-248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Sparks</td>
<td>E-249 to E-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Campbell</td>
<td>E-251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood and Rhoda Ison</td>
<td>E-252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Whitaker</td>
<td>E-253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Stanfill (Kentucky Farm Bureau)</td>
<td>E-255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa McFall (Napa Auto Works/Childers Tire and Supply)</td>
<td>E-256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Ingran</td>
<td>E-257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Breeding</td>
<td>E-258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Walters</td>
<td>E-259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Cornett</td>
<td>E-260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Fleming (MCHC)</td>
<td>E-261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Creech</td>
<td>E-263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Withheld</td>
<td>E-264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Hammonds (Whitaker Bank Inc.)</td>
<td>E-265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hares</td>
<td>E-266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennith Watts</td>
<td>E-267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Kirby</td>
<td>E-268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addie Raleigh</td>
<td>E-268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Sanders</td>
<td>E-269 to E-270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Craft</td>
<td>E-271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmie Farley</td>
<td>E-272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Narramore</td>
<td>E-273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard and Pat Yinger</td>
<td>E-274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Fields</td>
<td>E-275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol and Louis Brown</td>
<td>E-276 to E-277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Hall</td>
<td>E-278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Holbrook, Jr.</td>
<td>E-279 to E-280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Greer</td>
<td>E-281 to E-282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maura Ubinger</td>
<td>E-283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noam Brown</td>
<td>E-284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Parkin</td>
<td>E-285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Reed Miller</td>
<td>E-286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Nguyen</td>
<td>E-287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willie Dodson</td>
<td>E-288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Reynoso</td>
<td>E-289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Ball</td>
<td>E-290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Page Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby Gho</td>
<td>E-291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toby Fraser</td>
<td>E-292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panagioti Tsolkas</td>
<td>E-293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form Letters</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form Letter 1</td>
<td>E-295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form Letter 2</td>
<td>E-296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form Letter 3</td>
<td>E-297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form Letter 4</td>
<td>E-298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form Letter 5</td>
<td>E-299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form Letter 6</td>
<td>E-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form Letter 7</td>
<td>E-301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form Letter 8</td>
<td>E-302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Petitions – received 1,251 signatures</td>
<td>E-555 to E-592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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March 30, 2015

Mr. Isaac Gaston
Site Selection Specialist
320 First Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20534

Subject: Proposed United States Penitentiary and Federal Prison Camp, Letcher County, Kentucky
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

Dear Mr. Gaston,

Consistent with our responsibilities under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 4 has reviewed the above DEIS for the proposed United States Penitentiary and Federal Prison Camp, Letcher County, Kentucky and are providing the following comments for your consideration.

The DEIS states that:

"Abstract

The Federal Bureau of Prisons has prepared this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to evaluate the environmental impacts of site acquisition and development of a proposed United States Penitentiary (USP) and Federal Prison Camp (FPC) in Letcher County, Kentucky. The proposed action is to acquire the property and construct a new USP, FPC, auxiliary facilities and access roads. The purpose of the proposed federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky, is to develop additional high-security and medium-security facilities to increase capacity for current inmate populations in the Mid-Atlantic Region based on an identified need for additional bedspace. The Bureau has determined that there is a need for additional high-security and medium-security facilities within this region to reduce the demonstrated overcrowding that compromises the mission of the Bureau. The Draft EIS analyzes the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the No Action Alternative, two build alternatives, Alternative 1-Payne Gap and Alternative 2-Roxana, with regard to climate, topography, geology, soils, water, biological and cultural resources, air quality, noise, land use and zoning, socioeconomic, traffic and transportation, recreation, utilities, and hazardous substances."

http://www.epa.gov
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Federal Bureau of Prisons (Bureau) is proposing to construct a new United States Penitentiary (USP), Federal Prison Camp (FPC) and associated ancillary facilities in Letcher County, Kentucky. The Bureau has prepared this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to analyze the impacts associated with the construction and operation of the proposed action.

The USP is anticipated to be approximately 61,654 square meters (653,618 square foot) and will house approximately 1,088 inmates. The FPC is anticipated to be approximately 6,063 square meters (65,267 square foot) and house approximately 128 inmates. Ancillary buildings would include a central utility plant, firing range, outside warehouse, UNICOR warehouse, and staff training building. A non-lethal/lethal fence would be installed around the perimeter of the USP. Operation of the USP and FPC would employ approximately 300 full-time staff.

PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the proposed federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky, is to develop additional high-security and medium-security facilities to increase capacity for current inmate populations in the Mid-Atlantic Region based on an identified need for additional space. The Bureau has determined that there is a need for additional high-security and medium-security facilities within this region to reduce the demonstrated overcrowding that compromises the mission of the Bureau.

PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed action being evaluated in this Draft EIS is the acquisition of property and the construction and operation of a federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky. The Bureau proposes to acquire approximately 806 acres (324 hectares) to construct a USP (approximately 61,654 square meters or 653,618 square foot) and FPC (approximately 6,063 square meters or 65,267 square foot) in Letcher County. Inmates housed in the USP would be high-security male inmates and those housed in the FPC would be minimum-security male inmates. The proposed facilities would house approximately 1,200 total inmates (approximately 1,088 within the USP and approximately 128 within the FPC). In addition to the USP and FPC, several ancillary facilities necessary for the operation of the USP and FPC would be constructed. A non-lethal/lethal fence would also be installed around the perimeter of the USP. The non-lethal/lethal fence would be placed between two parallel, chain link and razor wire fences.
ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Three alternatives were analyzed in this Draft EIS, the No Action Alternative and two build alternatives: Alternative 1-Payne Gap and Alternative 2-Roxana.

No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative does not meet the project purpose and need; however, it represents the existing conditions and is analyzed in the Draft EIS as a baseline for comparing the proposed action. The purpose for this comparison is to allow the federal agency to assess the effects of taking no action versus implementing the proposed action. In some cases the no action alternative would result in impacts to certain resources if the proposed action is not implemented. Therefore, the assessment of the no action Alternative is an important component of all National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents.

Alternative 1-Payne Gap

Under Alternative 1, the Bureau would acquire approximately 753 acres (305 hectares) of land known as the Payne Gap site. The site is located in eastern Letcher County, approximately 7 miles northeast of Whitesburg, along the Kentucky and Virginia border (Figures 2-1 and 2-2). The Bureau would then construct and operate a USP and FPC on this site. Alternative 1 would require extensive earthwork to prepare the site for development. Approximately 8,342,923 cubic meters (10,912,130 cubic yards) of excavation and 10,568,450 cubic meters (13,823,012 cubic yards) of fill would be required prior to the beginning of construction activities.

Alternative 2-Roxana

Under Alternative 2, the Bureau would acquire approximately 700 acres (283 hectares) of land known as the Roxana site. The site is located 7.5 miles west of Whitesburg, Kentucky (Figures 2-1 and 2-4). The Bureau would then construct and operate a USP and FPC on this site.

Alternative 2 would also require extensive earthwork to prepare the site for development. Approximately 2,520,582 cubic meters (3,331,749 cubic yards) of material would need to be excavated from the site and approximately 3,282,034 cubic meters (4,293,001 cubic yards) of fill would be required to prepare the site for construction activities.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The Bureau published a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS on July 26, 2013. The Bureau held a 30-day scoping period between July 26 and August 26, 2013. A public scoping meeting was held during this scoping period. The meeting was held August 13, 2013 to inform the public about the proposed project and to explain NEPA and the associated
environmental impact analysis. A total of 453 community members attended the public meeting and a total of 320 comments were received during the 45-day public comment period. Additionally, 169 letters of support were presented at the public meeting, as well as two petitions in support of the project with a total of 124 signatures. Scoping comments were in support of the project with no major issues or concerns raised.

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Table ES-1 provides a summary of the potential environmental effects from the No Action Alternative and the two build alternatives: Alternative 1-Payne Gap and Alternative 2- Rhoades. Potential mitigation and site preparation costs have also been provided in this table. These mitigation measures and costs are likely to change over the course of the project, coordination with various agencies, and further development of mitigation measures with the agencies; however, this is the best available information at the time this Draft EIS was drafted and serves to assist in the comparison of the alternatives.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

The United States (U.S.) Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons (Bureau) has prepared this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500-1508), and the Department of Justice procedures for implementing NEPA (28 CFR 61). The Bureau's Draft EIS evaluates the potential environmental consequences of the proposed construction and operation of a federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky. Two action alternatives and the No Action Alternative are assessed.

BACKGROUND

The Bureau was established in 1930 to provide more progressive and humane care for federal inmates, to professionalize the prison service, and to ensure consistent and centralized administration of federal prisons. The mission of the Bureau is to promote society by confining offenders in the controlled environments of prisons and community-based facilities that are safe, humane, cost efficient, and appropriately secure, and that provide work and other self-improvement opportunities to assist offenders in becoming law-abiding citizens.

SECURITY LEVELS

The Bureau accomplishes its mission through the appropriate use of the following types of community-detention, correctional, and correctional facilities:

- Federally owned and operated
- Federally owned and non-federally operated
- Non-federally owned and operated
Regardless of facility ownership, the Bureau operates correction and detention facilities at various security levels. Each security level is characterized by the type of housing within the institution, internal security features, and staff-to-inmate ratio. Different security levels require particular features such as external patrols, guard towers, security barriers, or detection devices. The five categories of security levels are described as follows:

- **Minimum-Security**: Also known as Federal Prison Camps (FPCs) or satellite work camps. They are characterized by dormitory housing, a relatively low staff-to-inmate ratio, and are without fences. They are typically associated with a larger institution or military base where inmates can help serve labor needs of the institution or base.

- **Low-Security**: Federal Correctional Institutions with double fenced perimeters, primarily dormitory housing, and strong work and program components.

- **Medium-Security**: Federal Correctional Institutions with strengthened perimeters (e.g., double fences with electronic detection systems), cell-type housing, a wide variety of work and treatment programs, and an increased inmate-to-staff ratio to provide greater control.

- **High-Security**: Also known as United States Penitentiaries (USP). These facilities have highly secure perimeters (e.g., walls or double fences with barbed wire fencing, non-lethal/lethal fences), multiple single occupant cell housing, guard towers, close staff supervision, and movement controls.

- **Administrative**: Institutions that house offenders who require an uncommon level of security due to their serious records of institutional misconduct, involvement in violent or escalated behaviors, and/or who have unusual security needs based on the nature of their offense. These facilities have highly secured perimeters consisting of walled or double fenced enclosures with guard towers.

**EXISTING FEDERAL PRISON POPULATION**

In 1981, the federal inmate population consisted of approximately 23,800 inmates. By 1986 the federal inmate population had increased to about 38,700: a 63 percent increase. Growth continued at a steady rate through the 1990s and in 1998 the federal inmate population had grown 380 percent, reaching 100,000 inmates. As of November 7, 2014, the Bureau inmate population reached 213,620; this includes 171,744 inmates being housed in 120 Bureau institutions, 27,637 being housed in privately-managed secure facilities, and 14,249 being housed in other contracts. Of the 171,744 inmates housed in Bureau Institutions, 23,958 are high-security inmates. The Bureau houses these 23,958 high-security inmates in 19 USPs located throughout six regions within the U.S.: the Mid-Atlantic Region; North Central Region; Northeast Region; South Central Region; Southeast Region; and Western Region. Each region provides facilities for housing inmates at all security levels. The 19 USPs are rated for a total capacity of 14,274 high-security inmates. Therefore, the Bureau's high-security institutions are currently 52 percent overcrowded and are operating at above rated capacity.
To meet the current and projected bedspace needs, the Bureau evaluates the bedspace needs of the regions using a geographically balanced program. When considering placement of an individual, the Bureau considers the origin of the inmate and attempts to place the inmate in an institution that is within the region of the inmate's origin. Placing inmates within their region of origin provides greater opportunity for visitation with family, which aids in the rehabilitation process.

**FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS MID-ATLANTIC REGION**

One of the regions identified by the Bureau as having an increasing need for additional high-security bedspace in order to reduce overcrowding in the Mid-Atlantic Region. Approximately 5,302 inmates, including those in special programs, are housed within the Mid-Atlantic Region. The current rated capacity for those institutions is 3,400. Therefore, the Bureau has determined that due to the overcrowding in the Mid-Atlantic Region, specifically within the USPs and FPCs, that construction of a new high-security facility would be warranted in the region.

There are currently 15 correctional facilities within the Bureau's Mid-Atlantic Region. Of these, only four are USPs or high-security facilities: USP Hazleton located in Hazelton, West Virginia; USP Lee located in Jonesville, Virginia; USP Big Sandy located in Letcher County, Kentucky, and USP McCracken located in McCracken, Kentucky. Table 1-1 depicts the current populations associated with each of the USPs in the Mid-Atlantic Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USP</th>
<th>Existing Inmate Population (does not include those in special programs)</th>
<th>Rated Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Sandy</td>
<td>1,53</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCracken</td>
<td>1,22</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,63</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PURPOSE AND NEED**

The purpose of the proposed federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky, is to develop additional high-security and medium-security facilities to increase capacity for current inmate populations in the Mid-Atlantic Region. The need for the proposed facility is that the current inmate populations of the USPs in the Mid-Atlantic Region are exceeding their rated capacity and their associated FPCs are at or near capacity. The Bureau has determined that there is a need for additional high-security and medium-security facilities within this region to reduce the demonstrated overcrowding that compromises the mission of the Bureau. The Bureau’s mission is to protect society by confining offenders in the controlled environments of prisons and community-based
facilities that are safe, humane, cost-efficient, and appropriately secured, and that provide work and other self-improvement opportunities to assist offenders in becoming law-abiding citizens.

PROPOSED ACTION
The proposed action being evaluated in this Draft EIS is the acquisition of property and the construction and operation of a federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky. The Bureau proposes to acquire approximately 800 acres (324 hectares) to construct a USP (approximately 61,634 square meters (663,438 square feet)) and FPC (approximately 6,063 square meters (65,363 square feet)) in Letcher County. Inmates housed in the USP would be high-security male inmates and those housed in the FPC would be minimum-security male inmates. The proposed facilities would house approximately 1,316 total inmates (approximately 1,088 within the USP and approximately 128 within the FPC). In addition to the USP and FPC, several ancillary facilities necessary for the operation of the USP and FPC would be constructed. A non-lethal/non-lethal fence would also be installed around the perimeter of the USP. The non-lethal/non-lethal fence would be placed between two parallel, chain link and razor wire fences. The fence would be approximately 12 feet high. The ancillary facilities would include the following:

- Central Utility Plant-1,217 square meters (13,100 square foot)
- Firing Range-96 square meters (1,033 square foot)
- Outside Warehouse-3,279 square meters (35,205 square foot)
- UNICOR Warehouse-1,375 square meters (14,800 square foot)
- Storage Building-910 square meters (9,975 square foot)
- Garage/Landscape Building-653 square meters (7,028 square foot)
- Access Roads

Operation of the USP and FPC would employ approximately 300 full-time staff.

General Design Features of the United States Penitentiary and Federal Prison Camp
The Bureau has standard design layouts for their correctional facilities that include similar design characteristics. General design features of a USP include:

- Single road for controlled access to each correctional facility
- Parking lot located near the public entrance to each correctional facility for use by both employees and visitors
- One- to two-story structures
- Multipurpose activity spaces
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

National Environmental Policy Act

In 1969, Congress enacted the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), which requires consideration of environmental issues in federal agency planning and decision-making. Regulations for federal agency implementation of the act were established by the President's CEQ. NEPA requires federal agencies to prepare an environmental assessment (EA) or environmental impact statement (EIS) for any federal action, except those actions that are determined to be "categorically excluded" from further analysis. An EIS is prepared for those federal actions that may significantly affect the quality of the human and natural environments or where the impacts are largely unknown or controversial. The EIS must disclose significant environmental impacts and inform decision makers and the public of the reasonable alternatives that would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment. The intent of this EIS is to document the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed action, acquisition of property and construction and operation of a USP and FPC. The Bureau is the decision-maker with regard to this proposed action. This document, together with its appendices and other documents incorporated by reference, constitutes the Draft EIS pursuant to NEPA, the CEQ regulations, and the Department of Justice procedures for implementing NEPA.

The Draft EIS evaluates environmental impacts to: land use and zoning; topography, geology, and soils; socioeconomic and environmental justice; community facilities and services (fire and police services, emergency services, health care facilities, etc.); transportation and traffic; air quality; noise; infrastructure and utilities; cultural resources (historic properties, archaeology); water resources; biological resources (threatened and endangered species, wetlands, vegetation, etc.); and hazardous materials and waste. The evaluation will determine the potential impacts of the proposed action and, if necessary, where impacts may be avoided or minimized, as well as if the impacts would require mitigation. The evaluation of the proposed sites will also determine which site would result in the least amount of impact to the environment.

Related Environmental Documents

In 2008, the Bureau conducted a site reconnaissance study in Letcher County, Kentucky. The site reconnaissance report identified several resources associated with potential sites that would require additional studies to determine if the sites were viable for the development of a federal correctional institution. Based on this 2008 study, a second study was conducted in 2010 to rank these sites and verify that the issues originally identified in 2008 had not changed. Based on the data collected from both the
2008 and 2010 studies, it was determined that a feasibility study to analyze the resources of concern would be conducted to further assess the viability of construction at each of the sites.

In 2012 a feasibility study was completed by the Bureau to evaluate four potential sites for the development of a USP and FPC in Letcher County, Kentucky (TEC, Inc. 2012). The purpose was to conduct additional studies, including wetland identification and delineation, cultural resource surveys, geotechnical studies, boundary surveys, and a utility assessment of the proposed sites to determine if there would be constraints associated with these resources and the development of the sites. The feasibility study evaluated the benefits, challenges, and potential risks associated with development of each site. Based on the results of the feasibility study and changes with the offers of sites, it was determined that two sites, Payne Gap and Roxana, would be carried forward for analysis in this Draft EIS.

Agency Coordination

In addition to NEPA, other laws, regulations, permits and licenses may be applicable to the proposed action. Specifically, the proposed action may require:

- Informal consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the occurrence of threatened and endangered species within the sites
- Concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Office on cultural resource findings
- Clean Water Act Section 404 permit if wetland impacts occur
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination permit for non-point source discharge
- Erosion and sedimentation control plan for new construction.

Public Involvement

NEPA requires the public be informed and involved throughout the development of the EIS, beginning with public scoping. The public scoping meeting is an opportunity for the federal agency, in this case the Bureau, to introduce the project to the public and receive input on the scope of the issues to be addressed in the EIS. The local public has knowledge of the area where the proposed action may take place, and can provide insight into local resources, as well as the concerns of the community. Public involvement in the NEPA process is required and is an extremely valuable tool in the successful completion of NEPA documents.

The official scoping period for this project began when the Bureau published a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS on July 26, 2013, in the Federal Register, and lasted until August 26, 2013. A scoping meeting was held on August 12, 2013 to inform the public about the proposed project and to explain NEPA and the associated environmental impact analysis. A total of 450 community members attended the public meeting and a total of 200
responses were received during the 45-day public comment period. Additionally, 169 letters of support were presented at the public meeting, as well as two petitions in support of the project with a total of 124 signatures. Stakeholder comments were in support of the project with no major issues or concerns raised.

ALTERNATIVES

CEQ’s guidelines for implementing the procedural provisions of the NEPA establish a number of policies for federal agencies, including “...using the NEPA process to identify and assess alternatives to the proposed action that will avoid or minimize adverse effects of these actions on the quality of the human environment” (40 CFR 1502.1(e)). The guidelines also require an analysis of alternatives based on the information and analysis presented in the sections on the Affected Environment (§1502.15) and the Environmental Consequences (§1502.16). The guidelines further state that the analysis “should present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice.” According to CEQ guidelines the alternatives analysis is also required to:

- “include the alternative of no action”;
- “...explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated”;
- “Devote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail including the proposed action so that reviewers can evaluate their comparative merits”;
- “Include reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency”;
- “Identify the agency’s preferred alternative or alternatives, if one or more exists, in the draft statement and identify such alternative in the final statement unless another law prohibits the expression of such a preference”, and
- “Include appropriate mitigation measures not already included in the proposed action or alternatives.”

The analysis of alternatives considered in this EIS was conducted under these guidelines to address the following:
- No Action Alternative. A decision not to proceed with the proposed action to develop a new USP and FPC.
- Alternative Locations-Nationwide. Locations other than the Letcher County, Kentucky area for implementation of the proposed action.
• Alternative Locations. Within the Geographic Area of Interest Warranting Consideration, potential site(s) which meet minimum requirements for accommodating the proposed facility, are located within the geographic area of interest (Kentucky), and have been offered and are available for Bureau consideration.

A discussion of these alternatives follows. No reasonable alternatives outside the jurisdiction of the Bureau (the lead agency) have been identified or warrant inclusion in the Draft EIS.

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Under the No Action Alternative, the Bureau would not acquire property or construct and operate a new USP or FPC. Existing USPs would remain overcrowded and prevent the Bureau from meeting its mission.

The No Action Alternative would avoid potential impacts associated with the development of a USP and FPC. The No Action Alternative does not meet the project purpose and need and is therefore, not considered a viable alternative. The No Action Alternative is discussed in this EIS because it serves as a baseline against which to compare the action alternatives.

ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS-NATIONWIDE

The locations of new federal correctional facilities are determined by the need for incarceration in various regions of the country and the resources available to meet that need. To meet these needs the Bureau routinely identifies and evaluates potential sites that may be appropriate for development of new federal correctional facilities. Under an ongoing Congressional mandate, consideration is given to surplus properties while other publicly- or privately-owned properties offered to the Bureau are also examined for possible use.

The initial steps in the planning process include the identification and evaluation of potential sites. Identification of a site that has the potential to house more than one federal correctional facility is a key factor in the evaluation of sites. Acquisition of property that has the potential for facility expansion provides the Bureau with the opportunity to expand as the inmate population grows. The Bureau also responds to initiatives from communities requesting consideration to host new federal correctional facilities. When approached by a community to host a facility, the Bureau's first steps are to visit the sites offered and:

• Identify the interest and support of the community, including the support/opposition of elected and appointed officials, community leaders, stakeholders, and the general public in having a federal correctional facility within their community.
• Identify suitable locations for development of the federal correctional facility based on infrastructure conditions, environmental resources, land use and zoning, and other related criteria

• Determine the on-site conditions including constructability of the site

• Identify potential environmental issues that require consideration under NEPA (National Historic Preservation Act, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, etc.)

• Determine what further investigations and detailed studies may be warranted to obtain additional information about the potential sites

After the initial screening process, those sites with favorable conditions are moved forward and evaluated under another set of criteria, including optimal infrastructure and environmental requirements. The criteria used to evaluate the sites are established by the Bureau; however, these general criteria can be supplemented if needed to assess issues or potential issues and make sure they are addressed adequately in the evaluation of the sites.

The general criteria the Bureau uses to screen potential sites for development include:

• The site should have sufficient land area (300-350 acres minimum [121-142 hectares]) to accommodate the institution and ancillary facilities, provide a buffer zone between the facility and neighboring properties, and allow for future expansion

• Proposed site should be relatively flat (less than 10 percent grade) to provide for minimal site preparation and proper drainage (this can be affected by geographic regions with mountainous terrain)

• Sites should avoid significant environmental resources (i.e., floodplains, wetlands, threatened and endangered species, cultural and historic resources, etc.)

• Sites should avoid potential incompatible land use conflicts.

• Emergency services, including police and fire protection, and utilities should be available to provide services to the prospective sites

• Site should be served by well-maintained state and county roadways to ensure safe commutes for employees, service vehicles, and visitors

• Support of key elected officials, community leaders, the public and owners of the sites

Sites that the Bureau determines meet these general criteria, and are viable for the development of a federal correctional facility, are then evaluated in more detail in either an EA or EIS, in compliance with NEPA.
ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT

The Bureaus a priority need for additional facilities within the Bureau's Mid-Atlantic Region, which includes the State of Kentucky. The Bureau was contacted by the Letcher County Planning Commission (LCPC) with an offer of potential sites for a new USP and FPC in Letcher County, Kentucky. Understanding the needs of the Bureau, the LCPC identified potential locations for development and brought those sites to the attention of the Bureau to determine if the Bureau had an interest in developing a new facility at one of the locations. The opportunity to provide additional bedspace in Letcher County would meet the need for additional capacity within the Mid-Atlantic Region, allow the Bureau continued management of inmates originating from the region, and allow those inmates to remain close to family and friends.

