APPENDIX E: COMMENT RESPONSES

E.1 Introduction

In accordance with NEPA and CEQ’s NEPA Regulations at 40 CFR 1503.4, VA has considered all of the public comments submitted on the draft Replacement Robley Rex VAMC EIS both individually and collectively. VA has also responded to these comments, including making factual corrections and modifying the analysis where necessary.

Regardless of whether VA considers particular comments to be non-substantive or out of scope, VA has included all of the written comments received and the full transcripts of verbal comments from the public meetings on the Draft EIS in the Final EIS (Appendix E (Section E.6)). Given the significant controversy surrounding the proposed new Replacement Robley Rex VAMC location and VA’s decision to prepare an EIS rather than respond to comments on the preceding draft EA (although previous comments were considered when developing the scope for the EIS), VA believes it important that every comment submitted becomes a part of the official public record for the EIS and is available for review by all interested parties.

E.2 Public Comment Process

VA (Louisville) received comments on the Draft EIS in writing by U.S. mail or email to the VA Louisville VAMC (156 comment forms or letters), through a website managed by the EIS contractor (427 comment letters), and at the public hearings (transcripts and comment cards dropped off at the public meetings - 82 speakers or comment cards total). In addition, a petition package submitted by the Mayor of Crossgate to request additional time to review the EIS, also included comments from 157 public citizens. Crossgate is the community that immediately adjoins the Brownsboro property to the east and south. Altogether, VA Louisville received comments from over 800 individuals, government agencies, other organizations and one Indian Tribe. Additional information on the commenters is discussed in Section E.5. All comments are presented in Section E.6 at the back of Appendix E.

Many commenters requested that the public comment period be extended. In response, VA extended the 45-day comment period by 30 days, from December 12, 2016 to January 11, 2017. In addition, a petition package submitted by the Mayor of Crossgate to request additional time to review the EIS also included comments from 157 citizens. Crossgate is the community that immediately adjoins the Brownsboro property to the east and south. Most of the comments reiterated the need for more time, expressed a general statement of opposition to the Brownsboro location or suggested a new alternative site location (comments on new site locations are addressed in Section E.4.4.1); all 157 comments are included as part of the petition package.
included in Section E.6. Note that many of these citizens also submitted separate written comments on the Draft EIS via email or website.

E.3 General Statements of Opposition and Support

While the majority of commenters agreed that a new VAMC was necessary, the overwhelming majority of commenters opposed the VA’s Preferred Alternative location on Brownsboro Road. Approximately twenty commenters expressed support of the proposed location, many because they wanted no further delays in providing Veterans with a new replacement hospital.

Many of the commenters opposed to the Brownsboro Site included a simple opposition statement. Others cited one or more reasons for their opposition (primarily due to traffic), but did not offer a specific comment or criticism regarding the EIS. Approximately one third of the commenters opposing the Brownsboro Site suggested one or more alternative locations. Some commenters noted a preference for a general location; others identified a specific site that had not been identified or evaluated in the Draft EIS. In several instances new land parcels of land were offered up for consideration. VA’s response to the comments regarding other possible locations or sites is contained in Section E.4.4.

Most commenters opposed to the selection of the Brownsboro Site cited the current high volumes of traffic congestion in the area as their primary reason for opposition. Other reasons included:

- There is insufficient public transit for public and Veteran access;
- The proposed site is a far distance from where Veterans live, from medical centers downtown, and from doctors and staff who would work at the replacement VAMC;
- The proposed site is “landlocked” with no room to expand;
- There is a single point entry and no other access in emergency; and
- Use of the proposed site would impose adverse environmental impacts (primarily aesthetics, air quality, land use, and noise).

Finally, a few commenters supported the No Action Alternative (continue services at the current level at the existing VAMC on Zorn Avenue); many more commenters wanted VA to stay at the same location on Zorn Avenue but wanted VA to rebuild/renovate/expand the existing VAMC. Responses related to potential redevelopment of the VAMC at its existing location on Zorn Avenue are addressed in Section E.4.4.4. Finally, several commenters expressed a preference for the St. Joseph Site over the Brownsboro Site if remaining at the Zorn Avenue Site was not possible.

Those opposing on the general grounds cited above are referred to other sections in the appendix where VA provides responses to specific comments on these topics, particularly resource-specific impact issues addressed in Table E-4, organized by resource area; Table E-4 is found at the end of Section E.4.6.

The purpose of a NEPA analysis is to identify and disclose potential environmental impacts of a proposal and reasonable alternatives to aid in federal decisionmaking. While public support of and opposition to VA’s preferred Brownsboro Site has been duly noted (and all comments are included in Appendix E.6), VA will simply not count up the stated preferences to determine “the winner.” Rather, VA will consider
the potential environmental impacts of the alternative sites described in the Final EIS, along with cost, technical feasibility, time constraints, the extent of support and opposition and the reasons for those stated positions, and other factors as appropriate in its decisionmaking process for the replacement VAMC. These will be provided in the Record of Decision.

### E.4 Summary of Major Issues Raised on Replacement Robley Rex VAMC Draft EIS During Public Comment Period

Table E-1 identifies the major issues identified in the public comments and serves as a guide to commenters to see where their comments have been addressed within Section E.4; major issues are each addressed as part of a group response. Other comments specific to the Draft EIS and not identified below are addressed in individual comment response tables relating to Proposed Action and Alternatives (Table E-2), Traffic and Transportation (Table E-3), and Other Resource-Specific Impact Areas and Mitigation (Table E-4), which are found at the end of Section E.4; all NEPA process and Purpose and Need comment issues are captured in Table E-1.

VA appreciates all the comments received and notes that many of the public comments have resulted in revisions to the Final EIS, primarily in Chapters 2 (Alternatives) and 4 (Impacts) where discussions have expanded to provide further clarity, explanation or supporting details; in some cases new analyses have been included and mitigation measures have also been expanded. VA’s response to comments identifies where changes have been made in the document in response to comments.

#### Table E-1. Major Comment Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Most Significant Issue(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| NEPA Process (see Section E.4.1) | • Flawed analysis and fundamental bias towards Brownsboro Site because property purchased before NEPA process complete  
• VA NEPA regulations need updating  
• Request for timeline and detail of property transaction  
• What happens to public comments |
| Purpose and Need (see Section E.4.2) | • Failure to prioritize health of Veterans / quality of care  
• Failure to address distribution of Veterans (account for where they live)  
• Lack of evidentiary support for consolidation of CBOCs and VBA  
• DEIS lacks sufficient data and evidence to support purpose and need  
• Data supporting purpose and need are inconsistent and lack sufficient explanation  
• DEIS does not provide any basis or criteria to evaluate potential new sites  
• Data lacking on what services are needed and current utilization rates, etc. |
| Proposed Action (see Section E.4.3) | • No room for future expansion at Brownsboro. |
Table E-1. Major Comment Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Most Significant Issue(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Does not address site access problems at Brownsboro  
Note: Other individual comments are addressed in detailed Comment Response Table E-2 |
| Alternatives  
(see E.4.4) | • Range of Alternatives is too limited (E.4.4.1)  
• Criticisms of site selection process (E.4.4.1)  
• Identification of New Alternative Sites for VA to consider (E.4.4.1) [a small subset of comments expressed opposition to some of the new locations identified]  
• VA should consider sites previously dismissed (Fegenbush and Downtown) (E.4.4.2)  
• St. Joseph Site (Alternative B) is no longer viable (E.4.4.3)  
• Reconsider rebuilding/expanding/renovating the existing VAMC at Zorn Avenue (E.4.4.4)  
Note: Other comments relating to alternatives (e.g., non-location alternative options) are addressed in detailed Comment Response Table E-2. Comments pertaining to the evaluation of alternatives are addressed as part of the impact analysis in Section E.4.6. |
| Impacts - Traffic and  
Transportation (E.4.5) | • Need for VA coordination with KYTC  
• Planned KYTC improvements - status and schedule concerns  
• Size of study area and baseline traffic data count concerns  
• Need to consider a “no build-no development” scenario at Brownsboro  
Note: Given the large number of traffic comments, the remaining comments are addressed in a traffic-specific comment response table (Table E-3). |
| Impacts on Other Resource Areas  
(E.4.6) | • Failure to conduct “hard look” analysis  
• Unclear methodology and approach  
• Opposition to Brownsboro by other agencies  
• Environmental justice concerns (relating to impact analysis and basis for site selection)  
Note: All resource impact specific comments are addressed in a detailed Comment Response Table E-4. Comments were received on every resource area. |
| Out of Scope/Miscellaneous  
(see E.4.7) | Examples include VA’s history of project overruns, other uses for the Brownsboro Site, terms and conditions of the purchase of Brownsboro property, and general criticisms of VA |

In summary, the majority of comments were focused on the alternatives and transportation. The next major set of comments related to the potential project impacts under Alternative A specifically in the areas of air quality, aesthetics, geology (relating to karst features), hydrology (relating to stormwater management and local flooding concerns), land use, noise, and environmental justice; criticisms were also directed at the overall methodology and approach used in evaluating impacts and the varying levels of...
detail provided in the analysis of the two action alternatives (criticizing DEIS of analyzing the proposed action (Alternative A) in greater detail than the other action alternative (Alternative B)). Many of the comments came from residents who live in nearby communities, particularly the City of Crossgate that lies immediately adjacent to the Brownsboro property. The law firm of Strobo Barkley, representing the “Cities” of Crossgate, Graymoor-Devondale, Old Brownsboro Place, Northfield and Windy Hills (with a combined population of over 7,000 citizens), submitted over 60 pages of substantive comments; and a second law firm of Frost, Brown and Todd submitted over 20 pages of substantive comments on behalf of their client, Grow Smart Louisville. Comments submitted by the two law firms overlapped significantly. They covered most of the major issues identified in Table E-1, and also captured many of the issues raised by other individual citizens in their comment letters. Many of the comment summaries included in the group responses in Section E.4 were pulled from the law firm comment letters.