The process to identify potential sites for constructing a USP and FPC in Letcher County began in 2008 with site reconnaissance studies of four sites that had been offered to the Bureau by members of the community. The purpose of the site reconnaissance studies was to collect preliminary data on the sites and determine their suitability for development based on site conditions, infrastructure and utilities, and environmental resources. Based on this initial analysis, it was determined that the four sites evaluated should be studied more in depth in a feasibility study: Meadow Branch, Payne Gap, Rock, and Van/Fields. The feasibility study provided an opportunity for more detailed analysis of each site and identified constraints that may eliminate a site from further consideration. In 2011, the Bureau completed a feasibility study that assessed cultural resources, wetlands, geologic conditions, and infrastructure. The feasibility study also included the production of aerial and topographic mapping, and a boundary survey. During the initial phases of the feasibility study, the Meadow Branch site was removed from further consideration due to changes in the offender, and the site no longer available for consideration by the Bureau; therefore, no detailed analysis of the site was included in the feasibility study. During the feasibility study for the remaining three sites, wetlands were delineated, archaeological and historic structures surveys were completed, and geotechnical studies were conducted. The feasibility study highlighted potential concerns with development of the sites, as well as estimated costs of infrastructure improvement and site preparation (excavation and/or fill for each site, and grading activities on each site. The feasibility study determined that two constraints that would prevent development of the three sites (TEC, Inc. 2012). During the finalization of the feasibility study there were changes with the offense of the Van/Fields site, and this site was removed from further consideration. The remaining two sites, Payne Gap and Rock, were identified as alternatives to be carried forward for study in an EIS (Figure 2-1).
ALTERNATIVE 1 - PAYNE GAP

Under Alternative 1, the Bureau would acquire approximately 733 acres (305 hectares) of land known as the Payne Gap (Payne Gap) site. The site is located in eastern Letcher County, approximately 5 miles north of Whitesburg, along the Kentucky and Virginia border (Figures 2-1 and 2-2). The Bureau would then construct and operate a USP and FPC on this site. The site is situated on a gently sloped to steeply sloped upland landform above the Kentucky River at its confluence with the Laurel Fork. State Route 119 is located along the north end of the proposed site and would provide site access. The site is forested with secondary growth forests and the original topography of portions of the site have been altered by past surface mining and associated mining activities such as spoil piles, roads, and fill piles. Mining permit applications indicate surface and underground mining operations have occurred within the proposed project site since the 1950s. Figure 2-3 depicts the proposed conceptual layout of the facility at the Payne Gap site. To accommodate the USP, FPC, ancillary buildings, and roads as described in Section 1.6, Proposed Action, the site would require extensive excavation and fill material to level and prepare the site for construction. The Bureau would require a minimum of 300 acres (121 hectares) for construction of the USP and FPC at this site. Table 2-1 depicts the site preparation quantities.

Table 2-1: Estimated Site Preparation Quantities for Alternative 1 - Payne Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spoil Excavation</td>
<td>2,394,000 yd³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Excavation</td>
<td>8,117,290 yd³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Fill</td>
<td>9,371,100 ft³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoil Fill</td>
<td>2,816,083 yd³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Compaction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Brush Area</td>
<td>7 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Forest Area</td>
<td>2,981 ac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: yd³ = cubic yards; ac = acres.

ALTERNATIVE 2 - ROXANA

Under Alternative 2, the Bureau would acquire approximately 700 acres (283 hectares) of land known as the Roxana site. The site is located 7.5 miles west of Whitesburg, Kentucky (Figures 2-1 and 2-4). The Bureau would construct and operate a USP and FPC on this site. Figure 2-5 depicts the proposed conceptual layout of the facility at the Roxana site. To accommodate the USP, FPC, ancillary buildings, and roads as described in Section 1.6, Proposed Action, the site would require extensive excavation of spoil material and lesser amounts of structural fill and spoil fill. Preparation of the site for construction activities would also require dynamic compaction, clear mined area, and forest clearing. The Bureau would require a minimum of 300 acres (121 hectares) for construction of the USP and FPC at this site. Table 2-2 depicts site preparation quantities.
1. The Preferred Alternative has been identified in Section 2.6 of the Final EIS.

2. Time schedules for the proposed project have not yet been established. Detailed project schedules will only be determined if/when a Record of Decision has been issued and appropriated funds required for the project have been made available. Required funds for the proposed project have not yet been appropriated and the timing and availability of such funds is beyond the Bureau’s control.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

4. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

5. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

6. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

7. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

8. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

---

**Table 2-2 Estimated Site Preparation Quantities for Alternative 2 - Roxana**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil Excavation</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Excavation</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Fill</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheet Fill</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Compaction</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Timber Area</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Forest Area</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**EPA COMMENTS TO DEIS**

1. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) should clearly state which is the Preferred Alternative and should include clear discussions and conclusions on why the Preferred Alternative was selected compared to the other alternatives. The Preferred Alternative should be individually evaluated, i.e., without solely referring to the impacts attendant to other alternatives. This identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the Final EIS.

2. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) should include time schedule showing proposed start and finish dates for each project task.

3. The Bureau should comply to the maximum possible degree with the recommendations made by the recipients listed in the DEIS Distribution List.

4. EPA recommends the Bureau monitors the contractor closely during construction to ensure compliance with the implementation of all of these permitting and regulatory requirements.

5. The Bureau should ensure the public is well informed at all times through frequent meetings, flyers, announcements and public hearings to secure their support and input for the project.

6. If there is any recycling, it should be done according to Department of Defense (DoD) 4160.21-M, Chapter 7 RESOURCE RECOVERY AND RECYCLING PROGRAM (RRRP) which states: All installations, worldwide, shall have recycling programs as required by Executive Order 12789. Pursuant to Public Law 97-214 (10 USC 2577), and DoD Instruction (DoDI) 4715.4, Pollution Prevention.

7. The Bureau should ensure the project implements the best management practices (BMPs), elements of Green Building techniques, recycling of materials, disposal of federal property, federal regulations for disposal of federal property and etc.

8. Attached Number 1 is a check list of items that could help facilitate your compliance with the NEPA regulations.

9. Other links that could be beneficial to the project include:
   - Waste Reduction Resource Center - hosted by North Carolina but it is an EPA Region 4 resource - [http://www.epa.gov/](http://www.epa.gov)
   - [http://www.epa.gov/osw/conservenrr/rrr/nrrtdex.html](http://www.epa.gov/osw/conservenrr/rrr/nrrtdex.html)
9. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

10. See reply No. 1 above and Table ES-1 of the Executive Summary. The Preferred Alternative has been identified in Section 2.6 of the Final EIS as the Roxana site. The Bureau has conducted coordination with the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the US Army Corps of Engineers to outline minimization measures and develop appropriate mitigation for impacts which cannot be avoided. Chapters 4 and 5 discuss anticipated impacts, agency coordination and proposed mitigation measures. Appendix A contains agency correspondence.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Heinz Mueller, Chief
NEPA Program Office
Resource Conservation Recovery Division

Attachment
ATTACHMENT NUMBER 1
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 4
NEPA CHECK LIST

Consistent with our responsibilities under Section 1502 of the National Environmental
Policy Act and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(EPA), Region 4 offers the following general comments/suggestions for your
consideration/inclusion that could help facilitate your compliance with the NEPA regulations
in this project and in future Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), Draft
Environmental Assessment (DEA) and/or Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for
Proposed United States Penitentiary and Federal Prison Camp, Letcher County,
Kentucky.

1. FEIS development must be consistent with Section 309 of the Clean Air Act,
2. The FEIS should include clear discussions and conclusions why the Preferred Alternative
was selected over the other alternatives. The "Preferred Alternative" should be
individually evaluated, i.e. without solely referencing to the impacts attended to other
alternatives.
3. The FEIS should have a complete list of abbreviations, definitions, acronyms and symbols
4. Similar subjects/terminologies should be cross-referenced with like definition
shown found on other document’s pages.
5. The FEIS should be specific and describe what facilities or portions of the facilities will be
demolished and when. Any deconstruction (demolition) should be done according to the nine
Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA),’s rules,
regulations and guidelines and should ensure disposal of federal property is done according
to federal regulations for disposal of federal property. Ensure the demolition and construction
debris be properly handled by licensed contractors (if needed) and disposed in licensed
sanitary landfills for each type of debris.

In construction/demolition projects the FEIS should address: proper handling of
hazardous materials removal and disposal (asbestos, PCBs, lead from paint), and waste
management (e.g., reuse or recycling as opposed to landfill dumping), wastewater
management, indoor air quality, energy and water conservation (e.g., low flow toilets, energy
efficient windows and doors, efficient lighting, etc.); other pollution prevention measures
(e.g., use of materials with recycled content) as well as impacts to water, traffic, air and water
quality, wildlife and vegetation (could any endangered or threatened species be impacted?);
erosion, sedimentation control, and impacts to historic resources.

6. The FEIS and draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) should be made available for
public inspection at various public locations. It would be very beneficial to ensure the public
is well informed at all times through frequent public meetings, flyers, announcements and
public hearings.
7. The FEIS should address the needed and required permits, how to obtain them from the
associated regulatory agencies and how to implement and comply with them.
8. The FEIS should address land cleared or forested clear-cut harvesting trees and should
describe the type and age of trees present, will the trees be harvested? Concerning cumulative
impacts, recently (in the near past/present/future) how many other sites and cumulative number
of acres of land will or have been cleared at the facility?
9. The FEIS should make sure decisions made based on archaeological surveys done in
previous years are still valid.
10. The FEIS should address impacts to traditional American Indian resources, if any, under the various alternatives. Consultation with the American Indian Tribal organizations should be made and it should include a list of tribes and or Native American Indian Organizations consulted about this project along with their responses and comments.

11. The FEIS should address the Graves and Repatriation Act – (NAGPRA) to identify National Register-eligible archaeological sites; to ensure proper evaluations are carried out in order to minimize the adverse impacts to historic properties in the project area; and so that in the event burial sites are located during ground-disturbing activities, the proper procedures for unexpected discoveries are followed.

12. The FEIS should discuss in some detail if there was any EJ community involvement, follow-up analyses, and/or outreach efforts performed. Also, what impact will the project have on minority businesses?

13. In addition to the noise analyses to be done related to the entire site, the FEIS should also discuss what noise effects can be attributed to the temporary (site type and length of time) demolition and construction that will take place on the site.

14. The FEIS should establish the contractor’s procedures for borrow materials which should be approved, tested, and used. The contractor’s procedures must be designed to minimize the disturbance of the borrow area and the quality of the material should be such that it will not contribute to pollution and will not be detrimental to the receiving environment.

15. If there are any reasons to suspect the contractor to excavate or expose any contaminated soils, this should be discussed in detail in the FEIS and the proper studies of the site should be done along with the corrections before any work on the project is done by the contractor.

16. In addition, contaminated soils, solid wastes, chemicals and hazardous materials should be properly handled by licensed contractors and disposed of in licensed sanitary landfills according to the type of waste; that hazardous and hazardous material be disposed of according to local, state, Federal and Clean Water Act (including RCRA and CERCLA) rules, regulations, guidelines and requirements.

17. The FEIS should address handling of above ground underground storage tanks (AST/UST), if any, according to the State and Federal rules regulations and guidelines. The FEIS should address the issue of removing or not removing tanks and should include state and federal documentation concerning/containing, with the final decision.

18. In general, construction activities should be restricted to existing roads of way, if possible and best management practices should be utilized. Impacts to wetlands, floodplains, and other sensitive resources should be avoided. If avoidance is not possible, mitigation must be offered to minimize adverse impacts. If construction must run through a wetland, the area should be restored to its “natural” state. That is, the affected area should be returned to its original soil horizons as well as original contours. Also, the area should be re-vegetated with indigenous species.

If structures must be placed in a floodplain, they should be constructed to minimize the infiltration/inflow (I/I) of flood waters and should be sturdy enough to withstand the uplift and velocity forces of such waters. To minimize impacts to prime farmland and public health, water and sewer lines should not run directly through fields or obstruct the flow of water to crops. The land should be returned to its original contour and re-vegetated with indigenous plant life. Ancillary facilities (e.g., pump stations) should be designed so as not to impede the natural flow of flood waters.

Since soil disturbance associated with the demolition and construction would require disturbance to the existing site, soils topography could result in considerable amounts of storm water, erosion and environmental harm, the owner should require the personnel
involved in the project, including the consultant engineers and contractors to comply with existing local, state and federal rules, regulations and guidelines to minimize potential adverse impacts on wetlands, groundwater, aquifers, streams, rivers, lakes, ponds, reservoirs, and water quality. The owner should comply with the local and state erosion and sediment rules and guidelines; the Clean Water Act; the required state COE permits; the Executive Order 11988 - Flood Plain Management and the Executive Order 11990 - Protection of Wetlands. Runoff controls should be updated periodically for the duration of the construction (e.g., every 3-5 months and maintained to help ensure success - e.g., all fences repaired and hay bales replaced).

19. The FEIS should include the latest cumulative impacts (past, present and future) and also the total direct and indirect impacts analysis so that they affect the air quality in the area.

20. The owner should encourage the contractors to maintain and operate all construction equipment per manufacturer’s specifications and recommendations to minimize air emissions. The owner should also consider offering incentives for contractors to specify the use of retrofitted diesel equipment or purchase of available ultra-low diesel fuel in their bids. The FEIS should address the impact of the construction on the air quality if one of the construction could be done at night.

21. The long-term and indirect impacts of the proposed action should be considered. If the extension of service to the proposed users would cause further development of an environmentally sensitive area, alternate alignments/align should be considered.

22. The FEIS should include a Time Schedule showing proposed start and finish dates for each project task.

23. Recycling should be done according to Department of Defense (DoD) 4160.21-M/Chapter 7 RESOURCE RECOVERY AND RECYCLING PROGRAM (RREP) which states: All installations, worldwide, shall have recycling programs as required by Executive Order 12780, pursuant to Public Law 97-214 (10 USC 2577), and DoD Instruction (DoDI) 4151.4, Pollution Prevention.

24. Ensure all project reports and rehabilitation should comply with the FEMA regulations and guidelines.

25. Permit information - Contact the appropriate Federal, State, County or City officials regarding permits and local ordinances.

26. Open Burning - The burning of materials for waste disposal purposes is referred to as open burning. Open burning permits and/or specific standards, state and local standards must be followed.

27. Ensure owners can afford the flood insurance after the property is rehabilitated.

28. The EPA suggests the recommendations made by Green Building to be followed whenever possible. Green or sustainable building is the practice of creating healthier and more energy-efficient modes of construction, renovation, operation, maintenance, and deconstruction. Research and experience is increasingly demonstrating that when buildings are designed and operated with their lifecycle impacts in mind, they can provide great environmental, economic, and social benefits.

Elements of Green building include:

* Smart Growth and Sustainable Development
* Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy
* Water Stewardship
* Environmentally Preferable Building Materials and Specifications
* Waste Reduction
* Toxics and
* Indoor Environments.
Additional information on Green Building can be found at:
http://www.epa.gov/greenbuilding/
http://www.greenroof.org/
www.epa.gov/energybuilding
www.greenhighways.org
http://www.epbinc.org/
www.greenelectric.org

Other Links
Waste Reduction Resource Center - hosted by North Carolina but it is an EPA Region 4 resource http://www.epa.gov/ Region4/industrial_materials -
http://www.epa.gov/region4/industrial_mat.html
http://www.epa.gov/region4/industrial_mat.html
C&D - http://www.epa.gov/conserve/mtw/mtwa/mtd
www.epa.gov/osw/cdp
http://www.epa.gov/conserve/mtw/mtwa/mtd
http://www.epa.gov/conserve/mtw/mtwa
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VpYNA
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
4. These BMPs have been added to the Air Quality sections of the Final EIS.

The Division would like to offer the following suggestions on how this project can help us stay in compliance with the NAAQS. More importantly, these strategies are beneficial to the health of citizens of Kentucky.

§ Utilize alternatively fueled equipment.
§ Utilize other emission controls that are applicable to your equipment.
§ Reduce idling time on equipment.

The Division also suggests an investigation into compliance with applicable local government regulations.

This review is based upon the information that was provided by the applicant. An endorsement of this project does not satisfy, or imply, the acceptance or issuance of any permits, certifications or approvals that may be required from this agency under Kentucky Revised Statutes or Kentucky Administrative Regulations. Such endorsement means this agency has found no major concerns from the review of the proposed project as presented other than those stated as conditions or comments.

If you should have any questions, please contact me at (502) 564-2150, ext. 3125.

Sincerely,

Ronald T. Price
State Environmental Review Officer
Kentucky Department for Environmental Protection
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

March 3, 2015

Mr. Charles E. Samuels, Jr.
Director
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Samuels:


As Governor, I have steadfastly supported programs, projects, and initiatives that provide opportunities to grow local economies, and employ hardworking Kentuckians. As noted in the current draft Environmental Impact Statement, this project would not only help to alleviate overcrowding in other Federal penitentiaries, but also create 300 full-time positions, which would have a significant, positive impact on the economy of Letcher County and surrounding counties.

Kentucky has a strong track record of partnership with the Bureau of Prisons, and a workforce that is prepared and eager to meet the needs of employees.

Thank you for giving this project your thoughtful consideration. If you have any questions, please contact Rebecca Byers, Director, Kentucky Washington Office, at (202) 220-1350.

Sincerely,

Steven L. Beshear

CC: The Honorable Eric Holder, U.S. Attorney General
The Honorable Hal Rogers, U.S. Congressman
Jonas Gaston, Site Selection Specialist, Federal Bureau of Prisons
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

March 12, 2014

Isaac Gaston
US Department of Justice
Site Selection Specialist
320 1st Street
Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Gaston,

We write to express our support for the proposed United States Penitentiary and Federal Prison Camp to be located at Payne Gap, Kentucky.

As members of the governing body of Jenkins, Kentucky the nearest municipality to the Payne Gap site our endorsement of Payne Gap should be given weight to any final location decision.

While draft Environmental Impact statement adequately addresses the pros and cons of each site. We would like to address the advantages of the Payne Gap site from an ancillary point of view. We feel we have special insight to these benefits as Payne Gap lies near our City boundary.

We would expect City utility services to be extended to the Prison. Our water and sewer capacity should be more than adequate to meet the Prison needs. We already provide water to the Payne Gap area. Our Police and Fire Department are only a few miles away. Locate likewise benefits our site as it is a mere five miles to the Virginia state line.

While Payne Gap individual categories may suffer in comparison the overall cumulative effect of all factors should tilt the decision in Payne Gap’s favor.

Therefore, we respectfully add our support to the Payne Gap site as the one most suitable for the Prison location.

Yours Truly,

Richard Davis
James Stephens

1
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March 30, 2015

U.S. Department of Justice
Bureau of Prisons
Attn: Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
320 First St., NW
Washington, DC 20534
VIA EMAIL (igaston@bop.gov)

Re: Proposed USP/FPC Letcher County
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Gaston:

Please accept the following comments concerning the environmental impact statement (“EIS”) issued by the Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”) in February 2013.

The Human Rights Defense Center (“HRDC”) is a non-profit organization that advocates on behalf of the human rights of people held in U.S. prisons, jails, detention centers, civil commitment facilities, and other institutions. As an advocate for incarcerated people throughout the United States, HRDC is particularly concerned about the environmental impacts of prisons—both the impacts felt by prisoners themselves, as well as impacts on the “external” social and ecological environment.

As discussed in more detail below, the EIS fails in numerous respects to adequately identify environmental impacts and describe mitigation efforts. The proposed activity cannot proceed unless BOP complies with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”).

The BOP proposes to construct a mixed security facility, housing approximately 1,200 prisoners, in the Eastern Kentucky Coalfields. In the words of Harry Caudill, this is a region that has long suffered from an “economic malaise” due in large part to the fact that it has exported its resources, all of which—timber, coal, and even crops—have had to be wrested violently from the earth. The nation has siphoned off hundreds of millions of dollars’ worth of its resources while returning little of lasting value. For all practical
1. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Bureau has evaluated a reasonable number of alternatives based on the project needs. The National Environmental Policy Act and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) do not identify that a set number of alternatives be evaluated, just that a reasonable number of alternatives are evaluated. CEQ guidance specifically states “What constitutes a reasonable number of alternatives depends on the nature of the proposal and the facts in each case.” The process of alternatives evaluation began during the feasibility study and four alternatives were considered. Based on the outcome of that study it was determined that there were two reasonable alternatives that would meet the requirements of the Bureau and the proposed project. Chapter 2 discusses the alternatives development for the project.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment. The Bureau is responsible for housing inmates sentenced by the federal court system. The Bureau is not the agency responsible for developing sentencing guidelines or alternatives to current sentencing guidelines.

3. Placement of an inmate depends on numerous factors as outlined in the Bureau’s Program Statement 5100.08. Attempting to locate the inmate within the region of origin provides greater opportunity for family to visit.
4. Public involvement for this Final EIS is in full compliance with NEPA requirements. Section 1.7.4 of the Final EIS details public involvement activities that occurred for the project. All comments received at any point during the development of the Draft EIS and Final EIS are part of the project Administrative Record.
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

are temporary, she says, and they can’t transform the economy in a meaningful way. By
taking short term jobs, she claims, Appalachia is harming its community in the long term.
“I think it is helpful to think of prisons construction as a continuation of the industrial
recruitment strategies of the 1990s, where economic development officials looked outside
the region, for some new big thing to come in and fix everything that’s wrong. And just as
industrial recruitment failed to bring the region out of poverty, so will prison recruitment.
It’s a race-to-the-bottom strategy, not based on meeting the needs and cultivating the
skills of a particular community, but rather forcing marginalized communities to compete
for the kinds of industries that no one else wants. And the effects are disastrous."

Some might argue that even if the jobs are temporary, they are a stopper solution that
otherwise wouldn’t exist. Ryerson maintains that the evidence shows the opposite to be
true. “[W]hen looking at studies as well as our neighboring counties, … prisons make
communities poorer,” Appalachia needs a vibrant, diversified and skilled economy.
Prisons discourage those businesses, making Appalachia a less attractive place. “Many
prison host communities have seen increases in drug abuse, domestic violence and
divorce rates following the prisons opening.” Additionally, in a region struggling to keep
its young people at home, she worries about the unspoken message building a prison
sends. “Is this what we want to be telling young people may be their best option if they
want to stay home and have a good paying job?”

Furthermore, prisons create their own very dangerous economy. In order for a prison to
become economically viable, it needs more and more prisoners. “[H]igh incarceration
targets poor people of all colors,” Ryerson says. “The more our economy here in eastern
Kentucky depends on insanely high incarceration rates nationwide, the more people from
here in eastern Kentucky will end up going to prison.”

In an excerpt from another Daily Yonder article, the author provides background on other prison
facilities in the region and the falling economic impacts they continue to have:

It’s been 21 years since the federal prison opened in Clay County, a decade since the
prison opened in Martin County, and nine since opening day at the McCreary prison –
and none of the promises of Dorworth [the federal prison official] have been fulfilled.
Clay, McCreary and Martin remain three of the poorest counties in one of the nation’s
poorest Congressional districts.

Central Appalachia’s experience is not unique. Prisons don’t work as economic
development engines, researchers say. One study analyzed data on every rural county in
the United States, with or without a prison, from 1969-2004. The report concluded “We
find no evidence that prison expansion has stimulated economic growth. In fact we
provide evidence that prison construction has impeded economic growth in rural counties
that have been growing at a slow pace.”

---

11 The Prison Industry: Current Expansion and Employment in U.S. Counties
5. No health and safety impacts are anticipated. Based on review of coal ash sites, none are located in Letcher County near the proposed alternatives (http://content.sierraclub.org/coal/disposal-ash-waste, http://www.epa.gov/osw/nonhaz/industrial/special/fossil/ccrs-fs/).

Additionally no slurry ponds are located within Letcher County (http://www.epa.gov/osw/nonhaz/industrial/special/fossil/surveys2/index.htm)
6. The proposed project is not located near coal mining waste facilities. There are no active coal mines on either of the proposed sites. Studies, including geotechnical, have been conducted to determine extent of excavation and grading activities to remove mine spoil and prepare the site for development.

The proposed facilities would be developed and operated in accordance with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations, including health and safety as well as environmental requirements. No impacts to the health and safety of persons (inmates, staff, visitors, or contractors) is anticipated as a result of the project or past mining activities on the proposed site.
probable environmental consequences of a proposed project. Highlighting positive economic benefits of a proposed prison while utterly ignoring probable health dangers does not satisfy BOP’s statutory duty to analyze and balance environmental impacts, costs, and alternatives in good faith.