The VA group responses below are broken out by major section within the EIS. While comment summaries are included in Section E.4, every comment submitted on the Draft EIS is included in its entirety in Section E.6 of Appendix E. The comment summaries provide a brief overview of the comments for the reader’s convenience in reviewing the responses, and are not intended to provide a complete representation or interpretation of the comment’s meaning. VA responses reflect the full context of the comments as appropriate. VA considers each comprehensive “group response” to a given issue as its formal response to like comments on this issue - either in lieu of (if no change made in the EIS), or in addition to, any changes made in the EIS, which are also noted in the responses. Other individual-specific comments warranting a VA response, along with VA’s individual responses, are included in Tables E-2 through E-4 as noted above. Finally, many comments provided were out of scope and these are summarized in Section E.4.7.

E.4.1

NEPA Process

1. Comment Summary: Flaws in the alternatives analysis reflect a fundamental bias toward the Brownsboro Site that has tainted the entire Draft EIS and requires the NEPA process to be re-started in a manner that eliminates the inherent bias of the current VA decision makers. The entire EIS is unlawfully prejudiced by the inappropriate and premature decision of VA to purchase the Brownsboro Site prior to preparation and publication of an EIS. NEPA regulations make it clear that an agency shall not take any action that would “limit the choice of reasonable alternatives” prior to completion of the NEPA process and issuance of a ROD.

VA Response: As described in Section 1.3 of the EIS, the VA prepared a programmatic environmental assessment (PEA) in 2012 that evaluated the environmental effects of selecting and acquiring a site for the construction and operation of a replacement VAMC. This PEA analyzed the effects of transferring operations from the existing VAMC to a replacement VAMC at either the Brownsboro Site or the St. Joseph Site, as well as the No Action Alternative of continuing operations at the Zorn Avenue location. The Brownsboro Site was identified as the VA’s preferred alternative. In the PEA, VA stated its intention to prepare a tiered, site-specific EA on the alternative that was selected (p. 112).
On the basis of the 2012 programmatic EA, the VA concluded that there would be no significant environmental impacts associated with either the Brownsboro Site or the St. Joseph Site as long as the identified mitigation measures were implemented. Following the selection of the Brownsboro Site on the basis of the PEA, the VA purchased the site. Thus, the site was purchased after completion of the NEPA process for the decision to transfer operations to a replacement VAMC.

After purchasing the Brownsboro Site, VA completed a subsequent, tiered EA to analyze the potential environmental impacts at the selected site. Tiering from a programmatic NEPA document to a site-specific document is an appropriate NEPA practice when the sequence of analyses is from a NEPA document on a specific action at an early stage (such as need and site selection) to a subsequent NEPA document at a later stage (such as environmental mitigation). See 40 CFR § 1508.28.

In 2014, VA began preparation of the tiered site-specific EA for the construction and operation of a VAMC at the Brownsboro Site, in keeping with its 2012 decision on the basis of the PEA. After publishing a draft EA for comment, the VA determined that an EIS was the appropriate level of documentation for evaluating the potential adverse impacts from constructing and operating a replacement VAMC at the Brownsboro Site.

By the time of the decision to prepare a tiered EIS, the VA had already purchased the Brownsboro Site. Despite the preference for the Brownsboro Site, which had been made clear since the PEA in 2012, the VA has nonetheless fully re-analyzed the Brownsboro Site and the St. Joseph Site, as well as the No Action Alternative, in the EIS.

While the Brownsboro Site was purchased prior to the completion of the EIS now in progress, it was purchased after completion of the NEPA process for a VAMC replacement determination. That determination was not challenged in court at the time it was made.

The VA’s current ownership of the Brownsboro Site does not imply a bias in favor of that site. The site has not been improved or developed. Construction funds would not be committed until after the NEPA process is complete. It could be used by the VA or another federal agency for another purpose or sold if the VA selected another site for the proposed VAMC.

2. Comment Summary: Commenters expressed concern that VA should withdraw the DEIS and reconvene the NEPA process only if and until the VA updates its NEPA regulations.

VA Response: In a separate action, VA is working to update its NEPA regulations. However, this EIS has been prepared in accordance with the VA NEPA regulations that are currently in place; those regulations were promulgated in compliance with NEPA and the CEQ NEPA regulations. While revised VA NEPA regulations may alter VA’s NEPA procedures, such revisions would not change the requirements set forth in NEPA or the CEQ NEPA regulations. Thus, following future revised VA procedures would not result in different alternatives being examined or different analyses being conducted.

3. Comment: I am extremely concerned that VA property transaction occurred prior to a true environmental study as per regulation. And so, for the record, Crossgate is requesting a timeline and detail of the property transaction.
VA Response: See response to Comment 1 above regarding the timing of VA’s purchase of the Brownsboro property and the NEPA process. A CERCLA Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the environmental condition of the property and a NEPA Programmatic Environmental Assessment of potential impacts of the proposed action (construction and operation of a VA hospital) on the human environment were completed in November 2010 and June 2012 respectively. The property was purchased by VA in July 2012 after publication of the PEA and associated (mitigated) Finding of No Significant Impact. VA is not required to document a more detailed timeline of the property transaction as requested by the commenter. Section 2.1.1 of the Final EIS also has been expanded to include a more detailed discussion of the site selection process that identified the alternative sites evaluated in the PEA.

4. Comment Summary: What will happen with these comments? We’ve repeatedly asked for input back from VA about what we’ve had to say in past and have not gotten anything back. It’s been a very frustrating, long road for many of us and there are certain people here who have been working for several years trying to get answers back about this particular project. Request that VA be more open, transparent and provide more detail in their responses.

VA Response: Although VA did not formally respond to comments on the draft site-specific EA because the agency determined that an EIS should be prepared, VA did consider those comments to be scoping comments for the development of the EIS and used them as input to the scope of issues addressed in this EIS.

For the comments submitted on the Draft EIS, VA has assessed and considered all comments both individually and collectively, and has included them in Appendix E of the final EIS. Because many commenters expressed the same concerns, the VA has consolidated the comments into subject areas and has responded fully to each. Appendix E also includes three tables (E-5 through E-7) that show where in Appendix E every commenter’s comment is addressed.

VA responses to comments include modifications to the analysis or factual corrections to the EIS where appropriate, as well as explanations why a particular requested action is not being taken (where no change was made to the EIS).

E.4.2

Purpose and Need

Major issues are addressed below; additional responses to other public comments related to purpose and need are addressed in the detailed comments response Table E-2 at the end of Section E.4.

Comment Summary: Without prioritizing the health of Veterans and without an alternatives analysis that seeks to hold the care and preferences of Veterans as a priority, any evaluation of the purpose and need of the project and of the reasonable alternatives pursuant to NEPA must be withdrawn. A Kentucky Medical Association resolution supports a location in close proximity to the University of Louisville Medical Center.
ast Veteran preference surveys indicate that Veterans prefer and desire the “Renovate Zorn Avenue” option (which commenter used in support of finding that accessibility is number one factor in location).

Many commenters criticized the underlying purpose and need element of the Draft EIS for its failure to consider the quality of care provided to Louisville-area Veterans, in deciding where to locate a replacement VAMC. They consider the absence of that analysis as a fundamental flaw in the DEIS as it threatens the quality of care for thousands of Veterans in the service area. Related to this concern is their criticism of VA’s elimination of other locations from further consideration, especially the downtown site (see Sections E.4.4.1, E.4.4.2 and E.4.4.4 for responses related to the consideration of other site locations).

**VA Response**: VA’s mission prioritizes the health of the Veterans and the proposed new VAMC is a direct result of this mission priority. A replacement VAMC would offer Veterans a new state-of-the-art facility with modern new equipment to provide higher quality care to Veterans, as compared to the existing outdated facility that cannot be brought up to the standards necessary to meet the current and future needs of modern healthcare as cost effectively or without significant adverse impact to Veterans’ access to care. The new hospital would be designed and constructed with the necessary systems and flexibility to meet such need, along with sufficient capacity to serve current and future demand. Use of new state-of-the-art medical equipment in the new hospital also would eliminate current problems at the existing VAMC relating to equipment failure and faulty equipment.

Ensuring that excellent health care remains available to Veterans is one of the main reasons for the 15-mile distance restriction criterion used in the site selection process. VA believes this distance helps ensure the viability of its ongoing sharing agreements with the University of Louisville Medical Center, by maintaining sufficient proximity and access for future patients and the necessary medical personnel to travel between the University of Louisville medical center and the proposed new VAMC. In fact, the proposed location at Brownsboro Road is physically only 6.4 miles or a 10-mile driving distance from the downtown medical center.

The care of our nation’s Veterans is important to all and a priority not just to VA but to the professional medical community in Louisville as well. By keeping the site location within a reasonable 15-mile radius of its downtown sharing partner, VA is confident that these professionals will continue to provide timely and quality health care services to our Veterans no matter the final location or travel distance required within this radius.

Additional information on the site selection process and the alternatives evaluated in the EIS is provided in Section E.4.4 and has also been added to Sections 2.1 and 2.3 of the Final EIS. This includes a detailed explanation as to why and how VA determined that rebuilding at Zorn Avenue is not reasonable and that a downtown site location also is not reasonable or in the best interest of Veterans or VA. Finally, VA notes, as did the commenter, that past Veteran preference surveys, in addition to indicating a preference for remaining at Zorn Avenue, also clearly indicate that Veterans do **not** want a new VAMC to be located downtown.

**2. Comment Summary**: EIS fails to address distribution of Veterans in relation to Brownsboro Site; it is farthest from where most Veterans live (western and southwestern side). VA failed to analyze where Veterans reside in relation to the preferred alternative site. One commenter (Strobo-Barkley) provided a
review that examined the residency of Veterans in Jefferson County by zip code. The results of this review, which are included in the comment letter, identified a substantial majority of Veterans living in the western and southwestern areas of Jefferson County. VA’s preferred site is farthest from where Veterans live, especially compared to a west Louisville, downtown site, or the current site. Relying on public transportation will not fill the void left by increased travel miles and times. The comment letter also includes statistics from the Institute for Health, Air and Water.