Indeed, the EIS is inadequate on its face due to the BOP’s failure and refusal to candidly discuss opposing viewpoints. The “Enhanced Utility Investigation Report” attached as Appendix D to the EIS states that “[the Site Investigation Memo (KCT 2010) recommended that the Payne Gap site be removed from consideration due to ‘significant concerns with its locations, past mining, and excavation.’]” The EIS’s discussion of the Payne Gap site does not contain any disclosure of concerns related to past mining and excavation activity, even though the site investigation memo indicates that such concerns have been directly presented to BOP. Oblique reference to the site investigation memo is not an acceptable substitute for a candid disclosure of risks.

Other potential impacts to incarcerated populations which the EIS should be considering look like the December 2008 dike failure at TVA’s Kingston Fossil Plant, where 5.4 million cubic yards of coal ash cascaded into the Emory and Clinch rivers and smothering about 300 acres of land. The breach released a slow-moving wave of toxic sludge and polluted water into the river in what remains the nation’s largest coal-ash spill in history. Or like the January 2014 chemical spill related to a coal processing facility in West Virginia which resulted in prisoners of a county jail being forced to drink contaminated water long after other area residents in the surrounding region were relieved with clean water deliveries.

Indeed, the existence of the site investigation memo proves that qualified professionals have expressed concern about the dangers posed by former mining activity. BOP has subsequently published the EIS, bluntly ignoring this contrary viewpoint and without providing any hard data or analysis that suggests mining activity will not have a negative impact on the proposed facility. As federal courts have explained, “NEPA requires that the public receive the underlying environmental data from which” government experts derive their opinions. In addition, NEPA requires agencies to directly address potential impacts—although the agency may opine on the...

32 Seattle Audubon Society v. EPA, 986 F.2d 699, 703 (9th Cir. 1993) (quoting Lathrop Concerns, League v. Manna, 1986 F.2d 1508, 1514 (9th Cir. 1983))

33 Colville Cott. (Coordinating Comm’n v. U.S. Atomic Energy Comm’n, 440 F.2d 1189, 1115 (D.C. Cir. 1971)) (“NEPA mandates a particular sort of careful and informed decisionmaking process and creates judicially enforceable duties. . . . [if an agency] decision was reached procedurally without individualized consideration and balancing of environmental factors—conducted fully and in good faith—it is the responsibility of the courts to reverse.”)

34 43 C.F.R. § 1922.21 (“No material may be incorporated into an EIS by reference unless it is reasonably available for inspection by potentially interested persons within the time allowed for comment.”).

35 “5 years after coal ash spill, little has changed,” USA Today, Oct. 22, 2013

36 “The Untold Story of What Happened at an Overlooked West Virginia Jail After The Chemical Spill,” Think Progress, May 23, 2014

37 Idaho Northern Cowboy v. Thomas, 137 F.3d 1146, 1159 (9th Cir. 1998), see also 40 C.F.R. § 1502.24 (agencies must ensure the scientific integrity of the discussions and analysis in a NEPA analysis)
Kentucky's Energy and Environment Cabinet, Department for Environmental Protection, Division of Water is responsible for protecting the public's potable drinking water supply. 401 Kentucky Administrative Regulations (KAR) Chapter 8 outlines the requirements for public water systems. This includes both treatment of water for distribution to the public, as well as, quality assurance procedures. Under 401 KAR Chapter 8, public water supplies are required to submit monthly reports to the Division of Water. If there are violations, recommendations are issued to the community. The Bureau would follow any recommendations regarding treatment of potable water by the Division of Water.

---

7. Kentucky’s Energy and Environment Cabinet, Department for Environmental Protection, Division of Water is responsible for protecting the public’s potable drinking water supply. 401 Kentucky Administrative Regulations (KAR) Chapter 8 outlines the requirements for public water systems. This includes both treatment of water for distribution to the public, as well as, quality assurance procedures. Under 401 KAR Chapter 8, public water supplies are required to submit monthly reports to the Division of Water. If there are violations, recommendations are issued to the community. The Bureau would follow any recommendations regarding treatment of potable water by the Division of Water.
8. The following text has been added to the Final EIS regarding radon:

Radon is naturally occurring, colorless, odorless, radioactive gas produced by the decay of uranium in rock and soil. Radon is a known carcinogen, responsible for increasing the risk of lung cancer when inhaled. Electrically charged radon atoms can attach to indoor air dust particles. Subsequently, these dust particles may be inhaled and adhere to lining in the lungs. The deposited atoms decay by emitting radiation that has the potential to cause cellular damage. Typically, outside air contains very low levels of radon (USEPA 2015), but radon tends to accumulate in enclosed indoor spaces. When present, radon gas would typically concentrate in relatively airtight buildings with little outside air exchange.

Mitigation

Although there are no federal regulations that mandate an acceptable level of radon exposure, the USEPA recommends the voluntary radon action level developed and issued by the American Society for Testing and Materials International (ASTMI), Standard Practice for Installing Radon Mitigation Systems in Existing Low-Rise Residential Buildings, ASTMI E-2121. Radon resistant construction techniques may be used to mitigate potential impacts from radon. In addition, periodic testing of the facility may be conducted to verify that no unacceptable radon gas buildup occurs. Installation of radon mitigation systems may also occur, as appropriate.

9. Environmental Justice guidance (Executive Order 12898) directs federal agencies to address “disproportionately high and adverse” human health or environmental effects of its actions upon minority and low income populations. The Bureau does not concur with the assertion that federal
inmates of mixed backgrounds (as to ethnicity, race, and income) to be housed in the proposed facilities constitute either a minority or low income population for purposes of EO12898. However, even assuming they may, neither “disproportionately high” nor “adverse” human health or environmental effects would result to the inmate population as a result of the proposed project.

Currently, there are no plans for a UNICOR operation at this facility, thus no additional information is available as to the type of operation that might be located there in the future. If UNICOR does operate at this location in the future, all applicable environmental laws and regulations will be adhered to and enforced.

10. Chapters 4 and 5 of the Final EIS discuss the affected environment, environmental consequences, and mitigation if there are impacts. Additionally, Appendix A of the Final EIS includes agency correspondence that describes coordination regarding necessary mitigation.
11. As stated in Sections 4.8 and 5.8 of the Final EIS, LWSD is the service provider for the area in which the proposed alternatives are located. The Bureau would receive potable water from the LWSD; therefore, as described in the Final EIS the capacity of the LWSD is what must be evaluated to determine if they can supply the proposed facility. Mitigation for proposed impacts is discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the Final EIS.

---

63 40 C.F.R. § 1502.20(2); see also id. §§ 1502.14(f) (requiring alternatives sections to include all appropriate mitigation measures), and 1502.16(b) (requiring the environmental consequences section to include a discussion of the means to mitigate adverse environmental impacts).
64 40 C.F.R. § 1503.2(a).
65 ESI, supra, at 10.
66 40 C.F.R. § 4.8.2.2.
67 See supra, text accompanying notes 63 and 64.
68 ESI § 5.9.2.2.
69 Hughes, supra note 43, at 64-66.
12. Permitted capacity is the amount an entity is permitted to use or supply, in this case the provider, LWSD, is permitted to use 4,000,000 gallons of water per day.

13. The Draft EIS stated in Chapters 4 and 5 that a Phase I bat habitat survey had been conducted and was currently under review by USFWS. The Draft EIS further stated that there is summer habitat at both alternative sites and winter habitat at the Payne Gap site. The Draft EIS also stated that coordination would be ongoing with USFWS to determine appropriate mitigation. The Bureau met with USFWS on May 20, 2015 to discuss mitigation. Chapters 4 and 5 have been updated to reflect the additional coordination and Appendix A contains agency coordination efforts.
14. Appropriate coordination with state and federal agencies occurred to determine if other threatened and endangered species had the potential to be affected. Agency coordination efforts are included in Appendix A of the Final EIS.

15. Please see response to comment 13.
16. Chapters 4 and 5 of the Final EIS discuss the affected environment, environmental consequences, and mitigation if there are impacts. Additionally, Appendix A of the Final EIS includes agency correspondence that describes coordination regarding necessary mitigation.

The Draft EIS stated in Chapters 4 and 5 that a Phase I bat habitat survey had been conducted and was currently under review by USFWS. The Draft EIS further stated that there is summer habitat at both alternative sites and winter habitat at the Payne Gap site. The Draft EIS also stated that coordination would be ongoing with USFWS to determine appropriate mitigation. The Bureau met with USFWS on May 20, 2015 to discuss mitigation. Chapters 4 and 5 have been updated to reflect the additional coordination and Appendix A contains agency coordination efforts.

The Final EIS mitigation text for threatened and endangered species has been updated to reflect the additional agency coordination that has occurred and updated mitigation requirements based on this coordination.

The amount paid into the mitigation fund is directly related to the time of year the habitat is removed, per USFWS Indiana Bat guidelines.
17. Records of communication with law enforcement and emergency service providers have been included in Appendix A. The Bureau has coordinated appropriately with these providers to determine what affect the proposed action may have on their ability to provide service.

Prisons do not bring litigation. Assessing related criminal and civil court filings for comparable Bureau facilities is not part of the proposed action.

The Bureau’s Employee Assistance Program (EAP) is a benefit to all full-time employees. This program provides brief counseling, consultation, and referral services to all staff and their immediate family members. These free services can be used to address any variety of work-related or personal concerns. Each facility also has its own Crisis Support Team (CST) which operates at the discretion of the warden, to attend to the needs of staff and their family during a crisis. Crises can include an individual staff member experiencing a family emergency (e.g., sick child, medical emergency, etc.) to opening and operating a Family Support Center for all staff and their families following a natural disaster. Both programs operate with the support of other regional institutions and resources, as well as the BOP’s Central Office. Together, EAP and CST aim to address most of the mental health needs of its staff, and can be accessed 24/7.
18. Currently, there are no plans for a UNICOR operation at this facility, thus no additional information is available as to the type of operation that might be located there in the future. If UNICOR does operate at this location in the future, all applicable environmental laws and regulations will be adhered to and enforced.

The Final EIS addresses environmental justice in accordance with EO 12898 and NEPA. No low-income, minority, or Indian tribes would be disproportionately impacted and no disparate or significant adverse impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action as described in Sections 4.3 and 5.3 of this Final EIS.
19. This is exclusively under legislative and/or election official’s oversight and beyond the Bureau's jurisdiction or control. With regard to potential dilution or other voting impacts, the incarceration of non-voting inmates at the proposed facility, regardless of where they come from, is believed to be a less than significant impact.

20. Cumulative impacts are evaluated for impacts an agency’s proposed action may have on a resource when an impact from the proposed action results. That impact is then compared to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects which may have impacts to that same resource resulting in the agency’s proposed action contributing to a cumulative impact to the resource. If the agency’s proposed action does not impact a resource it will not contribute to a cumulative impact. If an agency’s proposed action does impact a resource then, if there are other projects to compare it to, a cumulative impact assessment is done. Within the area of the proposed alternative locations, little to no development has occurred or is anticipated to occur in the future based on coordination with the Letcher County Planning Commission and the Socioeconomic Development Office. Potential cumulative impacts associated with the Bureau’s proposed action are discussed in Chapter 8.

21. NEPA requires that the EIS evaluate the proposed impacts associated with the proposed action outlined in the EIS. The other facilities were evaluated in separate environmental documents which evaluated the proposed impacts associated with the individual projects.
23. As stated in the EIS, Section 1.5 Purpose and Need, the purpose of the project is to increase capacity and reduce overcrowding. The No Action Alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the proposed action.

24. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

25. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

---
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The BOP wrongly states that the No Action Alternative would leave existing USP's overcrowded and that it is “not considered a viable alternative.” The population numbers presented in the EIS indicate clearly that the BOP will remain over-crowded even if the proposed facility is built. Addressing the issue of over-crowding would be a more time efficient and cost efficient manner to address over-crowding than providing a short-term Band-Aid solution by building this facility in a location that has suffered long-term environmental degradation and which should not have to contend with a prison at a time when ecological and economic health is a regional priority.

The BOP should not only be considering No Action as a viable option, but as the preferred option for this site, based on the BOP’s research that has been presented in the EIS, and based on the questions presented in this comment which remain unanswered.

Finally, for the reasons stated herein, the EIS does not contain a detailed discussion of environmental impacts as required by law, and therefore the proposed alternatives of this project cannot proceed until BOP issues an environmental impact statement that complies with applicable law.

If you have questions or require additional information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Paul Wright, Executive Director, HRDC
(561) 360-2523

The HRDC submits this comment, along with the support of the individuals and organizations listed below:

Kentuckians For The Commonwealth
Dana Beatty Brown, chairperson
280 Plaza Drive, Suite 4
Lexington, KY 40503
(859) 276-0563

Abolitionist Law Center
P.O. Box 9654
Pittsburgh, PA 15221
(412) 634-9070
abolitionistlawcenter.org

Center for Biological Diversity
Lori Ann Burd, Environmental Health Director
Portland, OR
(503) 517-6405
laburd@biologicaldiversity.org
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Virginia Organizing
Sandra A. Cook, Chairperson
707 Concord Avenue
Charlottesville, VA 22903-5208
(434) 984-4635 ext. 222

Architects / Designers / Planners for Social Responsibility
Rephed Sperry, President
(415) 519-7027
sperry@alpsca.org

Global Justice Ecology Project
Anne Petersen, Executive Director
Buffalo, NY
(716) 551-5833
anne@globaljusticeecology.org

Stories from South Central WV
Chris Gang
chrisgang@gmail.com
301-214-0834

Radical Action for Mountain Peoples’ Survival (RAMPS)
Kim Ellis
PO Box 121,
Rock Creek, WV 25174
info@rampscomposition.org
304-854-9556

Prison Books Collective
Chapel Hill, NC
(919) 433-0236
prisonbooks@gmail.com

Working Narratives
1512 Orange Street
Wilmington, NC 28401

Individual Signers
Preston Ehrud, Ph.D.
Professor and Division Chair
Undergraduate Studies
School of Justice Studies
Eastern Kentucky University
Richmond, KY 40475 USA
(859) 622-1163
Bill McClaranah
Louisville, KY, USA
wmmcl@exo.ac.uk

Victoria E. Collins, PhD
Co-Director, International State Crime Research Center
Assistant Professor
School of Justice Studies
Eastern Kentucky University
Richmond, KY 40475
Victoria.Collins@eku.edu

Judah Schept, PhD
Assistant Professor
School of Justice Studies
Eastern Kentucky University
Judah.schept@eku.edu

Jordan E. Mazurek
3401 Gatewood Ct, Apt 56
Lexington, KY 40517
Eastern Kentucky University
Criminal Justice, MSc (2016)
(617) 944-0966
j.e.mazurek2@gmail.com

Dan Berger, PhD
School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
University of Washington Bothell
dberger@uw.edu

Stephen Raher
Portland, OR
stephen.rahers@gmail.com

Patagionti Tsoukias
HRDC’s Prison Ecology Project,
Lake Worth, FL
(561) 360-2323
ptso@prisonlegalnews.org
Hello,
My name is Quentin Savage and I am writing on behalf of the organization, Bereans for Michael Brown in Berea. KY. We would like to express our discontent with the Bureau of Prisons' decision to build a prison in Letcher County by signing onto your circulating letter. We feel that the Prison Industrial Complex is an unwelcome blemish on the vision we have of relations with our loved ones and neighbors.

In solidarity,
Bereans for Michael Brown, Berea KY

1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

March 12, 2015

Charles E. Samuels, Jr., Director
Federal Bureau of Prison
320 First St., NW
Washington, DC 20534

Re: U.S. Penitentiary Letcher County

Dear Sir,

I fully support the location and construction of a federal prison in Letcher County, Kentucky. I believe that the prison will benefit both the Bureau of Prisons and Letcher County. It will be a wonderful partnership. For the Bureau, it will relieve overcrowding in the system and provide a facility that is centrally located for most of the eastern United States. It will provide a ready workforce and enjoy strong support from the area citizens, public and state officials. It will provide a wonderful place to live for the prison's staff, conveniently located from large population centers, low crime rate, good elementary and post elementary schools, great health facilities and a wholesome, family atmosphere.

For Letcher County it will create up to 450 permanent jobs, sixty percent or more which will be filled by our residents of Letcher and surrounding counties. Of the remaining jobs, many will be filled by our citizens who have grown up here but now work in the BOP system in other locations, waiting for the opportunity to come home. But that is just the start. Construction is estimated to cost from 300 to 400 million dollars and will take place over three years. That is construction jobs for our people. That is millions of dollars that will be poured into our economy for housing, food, services and retail sales. It will give our economy a much needed boost, help to support existing businesses and provide a fertile environment for new businesses to locate. Once construction is completed, the effects will continue with the actual staffing and operations of the prison.

It will give our unemployed miners opportunities for employment both directly and indirectly, it will give our children a goal to focus on and encourage them to complete their education. It will give us in the older generation the satisfaction of keeping our children close with good paying jobs and our grandchildren where we can see them on a regular basis and be part of their everyday life as they grow up.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

I see this as a win win situation where the Bureau of Prison, its employees, Letcher County and its citizens can work together to be mutually beneficial to all concerned. I urge you to take all the steps necessary to make U.S. Penitentiary Letcher County a reality as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

L.M. (Mike) Caudill, CEO
Mountain Comprehensive Health Corporation
PO Box 40
226 Medical Plaza Lane
Whitesburg, KY 41858
(606) 633-4823 (V)
(606) 633-1874 (F)
lmcaudill@mtncomp.org
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The preferred alternative for the proposed action has been identified in Chapter 2, Section 2.6-Preferred Alternative of the Final EIS. At this time there is no information regarding construction schedule.
March 17, 2015

Thomas A. Webster
Chief, U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
320 First Street, NW
Washington, DC 20534

Re: Federal Correction Facility, Letcher County, Kentucky

Dear Chief Webster:

On January 7, 2014, President Barack Obama announced that Kentucky Highlands in partnership with eight Southeastern Kentucky Counties would be the first and only rural Promise Zone in the nation. These entities are working together in a collaborative and comprehensive process to improve the overall quality of life in the region.

The Federal Bureau of Prisons is evaluating sites in Letcher County, Kentucky for a Correction Facility. This county is one of the eight forming the Promise Zone. The Correction Facility project fits into our strategic vision, "The people and organizations of the Promise Zone will mobilize their human, natural, cultural, historic and economic assets to design communities where: A, a competitively trained workforce that can find meaningful work which provides wages and benefits capable of supporting a family." And, more specifically, into our Goal Number Three, "Seek competitive advantages based on natural, built, economic and human capital by coordinating the diversification of the economic base of the region."

The Promise Zone designation can leverage the economic impact of the Correction Facility. The designation comes with prioritization on certain federal grants, free technical support and possibly future tax credits. With these tools, entrepreneurs can provide the auxiliary and support services necessary to support the Correction Facility, as well as, any relocating personnel.

But we understand that this project is unfunded. It is our strongest desire that Bureau added the Promise Zone designation to its list to justify this facility in this location. The Kentucky Highlands Promise Zone is pleased to offer our support to this project. We stand ready to assist you through these final hurdles.

Sincerely,

Jerry Rekett
President/CEO
Kentucky Highlands Investment Corporation
And Lead Entity of the
Kentucky Highlands Promise Zone

Cc: Tom Farm, Kentucky’s USDA Rural Development Director

1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS.
Public Scoping Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

The Federal Bureau of Prisons is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed acquisition of property and construction of a new federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky. Please record your comments on this form and submit it by:

☐ Dropping this form in the comment box at the public scoping meeting
☐ Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Weber, Chief, or
   Isaac C.aston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534

Please Note: Written comments become part of the administrative record associated with this proposed action. Individual citizens may request that their name and/or home address be withheld from public disclosure, which will be honored to the extent allowable by law. If you wish to have your name and/or home address withheld, you must check the box(es) below. Please note that contact information for individuals or offices representing organizations and businesses may be disclosed.

☐ Please withhold my name from public disclosure to the extent allowable by law.
☐ Please withhold my address from public disclosure to the extent allowable by law.

If you wish to receive a copy of the Final EIS please check the box below:

☐ Please add my name to the mailing list and send me a CD containing an electronic copy of the Final EIS.

Please provide comments no later than March 30, 2015 to ensure they are considered in the Final EIS.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND LEGIBLY

Name: [Handwritten]
Organization/Affiliation: [Handwritten]
Address: [Handwritten]
City, State, Zip Code: [Handwritten]

Comments: [Handwritten]

[Signature]
Date: 3/12/2015

1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
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Public Scoping Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

The Federal Bureau of Prisons is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed acquisition of property and construction of a new federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky. Please record your comments on this form and submit it by:

1. Dropping this form in the comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
   Issac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534

Please Note: Written comments become part of the administrative record associated with this proposed action. Individuals may request that their name and/or home address be withheld from public disclosure, which will be honored to the extent allowable by law. If you wish to have your name and/or home address withheld, you must check the box(es) below. Please note that contact information for individuals or officials representing organizations and businesses may be disclosed.

☐ Please withhold my name from public disclosure to the extent allowable by law.
☐ Please withhold my address from public disclosure to the extent allowable by law.

If you wish to receive a copy of the Final EIS please check the box below:
☐ Please add my name to the mailing list and send me a CD containing an electronic copy of the Final EIS.

Please provide comments no later than March 30, 2015 to ensure they are considered in the Final EIS.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND LEGIBLY

Name: ___________________________ Date: 3-12-15
Organization/Affiliation: Letcher County Schools
Address: _______________________
City, State, Zip Code: __________________________

Comments: I would like to recommend that the proposed site of Payne Gap be chosen because I feel this site is more accessible.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
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1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

[Comment Form]

Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting: 12 March 2015

Public Scoping Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

The Federal Bureau of Prisons is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed acquisition of property and construction of a new federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky. Please record your comments on this form and submit it by:

1. Dropping this form in the comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   325 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534

Please Note: Written comments become part of the administrative record associated with this proposed action. Individual citizens may request that their name and/or home address be withheld from public disclosure, which will be honored to the extent allowable by law. If you wish to have your name and/or home address withheld, you must check the box(es) below. Please note that contact information for individuals or officials representing organizations and businesses may be disclosed.

☐ Please withhold my name from public disclosure to the extent allowable by law.
☐ Please withhold my address from public disclosure to the extent allowable by law.

If you wish to receive a copy of the Final EIS please check the box below:
☐ Please add my name to the mailing list and send me a CD containing an electronic copy of the Final EIS.

Please provide comments no later than March 30, 2015 to ensure they are considered in the Final EIS.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND LEGIBLY

Name: 
Organization/Affiliation: 
Address: 
P.O. Box 402
City, State, Zip Code: 
Comments: 

1. I would like to see the prison go to the Kingsford site. I know we would provide jobs and be an asset to the area.
2. I believe the prison would be a benefit to the area.
3. Please consider us in your final selection.

Thank you.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for your participation.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
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1. The Bureau thanks you for your participation.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for your participation.
The Bureau thanks you for your participation.
The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for your participation.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
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1. The Bureau thanks you for your participation.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015

Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

It would also greatly boost our economy to bring jobs to our area.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting.

2. Mailing your comment form to:
   
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 36, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
   Issac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534

Appendix E
E-152
July 2015
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

New atmosphere Eastern University has agreed to allow Criminal Justice Students to achieve a Bachelor's Degree at Southeast Community College and are in talks to allow a Master's degree there. This is the perfect combination for our future generations to change the trajectory of their lives. To bring a future and a hope to our children. The construction jobs would allow financial independence for a lot of the area and also offer a career path that has few hurdles. The area is hard working and we believe our men and women in this area have a solid foundation to support themselves and their families. Thank you for the consideration with this opportunity our community could produce a whole new generation of law enforcement in many different fields.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webb, Chief of
   Isaac Gallow, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   330 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr./Ms. Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
320 First Street, NW
Washington, DC 20534

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:

Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
320 First Street, NW
Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau appreciates your participation and would meet with families to discuss the potential acquisition of properties.
2. The Bureau appreciates your participation and would meet with families to discuss the potential acquisition of properties.

3. The Bureau would not impact cemeteries.

4. Property that is acquired by the Bureau for the facility becomes the Bureau’s property and for safety and security reasons the public cannot have access to the property.

5. Figure 2-3 depicts the distance between the proposed facility and nearby residences.

6. The Bureau would not impact or relocate cemeteries.

7. The Bureau appreciates your participation and would meet with families to discuss the potential acquisition of properties.
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Public Scoping Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

The Federal Bureau of Prisons is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed acquisition of property and construction of a new federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky. Please record your comments on this form and submit it by:

1. Dropping this form in the comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Weber, Chief
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534

Please Note: Written comments become part of the administrative record associated with this proposed action. Individual citizens may request that their name and/or home address be withheld from public disclosure, which will be honored to the extent allowable by law. If you wish to have your name and/or home address withheld, you must check the box(es) below. Please note that contact information for individuals or officials representing organizations and businesses may be disclosed:

☐ Please withhold my name from public disclosure to the extent allowable by law.
☐ Please withhold my address from public disclosure to the extent allowable by law.