**VA Response:** VA appreciates the effort to identify the Louisville Veteran population by zip code. VA wishes to make several points in response to this comment. First, the number of Veterans by zip code does not specify which Veterans actually are enrolled and currently receiving care from the VA, which would be a subset of where they reside. In addition, the identification of Louisville Veterans by zip code does not account for Veterans who live beyond the eastern, western and southern portions of the Louisville metropolitan area and beyond Jefferson County to include other parts of the service area (i.e., the 34 other counties in Kentucky and Indiana); the new VAMC will need to serve these Veterans too. Finally, in addition to considering current patient needs, VA also must consider where future patients may come from over the life-span of the facility, since these will change over time. Therefore, current distribution is not necessarily a reliable predictor in determining where greatest patient needs will come from in future years.

VA utilizes a robust model to project workload demands, including patient demographics and geography. This workload projection is one of several factors used in identifying possible sites for VA facilities. The alternatives analyzed in the EIS meet the criteria used to identify reasonable alternatives, including ready access from a primary road (see Section 2.1.1 of the Final EIS). In addition, the alternative sites are highly visible and accessible from major highways, which is an aid (and was a major consideration) in patient and visitor navigation.

**3. Comment Summary:** Lack of Evidentiary support for closing CBOCs/consolidation of CBOCs and VBA. The DEIS lacks sufficient data to support the claimed need for additional VAMC capacity in the Louisville area, or to evaluate potential alternatives to evaluate that need. The DEIS does not provide any specific data or analysis to demonstrate why the general increases in healthcare enrollment justify the construction of a replacement VAMC or why they dictate the specific size, composition, and location of the proposed replacement VAMC. The Purpose and Need statement (and Section 1.2 in particular) contains no justification for the need to close and relocate three CBOCs or to consolidate the VBA regional office with the VAMC. Nor does it discuss criteria for determining where any new CBOC’s or a new VBA office should be located. Rather it says they are over capacity, with limited options for expanding to meet existing needs, and that the VA “determined it would be advantageous to co-locate functions of the VBA regional office on the proposed new campus.” DEIS assumes that the replacement facilities - CBOCs and VBA office - should be co-located with the proposed new VAMC. NEPA requires more. Even assuming the exiting CBOCs and VBA cannot be expanded at or near their current location, it is not a foregone conclusion that they should be relocated to the sites of a new VAMC. The purpose and need discussion contains no information about important issues relevant to the location of these facilities, including the need to have CBOCs located throughout the community in order to provide convenient outpatient services to area Veterans. Regardless, of the merits of relocating CBOCs to single location, the discussion of purpose and need contains no information to guide the VA’s decision-making regarding where those facilities should be located or what other factors should be considered in making that...
decision. Section 1.2 is similarly deficient with respect to the purported need to relocate the VBA regional office to the site of a new VAMC.

A related comment is that VA’s decision to conserve the relocated CBOCs and VBA regional office with the replacement VAMC at the proposed location may have significant effects on the location, size, and configuration requirements for that facility (i.e., it may have prejudiced the consideration of alternatives). It may also have significant effects on the quality of care provided to Louisville-area Veterans, VA employees, and the community at large, as a result of the consolidation of these facilities. DEIS must be revised to explain the purpose and need for closing and relocating the existing CBOCs and VBA regional office, and to provide clear, justified, criteria for evaluating any alternatives intended to address that need.

VA Response: VA is the leading agency charged with administering Veteran health care and benefits and has used its expertise in determining that consolidation of the VAMC, the three CBOCs and the VBA is the best way to meet Veterans’ needs and improve service levels. Such decisions on how to administer care are not subject to NEPA review given VA’s prerogative to exercise its expertise and discretion in fulfilling its mission. It is beyond the scope of this EIS to determine the specific health care services that VA offers to Veterans at any location (e.g., existing CBOC or new VAMC). These are decisions made by Veterans Health Administration’s (VHA’s) managers, planners, and health care practitioners to further the VHA mission to “Honor America’s Veterans by providing exceptional health care that improves their health and well-being.” Each facility’s medical services and associated support processes are monitored and adjusted based on VHA standards of care to ensure that Veterans and their families receive high-quality and safe care.

Although decisions about how health care services are provided are not within the scope of this EIS, decisions regarding the location of appropriate physical buildings and infrastructure required to provide these services are the focus of this EIS and the NEPA process. For example, the number of patients receiving primary care determines the size of waiting rooms, number of exam rooms, size of the parking lot, and number of physician offices. Specialty services such as laboratories or operating rooms require spaces specifically designed for those purposes. Thus, while decisions on health care services offered are not subject to NEPA analysis, the scope of the NEPA decision does include changes to the facilities the design of which is driven by VA’s projections for services.

VA desires co-location of VAMC and VBA assets in an effort to provide more effective and efficient services to Veterans. Co-locating the VBA regional office with the new VAMC would improve Veteran access to healthcare and benefits by allowing both to be accessed from the same location. With respect to the three CBOCs to be consolidated with the VAMC, these were originally created as stop gap measures because the capacity was not available within the existing VAMC to deliver these outpatient services at the time they were created. As such, duplicate services now offered between the CBOCs and VAMC create inefficiencies in the current health care system. Moving the CBOCs from their current locations eliminates the cost associated with leasing the CBOC facilities, and increases efficiency of providing primary care services to Veterans and their families by consolidating clinical services.

All three CBOCs are in the Louisville metro area and proximate to the VAMC, i.e., within VA’s access guidelines (30 minute drive for primary care). They are located at: 4010 Dupont Circle, 3430 Newburg Road, and 3934 North Dixie Highway. No other CBOCs would be affected.
A new VAMC would have sufficient capacity (within the primary care space) to address the current and projected workload of these CBOCs and to deliver more efficiently and effectively these and other services. This is also further clarified in Section 1.2 of the Final EIS.

**4. Comment Summary:** VA crafted a statement of purpose and need that was foreordained for approval of the Brownsboro Site. VA’s purpose and need statement has failed to offer adequate and detailed evidence and data in support of the underlying purpose and need.

**VA Response:** As discussed in Section 1.2 of the EIS, the purpose of the proposed project is to provide Louisville-area Veterans with facilities of sufficient capacity to meet their current and projected future health care needs. The EIS provides statistics on the current Veteran enrollment served and the expectation that enrollment will increase 11 percent by FY 2024 (see related response to related Comment Summary 5 below on explanation and correction of Veteran population data inconsistencies). The proposed project is needed because the current hospital cannot be cost effectively updated to accommodate the current and future needs of healthcare delivery or sufficiently expanded to provide the functional capability and capacity necessary to avoid inefficient redundant facilities without adversely impacting Veteran access to care. Thus, it is at maximum capacity and unable to accommodate the projected increase in enrollment. The EIS (Chapter 1) cites a CARES study that was completed in 2004 that demonstrated that:

- Current hospital infrastructure would not allow renovations to meet current design criteria (identified in Section 1.2 of the EIS).
- There is no appreciable vacant space on the existing VAMC campus to facilitate expansion or new construction without adversely impacting Veteran access to care.
- Parking is limited with no place to expand.

See also related VA response in Section E.4.4 (and revised Section 2.3.3 of the Final EIS) for a more detailed explanation why VA is unable to expand at the existing Zorn Avenue location. Further, the VA explained its intention to consolidate the hospital, outpatient clinics, and VBA regional office functions to meet the needs of area Veterans.

While some commenters question or disagree with the consolidation plan, VA’s mission is to provide care for our Veterans in the most effective and efficient manner. VA’s decisions relating to how best to provide for the benefits and health care needs of Veterans - including closure of three existing CBOCs and consolidation of the VBA – are not subject to NEPA given the VA’s prerogative to exercise its expertise and discretion in fulfilling its mission. Using its expertise in Veterans’ care, the VA determined that consolidation would be the best way to meet Veterans’ needs and improve service levels.

This statement of purpose and need is in keeping with the CEQ NEPA-Implementing Regulations which require federal agencies to “briefly specify the underlying purpose and need to which the agency is responding in proposing the alternatives including the proposed action.” 40 CFR § 1502.13.

**5. Comment Summary:** Data Supporting Purpose and Need are inconsistent. The limited data included in the Purpose and Need statement are inconsistent and lack sufficient explanation, rendering the decision-making process flawed and resulting in a public that is not adequately informed as required by NEPA. The DEIS references inconsistent data sets on pages 1 and 3 regarding Veteran population and
bed count inconsistencies on pages 3 and 17. The stated growth reasons for the need of new facility do not match up to a decrease in beds.

**VA Response:** The commenters correctly note that certain references to Veteran population data are different. The reason is that these numbers change over time and the numbers included in Chapter 1 of the EIS represent two different points in time. Veterans move in and out of the catchment areas. Thus projections change over time, due to economic or other forces, or if military conflicts would arise. That said, VA understands the differing numbers are confusing and has revised the Veteran population numbers on pages 1 and 3 (Sections 1.1.1 and 1.2) to be consistent in the Final EIS; data are for 2014 with projections out to 2024).

Regarding the numbers provided, 168,000 was meant to refer to the Veteran population living within the Louisville service area. However, after re-checking the totals for the Veteran population in the Louisville catchment (or service) area for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014 (FY 2014), VA discovered an error; the correct total population for this period was 150,061. This has been corrected in the Final EIS. The other numbers are correct; 68,000 refers to the projected number of Veterans in the service area who would be enrolled in 2024 to receive healthcare services; 963,000 refers to the total number of clinic stops (i.e., individual patient encounters/health care service visits) that the projected 68,000 Veterans would be expected to have in that same year - based on the assumption that each Veteran would require more than one visit for health care services over a given year (e.g., for lab work, physical therapy, mental health services, etc.). The outpatient clinic stops representing existing conditions (762,104) are the total of the VAMC and CBOC locations.

The explanation for the proposed lower bed count at the proposed replacement VAMC is that VA’s workload projections include reduced inpatient (bed) demand, and increased outpatient (clinic) demand. The proposed new services at the replacement VAMC reflect VA’s updated projections, which are also consistent with hospital trends across the country. This has also been clarified in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS.