If you wish to receive a copy of the Final EIS please check the box below:

☐ Please add my name to the mailing list and send me a CD containing an electronic copy of the Final EIS.

Please provide comments no later than March 30, 2015 to ensure they are considered in the Final EIS.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND LEGIBLY

Name: ________ Date: 3/12/15
Organization/Affiliation: __________
Address: __________
City, State, Zip Code: White Sulphur Springs, KY 41858
Comments: __________________________

(Use reverse side for more space)
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

The county does not have a very bright future economically if we don’t have a breakthrough with some type of economic boost. I direct a Community Center that is trying to establish a Community Theater. If your people have any resources to direct us to, we would greatly appreciate that. In my opinion, a live theater would be an asset to your program should you desire to locate here. My contact info is on the front page.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

As a current employee of the BOP I know that bringing a Federal Prison to Letcher, Ky will benefit the community in many ways. It will provide many people with new careers with great benefits & bring many new members to the community which will in turn provide local businesses with more income.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

4. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

Comments:

Due to the current lack of available employment opportunities in Letcher County, we would welcome the jobs provided by a federal prison. I think the most appropriate site for the prison would be the

[Use reverse side for more space]
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Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

Roxana Location

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

Guided to improve the C&I economy, the both locations chosen are very good ones. Please take Letcher County into consideration.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 35, 2015 by:

1. Filing out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   330 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Building this prison will bring big opportunities for this community. With coal mining going away there are many people out of work. People struggle this day and time because the lack of jobs in this small community. This prison will give our longer population a chance at becoming an successful human being. There always going to be struggles in this place and change of this place but providing jobs this prison will help put all the other local police departments, hospitals, schools etc. because they will have contracts with the prison. The schools will have a higher attendance etc. because of people moving to this community for this job. Overall I think building this prison will be a great opportunity for people to get jobs and be successful in life. I support building this prison 100%! 

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
   Isaac Canton, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
I don't have a preference where it is built in the country. I feel that whatever location is best for the project to be a success in the important things. I will be going out of rapidly and the many jobs that would greatly help the local and regional economy. I feel that most people will support the project if they are willing to work with whoever it is necessary to make this project succeed.

Thank you for considering Letcher County for this project.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

- Filling out this form and dropping it in the comment box at the public scoping meeting
- Mailing your comment form to:
  - Thomas A. Walloe, Chief
  - Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
  - U.S. Department of Justice
  - Federal Bureau of Prisons
  - Site Planning and Construction Branch
  - 100 First Street, N.W.
  - Washington, DC 20530

E-178 July 2015
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. Owners of land acquired by the Federal Government are entitled under federal law to “just compensation” which generally means the Fair Market Value (FMV) of the property. The FMV of each property acquired would be determined by an appraisal conducted pursuant to federal law and in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions (2000 edition). To the extent a property to be acquired contains commercial timber, the appraisal/FMV determination would typically include the timber value as a component of the entire property value. Should timber be removed/harvested by a landowner prior to acquisition, the resulting appraised value/FMV would generally be reduced to reflect the recent timber removal/harvest. Surrounding landowners, as well as owners of land acquired by the Federal Government, are generally not entitled to consequential damages or damages for any contingent or potential future damages.
3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webster, Chief
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

I am from this construction. I personally want this prison at Royana because I have, family members in the area who desperately need jobs. The Royana area has always been dependent on the coal industry for a long time. With the prison at Royana, more diverse opportunities would be available for people who are or would be laid off from the coal industry. And that would be one more alternative job. Then the coal industry, people in Royana are hard working and reliable, which ensures security in not only economics but ethics as well. If the Bureau decides to construct a prison, please put Royana into consideration.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief
   Issac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

would also provide more jobs to Letcher County. It would also create more economic lift to Letcher County.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
So many of our residents having to leave for jobs elsewhere.

Brenda Blair

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. Traffic impact studies were conducted for both sites. Chapter 5, Section 5.5 in the Final EIS discusses traffic and roadway conditions, potential impacts, and proposed mitigation.
3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Very hard for unreasonable situations on the coal business. Our people are very proud and working individuals. It is a very prideful change that workers from this region are benefiting.

Secondly, I think this is great work for more prison reform. It would seem to be escalating at the alarming rate. I feel more facilities are needed to spread more

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   300 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

[Handwritten note]
Project on the Community if necessary but in the job market are clearly evident. I believe our community will be proud to have such a facility.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 31, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

4. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief
   Isaac Gaffney, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

We have very good hard-working individuals in this area. This would provide the opportunity for our children not to have to move out of the area for employment.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   329 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

Site all the field will go into an area of this county. We need a decision soon.

Thank you.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Wattee, Chief
   Issac Gaia, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

Just the future teaching of kids.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:
1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
   Isaac Gleston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
   Isaac Gesto, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Our community needs this more now than ever. I am blessed to live in Letcher County Ky one day I hope to become an employee. Thank you and God Bless.

Melinda Watt

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. Section 4.8 of the Final EIS discusses infrastructure and utilities including solid waste. As described in the Final EIS, the county would pick up solid waste from the facility. The Bureau would pay the rate assessed by the county for disposal of their solid waste.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

See our residents have the opportunity
to gain employment in our home county. As a teacher, I see this as
an opportunity for our district to prosper both
financially and in growth. I have no
complaints with either location. I look forward
to economic growth in our community.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:
1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
   Isaac Carlson, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   820 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
The Bureau would not impact cemeteries.

The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

4. The Bureau thanks you for your participation and has noted your comment.

5. The career opportunities brochure has been forwarded to your address since there is no address provided for your mother.

---

**Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:**

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting

2. Mailing your comment form to:
   - Thomas A. Webber, Chief
   - Issue/Gestion, Site Selection Specialist
   - U.S. Department of Justice
   - Federal Bureau of Prisons
   - Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   - 330 First Street, NW
   - Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

4. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

5. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

6. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

7. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

8. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in a comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief
   Issac Grier, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

4. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

---

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   330 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
but there would be extensive excavation and
may displace some of the forest animals.
I look forward to the many new jobs this may
bring no matter which location that is chosen.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Making your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief
   Issac Gartho, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
Public Scoping Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

The Federal Bureau of Prisons is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed acquisition of property and construction of a new federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky. Please record your comments on this form and submit it by:

- Dropping this form in the comment box at the public scoping meeting
- Mailing your comment form to:
  
  Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
  Issac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
  U.S. Department of Justice
  Federal Bureau of Prisons
  Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
  330 First Street, NW
  Washington, DC 20534

Please Note: Written comments become part of the administrative record associated with this proposed action. Individual citizens may request that their name and/or home address be withheld from public disclosure, which will be honored to the extent allowable by law. If you wish to have your name and/or home address withheld, you must check the box(es) below. Please note that contact information for individuals or officials representing organizations and businesses may be disclosed.

☐ Please withhold my name from public disclosure to the extent allowable by law.
☐ Please withhold my address from public disclosure to the extent allowable by law.

If you wish to receive a copy of the Final EIS please check the box below:
☐ Please add my name to the mailing list and send me a CD containing an electronic copy of the Final EIS.

Please provide comments no later than March 30, 2015 to ensure they are considered in the Final EIS.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND LEGIBLY

Name:  
Organization/Affiliation: Letcher Co. Schools (West Whitesburg)
Address:  
City, State, Zip Code:  
Comments: I think that putting a Federal prison in Letcher County would be an excellent improvement for our community. Either site that is finally chosen will be

(Use reverse side for more space)

1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

Perfect we need the employment opportunities. It would also bring more money to our county economically.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

- Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
- Mailing your comment form to:
  Thomas A. Webber, Chief of
  Isaac Gaskin, Site Selection Specialist
  U.S. Department of Justice
  Federal Bureau of Prisons
  Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
  329 First Street, NW
  Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

Public Scoping Comment Form

The Federal Bureau of Prisons is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed acquisition of property and construction of a new federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky. Please record your comments on this form and submit it by:

1. Dropping this form in the comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Wolbar, Chief
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534

Please Note: Written comments become part of the administrative record associated with this proposed action. Individual citizens may request that their name and/or home address be withheld from public disclosure, which will be honored to the extent allowable by law. If you wish to have your name and/or home address withheld, you must check the box(es) below. Please note that contact information for individuals or officials representing organizations and businesses may be disclosed.

☐ Please withhold my name from public disclosure to the extent allowable by law.
☐ Please withhold my address from public disclosure to the extent allowable by law.

If you wish to receive a copy of the Final EIS please check the box below:

☐ Please add my name to the mailing list and send me a CD containing an electronic copy of the Final EIS

Please provide comments no later than March 30, 2015 to ensure they are considered in the Final EIS.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND LEGIBLY

Name: Regina Brown
Organization/Affiliation: Letcher County Public Schools
Address: 3350 1st St
City, State, Zip Code: Whitesburg, KY 41831
Comments: [Handwritten text]

(See reverse side for more space)
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief
   Isaac Gaston, Elite Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

Appendix E

1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

Hopefully in our county. We do not want to be a ghost town. Our people want to stay in our community. We would like a God send. For our young people and all in our area. Hopefully having the prison will help in the capacity for construction of new housing. We hate to see restaurants, businesses of any kind and help the businesses that are already here.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Wacker, Chief of
   Issac Gaskin, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

### Public Scoping Comment Form

**Federal Bureau of Prisons Environmental Impact Statement**

The Federal Bureau of Prisons is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed acquisition of property and construction of a new federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky. Please record your comments on this form and submit it by:

1. Dropping this form in the comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534

Please Note: Written comments become part of the administrative record associated with this proposed action. Individual citizens may request that their name and/or home address be withheld from public disclosure, which will be honored to the extent allowable by law. If you wish to have your name and/or home address withheld, you must check the box(es) below. Please note that contact information for individuals or officials representing organizations and businesses may be disclosed.

☐ Please withhold my name from public disclosure to the extent allowable by law.
☐ Please withhold my address from public disclosure to the extent allowable by law.

If you wish to receive a copy of the Final EIS please check the box below:

☐ Please add my name to the mailing list and send me a CD containing an electronic copy of the Final EIS.

Please provide comments no later than March 30, 2015 to ensure they are considered in the Final EIS.

**PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND LEGIBLY**

Name:  
Organization/Affiliation:  
Address:  
City, State, Zip Code:  

Comments:  

(Use reverse side for more space)
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

[Handwritten text]

easy access to other major roads that lead to Washington, like the (a growing city) with a university and renowned medical facilities, and dining and shopping in both Pikeville and communities just across the Virginia border. In addition, the Jenkins-Hopkins Gap area has many dispersed coal miners and other workers affected by the coal-related economic downturn who would constitute a readily available workforce.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webster, Chief
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534

Appendix E
E-240
July 2015
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Either site would be a great impact for the economically status of our county. The future of our youth depends on the impact this could have in our area.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:
1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting.
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

for security and sustaınment of the area economy Letcher County has always been my home and I hope she will share the same dream of staying home and working a difference in the Letcher County community of the option Roxana appears to be an ideal location and offers the best opportunity for an economic push for the area. As a teacher and coach I pray this region finds consistent income and an opportunity. I realize there is no immediate fix but I whole heartedly believe the prison will in sustaining our area for years to come and pledge my full support. Luminity thank and appreciate the Federal Bureau of Prisons for considering the Letcher County Area GOD BLESS.”

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Making your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Weber, Chief or
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
4. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
5. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 38, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief or
   Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015
Public Meeting Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

PROPOSED PRISON IN LETCHER COUNTY. THIS
PROJECT WILL BE THE GREATEST THING TO COME
SOME TIME IN THE FUTURE, FOLKS, YOU'LL BE
THANKFUL FOR THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR WHICH THE PRISON
OFFERS. IT WILL BRING JOBS AND
INCOME TO THE COMMUNITY.

With Smith

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by:

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in the comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Webber, Chief
   Isaac Carter, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534
The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Federal Bureau of Prisons Public Meeting 12 March 2015

Public Scoping Comment Form
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Environmental Impact Statement

The Federal Bureau of Prisons is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed acquisition of an existing property and construction of a new federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky. Please record your comments on this form and submit it by:

1. Dropping this form in the comment box at the public scoping meeting
2. Mailing your comment form to:
   Thomas A. Yeboah, Chief
   Isaac Gantos, Site Selection Specialist
   U.S. Department of Justice
   Federal Bureau of Prisons
   Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   320 First Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20534

Please Note: Written comments become part of the administrative record associated with this proposed action. Individual citizens may request that their name and/or home address be withheld from public disclosure, which will be honored to the extent allowable by law. If you wish to have your name and/or home address withheld, you must check the box(es) below. Please note that contact information for individuals or officials representing organizations and businesses may be disclosed.

- Please withhold my name from public disclosure to the extent allowable by law.
- Please withhold my address from public disclosure to the extent allowable by law.

If you wish to receive a copy of the Final EIS please check the box below:

- Please add my name to the mailing list and send me a CD containing an electronic copy of the Final EIS.

Please provide comments no later than March 30, 2015 to ensure they are considered in the Final EIS.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND LEGIBLY
Name:
Organization/Affiliation:
Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Comments:

[Use reverse side for more space]

Date: 3/13/2015
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. Owners of land acquired by the Federal Government are entitled under federal law to “just compensation” which generally means the Fair Market Value (FMV) of the property. The FMV of each property acquired would be determined by an appraisal conducted pursuant to federal law and in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions (2000 edition). To the extent a property to be acquired contains commercial timber, the appraisal/FMV determination would typically include the timber value as a component of the entire property value. Should timber be removed/harvested by a landowner prior to acquisition, the resulting appraised value/FMV would generally be reduced to reflect the recent timber removal/harvest. Surrounding landowners, as well as owners of land acquired by the Federal Government, are generally not entitled to consequential damages or damages for any contingent or potential future damages.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

---

Hello,

I met with you at the open house meeting in Whitesburg, KY 3/12/15.

I do commercial construction and am currently working in Austin, TX.

If you choose to build at the Roxana location I am well situated to build housing for construction workers. I have a 38 year history in the construction business, and own several hundred acres in that area.

Also remember the "Promise Zones" the president Obama set up for eastern Kentucky, would you not consider this a shovel ready project.

Please remember the Roxana area.

Thank You,

Addie Raleigh

Sent from Windows Mail

---

1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

---

Thank you,

Amelia Kirby

Whitesburg, KY

---

Amelia Kirby
606-821-5134
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment. Section 1.7.4 of the FINAL EIS has been revised to reflect that many comments were received, the majority of which were in support of the project; however, all comments, positive and negative that have been submitted have been noted and will be considered by the Bureau in connection with issuance of a Record of Decision regarding the proposed action.

Comment

Federal Bureau of Prisons
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Elizabeth Sanders
PO Box 495
Whitesburg, KY 41858

Here are a few things I believe need to be addressed:

Misrepresentation in Draft EIS of support for prison

The Draft EIS claims that all comments received during the scoping period were in support of the project. This is false. Saying otherwise is a huge disservice to the BOP and our community. Records should accurately reflect what actually happened and, at present, that is not the case. It is also troubling to me that, since any perceived negative comments or questions appear to have been cast aside, concerns raised in my own and other comments may not have been given adequate attention and/or serious thought.

Prison staff
2. The Employee Assistance Program (EAP) is a benefit to all full-time employees. This program provides brief counseling, consultation, and referral services to all staff and their immediate family members. These free services can be used to address any variety of work-related or personal concerns. Each facility also has its own Crisis Support Team (CST), which operates at the discretion of the warden, to attend to the needs of staff and their family during a crisis. Crises can include anything as small as an individual staff member experiencing a family emergency (e.g., sick child, medical emergency, etc.) to something as large as opening and operating a Family Support Center for all staff and their families following a natural disaster. Both programs operate with the support of other regional institutions and resources, as well as the BOP’s Central Office. Together, EAP and CST aim to address most of the mental health needs of its staff, and can be accessed 24/7.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment. The Bureau is not the agency responsible for sentencing guidelines nor does it participate in the sentencing of convicted felons. The Bureau’s responsibility is for housing those inmates sentenced within the federal court system.

No health and safety impacts are anticipated.

The Bureau provides healthcare services within their institutions. Under the Proposed Action, the Bureau would employ healthcare staff to meet the medical, dental and mental healthcare needs of inmates. In the event of a medical emergency that cannot be accommodated at the facility, coordination with local health care officials indicates that emergency treatment of an inmate can be accommodated by the local hospitals with no impact to the local healthcare system, as described in Chapter 4, Section 4.4.2.3 of the FINAL EIS.

4. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Mr. Isaac Gaston:

Dear Mr. Gaston, I am responding to the draft environmental study that has been done in Letcher Co.

A great job has been done in providing information to the public concerning the proposed prison.

I wish to add my approval to all that has taken place and hope that our county will be approved for a federal prison.

The amount of employment for construction plus the long term jobs that will be established will be a definite need to this area.

Thanks again for providing the information, and my concerns are for the future of this county.

Sincerely,

James A. Craft
75 Hale Dr.
Whitesburg, KY 41858-7727

1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

Lisa Narramore
26 Pine Street
Jenks, KY 41537
lara109@gmail.com
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Mr. Tim Webber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

James Fields
966 Toddby Br.
Hollie Ky. 41821

Letcher County & Eastern Ky need this job producing entity. We have the structure in place we are available to support the facility.

1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau is not the agency responsible for sentencing guidelines nor does it participate in the sentencing of convicted felons. The Bureau's responsibility is for housing those inmates sentenced within the federal court system.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

4. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

5. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

Dear Mr. Isaac,

We are not local to speculate that the jobs a federal prison would bring to Letcher County, KY are sorely needed.

The problem is, though, the federal correctional system is going in the wrong direction. State offices is reducing its prison population due to financial concerns, but the Feds keep expanding theirs. There are hundreds of federal crimes which exist solely to consume our tax dollars to prosecute them. Terrorism, or the threatening of federal officials, of course, should be a federal crime. But the vast majority of the rest are things which should be handled by the states and could be under our "federalist" political system, which is not "unitary" like they have in England.

As well, the chance that the "major players" who find themselves in a USP were running, can be expected to migrate to the communities surrounding them in their new home, to be brought in by guards or local citizen. The point of the BOP initiative was supposed to be to bring in economic opportunities - Besides building new prisons.

We are facilitators for a grassroots prison reform group, CARE-KY, and we urge you to tell the BOP that we don't want a new prison built there in KY! Sincerely, Carol Bruce Green
Carol and Louise Brown
Cori-KY
P.O. Box 221481
Louisville, KY 40222-1481

Mr. Isaac Branton, Site Selection Expert
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

2015
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

My name is Ann Hall. I live at 425 Sackett Loop, Whitesburg 41858. I think the location at Roxana would be preferable of the two. I think all of the inside and the exterior should be painted pink. There's a psychological reason for this because there's less violence. It has a calming, neutering affect I have been told. Sounds agreeable to me. Plus pink uniforms. Who can get into a macho fight if you are wearing pink?
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The stream impacts in Chapters 4 and 5 of the FINAL EIS are correct. The summary table in the Executive Summary reflected inaccurate numbers. These numbers have been revised to correspond to the numbers in Chapters 4 and 5. Engineering design for the proposed facility will require the development of stormwater management to manage stormwater on-site and minimize potential impacts. Stormwater runoff may have on nearby streams. Additionally, measures would be taken to keep as much of the forested area associated with the sites and the Bureau would evaluate re-vegetation of areas post-construction to reduce runoff, erosion, and sedimentation.
I can tell you about another area approximately 3 miles North of Jenkins, Kentucky that has been mined and reclaimed by Premier Elkorn Coal Company, located directly off of US Route 23, already has a good road to it that tractor and trailer coal trucks traveled during mining. Power is already available on the site, and the acreage is approximately 1,800 acres surface area permitted by the coal company. Most of it has had full bond release. This job won a reclamation award from the Division of Mining Reclamation and Enforcement. This site would require minimal grade work to be ready for construction. There has been some underground mining conducted but it was at such a lower elevation I don't think it would affect construction. This appears to be a more economical site than the two sites currently being considered. It is sparsely populated. If interested, I can provide you access to the site and any maps needed. Enclosed are Google Earth photos of the site.

In closing, I know my voice has no bearing on your decision and Leonard Lawson is a powerful political man that more than likely will be able to pull the necessary strings to get the prison built on his property. He bought his property from a local resident and has no sentimental value associated with it. On the other hand don't want to lose my property and would like to be able to hand it down for generations to come. I also am greatly concerned about the increased flooding potential that would directly affect me and my family. Your attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Charles Holbrook, Jr.
7541 HWY 115 North
Jenkins, KY 41537
(606) 821-6890

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment. The site described in your comment was not offered to the Bureau by the property owner.

4. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

The Bureau has identified the Preferred Alternative in Section 2.6 of the FINAL EIS.
Certain toys located in Letcher County. The only question was, where in Letcher County. Now it seems the location protocols to be decided, and maybe another one will be chosen. Hopefully this is not true. People in Letcher County will be assured they have been used by the EPA just for the purpose of maintaining the security at the taxpayers expense for the last several years of a cost of millions of dollars for environmental studies. We were assured by our Congressman Hal Rogers it would be located in Letcher County with different locations in “Letcher County” to be considered. I am a true proponent for environmental regulations, but it has gotten so far to the extreme as to bring more harm than good to the country. This is especially true for the coal mining industry which has played a huge part in the success of our United States. I do agree with some of the changes the EPA has made, but now it seems no other industry is being so hardly punished just for being in existence. It appears we will lose another industry to China who is the biggest polluting country in the world, it’s hard to find any product in the US that’s not made in China, and it’s no cheaper than what we used to purchase in the US. Our Country is being destroyed from within if this continues. This is my sincere opinion, I love my country, I am truly concerned.

Thank you for your comments. Please submit comments no later than March 30, 2015 by;

1. Filling out this form and dropping it in comment box at the public hearing meeting.
2. Making your comment form to:
   - Thomas A. Webster, Chief
   - Lisa Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
   - U.S. Department of Justice
   - Federal Bureau of Prisons
   - Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
   - 300 First Street, NW
   - Washington, DC 20534

Sincerely,

Maura Ubinging (former resident of Letcher Co. KY)
My name is Maura Ubinger, and I have reviewed a copy of the comment that is being submitted by the Human Rights Defense Center. I agree with the entirety of the Human Rights Defense Center's comments and urge you to take them into careful consideration. In particular please heed the section discussing the lack of alternatives explored by the BOP. Much has been in the public eye recently of the work being done to rethink mandatory minimum sentencing and other factors to greatly reduce prison population and some of the proposed suggestions are well underway. So, it seems that that's the way to greatly, and soon reduce the national prison overcrowding.

I also feel that extending the comment period will allow for more public input on the proposal, and ask that you do so in order to invite more people to engage in this important issue that effects the entire US.

Thank you for taking the time to study the comments submitted in regards to this matter.

Sincerely,

Maura Ubinger (former resident of Letcher Co. KY)
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

---

March 30, 2015

U.S. Department of Justice

Bureau of Prisons

Attn: Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist

320 First St., NW

Washington, DC 20534

VIA EMAIL

Re: Proposed USP/FPC Letcher County

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Gaston:

Please accept the following comments concerning the environmental impact statement ("EIS") issued by the Bureau of Prisons ("BOP") in February 2015:

My name is Neim Brown, and I have reviewed a copy of the comment that is being submitted by the Human Rights Defense Center. I agree with the entirety of the Human Rights Defense Center's comments and urge you to take them into careful consideration. In particular please heed the section discussing the lack of alternatives explored by the BOP.

I also feel that extending the comment period will allow for more public input on the proposal, and ask that you do so in order to involve more people in engaging in this important issue that affects the entire US.

Thank you for taking the time to carefully study all of the comments being submitted in regards to building a new prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

Neim Brown
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

March 30, 2015

U.S. Department of Justice
Bureau of Prisons
Attn: Isaac Guston, Site Selection Specialist
320 First St., NW
Washington, DC 20534

Via EMAIL

Re: Proposed USP/FPC Letcher County
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Guston:

Please accept the following comments concerning the environmental impact statement (“EIS”) issued by the Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”) in February 2015.

My name is Scott Parkin, and I have reviewed a copy of the comment that is being submitted by the Human Rights Defense Center. I agree with the entirety of the Human Rights Defense Center’s comments and urge you to take them into careful consideration. In particular, please heed the section discussing the lack of alternatives explored by the BOP.