**6. Comment Summary:** Criteria for evaluating new sites not addressed in Purpose and Need. The DEIS does not provide any basis or criteria to evaluate potential new VAMC sites. Such criteria are essential to understand and evaluate the nature and magnitude of site needs (acreage, configuration, location, accessibility, etc.). They are essential to identify a reasonable range of alternative sites and to evaluate relative ability of each such site to meet the identified needs. At best the DEIS makes the case that a new VAMC at new location is needed, but it does not identify criteria for evaluating what that site should be or how to compare the various site options to arrive at the most beneficial and environmentally sound decision.

**VA Response:** The DEIS summarizes the site selection process, including what criteria were used and how the set of sites compared against these criteria or certain characteristics, in Section 2.1 (and Table 2-1); this discussion has been significantly expanded in the Final EIS (see new Section 2.1.1). See also Section E.4.4 relating to Alternatives, including the siting process and identification of alternative sites for analysis in the EIS. The criteria used by VA to identify possible sites for a replacement VAMC are reasonable and consistent with Agency objectives to maximize access to high-quality health care for all area Veterans in the most efficient and cost-effective manner possible.
VA used the siting process as a means to identify the set of reasonable alternative (sites) that meet VA’s purpose and need and that are evaluated further in the EIS. This process included a rigorous second round screening of five initial alternative sites to reach the final set of two sites (excluding the no action alternative). These studies included Phase I environmental site assessments, American Land Title Association surveys, geotechnical investigations (except the Downtown Site), and additional onsite environmental investigations. The EIS analyzes and compares the potential environmental impacts of the two alternative sites found to be reasonable.

The site location decision will be made by the VA decision-maker based on multiple factors, including environmental impacts, economic (cost) and technical considerations, ability to fulfill the Agency’s statutory mission, and other factors. VA’s determination will be provided and explained in the Record of Decision. Finally, while the decision-maker will consider many factors, including environmental impacts, NPEA does not require an Agency to select the least environmentally damaging alternative, just that it make an informed decision with respect to potential environmental impacts.

7. **Comment Summary:** Need to clarify what services are needed in new VAMC. VA provides no information on current or forecasted utilization rates at existing Robley Rex VAMC, types of services currently provided or will be needed in future, or any patient service backlogs currently being experienced, or expected to occur at VAMC or associated CBOCs that VA proposes to replace. DEIS simply says current VAMC and CBOCs are “operating at maximum capacity and are unable to accommodate the projected increase in regional Veteran population.”

**VA Response:** The purpose of the EIS is not to evaluate all the data that went into decision making on the sizing for the project, but rather to evaluate the impacts of the project. As noted above, VA’s mission is to provide care for Veterans in the most effective and efficient manner possible. Decisions relating to the healthcare needs of Veterans and the best ways to configure the health care services offered fall within VA’s expertise and are not subject to NEPA.

Regarding capacity, while it is a concern, it is not the only driver. Another concern is that the existing facilities cannot be brought up to needed standards (and capacity) without significant additional time, expense, and adverse impact to ongoing delivery of services, primarily because the existing site is already developed to the maximum extent possible given topographical conditions. Thus, there is no “swing” space to accommodate new construction (including associated laydown areas and equipment) without adverse impact to operations. Further, simply adding capacity does not sufficiently address the current problems; rather, Veterans need modern healthcare assets that can accommodate current and future healthcare needs. The specific challenges with reconfiguring the existing VAMC at Zorn are addressed in Section E.4.4; Section 2.3.3 of the Final EIS has also been expanded to address the specific issues in more detail.

VA recognizes that the proposed new VAMC would provide the same type of services (primary care, specialty care, and inpatient care) currently available at Zorn; a full list of services is provided in Table 2-2 of the EIS. However, a new facility would provide more functional capability and capacity for the services needed. In addition, a new facility would be constructed to modern hospital standards to deliver higher quality care to current and future Veterans, and allow the VAMC to keep pace with technology and infrastructure needs and developments in the evolving health care services field. The new VAMC is sized to accommodate the projected workload and designed to accommodate the ongoing and future needs.
associated with healthcare delivery. As noted above and clarified further in the Final EIS, VA’s projected workload includes a decrease in inpatient demand (i.e., beds) and an increase in outpatient (clinic) demand. This is consistent with current health care trends across the country. This has been further clarified in Section 2.2.1 of the Final EIS.

E.4.3

Proposed Action

The majority of comments relating to the proposed action requested more detail on specific elements of the proposed project. Because of the individual variation in comments, these are captured in the detailed Comment Response Table E-2 at the end of Section E.4. One common comment many expressed, however, related to concerns over VA’s ability to expand the VAMC at the proposed Brownsboro Site if future health services needs required it. This is addressed below.

Comment Summary: Commenters are concerned that the Brownsboro location is too small for the amount of services the VA wishes to have onsite now and in the future, making it obsolete before it is built. They ask what is being suggested in the plans for the new VAMC if it keeps expanding but the space isn’t available. They also bring up eminent domain concerns: DEIS does not comply with NEPA in its failure to evaluate constricted, landlocked nature of Midlands [Brownsboro] site and the necessity of further acquisition including by Eminent Domain if the VAMC needs to expand in the future.

DEIS does not comply with NEPA in its failure to evaluate the constricted, landlocked nature of the Midlands Site and the necessity of further acquisition including by eminent domain if the VAMC needs to expand in the future.

VA Response: The VA has no expectation of needing to expand, although there is sufficient space to do so if future Veterans’ needs so require. The design concept developed for the analysis of alternatives demonstrates that a new VAMC at either alternative site could accommodate future expansion of up to 25 percent without needing to go beyond the boundaries of the sites. As stated in Section 2.2.1.1, the site layout at the Brownsboro Site allows for future hospital expansion to the south, if needed, in the area between the VAMC and the south parking structure. VA would not expand outside the boundaries of the current parcel. There is more flexibility for expansion options at St. Joseph given the larger parcel size.

With respect to eminent domain, its use to acquire additional land is contrary to VA’s policy regarding acquisition of property. VA’s actions during the site selection process clearly demonstrate that VA did not seek to utilize eminent domain at the existing Zorn Avenue Site and that VA cited it as one of the many reasons that a downtown alternative was not reasonable, while at the same time advertising for “willing” offers of property to satisfy current need. See also Section E.4.4 regarding Alternatives and revised Chapter 2 of the Final EIS (Sections 2.1 and 2.3).

2. Comment Summary: Site Access. VA failed to evaluate proper site alternatives. The DEIS does not adequately compare alternatives in regard to access issues for Veterans (e.g., long driving distance for some Veterans who also may not know the local roads, and limited public transportation options); does not adequately evaluate impact on traffic-related issues including noise and congestion; and does not contain any reasonable alternative sites. Other commenters are concerned that the closure of various
clinics will require Veterans to drive farther from their homes at what one commenter indicated “will basically be a clinic and not a hospital.” [Roles] Concerns relating to access also relate to earlier comments about the quality of patient care being affected by relocating the VAMC to the Brownsboro Site.

**VA Response:** First, in response to the concern that the new hospital will be basically a clinic, it is important to clarify that the proposed replacement VAMC would be a full service hospital with a co-located regional benefits office that would improve the overall Veteran experience and access to benefits. Second, regarding the distance concerns, VA has always recognized the importance of limiting the distance between the existing VAMC and a new site in order to ensure eventual selection of:

1. a location that allowed VA to maintain a viable relationship with the University of Louisville sharing partner (which serves as a critical backup to the VAMC providing emergency and specialty care to Veterans), while also providing
2. a location central for the entire Veteran population served inasmuch as the Louisville service area extends beyond the Louisville metropolitan area to include a 35-county service area within Kentucky and Indiana.

VA believes that the 15-mile radius it imposed as part of the site selection process accurately addressed these requirements.

While both the Brownsboro and St. Joseph Sites are not as close to the University of Louisville medical center, both of those sites meet the 30- to 60-minute access VA criteria for primary and acute care and are centrally located within the VA’s Louisville catchment area. Within the service area, the access distance most affects those in Hardin County, KY, because the existing campus distance is already outside the 30-minute zone. However, the greatest growth of service needs is projected for Oldham and Spencer Counties in KY, and the proposed eastern location on Brownsboro Road would benefit both of these counties.

Regarding public transit access, VA also would continue to work with TARC to support increased access to the proposed VAMC if employee and patient demand warrants it.

**E.4.4 Alternatives**

Many commenters expressed concern regarding what they viewed as the limited range of alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS. Many asked VA to consider putting the VAMC somewhere else (instead of Brownsboro). Suggestions ranged from putting it where the Veterans want to be, to conducting a property exchange (e.g., American Red Cross Legion), relocating to another hospital (e.g., Jewish Hospital), or another specific location that was previously developed but now abandoned, for example. Over one third of the commenters who opposed the proposed Brownsboro Site suggested new alternative locations for the VA to consider. Many comments also included criticisms of VA’s original site selection process (addressed in Section E.4.4.1), including challenges to the dismissal of sites previously considered - Fegenbush and Downtown (addressed in Section E.4.4.2); the viability of the St. Joseph Site (addressed in
Section E.4.4.3); and the dismissal of the existing Zorn Avenue Site (addressed in Section E.4.4.4). Regarding Zorn Avenue, commenters did not understand why the VA did not consider previous surveys showing strong Veteran preference for staying at Zorn Avenue, and why the VA could not rebuild at Zorn. The remaining comments on alternatives included: other non-location alternative type suggestions for VA to consider; criticisms of unequal treatment in providing the project descriptions for Alternatives A and B; and final disposition of the VAMC at Zorn. Responses to these comments are provided in the detailed Comment Response Table E-2 at the end of Section E.4. Related comments on the unequal treatment of impacts between Alternatives A and B are addressed in Sections E.4.5 (traffic) and E.4.6 (impact analysis for other resource areas).

E.4.4.1.