I also feel that extending the comment period will allow for more public input on the proposal, and urge that you do so in order to invite more people to engage in this important issue that affects the entire US.

Thank you for taking the time to carefully study all of the comments being submitted in regards to building a new prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

Scott Parkin
Rising Tide North America
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

---

Dear Mr. Gaston:

Please accept the following comments concerning the environmental impact statement ("EIS") issued by the Bureau of Prisons ("BOP") in February 2015.

My name is Travis Reed Miller, and I have reviewed a copy of the comment that is being submitted by the Human Rights Defense Center. I agree with the entirety of the Human Rights Defense Center’s comments and urge you to take them into careful consideration. In particular please heed the section discussing the lack of alternatives explored by the BOP.

I also feel that extending the comment period will allow for more public input on the proposal, and ask that you do so in order to invite more people to engage in this important issue that affects the entire US.

Thank you for taking the time to carefully study all of the comments being submitted in regards to building a new prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

T. Reed Miller
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

I have many concerns about the proposed prison. I do not wish to enumerate them here, however I do wish to express support for the Human Rights Defense Center’s comments. I would like to encourage you to take them into careful consideration. In particular please heed the section discussing the lack of alternatives explored by the BOP.

I also feel that extending the comment period will allow for more public input on the proposal, and ask that you do so in order to invite more people to engage in this important issue that affects the entire US.

Willie Dodson
Pound, Va.
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

Ben Reynoso
March 30, 2015

U.S. Department of Justice
Bureau of Prisons
Attn: Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
320 First St., NW
Washington, DC 20534
VIA EMAIL: (gaston@bop.gov)
Re: Proposed USP/FPC Letcher County
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Gaston:

Please accept the following comments concerning the environmental impact statement ("EIS") issued by the Bureau of Prisons ("BOP") in February 2015.

My name is Benjamin Reynoso, and I have reviewed a copy of the comment that is being submitted by the Human Rights Defense Center. I agree with the entirety of the Human Rights Defense Center's comments and urge you to take them into careful consideration. In particular, please heed the section/discussion on the lack of alternatives explored by the BOP.

I also feel that extending the comment period will allow for more public input on the proposal, and that you do so in order to invite more people to engage in this important issue that effects the entire US.

Thank you for taking the time to carefully study all of the comments being submitted in regards to building a new prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Reynoso
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

3. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Please accept the following comments concerning the environmental impact
statement ("EIS") issued by the Bureau of Prisons ("BOP") in February
2015.

My name is Libby, and I have reviewed a copy of the comment that
is being submitted by the Human Rights Defense Center. I agree with the
entirety of the Human Rights Defense Center's comments and urge you to
take them into careful consideration. In particular please heed the section
discussion the lack of alternatives explored by the BOP.

I also feel that extending the comment period will allow for more public
input on the proposal, and ask that you do so in order to invite more
people to engage in this important issue that affects the entire US.

Thank you for taking the time to carefully study all of the comments
being submitted in regards to building a new prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

Libby Gho
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

March 30, 2015
U.S. Department of Justice
Bureau of Prisons

Attn: Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
320 First St., NW
Washington, DC 20534
VIA EMAIL.

Re: Proposed USP/FPC Letcher County
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Gaston:

Please accept the following comments concerning the environmental impact statement (“EIS”) issued by the Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”) in February 2015.

My name is Toby Fraser, and I have reviewed a copy of the comment that is being submitted by the Human Rights Defense Center. I agree with the entirety of the Human Rights Defense Center’s comments and urge you to take them into careful consideration. In particular please heed the section discussion the lack of alternatives explored by the BOP.

Thank you for taking the time to carefully study all of the comments being submitted in regards to building a new prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

Toby Fraser
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

To: Brian Gorton
Cc: beaverfork@fpc.gov
Subject: Public Comment BF: Proposed USP/FPC Letcher County Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Greetings,

Please find attached a comment regarding the Proposed USP/FPC Letcher County Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

This comment is on behalf of 13 organizations and 8 individuals.

Please confirm that it has been received and filed for the public record.

Thank you,

Jared Frank,
Prison Ecology Project Coordinator,
Human Rights Defense Center
(562) 365-0223
2. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Following are all the signed Form Letter 1’s that were received.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form Letter 2</th>
<th>1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment. Following are all the signed Form Letter 2’s that were received.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 12, 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 First Street, N.W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C. 20534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gaston,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

Following are all the signed Form Letter 3’s that were received.
Form Letter 4

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.
Following are all the signed Form Letter 5’s that were received.
1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

Following are all the signed Form Letter 6’s that were received.
Form Letter 7

Mr. Tom Webber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mister Webber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

1

1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment.

Following are all the signed Form Letter 7’s that were received.
Form Letter 8  
March 12, 2015  

Mr. Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Federal Bureau of Prisons  
330 First Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20534  

Dear Mr. Gaston:  

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor with good schools, and excellent medical opportunities. Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry, therefore you will find many capable workers. The economy in Letcher County will be greatly improved by the jobs the prison will bring. Thank you for your consideration in bringing the prison to Letcher County.  

Respectfully yours,  

_________________________  

_________________________  
Street address  

_________________________  
P.O. Box (if applicable)  

_________________________  
City, State, Zip  

1. The Bureau thanks you for reviewing the Draft EIS and has noted your comment. 

Following are all the signed Form Letter 8’s that were received.
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

Dear Mr. [Name],

I am pleased to reply to your letter of [Date] regarding the United States Federal Power Act proposal, being submitted by the Letcher County Planning Committee in Letcher County, Kentucky.

The Letcher County Planning Committee has developed strategies and policies to benefit the entire Eastern Kentucky area. The objective of economic and community development has always been to emphasize the need for diversification in the region. Years of preparation and public hearings have been held by the Letcher County Planning, with support of public officials and federal officials.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Address]

July 2015

Appendix E  E-304
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

Appendix E
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Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

[Text snippets from the image are partially visible, likely containing discussions and letters related to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky.]
Appendix E  E-311  July 2015
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky
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July 2015
March 17, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. As I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will add a workforce to Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. This will support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,
[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,
[Signature]
Mr. Tim Webber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
338 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are aware of the needs in the county, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I really support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
338 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
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Dear Mr. Gates,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our medical opportunities are good. Our young workers are good. Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gates, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

---

Mr. Gates,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

---

Mr. Isaac Gates, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gates,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our medical opportunities are good. Our young workers are good. Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
350 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
350 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Dated Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Dated Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
2300 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webber,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

P.O. Box 117
Lynch, Ky 40455

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tom Webber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I fully support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

P.O. Box 117
Lynch, Ky 40455
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Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well.

I fully support the locating of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

[Name]

Dear Mr. Webster,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Name]

March 12, 2015

[Name]

Mr. Lisa Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gaston,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. The schools are good. Our medical opportunities are good. Our young workers are good. Thank you for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

[Name]
Mr. J. oatson, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. oatson,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. We will see Letcher County as a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our medical opportunities are good. Our young workers are good. Thank you for considering Letcher County.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. oatson, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. oatson,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Midwest region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Leroy Gösten, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gösten,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison Project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support for our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Lawrence Kernel

March 12, 2015

Leroy Gösten, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gösten,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Lawrence Kernel

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tom Walder, Chief, Correctional Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
120 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Walder,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only immediately help to create new jobs, but the project will also find many locals to work. I am a hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Kernel

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tom Walder, Chief, Correctional Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
120 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Walder,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are aware of the needs. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find it welcoming to Letcher County; not only for the facilities, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Kernel
Dear Mr. Gannon,

I would like to express my support for the USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky project. I believe that the proposed development would bring significant benefits to the community in terms of economic growth, job creation, and improved infrastructure.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

[Name and Title]
[Address]

Dear Mr. Gannon,

I am writing to express my support for the USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky project. I believe that the proposed development would bring significant benefits to the community in terms of economic growth, job creation, and improved infrastructure.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

[Name and Title]
[Address]
March 12, 2015

H. Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
325 1st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Jeffrey Ready
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March 12, 2015

[Address]

Mr. Gator,

I am writing to state my support for the Federal Prison project
in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support, our community
and our elected officials also support this project. This would go
along way to promote the success of this project. Our people are
good workers which would add to the potential success of this
project. Thank you for your consideration!

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

[Address]

Mr. Gator,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison
project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the
overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in
Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I
hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated
employees that would assist in making this a successful project.
Thnak you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Dear Miss Webster:

Letcher County is experiencing a severe decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Project will not only tremendously help the county but the project will also find many capable workers.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dear Mr. Coulter:

I feel strongly about your support for the Letcher County Federal Prison. You will find Letcher County a good working place.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Nico Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support the project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Nico Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Dear [Name],

I am writing to express my support for the Letcher County Planning Commission's efforts to address the needs of our community.

The Letcher County Planning Commission has proposed a new project that will bring much-needed economic opportunities to our area. I firmly believe that this project will be a catalyst for growth and development in Letcher County.

I urge you to consider all the benefits that this project will bring to our community. It is an investment in our future and one that will benefit all who reside here.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

40 Shady Drive

Whitleyburg, Ky 41858
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
520 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and efforts.

Sincerely yours,
[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
520 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that you are aware of the overwhelming situation in the Mid-South region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowding conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,
[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Gaston,

Letcher County is experiencing a severe decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only improve the economy but it will also create many jobs. Letcher County is extremely excited about this project.

Sincerely,
[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. Not only will this support our community and our entire area, but it will also create many jobs for the people.

Sincerely yours,
[Signature]
Mr. Gaddis, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaddis,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the federal prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new federal prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Gaddis, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaddis,

I was pleased to receive a memo in support of the federal prison project being announced by the Letcher County Planning Committee, Letcher County, Kentucky. The Letcher County Planning Committee has supported the prison and will continue to support the project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Gaddis, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaddis,

I was pleased to receive a memo in support of the federal prison project being announced by the Letcher County Planning Committee, Letcher County, Kentucky. The Letcher County Planning Committee has supported the prison and will continue to support the project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Dear John W. Zito,

I am writing to express my support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. This project will bring much-needed jobs and economic development to our community, and I am confident that it will be a success.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Zito,

I am writing to express my support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. As a resident of Letcher County, I believe this project will bring much-needed jobs and economic development to our community.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
820 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
820 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowded situation in the big Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
820 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowded situation in the big Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
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March 17, 2015

Isaac Garton, Site Selection Specialist  
U.S. Department of Justice  
330 First Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Garton,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 17, 2015

Isaac Garton, Site Selection Specialist  
U.S. Department of Justice  
330 First Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Garton,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support, our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 22, 2015

Isaac Garton, Site Selection Specialist  
U.S. Department of Justice  
330 First Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Garton,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support, our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Mr. Gostan, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gostan,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because this people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 17, 2015

Mr. Gostan, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gostan,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overwhelming situation in the 5th Judicial District. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

[Handwritten letter]

March 12, 2015

[Handwritten letter]
March 12, 2015

Mr. Gasior, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
232 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gasior,

I am writing to express my support for the Letcher County project. The Letcher County Community is excited about this project and is prepared to support it in any way possible. I believe that this project will benefit our community and contribute to its economic growth.

Sincerely,

Sarah Klopp

March 12, 2015

Mr. Gasior, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
232 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Ms. Boyd, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
232 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gasior,

I am writing to express my support for the Letcher County project. I believe that this project will benefit our community and contribute to its economic growth.

Sincerely,

Sarah Klopp
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gason, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20538

Mr. Gason,
Thank you for your effort pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gason, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20538

Mr. Gason,
I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Michelle Long  
Site Selection Specialist  
U.S. Department of Justice  
320 First Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,  

Thank you for the efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,  

Michelle Long

March 12, 2015

Michelle Long  
Site Selection Specialist  
U.S. Department of Justice  
320 First Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,  

I am writing this letter to express my interest for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,  

Michelle Long
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
3301 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I was delighted to read the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I support the construction of the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I support the construction of this project and the development of the county. I believe that the Federal Prison project will create jobs and help the local economy. I would like to see the project completed as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Michelle Long

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
3301 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing to express my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I believe that this project will bring many benefits to the community, including jobs and economic growth. I support the construction of this project and the development of the county. I would like to see the project completed as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Michelle Long

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
3301 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gaston,

I am writing to express my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I believe that this project will bring many benefits to the community, including jobs and economic growth. I support the construction of this project and the development of the county. I would like to see the project completed as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Michelle Long
March 12, 2015

Hassan Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
331 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the New Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Hassan Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
331 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowding conditions. I hope you select our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

[Signature]

[Name]

Mr. Gassett, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
329 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people here are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

[Signature]

[Name]

Mr. Gassett, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
329 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that this location of the Federal Prison would help decrease the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
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March 22, 2016

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. Along with my support for our community and our elected officials, I also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 22, 2016

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gaston,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good, our medical opportunities are good, our people are good. This project will bring good things to Letcher County.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Ike Gaston, Site Selection Specialist  
U.S. Department of Justice  
320 First Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Dalton Holmes

March 12, 2015

Ike Gaston, Site Selection Specialist  
U.S. Department of Justice  
320 First Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Dalton Holmes

March 12, 2015

Mr. Earl Welker, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Division  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Federal Bureau of Prisons  
320 First Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Welker,
Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county but the project will give hundreds of workers.

Sincerely,

Dalton Holmes

March 12, 2015

Ike Gaston, Site Selection Specialist  
U.S. Department of Justice  
320 First Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support, our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would get a long way to improve the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Dalton Holmes
Mr. Claude Gaston, Site Selection Coordinator
US Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1200 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gaston,

I write in response to your letter of March 12, 2015, expressing your support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. Your words are greatly appreciated, and I extend my sincere thanks for your support. We are all committed to making this project a success, and I believe that it will provide many benefits to the community.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

[Name]
Site Selection Coordinator
US Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1200 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Claude Gaston,

Thank you for your support of the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. I am confident that the project will provide many benefits to the community, and I look forward to working with you to ensure its success.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

[Name]
Site Selection Coordinator
US Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1200 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Claude Gaston,

I am pleased to announce that the Letcher County Federal Prison Project is moving forward. The project will provide many benefits to the community, and I am confident that we will be able to achieve our goals.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
325 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support for our community and our elected officials, I also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers who would add to the positive success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
200 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Jill Weather, Chief, Equitable Planning and Regulatory Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Prison Project
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531

Dear Jill Weather,

I understand that we are reviewing a proposal for a new prison in Letcher County. I am writing to express my support for this project and to comment on some of the concerns you may have.

The proposed prison would not only provide jobs and economic benefits to the community, but it would also help to reduce crime and improve public safety. In addition, the project would create opportunities for local businesses and workers, and it would help to address the pressing needs of our community.

I would like to assure you that the prison project is not a one-time solution to our problems. It will provide a steady stream of employment and economic growth, and it will have a positive impact on the lives of the people in Letcher County.

Thank you for considering my comments. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 17, 2015

Hi Jill,

I appreciate your concern about the potential impact of the prison project on the community. However, I believe that the benefits of the project outweigh any potential drawbacks.

The prison would create jobs and economic opportunities for the local community, and it would help to reduce crime and improve public safety. Moreover, the project would provide a source of revenue for the state and local governments, which could be used to support other important initiatives.

I would like to suggest that we explore ways to mitigate any potential negative effects of the project, such as by implementing programs to assist those who may be displaced by the new facility.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

June Garton, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Garton,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 13, 2015

June Garton, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Garton,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that this new prison would help improve the overcrowded conditions and bring new employment opportunities to the area. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Gaston,

I am writing to express my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Candice Bailey

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
385 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support for our community and our elected officials who support this project, this would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are great and we would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Candice Bailey

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
385 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Candice Bailey
March 12, 2015

Han G. Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
370 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, KY. Along with my subdistrict community and many officials, I support this project. This would be a big win for the community since it is a federal project. It would provide a 415-bed facility which would add to the economic success of this project.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Gaston

Dear Mr. Gaston,

I am writing to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. As a resident of the county, I believe this project will be beneficial to our community. The proposed facility is expected to create jobs and stimulate the local economy. It is an important step in addressing the need for a reliable source of income for our residents.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Hers Gosten, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
329 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gosten,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 17, 2015

Isaac Gosten, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
329 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gosten,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. The new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope that our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tom Walsh, Chief, Capital Planning and Construction Branch
Federal Bureau of Prisons
329 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Walsh,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many usable workers. I am also pleased with this project.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 17, 2015

Isaac Gosten, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
329 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gosten,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Mike Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston;

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mike Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston;

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Dear Mr. Gates,

I am writing in support of the Letcher County Federal Prison project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our medical profession are good. Our young men are good. Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Sincerely,

Edward H. Rowan

March 12, 2015

Dear Mr. Gates,

I am writing in support of the Letcher County Federal Prison project. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Pamela R. Johnson

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tim Weber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
US Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1200 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20534

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. That Letcher County Prison Project will not only economically benefit the county, but the project will also find many suitable workers. I hope hundred people for this project.

Sincerely,

Phoebe Eldridge
March 12, 2015

George Gaskin, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

Mr. Gaskin,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,
[Signature]

March 12, 2015

George Gaskin, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

Mr. Gaskin,
Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are great workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,
[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
930 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overpopulated conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
930 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Marc Gaston, Site selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
350 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only provide economic benefits to the county, but will also provide new job opportunities for the area. I am very excited about this project.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Page]

March 12, 2015

Marc Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
350 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only provide economic benefits to the county, but will also provide new job opportunities for the area. I am very excited about this project.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Hank Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
1201 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20530

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Sandie Stewart

March 12, 2015

Hank Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
300 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20530

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded facilities. I thank you for our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would work in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Sandie Stewart

March 12, 2015

Mr. Ray Webster, Chief, Capital Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1201 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20530

Mr. Webster,

I want to express my support for the Letcher County Federal Prison project. You will find Letcher County a great location for the project. The projects are good, the economic opportunities are good, the people are good. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely yours,

Sandie Stewart

March 12, 2015

Mr. Ray Webster, Chief, Capital Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
d 1201 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20530

Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is experiencing a downturn in its industry. This is a Federal Prison Project will not only tremendously benefit the county, but the project will also find many workers. I appreciate your hard work on this project.

Sincerely yours,

Sandie Stewart
March 22, 2015

Sandra Stone, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter on behalf of support of the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am writing this letter to express my support for the project and the people of Letcher County. This project will bring new opportunities and jobs to the area, and it will improve the overall quality of life for the residents. I believe this project will benefit the community in many ways, and I urge you to support it.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Sandra Stone, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to express my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that this project will benefit the community in many ways, and I urge you to support it.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 27, 2015

Isaac Gannon, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
929 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gannon,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 30, 2015

Isaac Gannon, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
929 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gannon,

I agree with your support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. We have good schools, good wages, good employment, good medical amenities, and good living workers. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]
March 17, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
820 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
820 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overwhelming situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Irene Gaster, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
340 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaster,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new federal prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Lora Candell

March 12, 2015

Irene Gaster, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
340 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaster,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that you will make the wise decision of the penal institution in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would be of great benefit to the local communities. It is hoped that the area will realize a long-term economic and educational improvement. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Lora Candell
Mr. Tom Weber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Weber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are putting the future of the community first. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will fill a critical need in Letcher County, not only for the community, but for the prison employees who will live in the area and support the families of the prisoners in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Adam Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Iraan H. Caster, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Caster,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

July 2015

E-368

Appendix E
Dear Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employers that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Estate Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employers that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Estate Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employers that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 17, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist,
U.S. Department of Justice
1201 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your e-mail pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

CC:

April 10, 2015

Ms. Tom Weber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1201 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Ms. Weber,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the past few years. Making Letcher County a Prison County will not only tremendously help the county but the project will also have many positive effects.

I am very interested in this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

July 16, 2015

Mr. Tom Weber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1201 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Weber,

Letcher County is a community with tremendous needs. With an eye on the future, the Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a location in Letcher County not only for the inmates, but for the prison employees as well. I strongly support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

September 30, 2015

Ms. Weber, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1201 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Ms. Weber,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You and the Letcher County are a great neighbor. The inmates are good. Our medical and educational programs are good. Our young workers are good.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Wider, 

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many capable workers. I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely, 

[Signature]

419 Gate Dr. Whitesburg KY 41858
606-633-4278

---

Mr. Tony Wider, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
220 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Wider, 

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are ready on the grow. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome site in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison community as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely, 

[Signature]

419 Gate Dr. Whitesburg KY 41858
606-633-4278

---

Mr. Tony Wider, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
220 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Wider, 

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many capable workers. I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely, 

[Signature]

419 Gate Dr. Whitesburg KY 41858
606-633-4278

---

Mr. Tony Wider, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
220 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Wider, 

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are ready on the grow. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome site in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison community as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely, 

[Signature]

419 Gate Dr. Whitesburg KY 41858
606-633-4278
Mr. Yoni Wolber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
200 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Wolber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders willing to grow on the move. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County not only for the workforce, but for the prison employees as well. I fully support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

Vanessa Stock
7167 Highway 632 N
Letcher, KY 41539

Appendix E
E-372
July 2015
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve this overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and efforts.

Sincerely yours,

Shaun Smallwood
841 Hummingbird Dr.
Jenkins, KY 41537

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Shaun Smallwood
841 Hummingbird Dr.
Jenkins, KY 41537
Appendix E  E-374  July 2015
March 12, 2015

Isaac Wilson, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
SSB First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Randy Bell

---

Mr. Ron Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
325 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is experiencing a severe decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only help the county but its project will also train many capable workers. I am very interested in this project.

Sincerely,

Randy Bell

---

Mr. Ron Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
325 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Ron Webster, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
325 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a great partner. Our schools are great. Our work opportunities are great. Our young workers are great. Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully yours,

Randy Bell
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

March 12, 2015

[Signature]

March 13, 2015

[Signature]

March 17, 2015

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Weiler,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many capable workers. I am not opposed personally to the project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

----------

Dear Mr. Weiler,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with a plan on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will bring a welcome to Letcher County, not only for thelocation, but for the prison construction as well. I totally support the location of the prison to Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

----------

Dear Mr. Green,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Jail Project. I will find Letcher County a great location. The schools and hospitals are good. The young workers are good. I appreciate your support.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

----------

Dear Mr. Green,

If my presence were a vote in support of the United States Federal Prison proposal, I would support the project. The Federal Bureau of Prisons has proposed a project that will benefit the entire Southeast Kentucky area. The Letcher County Planning Committee has planned strategically and with great support from the community. The location of the prison is strategic, and I believe it will provide a significant benefit to the region.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowded situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are open to the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the incarceration, but for the areas employed as well. I firmly support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

---

March 12, 2015

Lisa Gasson, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gasson,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Reprinted text from another page]

Mr. Ron Weimer, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Weimer,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are aware of the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. Letcher County will support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support of our community and our elected officials, I also support this project. This would be a good way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Goslin, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
351 1st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Goslin,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and disciplined and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Van Borker, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
351 1st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Goslin,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are eager to see the Federal Bureau of Prisons build a new Federal Prison in the county. We are thankful for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Dr. John Williams
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
351 1st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Goslin,

I am in full support of your proposal for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. This project will benefit the county tremendously by providing employment opportunities, improving the local economy, and increasing the quality of life for the residents. I commend your efforts and look forward to working with you on this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
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March 17, 2015

Isaac Gutson, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gutson,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overwhelming support in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowding conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 17, 2015

Isaac Gutson, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gutson,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to improve the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 17, 2015

Isaac Gutson, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gutson,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
To: Mr. Tim Winder, Chief, Planning and Environment Branch
US Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
3350 First Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20534

From: [Signature]

Subject: Letter Regarding Federal Prisons

Dear Mr. Winder,

Let me begin by expressing my support for the Federal Prisons project. As a community leader, I believe the project will benefit Letcher County and its residents. I am encouraged by the progress made in the planning phase and look forward to its successful implementation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

---

To: Ms. Jessica Gonzalez
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
3350 First Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20534

From: [Signature]

Subject: Support for Federal Prisons

Dear Ms. Gonzalez,

I am writing to express my support for the Federal Prisons project. As a local resident, I believe this initiative will enhance the community's infrastructure and support local businesses. The project aligns with our efforts to improve the quality of life for our residents.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Getten, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
329 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Getten,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Julene Banks

March 12, 2015

Isaac Getten, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
329 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Getten,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Julene Banks
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March 12, 2014:

Hale Gordon, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gordon,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people here are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2014:

Mr. Tutt Weimer, Chief-Occupy Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1301 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Weimer,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only immediately help the county but the project will also find many qualified workers. I am the best person for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2014:

Mr. Weimer,

Let our County be a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I highly support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2013

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
500 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overwhelming situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2013

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
500 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overwhelming situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
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March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaster, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaster,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the federal prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaster, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaster,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Weinber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are committed to the future. The federal facility at Pineville will be a benefit to Letcher County, not only for the jobs it will create, but for the people it serves as well. I fully support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Date]

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaynor,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that this is a win-win situation for the state and the community. The facility will create jobs and provide opportunities for your residents. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2013

Ivan Gatsen, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
3301 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gatsen,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

March 32, 2013

Ivan Gatsen, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
3301 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gatsen,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

March 12, 2013

Ms. Ettie Weber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
3301 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Ms. Weber,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the prison will also find many suitable workers. I am one hundred percent for the project.

Sincerely,

March 32, 2013

Ms. Ettie Weber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
3301 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Ms. Weber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the residents, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

Appendix E

E-394

July 2015

Dear Mr. Gaston,

I am writing to voice my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Kentucky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Mr. Tom Webley, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
130 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gaston,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders such as you on the Inside. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find it a welcomes in Letcher County, not only for the institution but for the prison employees as well. I fully support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Webster,

It is my intention to write a letter in support of the U.S. Plans for a future project that will benefit the entire Letcher County area. The people of the area and surrounding areas have worked hard to improve the area. The lifting of the ban on coal mining and exploration projects has been done by the Letcher County Planning Board, with support from judges, mayors, and federal officials.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacitor Planning and Operations Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the correction, but for the prison employees as well. I kindly support the location of the project in Letcher County.

Yours,

[Signature]

Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacitor Planning and Operations Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the correction, but for the prison employees as well. I kindly support the location of the project in Letcher County.

Yours,

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to express my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help to alleviate the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize that the area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees who would assist in making this a successful project.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Issac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
370 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. Along with my support for this project, our Mayor and City Council are also supporters. This would be a great opportunity for the citizens of Letcher County. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 17, 2015

Issac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
370 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534
Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The latter County Prison Project will greatly increase help and income, but the project will also need many capable workers. I support this project for this reason.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ms. Dawn Jenkins, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1801 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531

March 13, 2015.

Dear Mr. Webster,

I am writing this letter to express my strong support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County will help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature] Rachelle Summers
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Rachelle Skinner

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and disciplined and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Rachelle Skinner

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tim Nethercot, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prison
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Nethercot,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the community, but the project will also provide jobs for many able-bodied workers. I urge you to support the project.

Sincerely,

Rachelle Skinner

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tim Nethercot, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prison
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Nethercot,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prison will not only be a welcome to Letcher County, not only for the construction, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

Rachelle Skinner
March 12, 2015

Jane Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
325 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison Project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the West Virginia area. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions in the area. It would also provide a new source of employment for the local community. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Jade Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
325 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison Project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the West Virginia area. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions in the area. It would also provide a new source of employment for the local community. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
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March 12, 2015

Dear Ms. Gaston,

I am writing to express my support for the Federal Penitentiary project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my fellow community members, we are in favor of this project as it would be a great addition to our community. We believe this project will have a positive impact on our local economy and create jobs for our residents.

Thank you for considering our thoughts.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Dear Ms. Gaston,

I am writing to express my support for the Federal Penitentiary project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my fellow community members, we are in favor of this project as it would be a great addition to our community. We believe this project will have a positive impact on our local economy and create jobs for our residents.

Thank you for considering our thoughts.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 17, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County should help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support, our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would be a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Brett Toomey, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
530 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Toomey,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

---

April 19, 2015

Ms. Jane Cowan, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Toomey,

Letcher County is a measuring weapon where progressive leaders work on the issues. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County not only for the correctional facility but for the prison employees as well. Finally, support the location of the project in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015
Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
300 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gaston,

In my letter to you, I expressed my support for the Letcher County Prisons project, which I believe would be a strong boost to the economic development of Letcher County. I am confident that this project would greatly benefit the area and help to address the overcrowding in the county.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015
Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
300 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your letter of support for the Letcher County Prisons project. I believe this project would have a positive impact on the local economy and help to address the overcrowding in the county.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only measurably help the county, but the project will also add many capable workers. I am one business person for this purpose.

Sincerely,
[Signature]

Mr. Andy Glisson, Vice Solicitor Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1500 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531

Dear Mr. Glisson,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. You and the Letcher County is a good civilization. Our schools are good. Our medical opportunities are good. Our young, workers are good. Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully Yours,
[Signature]

303/315

Renee Gleston, Ten Selection Examiner
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1500 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531

Dear Ms. Gleston,

It is a pleasure to write a letter in support of the United States Federal Prison Project being solicited by the Letcher County Planning Committee. Letcher County.

The Letcher County Planning Committee has planned adequately and with acceptable input from the community. It is expected that we benefit the area. Letcher County has been created an economic environment or significance need for development in the region. Opportunities and economic benefits have been drawn by the Letcher County Planning, with attention of public, private, and federal sector officials.
March 12, 2015

Kendall F. Smith, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
1800 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowded situation in the mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Kendall F. Smith, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
1800 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as an expression of support for the Federal Prison Project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support, our community and elected officials also support this project. This would be a positive way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers who would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Kendall F. Smith, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
1800 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Gaster,

In the absence of a letter in support of the United States Penitentiary proposal being submitted by the Letcher County Planning Commission of Letcher County, Kentucky, this letter is intended to share the support that the community will extend to the proposed facility. The Federal Bureau of Prisons has expressed its desire to construct a new prison in Letcher County for the efficient treatment of the inmate population in the region. The proposed facility would provide a more humane and productive environment for inmates, reducing overcrowding and improving overall living conditions. This project is a significant investment in the local economy, offering job opportunities and enhanced security for the community.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaster, Site selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
333 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaster,

I am writing this letter to express my support for the Federal Prison Project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowded situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic, and the correctional employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you very much for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 31, 2015

Bass Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Enclosed is my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am writing this in support of the need for a new prison in our area.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 31, 2015

Bass Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This area is in great need of a new prison for the many residents who have no place to go.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

[Signatures]

March 12, 2015

[Signatures]
March 17, 2018

James Garber, Sr. Section Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
360 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531

Mr. Garber,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

(Handwritten Signature)

To: James Garber, Sr. Section Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
360 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531

March 17, 2018

James Garber, Sr. Section Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
360 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531

Mr. Garber,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

(Handwritten Signature)

To: James Garber, Sr. Section Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
360 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531
March 12, 2015

Jennifer Breaux

March 12, 2015

Jennifer Breaux, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
500 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Ms. Gatton,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Breaux

March 12, 2015

Jennifer Breaux

March 12, 2015

Jennifer Breaux, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
500 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gatton,

I am writing this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. Along with my support for this community and our elected officials also support this project. This would be a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are great workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Jennifer Breaux
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March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support for our community, and our elected officials also support this project. This would be a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers, which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
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[Handwritten text]

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]


March 12, 2015

[Handwritten text]

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

March 17, 2015
Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
310 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overwhelming situation in the mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope your project team has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that will assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,
[Signature]

March 12, 2015
Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
310 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,
[Signature]
March 12, 2013

Mr. Gasson,
Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

Mr. Gasson,
Thank you for your letter pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and efforts.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

May 27, 2013

Mr. Ron Carson, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Mr. Carson,
Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only economically benefit the area, but the prison will also provide much needed employment. I am excited to be a part of this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

April 11, 2013

Mr. Ron Carson, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Mr. Carson,
I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good location for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

April 11, 2013

Mr. Ron Carson, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Mr. Carson,
I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good location for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 17, 2015

Misty Quinnell, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
350 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Misty Quinnell

---

March 12, 2015

Misty Quinnell, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
350 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Misty Quinnell

---

March 17, 2015

Misty Quinnell, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
350 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Misty Quinnell

---

March 12, 2015

Misty Quinnell, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
350 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Misty Quinnell

---
Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Phase Project will not only immediately help the county, but the project will also find more suitable workers. I am sure the project will be a success.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

P.O. Box 1024

Rome, Ky. 40361

---

Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are eager to see this project through. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but also for the people as we will support the success of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

P.O. Box 1024

Rome, Ky. 40361

---

Ms. Jane Garten, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster,

I am writing in support of the Letcher County Federal Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our economic opportunities are good. The young workers are good. We know what it takes for success in Letcher County.

Respectfully Yours,

[Signature]

P.O. Box 1024

Rome, Ky. 40361

---

[Signature]
March 11, 2015

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the USA region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making into a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 11, 2015

Mr. Gaston,

This letter is to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the USA region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making into a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Gaston,

Over the past few years I have been working for the United States and have been very impressed with the dedication and hard work of our employees. I believe this new prison project will be a great benefit to our community. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
220 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I fully support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[March 2015]

JoAnn Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
220 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gaston,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our medical services are good. Our young workers are good.

Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Mark Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support for the community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers, which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Terrill Caudill

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great area to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Terrill Caudill

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tom Weber, Chief, Quantity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Tom Weber, Chief, Quantity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Weber:

Letcher County is experiencing a severe decline in the coal industry, and the Letcher County Prison Project will not only immediately help the economy, but the project will also bring new, steady, and usable workers. I am an advocate for this project.

Sincerely,

Terrill Caudill

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tom Weber, Chief, Quantity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Tom Weber, Chief, Quantity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Weber:

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are committed to the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I fully support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

Terrill Caudill
Dear Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the MIA Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534
March 12, 2018

J. G. Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20536

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the federal prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new federal prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

J. G. Gaston
3rd May 2018

Handwritten note:

Dear Mr. Gaston,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also fuel many local workers.

Sincerely,

J. G. Gaston
3rd May 2018

Handwritten note:

Dear Mr. Gaston,  
   Letcher County is community with prosperous leaders who are on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prison will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison of Letcher County.

Sincerely,

J. G. Gaston
3rd May 2018

Handwritten note:

Respectfully yours,

J. G. Gaston
3rd May 2018
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March 12, 2015

Isa Guzman, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Guzman,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Stephanie Coutts
7189 Hwy 7 North
Whitleyburg, KY 41858

Mr. Tom Weber, Chief, Capital Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Weber,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will not only help tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many capable workers. I am one hundred percent for the project.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Coutts
7189 Hwy 7 North
Whitleyburg, KY 41858
March 12, 2015

Ike Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize this area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Bobby Bundle
324 Hwy 903
Middlesboro, Ky 41341

March 17, 2015

Ike Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Bobby Bundle
324 Hwy 903
Middlesboro, Ky 41341

March 12, 2015

Ike Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize this area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Bobby Bundle
324 Hwy 903
Middlesboro, Ky 41341

March 17, 2015

Ike Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Bobby Bundle
324 Hwy 903
Middlesboro, Ky 41341
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Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
305 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the over-crowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Dwayne Johnson
889 Hwy 411 Hwy 4468
Jenkins, Ky 41537

--

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
305 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support for this project, I am confident that you are aware of the over-crowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Dwayne Johnson
889 Hwy 411 Hwy 4468
Jenkins, Ky 41537

--

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
305 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking,ago and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Dwayne Johnson
889 Hwy 411 Hwy 4468
Jenkins, Ky 41537

--

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
305 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Leather County is experiencing a serious decline in the past few years. The Leather County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also feed many local workers.

I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

Dwayne Johnson
889 Hwy 411 Hwy 4468
Jenkins, Ky 41537
Appendix E
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March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
329 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Dawne Ada

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
329 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Dawne Ada

---

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tim Webber, Chief, Capital Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
329 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Tim Webber, Chief, Capital Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
329 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webber,

Letcher County is experiencing a severe decline in its rural economy. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county but the project will also find many expatriate workers. I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

Dawne Ada

Dear Mr. Webber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County be it only for the inmates but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

Dawne Ada
Dear Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to express my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that this will alleviate the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. The new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaylor, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaylor,

I want to express my support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools, our medical opportunities are good. Our young people are good. Thank you for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

March 22, 2015

Isaac Gaylor, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaylor,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. Along with my support for the community, I also support this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
300 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

---

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tom Webber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
300 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are on the move. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the current employees as well. Finally, support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
820 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
820 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support our community and our guest tell all about this project with the potential of adding to the success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

Dear Ms. Webster,
Letcher County is experiencing a severe decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but also provide work for many unemployed workers. I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Image of handwritten note]

[Image of handwritten note]

[Image of handwritten note]

Dear Mr. Gilmore,
I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. We will make Letcher County a great experience for young families. Our schools are good. Our medical facilities are good. Our young workers are good. Thanks for looking at Letcher County.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

[Image of handwritten note]

[Image of handwritten note]

[Image of handwritten note]
Dear Mr. Blakley,

I am writing to express my support of the United States Forest Service proposal being submitted by the Letcher County Planning Commission in Letcher County, Kentucky.

The Letcher County Planning Commission has prepared an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project. The EIS is a comprehensive environmental assessment that evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project.

I am confident that the EIS will serve as a valuable tool in guiding the planning process and ensuring that the project is developed in a manner that minimizes its impact on the environment.

Sincerely,

Mary A. Durbacher
Appendix E
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July 2015
Appendix E

E-442

July 2015
Dear Mr. Dalton:

It is with pleasure to write in support of the United States Federal Power project being authorized by the Letcher County Planning Commission in Letcher County, Kentucky.

The Letcher County Planning Commission has been diligent and with considerable input from the community and supporting agencies has established a strong foundation for the project. The project will create new, permanent, and rewarding employment opportunities for the residents of Letcher County. The project will also have a significant economic impact on the region and will benefit the entire state of Kentucky.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Appendix E

E-443

July 2015

Dear Mr. Dalton:

I am writing to express my support for the United States Federal Power project being authorized by the Letcher County Planning Commission in Letcher County, Kentucky.

The Letcher County Planning Commission has been diligent and with considerable input from the community and supporting agencies has established a strong foundation for the project. The project will create new, permanent, and rewarding employment opportunities for the residents of Letcher County. The project will also have a significant economic impact on the region and will benefit the entire state of Kentucky.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Appendix E  E-444  July 2015
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

Appendix E

E-445

July 2015
Appendix E  E-446  July 2015
Dear Mr. Gaston:

I am writing to share my support for the current draft Environmental Impact Statement being proposed by the Letcher County Planning Commission. This plan will provide substantial benefits to the Letcher County area, which is currently experiencing significant economic challenges.

I am a long-time resident of Letcher County and have witnessed firsthand the impact of the coal industry’s decline on our community. The proposed project has been vetted by professionals and stakeholders from various sectors, and I believe it is a necessary step towards economic recovery.

I urge you to consider the benefits this project will bring to our area. It is essential that we find solutions to address our economic challenges.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

Appendix E  E-448  July 2015
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

Appendix E

E-449

July 2015
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

Appendix E
E-450
July 2015
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

Appendix E  E-453  July 2015
Appendix E
E-454
July 2015
June 2015

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Tommy Young

March 12, 2015

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community is supporting this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Vernita Isaac

March 12, 2015

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Elliot Walters
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support for this project, I believe it would be a great addition to the community and our elected officials also support this project. This would be a great way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely yours,
[Signature]

March 17, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support for this project, I believe it would be a great addition to the community and our elected officials also support this project. This would be a great way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely yours,
[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaak Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support for our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of the project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaak Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support for our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of the project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 21, 2013

\[\text{Signature} \]

March 22, 2013

\[\text{Signature} \]

March 21, 2013

\[\text{Signature} \]

March 22, 2013

\[\text{Signature} \]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support, our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support, our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Michael Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
500 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Andy Sturgill

March 12, 2015

Michael Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
500 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Jena Osbourn

March 17, 2015

Michael Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
500 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Spencer Workik
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534


Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]


March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534


Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 17, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
300 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 17, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
300 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015
Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015
Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support for the community and our elected officials, I support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Nate Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Nate Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

[Address]

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

[Address]

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 17, 2015

[Address]

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

[Address]

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
325 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Christian Stone

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
325 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Henry Nakhil
March 12, 2015

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Brenda Holland

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Michael facet

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Michael facet

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Wade Blair
March 12, 2015

Dear Gleston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
201 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Mr. Gleston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Dear Gleston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
201 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Mr. Gleston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Jake Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison. The people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Jake Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison. The people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 22, 2015

Rosicanna Parker

March 22, 2015

Malita Bell

March 12, 2015

March 12, 2015

March 12, 2015

March 12, 2015

March 12, 2015

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,
March 12, 2015

Ivan Gustin, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gustin,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Ivan Gustin, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gustin,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Ivan Gustin, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gustin,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our medical opportunities are good. The young workers are good. Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Sincerely Yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Ivan Gustin, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gustin,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our medical opportunities are good. The young workers are good. Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Sincerely Yours,

[Signature]
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky
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Dear Mr. Galloway,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our medical opportunities are good. Our young workers are good. Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully Yours,

[Signature]

Linda Castrell

[Address]

[City, State, Zip Code]

---

Dear Mr. Galloway,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our medical opportunities are good. Our young workers are good. Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully Yours,

[Signature]

R.O. Box 87

[City, State, Zip Code]

---

Dear Mr. Galloway,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our medical opportunities are good. Our young workers are good. Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully Yours,

[Signature]

[Address]

[City, State, Zip Code]

---

Dear Mr. Galloway,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our medical opportunities are good. Our young workers are good. Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully Yours,

[Signature]

[Address]

[City, State, Zip Code]
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky
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Mr. Isaac Gruen, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1001 Third Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mister Gruen,
I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our medical opportunities are good. Our young workers are good. Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully Yours,
[Signature]

---

Mr. Isaac Gruen, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1001 Third Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mister Gruen,
I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our medical opportunities are good. Our young workers are good. Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully Yours,
[Signature]
My name is Susan Jenkins, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Bureau of Prisons
1301 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Garrett,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our medical opportunities are good. Our young workers are good. Thank you for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully Yours,

[Signature]

Susan Jenkins

Mr. James Garrett, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1301 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Garrett,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our medical opportunities are good. Our young workers are good. Thank you for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully Yours,

[Signature]

Margaret Williams

Jenkins, KY
Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch, U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons, 320 First Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20534.

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many capable workers. I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch, U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons, 320 First Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20534.

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many capable workers. I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Weber,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only immediately help the county, but the project will also find many capable workers, thus making a hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr. Tom Weber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
335 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Tom Weber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
335 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Weber,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only immediately help the county, but the project will also find many capable workers, thus making a hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many capable workers. I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1301 East Street, NW
Washington, DC 20534
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Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
330 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Penal Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many capable workers. I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

130 Eddington Lane
Vyper, Ky. 41774

--

Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
330 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

--

Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
330 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Penal Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many capable workers. I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Address]

--

Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
330 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Weber,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county but the project will also find many capable workers.

I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Mr. Tim Webster, Chie, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mister Webster,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many capable workers.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr. Tim Webster, Chie, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mister Webster,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many capable workers.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many capable workers.

I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

120 Eddington Lane

Viper, Ky 41774
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March 12, 2015

Mr. Tim Walker, Chief, Capacity Planning and Conservation Branch
U.S. Department of the Interior
Federal Bureau of Prisons
550 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Walker,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the private and public employees as well.

I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tim Walker, Chief, Capacity Planning and Conservation Branch
U.S. Department of the Interior
Federal Bureau of Prisons
550 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Walker,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. fried...
March 12, 2015

Mr. Scott Clarks
The Solicitor General
Office of the Solicitor
Department of Justice
1470 L Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Mr. Clark,

I have reviewed the proposed changes to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky Project. I am writing to support these changes as they will significantly improve the project for the citizens of Letcher County.

The changes proposed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will ensure that the project is implemented in a manner that is consistent with the needs and desires of the local community. I believe that these changes will provide a more secure and stable environment for the citizens of Letcher County.

Thank you for considering these changes. I look forward to working with you to ensure that the project is implemented in a manner that is beneficial to the citizens of Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

March 12, 2015

Mr. John Doe
The Solicitor General
Office of the Solicitor
Department of Justice
1470 L Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20530

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement

I wanted to express my support for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky Project. I believe that the proposed changes will significantly improve the project for the citizens of Letcher County.

The changes proposed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will ensure that the project is implemented in a manner that is consistent with the needs and desires of the local community. I believe that these changes will provide a more secure and stable environment for the citizens of Letcher County.

Thank you for considering these changes. I look forward to working with you to ensure that the project is implemented in a manner that is beneficial to the citizens of Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
March 02, 2015

Mr. Isaac Elliot, Sr., Assistant Secretary
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
2201 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Elliot,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. We will find Letcher County a good neighbor with good schools, and excellent medical opportunities. Letcher County is experiencing a revenue decline in the coal industry, therefore you will find many working miners. The economy in Letcher County will be greatly improved by the jobs the prison will bring. Thank you for your consideration in bringing the prison to Letcher County.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

P.O. Box 372

March 02, 2015

Mrs. Laura Green, Assistant Director
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
2201 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mrs. Green,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. We will find Letcher County a good neighbor with good schools, and excellent medical opportunities. Letcher County is experiencing a revenue decline in the coal industry, therefore you will find many working miners. The economy in Letcher County will be greatly improved by the jobs the prison will bring. Thank you for your consideration in bringing the prison to Letcher County.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

P.O. Box 372
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Mr. Tom Wade
230 First Avenue
Eunice, LA 71338

Dear Mr. Wade:

I want to express my support for the Baker County Jail Project. You will find Baker County is an excellent location with good schools, and excellent police department. Baker County is experiencing a severe decline in the coal industry, therefore you will find many capable workers. The economy of Baker County is very dependent on the coal industry. Thank you for your consideration in bringing the prison to Baker County.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Bruce Brown
PO Box 1820
Booneville, KY 41307

Dear Mr. Brown:

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Jail Project. You will find Letcher County an excellent location with good schools, and excellent police department. Letcher County is experiencing a severe decline in the coal industry, therefore you will find many capable workers. The economy of Letcher County is very dependent on the coal industry. Thank you for your consideration in bringing the prison to Letcher County.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Mr. Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
332 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I want to express my support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. I believe this project will be a great addition to the community, providing much-needed employment opportunities. The people of Letcher County are hardworking and dedicated, and I believe this project will benefit the local economy.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
332 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 17, 2015

Jake Gaston, Sr. Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I believe our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Sr. Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I believe our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 17, 2015

Jake Gaston, Sr. Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I believe our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Sr. Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I believe our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situations in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situations in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
325 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
325 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overpopulated conditions in the Mid-Atlantic Region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Charles Campbell

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Charles Campbell

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because it has hardworking and dedicated people and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Charles Campbell
Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are committed to the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find it welcoming in Letcher County not only for the facilities but the 683 prison employees as well. I wholeheartedly support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

Charles Combs

---

Dear Mr. Gatten,

I want to express my support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. I believe that the construction of this facility will benefit the entire community and its residents.

Sincerely,

David Gandy

---

March 12, 2015

Dear Mr. Gatten,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that the new facility will significantly improve the conditions for the overcrowded facilities in the Mid-Atlantic region.

Sincerely,

David Gandy
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to guarantee the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great location to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hard-working and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tom Walker, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
335 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Lyle Moyer, Warden
Letcher County is experiencing a service decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also fill many empty positions. I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tom Walker, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
335 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Lyle Moyer, Warden
Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who love their state. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the detainees, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.
Mr. Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
1201 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gaston,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison project. I believe the educational opportunities will be excellent. I am a long-time resident of the area and I believe the Federal Prison will be a great asset to the County. I hope you will consider it favorably.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

[Address]

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

[Address]
March 12, 2015

Dear Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
201 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,
[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tom Webber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
120 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Webber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the inmates, but for the prison employees as well. I fully support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,
[Signature]
March 22, 2015

Natalie Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Natalie,

Consider this letter as my formal statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would be a huge way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 17, 2015

Natalie Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Kentucky region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowding conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Mr. Tim Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
120 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mister Webster,

Letcher County is experiencing a severe decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many suitable workers. I am one hundred percent for the project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ms. Jane Gimo, Procurement Specialist
J.J. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mister Gimo,

I write in support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good. Our medical opportunities are good. Our young workers are good. Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

Mr. John Jacob, Site Delegation Operator
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Jacob,

I am pleased to write a letter in support of the proposed Federal Prison project being reviewed by the Letcher County Planning Committee in Letcher County, Kentucky. The Letcher County Planning Committee has planned strategically and with substantial input from the community. A proposal that will benefit the entire Eastern Kentucky area. The decision of the site is necessary and supporting partners have included an economic assessment of significant need. The proposal has been further developed, thought of every possible aspect and extensive planning has been done by the Letcher County Planning with input of public view and input of local citizens.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overwhelming situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support, our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
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March 12, 2015

Hank Gist, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gatson,
Consider this letter as my statement of support for the federal prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the overall success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Israel Blosser, Sr. Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gatson,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gatson,

I am responding to your letter of March 12, 2015.