Selection of Alternative Sites and Identification of New Alternative Site Locations to Consider

1. Comment Summary: Many of the comments, criticizing the range of alternatives identified and evaluated in the Draft EIS as limited, were also directed as criticisms of the VA’s siting process. These included:

   • DEIS omits consideration of other viable sites that constitute reasonable alternatives, including sites that require assembly of multiple parcels and sites located within urban core of Louisville. VA’s failure to consider a reasonable range of alternatives appears to stem from undue reliance on initial site identification process that sought “expressions of interest from potential offerors of previously undeveloped property that might satisfy its need.” That process, which yielded 20 initial sites, unreasonably restricted the VA’s consideration of potential locations for a replacement VAMC. The result was an undue emphasis on large, single-owner greenfield sites in the suburban portion of Louisville/Jefferson County. VA failed to make good faith effort to identify other potential sites in Louisville area, especially in urban core, that might require some parcel assembly or not for sale by single owner, but that might be obtained with reasonable effort.

   • Focus on previously undeveloped property of certain size essentially predetermined VA would only be considering single-owner sites and ultimately leads to identification of properties outside the urban core. Thus, the VA effectively excluded any meaningful consideration of urban properties (except Downtown site), regardless of ability of such sites to otherwise meet the purpose and need for action. This unreasonably narrow focus constitutes a flaw in the VA’s NEPA analysis, and undermines the legal sufficiency of the DEIS.

   • DEIS should be withdrawn and an unbiased, rigorously thorough, and objective examination of all reasonable alternatives should be performed, including urban sites, that allows for a proper comparison of each alternative in compliance with NEPA and implementing regulations.

   • VA failed to rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives. The DEIS only considered three alternatives and one of the sites is currently slated for private development. Also, under auspices of considering only greenfield sites, VA unreasonably discarded all urban
sites. This is wholly inadequate and not in compliance with NEPA. Limited consideration of expressions of interest that might satisfy its needs was arbitrary. Greenfield, single-owner, 25-acre site unreasonably limited choice of alternatives even if those met purpose and need. Commenter references to other alternative sites VA should consider are captured in Comment 2 below.

**VA Response:** VA utilized a logical approach to narrow the universe of possibilities to determine reasonable site alternatives. This included conducting a feasibility study in 2009 which included consideration of downtown (urban), suburban, and stay-in-place alternatives with respect to cost, time to deliver, impact on access to services, potential for environmental issues, and Veteran experience, among other factors. That study concluded that a greenfield (previously undeveloped site) should also be considered as it could better meet VA’s project need compared to an urban site with respect to cost, time, schedule, and impact on healthcare delivery. In 2010, VA publicly advertised its need for a minimum of 25 acres of contiguous, available, and developable property that might satisfy its need; note that the originally advertisement was not limited to greenfield sites but rather included both developed and undeveloped properties. VA determined that 25 acres was the minimum space necessary to support a full service hospital (i.e., square footage and functional requirements), supporting infrastructure (including parking spaces) associated with the replacement VAMC - based on projected patient load and health care service needs, and the necessary design contingencies.

VA identified the sites offered that satisfied its criteria, whether in an urban or suburban location. In 2010 and 2011, VA conducted more rigorous screening on those identified sites, including Phase 1 environmental assessments, land surveys, and geotechnical investigations. Section 2.1.1 of the Final EIS has been expanded to provide additional detail on the siting process and the rigorous investigation each site received. Table 2-1 of the EIS summarizes this analysis, which further validated the feasibility study conclusions that a downtown assemblage would cost more; involve more time and effort to relocate willing and potentially unwilling property owners; likely involve significant environmental cleanup; potentially require extensive, costly and time-consuming coordination to resolve impacts to cultural resources; and ultimately delay delivery of the project which further adversely affects both VA’s mission to deliver care and services to Veterans and project cost. Thus, the downtown (urban) site was found not to be a reasonable alternative. VA designed its siting process to be rational, based on factual findings, and consistent with the requirements of NEPA. See related response to Comment #2 below.

Regarding the comment about one of the alternative sites being slated for private development, see VA response in Section E.4.4.3.

**2. Comment Summary:** Over a third of commenters commenting, who also opposed the proposed Brownsboro location, suggested unspecified (general area) and specific new alternative locations for VA to consider that had not been previously identified or evaluated by VA. Many of the general and specific locations identified were within the downtown (near existing medical facilities), western (e.g., Russell neighborhood on 9th Street) and southern parts of the Louisville metro area. The western and southern ends were identified because that is where a large Veteran population was assumed to live and/or because locating a new VAMC there, especially in the West End, would significantly boost the economy of this low-income area. Many of the suggested sites were previously developed or considered for development.
(e.g. Walmart and Food Port before pulling out), or housing projects slated for demolition (e.g., Beecher Terrace, old Iroquois Homes Housing Project, Clarksdale Housing area). A couple of developers also offered up properties within the Louisville metro area, and The Mayor of Louisville indicated his team had “other sites worthy of VA’s consideration.” Others just said to put it where the Veterans want it to be, based either on previous polling or new polling that commenters say should be conducted. Finally, there was also a big write-in campaign to move the VAMC out of the Louisville metro/ Jefferson County area either to the Fort Knox area (in general) or within Fort Knox property; Bullitt and Hardin Counties, the town of Radcliff, and St. Catherine College campus in Springfield, KY. Regarding Bullitt County, VA received notification that a judge executive in Bullitt County wanted to donate land for new VA hospital; and both the Hardin County and Meade County Chambers Commerce sent in letters encouraging VA to locate the VAMC at the Millpond Business Center in Radcliff, KY, based on the numerous advantages such a location offered.

**VA Response:** VA appreciates the suggestions of new alternative locations that came in during the public comment period, as well as the efforts that went into their identification. After careful study, however, as explained in detail in this response and further clarified in the Final EIS, VA stands behind the rigorous site selection process it conducted previously and the set of alternative sites evaluated in the EIS.

In the process of narrowing the universe of potential alternatives that could meet its purpose and need for the proposed project, VA completed a feasibility study in 2009 which examined the options of locating on a developed site, including the existing site, as well as a greenfield site and concluded that a full replacement hospital on a greenfield (previously undeveloped) site would likely be least expensive, fastest to delivery, and have the least adverse impact on ongoing Veteran access to care and services. To further narrow potential alternatives, in 2010 VA developed screening criteria and publicly advertised its need for property meeting those criteria which included but were not limited to, sites within a 15-mile radius of the University of Louisville Healthcare Center and with at least 25 acres of developable land; as noted previously, the notice sought out undeveloped or developed properties. This limited radius was critical for maintaining a viable relationship with VA’s University of Louisville sharing partner while at the same time ensuring a location central to the entire Veteran population served (which includes not only Veterans within the Louisville metro area, but those living within the entire 35-county service area in Kentucky and Indiana). As the Agency responsible for providing healthcare to our nation’s Veterans, VA exercised its expertise and discretion to define this delineated area and the criteria to be met for the sites offered. Use of reasoned criteria to narrow the range of reasonable alternatives is a long-standing and acceptable NEPA practice. VA also afforded an open and fair opportunity for offers from interested owners of properties in the “west end,” “south end,” or “downtown” that could meet the stated criteria. Of the sites offered for sale in response to VA’s public advertisement, 22 sites were evaluated and ranked according to how well they met VA’s criteria. In 2010 and during 2011 VA subjected the top three sites, a downtown assemblage proposed by the City of Louisville and University of Louisville, and the existing Zorn Avenue site to more rigorous screening, including Phase 1 environmental assessments, land surveys, geotechnical investigations, and additional onsite environmental investigations. The results of these subsequent analyses are provided in Section 2.1, Table 2-1 of the EIS, which have been further expanded in the Final EIS (see new Section 2.1.1). As a result of this thorough, multi-phase process, VA determined that the sites that best satisfied the purpose and need for the proposed project, with the least impact to the surrounding environment, were the Brownsboro and St. Joseph Sites. These two sites were carried forward and fully evaluated as reasonable alternatives in the EIS, along with the No Action Alternative.
(continuing operation at the Zorn Avenue facility). The other sites (Downtown and Fegenbush) were not considered reasonable and were dismissed from further consideration. This multi-phase process resulted in “a clear basis for the choice among options by the decision maker and the public” 40 CFR §1502.14. The alternatives eliminated from additional NEPA analysis and the reasons why they were eliminated are described in an expanded Section 2.3 of the EIS in accordance with 40 CFR §1502.14. VA designed the site selection process to be rigorous, transparent, and consistent with all NEPA requirements.

Further, reopening the site selection process to consider additional properties that may, or may not, now be available, could still leave out sites that commenters thought were preferable; and could potentially add another several years to investigate, evaluate, and perform additional environmental analysis. This would delay improving Veteran services and increase project cost by up to $110 million in added escalation cost alone. Once that reopened process was completed, it too could be criticized because still more sites may become available during the time additional sites were being identified and evaluated. A continuous effort to try to find a site acceptable to all stakeholders would not serve VA’s goal of improving Veteran services in the Louisville area.

As the Agency responsible for providing healthcare to our nation’s Veterans, VA has exercised its expertise and discretion to define this delineated area and the criteria to be met for the sites offered. Use of reasoned criteria to narrow the range of reasonable alternatives is a long-standing and acceptable NEPA practice. VA also afforded an open and fair opportunity for offers from interested owners of properties in the “west end,” “south end,” or “downtown” that could meet the stated criteria. Of the sites offered for sale in response to VA’s public advertisement, 22 sites were evaluated and ranked according to how well they met VA’s criteria. It is VA’s view that the site selection process described in the EIS has been rigorous, transparent, and consistent with NEPA requirements and that there is no basis for repeating the earlier effort. For these reasons, VA does not view the general locations or sites suggested in public comments as reasonable alternatives warranting additional investigation and detailed evaluation in the EIS.

3. Comment Summary: Some of the comments suggesting specific locations were critical of the EIS and the number of alternatives considered, for example:

There are several sites in the West and South End of Louisville that the VA failed to adequately consider within the range of reasonable alternatives. In addition, a company led by business partner and Veteran Reed Benet is making 50 acres of land in southern Louisville available as a donation to the VA for the new VAMC. Communities outside of Louisville have also offered to donate properties to the VA for constructing new VAMC (Bullitt County and the City of Radcliff as noted in Comment Summary 2). In addition, Louisville Mayor Fischer has indicated that his team has “other sites worthy of VA’s consideration. “ Commenters indicate VA should have engaged the Mayor and City of Louisville from the beginning to find properties that could meet the needs of the VA and the new VAMC but the VA chose not to do so. In light of the VA’s inadequate and limited range of alternatives, the failure to consider other alternatives and the overall deficiency of the DEIS, the VA should take the Mayor up on his offer. Each of the potential sites has their advantages and disadvantages and while the qualities of each location as a site for new VAMC are disputable, that does not mean they should be excluded from the range of reasonable alternatives.
VA Response: As part of the process to narrow the universe of possibilities for reasonable project alternatives, VA considered an offer from the City of Louisville and the University of Louisville to assemble a site downtown. After a thorough, multi-phase process, VA determined that previously developed urban locations were not reasonable alternatives. The City proposed no other alternative locations or other considerations to VA. See related responses to Comment Summaries 1 and 2 above and section 2.3.2 of the EIS for more information relating to challenges with a downtown site.

3a. Related (follow up) Comment Summary: Several comments, many from Veterans, also expressed opposition to some of the general alternative location suggestions. For example, many requested that VA not select a downtown or West End location. These commenters disliked a downtown site because of difficulties of driving and parking there, and disliked the West End because of safety concerns related to parking and walking in the neighborhood, especially after dark. Others objected to locating in Bullitt County and Radcliffe because of the distance and other concerns).

VA Response: VA acknowledges that many Veterans are opposed to a downtown or west end location and would prefer that a new hospital be located at the current Zorn Avenue location. VA’s 2009 feasibility study concluded that rebuilding at the Zorn Avenue site would be more expensive, take longer to construct, and have significant adverse impact to ongoing delivery of services than a new site. For these reasons, rebuilding or expanding the existing VAMC at Zorn Avenue is not a reasonable alternative warranting analysis in the EIS, although continuing operations at the existing VAMC at Zorn Avenue is analyzed as part of the No Action Alternative. As discussed in the responses above, VA has evaluated the alternatives it found reasonable in the EIS. Section 2.3.3 of the Final EIS has been expanded to address the challenges with rebuilding at Zorn Avenue.

E.4.4.2.
Dismissal of the Downtown and Fegenbush sites from further Consideration

Comment Summary: Many of the commenters were particularly critical of VA’s dismissal of the Downtown and Fegenbush sites from further evaluation in the FEIS. Examples include:

- VA’s cursory treatment of the downtown site further demonstrates this site bias. The site was dismissed from detailed evaluation because, among other reasons, the need to assemble multiple parcels. The reality is that many large public and private projects requiring multiple parcel assembly have been successfully constructed in urban core of Louisville. Elimination of the Downtown Site eliminated VA’s ability to evaluate the relative merits of such sites in terms of quality of care, socioeconomic impacts, access to transportation, economic development, and other important considerations. Whether such a site would have proved to be the preferred alternative is beside the point. The total exclusion of any such sites from detailed analysis makes the DEIS fundamentally flawed.

- The Downtown and Fegenbush sites were inappropriately dismissed without detailed evaluation. They were dismissed in the PEA, but regardless of whether this was appropriate or not, their
exclusion was not justified once VA prepared the EIS. Section 2.0 does not establish a reasonable basis for excluding either the Downtown or Fegenbush site from detailed evaluation and thus is fatally flawed. The reasons cited (Section 2.3.1, p. 35) provide a legitimate basis for further evaluation but none (individually or collectively) is sufficient to conclude the site is so problematic that it does not even warrant further evaluation in the DEIS. The reasons given for the Downtown site may make it less desirable, but they do not make it unreasonable. Because both the Fegenbush and Downtown sites clearly meet VA’s purpose and need and offer certain benefits over other alternatives, they should have been evaluated in detail. Their absence constitutes a fundamental flaw in that document.

- VA also arbitrarily dismissed two sites as result of the PEA - the Fegenbush site and Downtown site. While site selection in the earlier EA phase does not mean it should be eliminated from consideration in EIS, the claim that VA can carry forward with elimination of sites from a reasonable range of alternatives is even more arbitrary when VA itself determined that EIS was necessary under NEPA. Exclusion of these sites without a reasonable basis or full analysis in DEIS as part of the range of reasonable alternatives violates 40 CFR 1502.14 and NEPA. VA dismissed the Downtown site, the site overwhelmingly preferred by Veterans, siting several issues. VA dismissed the Fegenbush Site arbitrarily. None of these issues, together or individually, justify VA’s failure to include them in the range of reasonable alternatives requiring a more detailed analysis in the DEIS. Nor do these sites offer less desirable factors than VA’s preferred Brownsboro Site, which has many undesirable issues such as traffic and accessibility, non-compliance with zoning and land use ordinances, land-locked site that will require additional property acquisition for expansion, storm water issues, infrastructure and utility issues, incompatibility issues and a requirement to construct unfunded highway and road improvements among others. Each of the potential sites has their advantages and disadvantages and while the qualities of each location as a site for new VAMC are disputable, that does not mean they should be excluded from the range of reasonable alternatives.

**VA Response:** As noted above, VA utilized a considered, logical approach to narrow the universe of possibilities to determine reasonable project alternatives to be analyzed for the EIS. As described in an expanded section 2.3.1 of the Final EIS, the Fegenbush site was determined to be an unreasonable alternative, primarily due to its undesirable location, based on the preliminary studies conducted by VA. Its distance from major highways would involve more complicated navigation for patients, staff, and visitors and its proximity to an industrial park and lack of significant adjacent amenities would provide a less than desirable Veteran (and Veteran family) experience. Subsequent investigation also revealed the site to be encumbered by a commercial interstate natural gas pipeline running through different portions of the site. The combination of the location issues, the shallower depth to bedrock (more blasting likely to be required), the likely costly utility issues that would potentially involve significant time and expense to resolve, and the archeological and ecological concerns combined to make the site an unreasonable alternative that resulted in it being eliminated from further consideration.

Also, as described in an expanded Section 2.3.2 of the Final EIS, VA determined that considerable environmental and cultural resource issues existed with the Downtown Site. VA’s 2009 feasibility study concluded that these issues represented significant risk to project cost and schedule, while also presenting
significant challenges to Veteran health care. This was due to the need for complex demolition, significant environmental cleanup, significant effort to relocate existing property owners who may or may not be interested in selling their property, and/or considerable efforts to satisfactorily overcome impacts to cultural resources. VA also considered the potential risk of litigation associated with assembling approximately 80 parcels from some potentially unwilling property owners. As noted in the Veteran preference survey, several Veteran comments, and the feasibility study, a Downtown Site would also result in challenges for Veteran experience due to the complexity associated with navigating the maze of one-way downtown streets and the heavy traffic in and around downtown areas. Many of these same issues were detailed in Phase 1 environmental investigation performed for the downtown assemblage in 2010 and 2011 which contributed to VA’s ultimate conclusion that a downtown location was not a reasonable alternative warranting further evaluation.

E.4.4.3.

Viability of St. Joseph Alternative Location (Alternative B)

Comment Summary: The St. Joseph Site was sold in early 2016 and is currently being developed for residential homes. That property is no longer available as a potential replacement Louisville VAMC site, despite its consideration as an alternative in the DEIS.

VA Response: VA acknowledges that in the time that has elapsed since the start of the site selection process to the identification of reasonable alternatives and publication of the draft EIS, the St. Joseph property has been put under option for possible sale to another party, pending successful rezoning of the property for mixed use development. However, as of the date of publication of the Final EIS, no sale has been finalized. Further, VA could still potentially negotiate for the purchase of the property for a new VAMC even if a sale were finalized. Therefore, for purposes of the EIS, VA assumes that the entire site remains available for development for the proposed VAMC campus and has retained Alternative B as a viable alternative with the same scope as evaluated in the Draft EIS. This has been clarified in Chapter 2 (new Section 2.2.3) of the Final EIS.

E.4.4.4.

Expansion and Rebuild of Existing VAMC on Zorn Avenue

While some commenters supported continued use of the existing VAMC on Zorn Avenue as is (No Action Alternative C), which would not meet purpose and need, many others stated that VA should stay and rebuild/expand at the existing Zorn Avenue VAMC location. Their reasoning was that this is where Veterans want to be, based on past surveys, and they believe rebuilding and expansion is possible through consideration of new layouts and design, phased scheduling, and potential approaches on how the existing hospital could continue to operate during construction.

1. Comment Summary: Commenters criticized the VA for not taking into account past Veteran surveys that show an overwhelming majority wanted the VAMC to remain at Zorn Avenue and accusing the VA siting committee of ignoring Veteran preferences.
VA Response: VA made significant effort in reaching out to area Veterans to obtain their input since first determining that a new replacement VAMC was needed - issuing approximately 45,000 letters to area Veterans in the early stages of the siting process. In addition, VA worked with the Veterans Service Organization to encourage input from area Veterans and encourage attendance by area Veterans at community and public meetings. VA also published numerous press releases via the Louisville Courier-Journal Newspaper and the existing VAMC.

VA’s efforts also included surveying a portion of the Veteran population and learned, overwhelmingly, that Veterans do not want to locate a new hospital downtown. While most would prefer to stay at the Zorn avenue site, feasibility studies indicate that trying to make the Zorn Avenue site work would cost more and take longer to deliver the project while having a significant adverse impact to the ongoing mission.

VA has taken Veteran preference into account and rigorously studied options to make remaining at the existing Zorn Avenue location feasible (including a Zorn Avenue - downtown hybrid configuration). See also response to Comment 2 below and expanded Sections 2.1 and 2.3.3 in the Final EIS.

Last Veteran survey results have indicated that Veterans, when given an option of staying at Zorn Avenue or going to a Downtown location, overwhelmingly would prefer to stay at the Zorn Avenue site, and that many had concerns with moving downtown.