Letcher County is experiencing a serious economic downturn. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the economy, but the project will also add many capable workers. I am sure hundreds will be involved in this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky

To Mr. Geist,

I am writing this letter to urge your support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. This project is a great opportunity for the community. The site selected is within the county's existing jurisdiction, and the project will create new jobs and economic activity. I believe it would benefit the area and our community.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 22, 2015

To Mr. Geist,

I am writing this letter to express my support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. This project will bring new economic opportunities to the region. I believe it will benefit the community and create jobs for our people. I urge you to support this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 22, 2015
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Nikita Gibson

---

Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
220 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster:

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many available workers, I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

Nikita Gibson

---

Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
220 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster:

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are on the forefront. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will have a positive impact on Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

Nikita Gibson

---

Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
220 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster:

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. We will find Letcher County a good neighbor, the schools are good. Our medical facilities are good. Our youth programs are good. Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully yours,

Nikita Gibson
March 17, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
300 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees who would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,
Mike Holladay

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
300 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,
Mike Holladay
Dear Mr. Webster,

Let’s try to keep this simple, but at the same time, bring all the important points up front.

Mr. Webster, you have been the key player in this matter. For your services, we can’t thank you enough. We are looking forward to the same goodwill with which the Federal Bureau of Prisons team worked on the project. We are also looking forward to the completion of this project which will help us achieve our goal.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr. Webster
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Webster, you have been the key player in this matter. For your services, we can’t thank you enough. We are looking forward to the same goodwill with which the Federal Bureau of Prisons team worked on the project. We are also looking forward to the completion of this project which will help us achieve our goal.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Jane Gaston, Site Selection Specialist  
U.S. Department of Justice  
330 First Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,  

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,  

Keith Hughes

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist  
U.S. Department of Justice  
320 First Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,  

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support for our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,  

Keith Hughes

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tim Wieder, Chief, Capital Planning and Construction Branch  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Federal Bureau of Prisons  
320 First Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Wieder,  

Letcher County is experiencing a serious crime problem in the rural county. The Letcher County Prison project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many local workers. I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,  

Keith Hughes
Mr. Four Webster, Chief, Community Planning and Construction Branch,
U.S. Department of Justice,
Federal Bureau of Prisons,
335 New Jersey Ave,
Washington, D.C. 20538

Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, we rely on the intrusions, but for the peace and prosperity as well. I fully support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr. Isaac Gibson, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1101 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gibson,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County federal prison project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our medical and educational facilities are good. Our young people are good. Thank you for coming to Letcher County.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Issac Gibson, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
1101 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gibson,

I am writing this letter to voice my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-South region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 17, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the positive success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

James Johnson

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and the would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely your,

James Johnson

March 17, 2015

Mr. Tom Weber, Chief, Capital Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureaus of Prisons
321 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Weber,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the past forty years. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also find many capable workers. I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

James Johnson

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tom Weber, Chief, Capital Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureaus of Prisons
321 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Weber,

Letcher County is a community will progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the sanitation, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

James Johnson
Dear Mr. Gideon,

I want to express my support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a great place to live. The schools here are good. Our young people are good. Thank you for considering this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 17, 2015

I am writing this letter to show my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I know you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 17, 2015

I am writing this letter to show my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials who support this project. This would be a long way to promote the success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
201 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

-----

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
201 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Tom Weiler, Chief, Capital Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
FBI National Academy
5000 Floyds Way, BW
Washington, DC 20534

Dear Mr. Weiler,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only help the county, but the prison will also find many capable workers.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky
March 12, 2015

Mark Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mark Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support the project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mark Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Mr. Van Wester, Head, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
130 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Wester,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are anxious to see our county grow. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will add a welcome to Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I firmly support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Cynthia Foster, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Foster,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 31, 2015

Mr. Gaston, Site Selection Specialist,
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support the project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 31, 2015

Mr. Gaston, Site Selection Specialist,
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 31, 2015

Mr. Tom Webber, Chief, Correctional Planning and Construction Branch,
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webber,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will help prevent further economic decay, but the project will also find many suitable workers. We are sure Letcher County will respond to this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 31, 2015

Mr. Tom Webber, Chief, Correctional Planning and Construction Branch,
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders. With an eye on the future, the Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I fully support the creation of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. I think Letcher County is a good location. Our schools and local opportunities are great. Any new prison is good. Thank you for writing to Mark E. Kennedy.

Sincerely,
[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Lisa Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the 15 Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that you are aware of the overwhelming situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the over-crowded conditions here. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,
[Signature]
MARCH 12, 2015

Hank Gaster, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
329 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaster,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

MARCH 12, 2015

Fred Miller, Warden
Letcher County Correctional Facility
100 North Main Street
Letcher County, KY 40983

Dear Hank Gaster,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with a goal for the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will lend a welcome in Letcher County and only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I know the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would be a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Manuel Love

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would be a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Vanessa Hulseb
March 12, 2015

Isaac Goston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Goston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials all support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

---

March 12, 2015

Isaac Goston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Goston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Mr. Tom Webber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
330 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

---

Mr. Tom Webber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
330 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 17, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 17, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 11, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,
Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 11, 2015

Mr. Tom Wehner, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Wehner,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tom Wehner, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Wehner,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Webber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who can see the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I fully support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

---

Dear Mr. Webber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who can see the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I fully support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
330 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Image]

Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
330 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Mr. Tom Webb, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webb,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr. Tom Webb, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webb,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Mr. Tom Weller, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Weller,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are committed to the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will bring a welcome to Letcher County not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr. Tom Weller, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Weller,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are committed to the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will bring a welcome to Letcher County not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
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E-540 July 2015
Mr. Tim Weber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20531

Dear Mr. Weber,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisoners will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well.

I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Appendix E
E-541
July 2015
Dear Mister Wahtan,

Letcher County has historically been a progressive leader with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the prison employees as well. I fully support the expansion of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
920 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to express my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that you are aware of the overwhelming situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
920 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston:

Consider this letter as a statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. Along with my support our community and our elected officials who support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Jasen Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Mr. John Wehby, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
120 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Wehby,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are pushing for the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find it welcoming in Letcher County not only for the location, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 12, 2015

Jake Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Jake Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
330 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Appendix E

July 2015
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20536

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowded situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Dylan Bentley

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20536

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter as my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Dylan Bentley

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tom Weber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
101 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20536

Dear Mr. Weber,

Letcher County is experiencing a severe decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison project will not only tremendously help the county, but the project will also help many capable workers. I am one hundred percent for this project.

Sincerely,

Dylan Bentley

March 12, 2015

Mr. Tom Weber, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
101 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20536

Dear Mr. Weber,

Letcher County is a county with lots of progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a willing Letcher County, not only for the correctional facilities, but for the prison employees as well. I fully support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

Dylan Bentley
Dear Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. The new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I know you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Respectfully,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

[Address]

[Name and Title]

---

Dear Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to express my support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. Our schools are good, our medical representation is good. Our young people are good. Thanks for being in Letcher County.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

[Address]

[Name and Title]
March 12, 2015

Nanci Gilson, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gattos,

Thank you for your efforts pertaining to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Mr. Don Webber, Chief, Capital Planning and Construction Review
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1301 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Don Webber,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the coal industry. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only provide immediate help to the county, but the project will also serve many capable workers.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Nanci Gilson, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gattos,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders who are working on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the community, but for the prisoners as well. I fully support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
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Mr. Tony Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1200 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is experiencing a serious decline in the rural economy. The Letcher County Prison Project will not only significantly help the economy, but the project will also provide many needed services. I am very grateful for this project.

Sincerely,

Bill E. Statney

---

Mr. James Goss, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1200 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Goss,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor. The schools and medical opportunities are good. Our young men have good opportunities. I am very grateful for this project.

Respectfully Yours,

Bill E. Statney

---

Mr. Tony Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
1200 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster,

Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institution, but for the people employed as well.

I fully support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

Bill E. Statney
March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowded situation in the Mid-Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Isaac Gaston, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gaston,

Consider this letter my statement of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
USP and FPC Letcher County, Kentucky
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Mr. Tom Webster, Chief, Capacity Planning, and Construction Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Webster,
Letcher County is a community with progressive leaders with an eye on the future. The Federal Bureau of Prisons will find a welcome in Letcher County, not only for the institutions, but for the prison employees as well. I totally support the location of the prison in Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Address]

[Date]

Mr. Isaac Gaskin, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gaskin,

I want to express my strong support for the Letcher County Federal Prison Project. You will find Letcher County a good neighbor; the schools are good, our medical services are good, our young workers are good. Thanks for coming to Letcher County.

Respectfully Yours,

[Signature]

[Address]

[Date]

Mr. Isaac Gaskin, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Dear Mr. Gaskin,
I am writing this letter to state my support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County Ky. I am confident that you are aware of the overcrowding situation in the 3rd Atlantic region. This new facility in Letcher County would help improve the overcrowded conditions. I hope you realize our area has a strong work ethic and dedicated employees that would assist in making this a successful project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely Yours,

[Signature]

[Address]

[Date]
March 12, 2015

Dearl Gostson, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gostson,

Cancelor this letter as my statements of support for the Federal Prison project in Letcher County, Ky. Along with my support our community and our elected officials also support this project. This would go a long way to promote the success of this project. Our people are good workers which would add to the potential success of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

March 12, 2015

Dale Gostson, Site Selection Specialist
U.S. Department of Justice
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Mr. Gostson,

Thank you for your efforts in relating to the Federal Prison project in Letcher County. This would be a great place to locate the new Federal Prison because the people are hardworking and dedicated and this would lead to a successful project. Thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Mr. Isaac Minar, Vice President, Operations
US Department of Energy
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
5132 Folsom Boulevard, NW
Washington, D.C. 20585

Dear Mr. Minar:

I wrote to express my support for the Letcher County Fossil
Project. We will find Letcher County and its residents very
good. Our medical systems are good, our young people are
good. Thank you for coming to Letcher County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned, express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Martha K. Whitley, Jenkins KY 41537
Melissa Bell, Jenkins KY 41537
Loyd Meador, Jenkins KY 41537
Jonnae Brantley, Jenkins KY 41537
Cornelius Mosley, Jenkins KY 41537

Annie Hazel, Jenkins KY 41537
James Miller, Jenkins KY 41537
Helen Whitley, Jenkins KY 41537
Andrew White, Jenkins KY 41537

Ashley Robert, Jenkins KY 41537
Heidi Myers, Jenkins KY 41537

Petra Westman, Corbin KY 40701
Eddie Winstead, Corbin KY 40701
Michelle Sherrin, Martin KY 40857

Eva Smage, Whitley KY 41898

PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned, express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Kathleen White, Whitesburg KY 41859
Patricia White, Whitesburg KY 41859

Kathleen Fisher, Paintsville KY 41121

Shirley Hadley, Paintsville KY 41121

Molly Graham, Whitesburg KY 41859

Linda Bruce, Whitesburg KY 41859

Janet Strong, Corbin KY 40701
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We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Best Regards,

[Signatures]
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signature Lines]

PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signature Lines]
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Pamela Canny-Hall
Brittany Adkins
Mary Boone
Mark Blevins
Gerald A. Flowers
Gonda Campbell
Sandra Bowers
Jesse Pennington
Tom Baxley
Linda Blain
Katherine Abner
Amy Foster
Kim Maddox
Teresa Holloway
Rod Smith
James Cobb
John Maunders
Bobby Lofcase
Tennie Emery
William Addington
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signatures]

PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signatures]
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Kim E. Miller
Larry Love
Sandra Shively
Larry Scott
Bill Moore
Billie Surhart
Judith Bailey
Sherry Taylor
Lloyd Hinkle
Victoria Watts
Susan Jones
Matthew Bates
Michael Humphries
Misty Lewis
Mary Craft
Julie Stewart

PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Chet M. Cox
Deanna Newsom
Jimmie Howard
Danny Jones
Lisa Copeland
Lynn Howard
Richard Hall
James Bopp
Gary Atwood
Kerri Hengen
Steve Currence
Mary Carlisle
Damon Kuntz
Robert Mitchell
Allan Hoyt
Whitney Thompson
Susan Bristow
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PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Angie Shull
Charles Beul
Jodie Johnson
Mackenzie Hardesty
Jerry Steele
Gary Hallmark
Sharon Fields
Cory Shumard
Deloris Smith
Renee Simard
Sherron Adams
Audra Chastain
Terry Webb
Michelle Stone
James Stringer

PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Bella Winters
Cheryl Grammer
Shayla Hamilton
Stevia Taylor
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signatures]

PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signatures]
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Riley Roce Jenkins
Gary Ball Jenkins
Dorothy Roce Jenkins
Shawna Carter Jenkins
Bryan Carter Jenkins
Terry Carter Jenkins
Phillip Jenkins
Delilah Jenkins
Ned Phillips Jenkins
William Smith Jame Gap
Melinda Smith Jame Gap
Brandie Yearn Kentucky
Deven Milkie Perry
Nate Purdy Letcher
Machi Loores W. King

PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Pet Johnson Jenkins Ky
Andy Bynum Jenkins Ky
Terry Blandford Jenkins Ky
Kevin Woodford Jenkins Ky
Evan Woodford Jenkins Ky
Sash Pitts Jenkins Ky
Larisa Todd Jenkins Ky
Adam Woodford Jenkins Ky
Sandra Hendley Jenkins Ky
Terri Turlington Jenkins Ky
Albert Johnson Jenkins Ky
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Danny White
Wesley Price
Hubert Brown
Gary Sheets
Marcy Anthony
Grace P. Stagg
Sandra Hall
Danette Galloway

ANNIE BRYANT
JESSICA WELCH
WINSTON FULTON
JASON MILLIN
DEAN BARNES
RICKY CUNNINGHAM

PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Nancy Horn
Tom Hines
Julie Smith
Mike Hendricks
Ann Bibbs
Dave York
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PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Signed:

Wanda Murphy
Leroy Martin
Shirley Map
Kerry Blevins
Sarena Smith
Brenda Holl
Dakota Moore
Debra Beck
Jodi Austen
Billie Gates
Annasburg
Steve Kelly
Dale Tews
Greg Kinsey
Anna Mays
Mike McLeod
Pam Embrey
Mary Jane Allen
Jennifer Allen
Cecelia Rothe
Frances Taylor
James Mitchell
Sue Schmitz
Shawn Miller
Amy Sexton
Linda Siner
Eaton Miller
Dorothy Miller
Ryan Allen
Jane Miller
Bob Allen
Larry Miller
Mary Miller
Greg Kinsey
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signatures and addresses listed below]
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signature List]

PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signature List]
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Campion D. Jones, Jenkins, Ky.
Estill Wright, Jenkins, Ky.
Donnie Sergent, Jenkins, Ky.
Jessica Hicks, Jenkins, Ky.
Scotty Church, Jenkins, Ky.
Ray Kiner, Jenkins, Ky.
Donnie Adam, Jenkins, Ky.
Charity Phillips, Jenkins, Ky.
Hillery Daniels, Jenkins, Ky.
Jada Houchin, Jenkins, Ky.
Shawn White, Jenkins, Ky.
D.J. Carver, Jenkins, Ky.
Jason Crouch, Jenkins, Ky.
Wayne Crouther, Jenkins, Ky.
Kathy Keen, Jenkins, Ky.
Carrie Kelly, Jenkins, Ky.
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Joe L. Clay 107 E. Main St. Hazard Ky 41701
Tina Mullins 5413 Fitch Rd. Hazard Ky 41701
Joe Mullins 120 Cragin Rd. Hazard Ky 41701
Darnel Potter 235 N. 14th St. Hazard Ky 41701
Shawna Potter 235 N. 14th St. Hazard Ky 41701
Clint Stowe 37 Magnolia Rd. Hazard Ky 41701
Nancy Stoto 37 Magnolia Rd. Hazard Ky 41701
Stephanie Nicker 1205 Glen Rd. Hazard Ky 41701
William Nicker 1205 Glen Rd. Hazard Ky 41701
Chris Nicker 120 E. Main St. Hazard Ky 41701
Mary Shelley 407 Jenkins Rd. Hazard Ky 41701
Jenifer Potts 407 Jenkins Rd. Hazard Ky 41701
James Potts 407 Jenkins Rd. Hazard Ky 41701
Eric Shaw 2837 Hwy 931 South Whitesburg Ky 41858

Hazel Johnson 721 Good Rd. Morehead Ky 40351
Cindy Douglas 168 Willard St. Morehead Ky 40351
Cindy Douglas 168 Willard St. Morehead Ky 40351
Charles Knisto 168 Willard St. Morehead Ky 40351
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PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signatures]

PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signatures]
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signatures]

[Signatures]
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Eddie Walls  James Hart
Seth Abee  Chris Hart
Christine Belling  Chad Hart
Devin Belling  Becky Hart
William Fields  Christopher Hart
Anna Belling  Abby Gally
Tresa Belling  Johnathan Perry
Richard Belling  Chance Adams
Stephanie Belling  Dallas Adams
Anthony Fields  Janice Boggs
Jack Fields lick Boggs
Mary Fields  Kendon Wilken
Audrey Belling  Misty Wilken
Jatina Potter  Emily Wilken
Laci Pelle  Mable Wilken
Jeff Wilken  Trae Wilken
Robert Wilken  Tod Wilken
Wendy Belling  Michelle Wilken
Stephania Hale  Chelse Wilken
Victoria Bole  Michelle Wilken
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Carl Hall
Anna Hall
Calvin Wind

PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Bonnie Belling
Mary Bell
Margaret Bell
Lucas Bell
Matthew Belling
Sam Belling

Seth Belling
Bobby Belling
William Smith

Mike Hooper

Nick Hooper

Chuck Smith

Glenn Smith

Linda Brown

Lisa Brown

Ethan Hooper

Joel Hooper

Lori Madden

Windon Field

Holly Field

Amy Field
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signatures]

Jesse Haynes
Dwight Emers
Terry McQuady
Terry Byers
Ramon Hurd

PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signatures]

Stephany Lawberty
Sharon Johnson
Shannon Bentley
Shawn Hampton
Debra Shinkle

Billy Rutledge
Willie Shinkle
Mike Brewer
Steve Shinkle

[Other signatures]
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signatures]

[Signatures]
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Shawn Maxwell
Misty Dixon
Jenni Blevins
Hannah Lamb
Kathy Lambert
Carlynn Bentley
Mary Sieffman
Mary Hughes
Dennis Petsch
Hannah Bube
Heather Holman
Younghyun Kim
Mary R. Knasee
Donna Knasee

PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Shawn Maxwell
Misty Dixon
Jenni Blevins
Hannah Lamb
Kathy Lambert
Carlynn Bentley
Mary Sieffman
Mary Hughes
Dennis Petsch
Hannah Bube
Heather Holman
Younghyun Kim
Mary R. Knasee
Donna Knasee
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signature List]

PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

[Signature List]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Brown</td>
<td>634-3654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Peters</td>
<td>634-3654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Brown</td>
<td>634-3651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Scandinavia</td>
<td>333-3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista Brown</td>
<td>333-3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Jenkins</td>
<td>505-9999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Smith</td>
<td>666-6666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ray</td>
<td>654-1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Calloway</td>
<td>654-1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Conner</td>
<td>785-3785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Green</td>
<td>333-3734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Jackson</td>
<td>654-3747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Fort</td>
<td>888-0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Davis</td>
<td>642-3476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Sullivan</td>
<td>642-3476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Jimmy Neal
Mary Neal
Danny Wilson
Donna Warner
Billie Sloan
Brian Adams
Andrea Meade
Christie Miles
Evelyn Stanford
Sandra Bishop
Harold Hodge
Rodman Hendley
Julieann Sparks
Don Hill
James Mitchell
Wanda Meade
Elizabeth Wilt
Ann Cray
Sallieanne Carter

PETITION FOR LETCHER COUNTY PRISON PROJECT

We, the undersigned express our strong support for the Letcher County Prison Project. This project will be a great boost to this county and be an excellent location for the Federal Bureau of Prison.

Karen P. McQuillen
Marcia M. White
Theresa M. Waller
Sandra Bishop
Melba Blankenbaker
Jim Blankenbaker
Jill Blankenbaker
Grace Meade
We are supporters of a Federal Prison being built in Letcher County. Due to certain circumstances we could not attend the meeting, but wish our opinions to be counted.

Shirley E. Breeding
P.O. Box 1
Isom, KY 41824

Cora Lee Adams
P.O. Box 4
Isom, KY 41824

Donie C. Hill
P.O. Box 78
Isom, KY 41824

Mr. & Mrs. John P. Breeding Jr.
20 Amos Rd.
Isom, KY 41824

Rosa Breeding
P.O. Box 137
Isom, KY 41824

---

Please support the effort to bring the Federal Prison to Letcher County.

This would help bring hundreds of jobs to Letcher County!

Please sign the petition below. Thanks!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Print Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrice Partridge</td>
<td>152 Huddles Ridge, Middlesboro, KY 42965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Macniack</td>
<td>3456 Hickey Branch Road, Whitesburg, KY 41858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Tucker</td>
<td>1838 Dewey Street, Whitesburg, KY 41858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Parham</td>
<td>123 Main Street, Whitesburg, KY 41858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara White</td>
<td>101 White Road, Whitesburg, KY 41858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1500 White Road, Whitesburg, KY 41858

---
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## Petition to Federal Bureau of Prisons

We, the people of the Roxana area, believe our part of the county has been neglected in the past, the Payne Gap area has much better roads, which has afforded them better opportunity for business and has given them a big advantage over us. We don’t even have a local gas station, we have to drive 15 miles for gas and have a very small limited store with a few groceries.

Jenkins was awarded the Industrial Park at how many million? The Payne Gap site is located on the Virginia border, and the connecting Virginia counties have benefited for many years from the sale of alcohol while we have not. We feel our part of the county has missed and paid tax on as much or more coal in the past as the Payne Gap area has, and we have had nothing coming back in return.

The total known mitigation and associated coal listed in the Economic Impact Study page E5-6 shows a savings of $95,002,201 if the prison is built at Roxana.

So please when you consider where to build the prison remember our area needs it more.

We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to build the proposed Letcher County Prison on the Roxana Site.

### Printed Name | Signature | Address | Telephone | Date
---|---|---|---|---
2. Theresa Callow | Theresa Callow | 984 Hwy 331 South, Whitleyburg, Ky 40388 | 3/9/15
3. TALMAGE MEADE | Talmage Meade | 984 Hwy 331 South, Whitleyburg, Ky 40388 | 3/9/15
5. RICKY DAY | Ricky Day | 834 Hwy 640, Whitesburg, Ky 41858 | 3/9/15
6. ROGER HENDRIX | Roger Hendrix | 814 Hwy 640, Whitesburg, Ky 41858 | 3/9/15
7. JAMES CRARY | James Crary | 211 Kincaid Lane Brack Rd, Whitleyburg, Ky 40388 | 3/9/15
9. MARTIE WIEDA | Martie Wieda | 401 Lynn Br. | 3/9/15
10. JAMES CLARK | James Clark | 401 Lynn Br. | 3/9/15
11. ELAINE DAGGETT | Elaine Daggett | 475 Lynn Br. | 3/9/15
12. LAURA MURPHY | Laura Murphy | 475 Lynn Br. | 3/9/15
13. TERRY WARNER | Terry Warner | 818 Hwy 640, Whitesburg, Ky 41858 | 3/9/15
14. JAY HALL | Jay Hall | 818 Hwy 640, Whitesburg, Ky 41858 | 3/9/15
15. LESLIE STACY | Leslie Stacy | 984 Hwy 331 South, Whitleyburg, Ky 40388 | 3/9/15
16. THOMAS CALHOUN | Thomas Calhoun | 984 Hwy 331 South, Whitleyburg, Ky 40388 | 3/9/15
17. ROBERT WOODS | Robert Woods | 984 Hwy 331 South, Whitleyburg, Ky 40388 | 3/9/15
18. ROBERT MALLETT | Robert Mallett | 984 Hwy 331 South, Whitleyburg, Ky 40388 | 3/9/15
19. MARK ALCOTT | Mark Alcott | 984 Hwy 331 South, Whitleyburg, Ky 40388 | 3/9/15
20. WILLIAM ALDRED | William Aldred | 984 Hwy 331 South, Whitleyburg, Ky 40388 | 3/9/15
21. DAVID BARNETT | David Barnett | 984 Hwy 331 South, Whitleyburg, Ky 40388 | 3/9/15
22. NELA CARROLL | Nela Carroll | 984 Hwy 331 South, Whitleyburg, Ky 40388 | 3/9/15
23. JOSH PHELPS | Josh Phelps | 984 Hwy 331 South, Whitleyburg, Ky 40388 | 3/9/15
24. WILLIAM ALFORD | William Alford | 984 Hwy 331 South, Whitleyburg, Ky 40388 | 3/9/15
## Petition to Federal Bureau of Prisons

We the people of the Rosana area believe our part of the county has been neglected in the past, the Payne Gap area has much better roads, which has afforded them better opportunity for business and has given them a big advantage over us. We don't even have a local gas station, we have to drive 10 miles for gas and have a very small limited store with a few groceries.