Among the primary considerations for determining the extent of the project and its possible location were the ability to provide high-quality health care in a cost-effective and timely manner and avoiding impacts to ongoing delivery of services. The survey of Veterans’ preference, while an important consideration, did not outweigh these other considerations given that VA could likely successfully deliver services from any number of locations in the Louisville area. While not an element weighed by the site selection committee in making its recommendations for the sites that best met VA’s physical and geographical criteria, the survey nonetheless bolstered VA’s determination that a downtown option was not an acceptable alternative for further consideration in the EIS. While the survey did indicate a majority of Veterans would prefer to stay at the Zorn Avenue Site, construction of a replacement hospital at that location is not feasible given size requirements for updated medical equipment, existing topographical conditions at the site, and significant impacts to ongoing medical center operations and the delivery of care. Thus, rehabilitating the Zorn Avenue VAMC was also eliminated as a reasonable alternative for further analysis (though remaining at Zorn Avenue with no updates to the existing facility is analyzed in the EIS as the No Action Alternative to provide a baseline for comparison for construction and operation of a new facility at the Brownsboro or St. Joseph Sites). The only remaining feasible option considered reasonable for further study and analysis was to construct a new VAMC on a greenfield site. While not necessarily preferred by the Veterans surveyed, that option was clearly preferred over a different downtown location.

2. Comment Summary: Many commenters prefer the present VAMC location on Zorn Avenue and do not understand why remaining at this site is not an option. VA does not adequately explain why it cannot expand at the Zorn Avenue site. The Zorn Avenue site is much larger than the preferred site (65 acres versus 34.9), yet the VA has limited the developable land at Zorn to 22 acres without justification. The Zorn Avenue does have a challenging topography, but the VA offers no data or evidence that construction cannot occur on the property. Many developments around the Zorn Avenue VAMC have demonstrated that building on steep topography is possible. VA must also make public its plans for the Zorn Avenue VAMC site if they choose to move the VAMC.
Section 1.2 does not provide a reasonably detailed explanation for contention that there are “limited options to expand” at the current site. Factors listed primarily focus on difficulties in renovating the existing hospital infrastructure to meet current design criteria. Same discussion also states there “is not appreciable vacant space on campus for expansion,” but does not describe the total size of the property, the amount of space that is actually needed to construct a replacement VAMC on-site, or the reasons other than parking difficulties that such an expansion is not possible. Site does have challenging topography, but VA offers no data or evidence that construction cannot occur on the property. Clearly you can build on and around steep topography on site, as many other developments around Zorn have demonstrated. VA must also make public its plans for Zorn Avenue VAMC site if they choose to move VAMC.

Has the VA (or others) done any formal and/or rigorous analysis of the potential of onsite(Zorn Avenue) upgrading, renovating, modifying, mitigating, or rebuilding in whole or in part? In other words, has there been any written, in depth analysis of the deficiencies at the Zorn facility and why the deficiencies cannot be remediated? If so, who prepared the analysis and what were the results?

**VA Response:** VA identified several engineering and environmental challenges associated with remaining at the Zorn Avenue Site in its 2009 feasibility study. In particular, rebuilding or renovating at the current Zorn Avenue location would not resolve the issues that are driving the need for a replacement medical center campus including inability to meet current design criteria and the lack of available space for expansion. In addition, construction activities would cause a significant adverse impact to ongoing delivery of healthcare services to Veterans.

As elaborated on in Section 2.1 of the Final EIS, VA performed a feasibility study in 2009 which determined that while possible, construction or renovation at the existing site would be more expensive, take more time to deliver, and have a significant adverse impact on VA’s ongoing mission than other alternatives, such as those analyzed in the EIS. Specifically, VA studied VAMC reconfiguration options at the existing Zorn Avenue location as part of the 2009 Feasibility Study. As described in revised Section 2.3.3 of the Final EIS, this included two options: (1) full replacement with new parking structure; and (2) new construction of 400,000 GSF of inpatient space and renovation of 400,000 GSF of outpatient space with new parking structure. A third option combined a new downtown location (construction of a new 400,000 GSF inpatient facility with parking (800 space expandable to 1200 spaces) structure on a contiguous 16-acre site) with renovation of the Zorn Avenue campus (Building 1) to accommodate remaining ambulatory care services, research, etc., along with construction of a new parking structure (1,600 spaces - expandable to 2,400). After careful study, VA concluded the reconfiguration (including renovation and expansion) at the Zorn Avenue location was not reasonable.

To rebuild or renovate facilities at the current Zorn Avenue location would not resolve the issues that are driving the need for a replacement medical center campus. For example, the existing structure and floor-to-floor heights of the main hospital building do not support the needs of modern healthcare. Imaging systems, for example, require significant structural support and heavy shielding, along with significant vertical clearances to accommodate piping, ventilation, and other supporting utilities, that cannot be accommodated in structures built in the 1950s. In addition, the existing structures cannot accommodate VA’s current hospital building system standard which utilizes interstitial space to make it feasible to maintain supporting systems and reconfigure space as necessary to adapt to the constantly changing requirements of healthcare delivery. There is also no swing space available on the campus to...
accommodate renovations or new construction without significant adverse impact to ongoing delivery of healthcare. While the Zorn Avenue campus is approximately 47.75 acres in total, only about 22 acres is actually developable given its karst geology and uneven topography. The site contains areas that cannot be developed such as heavily wooded ravines, steep hills, small caverns, and located in a 100-year floodplain. Any attempt to create swing space or new parking through new construction would disrupt existing parking which would significantly adversely impact Veteran access to the facility. VA has exhausted avenues to rent reasonably priced nearby parking and cannot meet its current demand, much less the additional burden that construction would bring. Building a parking structure into the side of the hills in the ravine and wooded areas is not only impractical but would result in an ongoing maintenance challenges over and above a typical parking structure. In addition, rebuilding at Zorn would be more expensive, would take longer to construct, and would result in significant adverse impacts to ongoing delivery of healthcare to Veterans and their families. Section 2.3.3 of the Final EIS has been revised to further clarify the challenges associated with rebuilding at the Zorn Avenue location.

The final disposition of the Zorn Avenue VAMC, if it is moved, has not yet been determined. It is premature to get valid, interested parties to come forward for re-utilization of that site. The utilization study has not been completed and will not be completed until VA is closer to implementing the project. Once authorization is provided for construction of the replacement VAMC, VA will begin the process of performing reutilization studies to determine if there is legitimate interest from other Federal, State and local agencies and/or public and private entities in accordance with applicable law and regulations.

E.4.4.5.
Other Comments on Alternatives

Several other commenters suggested new alternative approaches all together, such as greater reliance on the local hospitals, at least for routine care and treatment; requested information on VA’s plans for the final disposition of the VAMC at Zorn Avenue, and suggested alternative uses for the Brownsboro property. VA’s responses to these individual comments are provided in detailed comment response Table E-2 at the end of Section E.4.

E.4.5
Traffic and Transportation

1. Comment Summary (EPA): Given traffic and transportation is a key issue for residents and the VAMC, the EPA recommends sustained coordination with local Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, the Transit Authority of River City, and other relevant stakeholders to address some of the proposed transportation improvements needed to support the VAMC. Efforts to continue working with the neighboring residents to ensure that traffic from the facility does not intrude onto surrounding neighborhood streets should be made.

VA Response: VA continues to coordinate with the KYTC on a broad number of issues, including project timing, right-of-way and easement issues, funding, etc., associated with the proposed transportation improvements. This includes coordinating on the scheduling of the planned interchange and possible
VAMC construction at the Brownsboro Site so that the interchange construction would be complete and open to traffic prior to the completion of construction at that site.

VA also continues to provide KYTC with information from studies it has conducted and to keep KYTC informed of progress throughout the NEPA process. If the Brownsboro Site were selected for the replacement VAMC, VA would fund any required signalization improvements at the main entry to the site and would coordinate with both KYTC and Louisville Metro to schedule and pay for this signalization.

Communication with TARC also will continue as VA develops construction documents and finalizes site details after a site is selected. Finally, VA would share project and transportation improvement updates with the surrounding neighborhoods as plans become more final and work with residents to address traffic and related safety concerns.

2. Comment Summary (Mayor of Louisville): EIS includes traffic impact study that recommends improvements to various area intersections to reduce congestion that will result from the estimated 10,000 average daily trips associated with the Replacement VAMC. The EIS concludes that area traffic conditions will be better with the construction of the Replacement VAMC than without it, and lists a number of area road projects that VA will advocate for in an effort to reduce impacts to already congested roads following project construction.

As many as 6 of these projects are not funded and not listed on the state’s Six Year Road Plan, the document that sets forth Kentucky’s transportation funding priorities and guides the implementation of roadway improvement projects. Schedule for constructing the Single-Point Urban interchange at US 42 and I-264, which would have greatest impact on area intersection functionality, has not yet been developed.

Without this critical improvement, there are 8 intersections functioning at LOS F in the morning commute and 10 functioning at LOS F during the evening commute.

CJ article on December 10, 2016 reported that the intersection at US 42 and I-264 is currently the second most congested intersection in the city, and that US 42 between Lime Kiln Lane and Seminary Woods, just east of the proposed location, is currently the 9th most congested area in the city. While staggered work hours will help avoid everyone arriving and departing at the same time, the Louisville Metro Government’s DPW has expressed concern that provision of only one site entrance for Replacement VAMC will cause additional congestion and traffic stacking, particularly during morning and evening commute times as employees enter and exit the site.

VA Response: As noted by the commenter, many of the transportation projects described in the EIS are not in the biennial spending plan of the KYTC current six-year plan.

Predicting which projects will appear in the next six-year plan (due April 2018) is difficult. Some projects that could help in the area are being considered even though they are not in the current six-year plan, and it is not unprecedented for needed projects to suddenly appear as priorities.

While the potential traffic improvements are not within VA’s authority, VA continues to coordinate with the KYTC on a broad number of issues, as noted in the comment response above. This includes
coordinating on the scheduling of the planned interchange and possible VAMC construction at the Brownsboro Site so that the interchange construction would be complete and open to traffic prior to the completion of construction at that site. VA continues to provide KYTC with information from studies it has conducted and to keep KYTC informed of progress throughout the NEPA process. If the Brownsboro Site were selected for the replacement VAMC, VA would fund any required signalization improvements at the main entry to the site and would coordinate with both KYTC and Louisville Metro to schedule and pay for this signalization.