Jenkins was awarded the Industrial Park at how many million? The Payne Gap site is located on the Virginia border, and the connecting Virginia counties have benefited for many years from the sale of alcohol while we have not. We feel our part of the county has mined and paid tax on as much or more coal in the past as the Payne Gap area has, and we have had nothing coming back in return.

The total known mitigation and associated cost listed in the Economic Impact Study page E8-ii shows a savings of $69,002.20 if the prison is built at Rosana. So please when you consider where to build the prison remember our area needs it more.

We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to build the proposed Letcher County Prison on the Rosana site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEO W. DAVIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE J. TURNER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH W. HENRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT B. SMITH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Petition to Federal Bureau of Prisons

We the people of the Rosana area believe our part of the county has been neglected in the past, the Payne Gap area has much better roads, which has afforded them better opportunity for business and has given them a big advantage over us. We don’t even have a local gas station, we have to drive 15 miles for gas and have very small limited store with a few groceries.

Jenkins was awarded the industrial Park at how many million? The Payne Gap site is located on the Virginia border, and the connecting Virginia counties have benefited for many years from the sale of alcohol while we have not. We feel our part of the county has mined and paid tax on as much or more coal in the past as the Payne Gap area has, and we have had nothing coming back in return.

The total known mitigation and associated cost listed in the Economic Impact Study page E-3-3 shows a savings of $69,000.201 if the prison is built at Rosana.

So please when you consider where to build the prison remember our area needs it more.

We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to build the proposed Letcher County Prison on the Rosana Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria Bennett</td>
<td>Jolene Bennett</td>
<td>12424 Tims Creek Rd</td>
<td>03/0/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Lewis</td>
<td>Jolene Bennett</td>
<td>1766 Main St</td>
<td>03/0/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Blair</td>
<td>Cindy Blair</td>
<td>61 W 40 MARY</td>
<td>07/4/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Allen</td>
<td>Kevin Allen</td>
<td>1820 Main St</td>
<td>07/4/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Potter</td>
<td>Donna Potter</td>
<td>1820 Main St</td>
<td>07/4/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster Brown</td>
<td>Poster Brown</td>
<td>1820 Main St</td>
<td>07/4/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Stagil</td>
<td>Amanda Stagil</td>
<td>1820 Main St</td>
<td>07/4/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Brown</td>
<td>Chris Brown</td>
<td>1820 Main St</td>
<td>07/4/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dillie Hendrix</td>
<td>Dillie Hendrix</td>
<td>1741 Hwy 93, Mount</td>
<td>3/10/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Hendrix</td>
<td>Bruce Hendrix</td>
<td>1741 Hwy 93, Mount</td>
<td>3/10/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Caldwell</td>
<td>Evelyn Caldwell</td>
<td>1741 Hwy 93, Mount</td>
<td>3/10/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer Beggs</td>
<td>Elmer Beggs</td>
<td>1741 Hwy 93, Mount</td>
<td>3/10/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Petition to Federal Bureau of Prisons

We the people of the Rosana area believe our part of the county has been neglected in the past, the Payne Gap area has much better roads, which has afforded them better opportunity for business and has given them a big advantage over us. We don’t even have a local gas station, we have to drive 15 miles for gas and have a very small limited store with a few groceries.

Jenkins was awarded the Industrial Park at how many million?
The Payne Gap site is located on the Virginia border, and the connecting Virginia counties have benefited for many years from the sale of alcohol while we have not.

We feel our part of the county has mined and paid tax on as much or more coal in the past as the Payne Gap area has, and we have had nothing coming back in return.

The total known mitigation and associated costs listed in the Economic Impact Study page ES-II shows a savings of $69,002,201 if the prison is built at Rosana.

So please when you consider where to build the prison remember our area needs it more.

We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to build the proposed Letcher County Prison on the Rosana Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Battle</td>
<td>Mike Battle</td>
<td>1000 Hwy 112, Whitesburg</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Coburn</td>
<td>Charles Coburn</td>
<td>9494 Hwy 112, Whitesburg, Ky</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Hill</td>
<td>Joe Hill</td>
<td>15 Eagle Dr, Whitesburg, KY</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Bentley</td>
<td>Tammy Bentley</td>
<td>1547 Hwy 112, Whitesburg, KY</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Fields</td>
<td>Brian Fields</td>
<td>26391 Hwy 589, Whitesburg, KY</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Mullins</td>
<td>Jennifer Mullins</td>
<td>20100 Hwy 589, Whitesburg, KY</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donny Coats</td>
<td>Donny Coats</td>
<td>37 Donnelly Dr, Whitesburg, KY</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-11-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Petition to Federal Bureau of Prisons**

We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to build the proposed Letcher County Prison on the Rosana Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>123 Main St, Rosana, KY 40987</td>
<td>555-1234</td>
<td>5/10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td></td>
<td>456 Oak Rd, Rosana, KY 40989</td>
<td>555-2345</td>
<td>5/10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>789 Pine Ave, Rosana, KY 40990</td>
<td>555-3456</td>
<td>5/10/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Petition for the proposed federal prison to be constructed on the Rosana Site**

We the people of the Rosana area believe our part of the county has been neglected in the past, the Payne Gap area has much better roads, which has afforded them better opportunity for business and has given them a big advantage over us. We don't even have a local gas station, we have to drive 10 miles for gas and have a very small limited store with a few groceries.

Jerminda was awarded the Industrial Park at how many million? The Payne Gap site is located on the Virginia border, and the connecting Virginia counties have benefited for many years from the sale of alcohol while we have not. We feel our part of the county has mined and paid tax on as much or more coal in the past as the Payne Gap area has, and we have had nothing coming back in return.

The total known mitigation and associated cost listed in the Economic Impact Study page ES-11 shows a savings of $99,000,001 if the prison is built at Rosana.

So please when you consider where to build the prison remember our area needs it more.
Petition to Federal Bureau of Prisons

We the people of the Rosana area believe our part of the county has been neglected in the past, the Payne Gap area has much better roads, which has afforded them better opportunity for business and has given them a big advantage over us. We don't even have a local gas station, we have to drive 10 miles for gas and have a very small limited store with only a few groceries.

Jenkins was awarded the Industrial Park at how many million? The Payne Gap site is located on the Virginia border, and the connecting Virginia counties have benefited for many years from the sale of alcohol while we have not. We feel our part of the county has mined and paid tax on as much or more coal in the past as the Payne Gap area has, and we have had nothing coming back to return.

The total known mitigation and associated cost listed in the Economic Impact Study page ES-ii shows a savings of $999,201 if the prison is built at Rosana.

So please when you consider where to build the prison remember our area needs it more.

We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to build the proposed Letcher County Prison on the Rosana Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darlon Webb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnie Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Prince</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mollie Patterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Ritchie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewey Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/11/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Petition to Federal Bureau of Prisons

We the people of the Rosana area believe our part of the county has been neglected in the past, the Payne Gap area has much better roads, which has afforded them better opportunity for business and has given them a big advantage over us. We don't even have a local gas station, we have to drive 10 miles for gas and have a very small limited store with only a few groceries.

Jenkins was awarded the Industrial Park at how many million? The Payne Gap site is located on the Virginia border, and the connecting Virginia counties have benefited for many years from the sale of alcohol while we have not. We feel our part of the county has mined and paid tax on as much or more coal in the past as the Payne Gap area has, and we have had nothing coming back to return.

The total known mitigation and associated cost listed in the Economic Impact Study page ES-ii shows a savings of $999,201 if the prison is built at Rosana.

So please when you consider where to build the prison remember our area needs it more.

We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to build the proposed Letcher County Prison on the Rosana Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marita Foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lula Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanisha Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Coats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacia Boyce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Stephens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/11/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1. Study Purpose and Objectives

Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB) was contracted by the Federal Bureau of Prisons to conduct a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and provide related traffic engineering services in the evaluation of two alternative sites for a proposed federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky.

The purpose of this TIS is to analyze the traffic operating conditions in the vicinity of the new facility. Specific attention will be given to the proposed access points that will serve the development. It is the goal of this document to follow the guidelines1 established by the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) on traffic impact studies that impact state-maintained facilities.

1.2. Summary of Proposed Action

The “Proposed Action” is a proposed federal correctional facility. It is expected that during construction the Proposed Action would temporarily add the following types of trips to the highway network:

- Construction worker commuting trips
- Trips involving the delivery and removal of construction equipment

Following construction, the proposed facility would add traffic to the surrounding roadway network on a recurring basis. This traffic increase would include employee commuting trips, plus additional trips (such as the transfer of inmates, inmate visitors, delivery of supplies and equipment, etc.) that would not necessarily coincide with peak commuting periods. The proposed facility would have a staff of 300 full-time employees. The employees would be expected to add trips during peak commuting periods. Based on hourly count data from KYTC, existing peak periods are 7:00 – 9:00 AM and 3:00 – 5:00 PM on a typical weekday.

1.3. Study Area

Two potential sites have been identified for the Proposed Action. The first site is referred to as the Payne Gap Site. It is located approximately 7.5 miles to the east of Whitesburg, Kentucky. The site is accessed from US 119 and is located east of Bottom Fork Road (KY 3406) and west of Talman Drive. The other site is referred to as the Roxana Site. It is located approximately 7.5 miles to the west of Whitesburg, Kentucky. The site is located south of KY 588 and to the west of KY 160. The site locations are shown in Figure 1-1.

---

Access to the Payne Gap Site is expected to be from US 119 only. Access to the Roxana Site is expected to be from KY 588 just east of Tolson Creek.

1.4. Data Collection

Data (including Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes) collected for this TIS was obtained from two different sources:

1) Existing 48-hour traffic counts provided by the KYTC for routes located near the study sites. These include the following stations:

   - US 119 – Station 272: 2013 AADT = 6,010
   - KY 160 – Station 755: 2014 AADT = 550
   - KY 588 – Station 796: 2014 AADT = 330
   - KY 2036 – Station 776: 2012 AADT = 80

2) Supplemental 48-hour classification counts at four locations conducted January 19 – 21, 2015. These counts were performed at the following locations:
For this analysis, the Highway Capacity Software 2010 package (HCS 2010) based on the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual was used to assess the peak period traffic operating conditions for the following study segments that are expected to be most impacted by the Proposed Action:

- US 119 (east of intersection with KY 805)
- KY 160 (between KY 2036 and KY 588)
- KY 588 (Big Branch Tolson Creek)
- KY 588 (just north of Paces Branch Rd)

All count data is included in Appendix A.

2.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS AND LEVEL OF SERVICE

US 119 is a four-lane facility with a flush median, and is therefore evaluated as a multi-lane highway. KY 588 is a two-lane facility and is considered to be a Class II highway. Class II highways include lower speed collector roadways and roads primarily designed to provide access. Levels of service for Class II highways are defined only in terms of a vehicle’s percent time spent following. Percent time spent following is the average percent of total travel time that vehicles must travel in platoons behind slower vehicles because of inability to pass on a two-lane highway. Average travel speed is not considered since drivers typically will tolerate lower speeds on a Class II facility because of its function as an access roadway (serving shorter trips and fewer through trips).

For each study segment, the volume to capacity ratio (v/c) as well as the resulting levels of service (LOS) was determined. It was assumed that LOS D or better would be acceptable for KY 588 (rural mountainous collector) based on guidelines from the AASHTO A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (6th Edition). For US 119 (rural level arterial), LOS B is the desired LOS based on the same guidelines. Also, it should be noted that all HCS 2010 output is included in Appendix B.

The major software inputs require roadway geometry (i.e. lane and shoulder widths), as well as traffic volumes by direction. The roadway geometry for the existing conditions was determined from the HIS database as well as aerial photos. The traffic volumes were determined from the data collection efforts.

Based on previous hourly counts from KYTC as well as the hourly counts conducted for this study, the peak hours on a weekday were noted between 7:00 – 9:00 AM and 3:00 – 5:00 PM. The highest hourly volumes from the counts were used for this analysis from these time periods. Table 2-1 and Table 2-2 present the v/c ratio and level of service for the study area segments for both the AM and PM peak periods.

---

3 Highway Capacity Manual 2010
### Table 2-1: AM Peak Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>v/c ratio</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 119</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY 588</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2-2: PM Peak Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>v/c ratio</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 119</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY 588</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic volumes are very low on KY 588 (less than 50 vehicles per hour). Based on the analysis of the v/c ratio, there is plenty of available capacity along these segments. A ratio of 1.0 is considered at capacity and all ratios shown are substantially below that threshold.

### 3.0 DEVELOPMENT

A copy of the development plan for the correctional facility or United States Penitentiary (USP) was provided by the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Included in this development plan were locations of site access, parking areas and the internal roadway network. The anticipated completion date is 2020. Figure 3-1 and Figure 3-2 provides the preliminary development plans for informational purposes only.
Figure 3-1: Payne Gap Site Development Plan

USP LETCHER COUNTY KY: PROPOSED USP SITE PLAN
Figure 3-2: Roxana Site Development Plan

USP Letcher County KY: PROPOSED USP SITE PLAN
Roxana Quadrangle
4.0 TRIP GENERATION

The primary development under consideration is a federal correctional facility. A review of the Institute of Transportation Engineer’s (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (9th Edition) does provide data for a similar land use (Land Use 571). Two values are presented for both the AM and PM Peak hours: 1) Number of trips generated in the peak hour of the generator; and, 2) In/out distribution percentages of those trips. The variable these values are based on is the number of employees. Background information provided by Cardno during the scoping process of this study noted that the proposed facility would have a staff of 300 full-time employees. Employees would be expected to add trips during peak commuting periods.

Utilizing this information, Table 4-1 provides a summary of the trip generation results. As both sites would have the same number of employees, these numbers are valid for both the Payne Gap and Roxana sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trips Generated</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent In</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Out</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A higher number of trips are expected to be generated in the PM Peak period based on the previous studies performed and documented in the ITE Trip Generation Manual of traffic patterns associated with a federal correctional facility. There are expected to be other trips to/from the sites that would not necessarily coincide with peak commuting periods. These trips include transfer of inmates, inmate visitors, and delivery of supplies and equipment. Given the low volumes on both KY 588 and US 119, there is expected to be little to no impact related to these off-peak trips. The peak periods evaluated represent the “worst case” scenario for traffic impacts to the existing routes.

5.0 TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT

The data collected for this study was used to determine directional splits of traffic entering/exiting the sites. Only trips generated by the site are included in the distribution and assignment. It is assumed that no pass-by trips are expected for this study given the proposed development. Due to the unique nature of the site as well, it is expected that there will not be any internal capture trips for this study.

Appendix C provides a summary of the trip generation/trip distribution for this study.
6.0 TRAFFIC FORECASTING AND ANALYSIS

The next step involved forecasting the traffic volumes for year 2020 (anticipated opening year). This was done using historical traffic trends of nearby KYTC count stations. The stations included 272 (US 119) and 796 (KY 588) in Letcher County. The change in traffic volumes from year to year resulted in an average decline for each of these stations ranging from 0.68% to 6.35% per year. Given the trending decline in growth, the conservative estimate for traffic impacts in the future would be to assume no growth at this point. Therefore, volumes evaluated for the 2020 year analysis are assumed to be the same as those used for the current year analysis.

Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 presents the level of service for the two segments previously evaluated utilizing the assumed 2020 base year volumes with the added trip generation due to the new prison facility. Table 6-3 and Table 6-4 provide analysis for the new intersections created by the new access road to the prison. The initial analysis assumed the intersections were STOP controlled on the minor approach (access road) with the mainline (KY 588 and US 119) left at free-flow conditions. No turn lanes were assumed for the initial analysis as well to provide a baseline for operations.

Table 6-1: Future Year (2020) AM Peak Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>v/c ratio</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 119</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY 588</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-2: Future Year (2020) PM Peak Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>v/c ratio</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 119</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY 588</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-3: Payne Gap Site Intersection Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>AM Approach Delay (sec)</th>
<th>AM Approach LOS</th>
<th>PM Approach Delay (sec)</th>
<th>PM Approach LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6-4: Roxana Site Intersection Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>AM Approach Delay (sec)</th>
<th>AM Approach LOS</th>
<th>PM Approach Delay (sec)</th>
<th>PM Approach LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown, the intersections at both sites operate at an acceptable LOS. Based on these volumes, no separate turn lanes are warranted at this time. A review of traffic signal warrants (per the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)) found that none of the volume warrants were met (Warrant 1: Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume, Warrant 2: Four-Hour Vehicular Volume, and Warrant 3: Peak Hour). Therefore, installation of a traffic control signal is not warranted at this time.

After consultation with the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC), a recommendation was made to consider constructing a left turn lane along US 119 and KY 588 into the site. This consideration was made based on safety implications—looking to reduce the possibility of a following vehicle rear-ending the turning vehicle. It may be necessary to move some of the grade drains in the middle of the median along US 119 depending on the exact entrance to the access road.

### 7.0 CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC IMPACTS ON ROADWAYS

An additional task as part of this evaluation includes determining the construction impacts on the roadways accessing the sites.

First, an analysis of the existing pavement of the two key routes was conducted using construction plans (as available) from KYTC.

#### US 119

Construction traffic may come from the east (Jenkins area) or west (Whitesburg area) along US 119. US 119 is a main route in Eastern Kentucky and should be able to support all associated construction traffic for the development of the site. The evaluation of the pavement and the supportable load is given below.

Archived design plans for the section of US 119 near the proposed site are from 1971. The design plans note the following:

- 24” Stabilized Rock Roadbed
- 11” Crushed Stone Base
- 2.75” Asphalt Base
• 2.75” Asphalt Base
• 1” Asphalt Surface

An Equivalent Single Axle Load (ESAL) is a measure of pavement damage and is used in pavement design. The ESALs (based on future year traffic and truck volumes) is 2,400,000. According to the KYTC calculation sheet, the current design should be acceptable up to 7,000,000 ESALs. The ESAL calculation sheet is included in Appendix D. It should be noted that US 119 is a state-maintained coal haul route and has a maximum gross vehicle weight of 80,000 lbs per KYTC Truck Weight Classification. Therefore, this route is intended to accommodate heavy truck traffic.

KY 588
The construction traffic would likely access this site from Whitesburg. This route follows KY 3401 to KY 588 / KY 160. It is a total of approximately 10 miles.

The available archived plans for KY 588 show it as a gravel road. However, it has been paved since then though those plans were not available for review. Through email communication with KYTC it was confirmed that no design plans were available. Therefore, for purposes of this study, an assumption was made that the pavement design of KY 588 would be less than that of a designated US Route such as US 119. It was further assumed that KY 588 (as a rural minor collector road with given traffic volumes and truck traffic) would have a pavement design as follows:

• 4” Crushed Stone Base
• 3.00” Asphalt Base
• 3.00” Asphalt Base
• 1.25” Asphalt Surface

The ESALs (based on future year traffic and truck volumes) for KY 588 are calculated at 100,000. The ESAL calculation sheet is included in Appendix D. Determination or confirmation of the pavement design and calculation of the maximum ESALs the pavement could support should be made and compared to the calculated ESALs (based on traffic volumes) to confirm if the existing pavement can support the projected loadings. It can be noted that per KYTC Truck Weight Classification, KY 588 is designated as a class “A” highway with a maximum gross vehicle weight of 44,000 lbs.

Construction Traffic Types
Next, research was conducted to obtain the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) vehicles classification. These categories are presented in Table 7-1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Typical ESALs per Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Motorcycles</td>
<td>All two- or three-wheeled motorized vehicles. Typical vehicles in this category have saddle type seats and are steered by handle bars rather than wheels. This category includes motorcycles, motor scooters, mopeds, motor-powered bicycles, and three-wheel motorcycles. This vehicle type may be reported at the option of the State.</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Passenger Cars</td>
<td>All sedans, coupes, and station wagons manufactured primarily for the purpose of carrying passengers and including those passenger cars pulling recreational or other light trailers.</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other Two-Axle, Four-Tire Single Unit Vehicles</td>
<td>All two-axle, four tire, vehicles, other than passenger cars. Included in this classification are pickups, panels, vans, and other vehicles such as campers, motor homes, ambulances, hearses, and carryalls. Other two-axle, four-tire single unit vehicles pulling recreational or other light trailers are included in this classification.</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Buses</td>
<td>All vehicles manufactured as traditional passenger-carrying buses with two axles and six tires or three or more axles. This category includes only traditional buses (including school buses) functioning as passenger-carrying vehicles. All two-axle, four-tire single unit vehicles. Modified buses should be considered to be a truck and be appropriately classified.</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Two-Axle, Six-Tire, Single Unit Trucks</td>
<td>All vehicles on a single frame including trucks, camping and recreational vehicles, motor homes, etc., having two axles and dual rear wheels.</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Three-Axle Single Unit Trucks</td>
<td>All vehicles on a single frame including trucks, camping and recreational vehicles, motor homes, etc., having three axles.</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Typical ESALs per Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Four or More Axle Single Unit Trucks</td>
<td>All trucks on a single frame with four or more axles.</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Four or Less Axle Single Trailer Trucks</td>
<td>All vehicles with four or less axles consisting of two units, one of which is a tractor or straight truck power unit.</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Five-Axle Single Trailer Trucks</td>
<td>All five-axle vehicles consisting of two units, one of which is a tractor or straight truck power unit.</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Six or More Axle Single Trailer Trucks</td>
<td>All vehicles with six or more axles consisting of two units, one of which is a tractor or straight truck power unit.</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Five or Less Axle Multi-Trailer Trucks</td>
<td>All vehicles with five or less axles consisting of three or more units, one of which is a tractor or straight truck power unit.</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Six-Axle Multi-Trailer Trucks</td>
<td>All six-axle vehicles consisting of three or more units, one of which is a tractor or straight truck power unit.</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Seven or More Axle Multi-Trailer Trucks</td>
<td>All vehicles with seven or more axles consisting of three or more units, one of which is a tractor or straight truck power unit.</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flatbed trucks that may transport construction equipment to / from the site would be classified as a Class 13. Most dump trucks will be classified as Class 7. Therefore construction equipment at the site may consist of a range of vehicles between these classes but these will be assumed to provide the upper and lower boundaries of impact.

To avoid damage to the existing roadways, it is recommended that the construction traffic loading not exceed the determined design pavement ESAL loadings calculated for each location. For US 119, vehicle weight limits should not exceed 80,000 lbs to comply with legal weight limits on this route.

**Mitigation Measures**
US 119 is not expected to have adverse impacts related to construction traffic based on the assessment of pavement design and geometric standards.
KY 588 has the potential to require mitigation measures due to additional construction traffic given the narrow lane widths and pavement design that is not at a level for a national or state truck route. Construction traffic may also affect other roadways in Letcher County. The location and intensity of these impacts can be estimated following the selection of the construction contractor(s).

To minimize impacts on KY 588, and other potentially affected roadways in Letcher County, the selected construction contractor would be required to perform an assessment of the routing of construction traffic to the site. Based on this analysis, the contractor would be required to:

- To the extent feasible, route construction vehicles so that the gross vehicle weight does not exceed the maximum weight limitations established by the KYTC and/or the pavement loading conditions set forth by the ESAL evaluation.
- For roadways that construction traffic may exceed these limitations, damage to the roadway surface would be need to be repaired by the contractor.
- For oversized vehicles and loads, maintenance of traffic plans should be developed to accommodate to maintain traffic flow during transport times. This will likely utilize flaggers to negotiate traffic flow as a result of narrow lanes.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS / CONCLUSION

The results presented in this document provide an overview of the anticipated traffic impacts associated with the construction of a proposed federal correctional facility in Letcher County, Kentucky. Based on the analysis conducted for this study:

- Both proposed sites have minimal impact on the traffic operations of the existing nearby state routes (US 119 and KY 588). The projected LOS for traffic operations is LOS A or B which is at or better than the desired LOS B for US 119 and LOS D for KY 588.
- Consideration should be given to constructing a left turn lane on US 119 and KY 588 into the site to minimize the potential for rear-end vehicle collisions. Depending on the exact site access, grade drains may need to be moved.
- Construction impacts to the existing US 119 roadway are expected to be minimal (if any).
- KY 588 has the potential to require mitigation measures as it is not a designated truck route and has limiting geometric features including narrow lane widths. Other roadways in Letcher County may also be affected, depending on the origin(s) of construction trips. The selected contractor for the development of this project would be required to perform an assessment of the routing of construction traffic to the site and potentially repair any surface damage caused by moving equipment as well as provide maintenance of traffic plans for moving oversized vehicles/equipment.