For purposes of the traffic impact analysis, the EIS did not assume that all of the planned improvements would be implemented, given the timing uncertainties. This allowed the EIS to identify a potential upper bound (worst case scenario) for impacts. However, actual impacts would be expected to become less over time, if and when more of the planned improvements are implemented.

In response to the comment - and in an effort to obtain the latest information available - VA’s traffic contractor made an inquiry in late 2016 to the KYTC (District 5) as to the status of various projects met with the following responses (shown in italics):

1. Is the project prioritization process looking at a project to widen I-71 between I-264 and I-265 to relieve that congestion or does it only look at projects in the current six-year plan? If not, is the District planning to ask for it? It is the District’s understanding that sections of I-71 widening between spaghetti junction in downtown Louisville to the KY53 interchange in Oldham County will go through the prioritization process. We are still tweaking the exact limits of each construction section at this time. This process will begin in late January 2017 and progress throughout the end of the year when the recommended Highway Plan is unveiled to the public.

2. Is any consideration being given to widening Herr Lane or Lime Kiln Lane currently? A project to widen Herr Lane from the Lime Kiln intersection to Westport Rd. was considered in the 2015 District Transportation Plan (DTP). This potential project should be going through the prioritization process. I am unaware of any project to widen or improve Lime Kiln Lane. There is a state funded project (5-371.16) that is on-hold to improve the Herr Ln. and Lime Kiln intersection. The majority of the project is to add a TWLTL on KY22 from Lime Kiln to the east where Ballard High School has an entrance.

In response to the comment regarding multiple (8 and 10) intersections with an LOS F in the AM and LOS F in the PM, VA acknowledges that existing conditions are not optimal as five intersections were analyzed in VA’s traffic impact study, although not all are currently at LOS F as suggested.

VA also acknowledges that the single main entry/egress point to the site referenced by the Mayor is less than optimal but VA is committed to avoiding routing traffic through adjacent neighborhoods to access the site. The only exception for potential use of Carlimar Lane would be for emergency vehicles in the event emergency responders could not access the campus through the main access/egress point in an emergency.

3. Comment Summary: Commenters noted that VA’s traffic impact study supports the conclusion that selection of the Brownsboro Site would increase traffic congestion in the area. Specifically, commenters
cite the average expected wait times for vehicles to pass through the intersections of US 42, KY 22, and Northfield Road during morning and evening commutes if the Brownsboro Site were selected and compares those to current wait times.

With respect to the traffic study itself, commenters expressed concern that the area considered in the traffic impact study for the Brownsboro Site was not large enough to fully capture area traffic conditions, and that the data used to create traffic projects is from 2013. In particular, commenters stated that there is no information in traffic impact study concerning the impact of a replacement VAMC at the Brownsboro Site on traffic moving from west to east through the US 42/I-264 interchange, and on other area drivers who routinely travel through the area around the site. These commenters recommend using more recent data to analyze traffic conditions to reflect current conditions and expanding the scope of traffic study to understand the impact to area drivers passing through key area intersections to create a more complete picture of traffic conditions after construction of a replacement VAMC at the Brownsboro Site. Finally, commenters stated that the VA’s traffic study does not do an adequate corridor level analysis of the I-71, I-264, US42, KY22, Westport Road and Herr Lane corridors, and that an increase in traffic in this area at this magnitude would have significant and wide-ranging impacts on the functioning of the larger surface transportation network near the Brownsboro Site.

VA Response: VA believes that expanding the traffic study to include more intersections will not reveal useful information. For example, the intersections of Holiday Manor @ US 42, Lime Kiln @ US 42, KY 22 @ Herr Lane, and KY 22 @ Seminary Drive which are east of the Brownsboro Site would not be affected because most of the traffic associated with the VAMC would come and go from I-264. Expanding the study to include all of the surrounding corridors (I-71, I-264, US42 and KY22) would require VA to speculate from where various segments of the traffic were coming. Analyzing changes in traffic signal timings for corridors not adjacent to the proposed site would be too speculative to be practical given the accuracy of origin and destination data available. VA recognizes that traffic conditions may have worsened in the last few years, given lower gas prices and an improving economy. However, adding to the traffic study additional intersections farther east from I-264 would not yield different results. Because specific origin-destination data for expected trips to and from a VAMC at the Brownsboro Site are not available, the traffic study assumed that travelers would all come from I-264 (worst case). Obviously, some trips would arrive and leave from Old Brownsboro Road and from US 42 to the east, but the differences are not expected to be significant compared to the travelers who arrive and leave via I-264. Delays occurring on I-71 between I-264 and I-265, where it shrinks from three lanes to two lanes, could also impact traffic at the proposed Brownsboro Site. However, it is beyond the scope of the EIS to model traffic conditions within the larger area and VA has no control over how traffic might be alleviated (i.e., need to widen I-71). Current assumptions are also consistent with the Interchange Modification Report currently being reviewed by the FHWA that uses the same forecasts as the VA traffic study.

Perhaps more importantly, a larger study area would not be expected to change the overall results which already identify the potential for increased traffic congestion in the area.

With respect to the request to update the general traffic counts and traffic study, the VA notes that, even if such annual updates were conducted, the new data would immediately be out of date because additional time would have passed between collection and analysis. Although NEPA requires the use of the most
recent available data, it has been recognized that agency decisionmaking would become intractable, always awaiting updated information only to find the new information outdated by the time the analysis was completed.

However, in an effort to provide more recent data in response to comments, VA reviewed KYTC traffic count data available from its Division of Planning website (www.transportation.ky.gov/Planning/Pages/count-maps.aspx February 7, 2017). This data shows the volumes on I-264 north of US 42 from 2001 – 2015. These trends offer further support why the baseline data years included in the VA traffic study are sufficient:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Traffic Volume (AADT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>48,200 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>55,100 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>58,900 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>59,200 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>59,000 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>59,300 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>59,200 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>57,400 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>54,200 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>58,500 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>65,581 AADT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data show the type of general traffic growth that has occurred in the east end of Louisville near the Brownsboro Site. While not all years were counted, increases in traffic counts up to 2011 are flat and the growth from 2011 to 2015 is about 3 percent per year. The forecast used for the KYTC Interchange Modification Request which was the basis for the forecasts used for the VA traffic study resulted in I-264 traffic at this point of 67,200 AADT in 2020 and 86,700 AADT in 2040. The data shown above indicate that traffic through 2015 has not grown more significantly than anticipated.

The KYTC traffic count data along US 42 as it passes over US 42 is not as complete, but shows the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Traffic Volume (AADT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>65,800 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>52,300 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>49,800 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>52,600 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>51,600 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>56,000 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>40,034 AADT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for the gaps in traffic counts is unknown, but the 2015 count was taken after the construction of the Westport Road interchange and the Ramp Split to Old Brownsboro Road. Those two events seem to have taken significant traffic off of the US 42 corridor which also showed up in counts taken for the 2011 US 42 Interchange Study and the 2016 Interchange Modification report following preliminary design which used new counts after the opening of the two new facilities.

With respect to traffic data counts at the St. Joseph Site, past trends show it is highly unlikely that new counts would significantly change the LOS or travel times at this site. Reviewing the KYTC traffic counts from the Division of Planning website (www.transportation.ky.gov/Planning/Pages/count-maps.aspx February 7, 2017), the I-265 counts have grown as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Traffic Volume (AADT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>53,300 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>52,700 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>56,866 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>56,240 AADT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With opening of the East End Bridge on Dec. 18, 2016, traffic may increase more significantly in 2017. On Old Henry Road, the traffic counts have increased as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Traffic Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>13,100 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>13,900 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>14,800 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>15,500 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>15,968 AADT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the last KYTC provided count was for 2013, it does show some leveling off for a relatively new road. On LaGrange Road, the counts have increased as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Traffic Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>17,500 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>18,800 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>18,800 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>18,100 AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>17,627 AADT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the last count was from 2013, the trend has been relatively flat. The traffic counts for intersection movements taken for the St. Josephs site were done in 2012. Given the lack of significant growth of traffic as measured by KYTC on I-265, Old Henry Road, and LaGrange Road, the collection of updated counts in 2017 would not be expected to yield significantly different results.

4. Comment Summary: Traffic analysis for Alternative A is fundamentally flawed because it does not use a true “no build” baseline to assess the impacts of the proposal. The traffic impact study conducted for the Brownsboro Site evaluated two primary scenarios for the 2025 design year: with the addition of the VAMC (“build” scenario) and without the VAMC at that site (“no build” scenario). However, in the “no build” forecast, the study assumes the existence of a speculative mixed-use development at that site instead of analyzing the true no build condition and conceals true impacts to transportation network that are attributable to the VAMC.

possibility of development by someone other than VA does not relieve VA from obligation under NEPA to conduct full and fair evaluation of impacts.

Related comment: Inconsistency in the traffic analysis methodology used for Alternatives A and B skews the projected impacts in favor of Alternative A. Study included speculative mixed use development in its “no build” traffic projections for Brownsboro but did not include a similar “no build” scenario for St. Joseph Site which has also been subject of private proposals for mixed use development. As a result, the projected effect on local traffic appears much greater for Alternative B than Alternative A when, in fact, this difference is primarily attributable to the inconsistent methodology used for each site.

VA Response: The mixed-use development scenario used in the analysis of the Brownsboro Site was based on a proposed development plan (the Midlands) that had been approved by Planning and Zoning in 2006. For this reason, VA assumed for purposes of analysis that the Brownsboro Site, if not used for a replacement VAMC, would be sold for use as a similar mixed use development. In comparison, at the time the St. Joseph Site was analyzed as an alternative location for the VAMC there were no plans for
development of the site and future development was speculative. In response to comments, VA has expanded the Final EIS to include an analysis of a No-Build scenario at the Brownsboro Site, assuming no development by either VA or a subsequent owner. This allows for a comparison of impacts for both action alternatives, to existing greenfield conditions at both the Brownsboro and St. Joseph Sites (assuming no development out to 2025). Section 4.13 of the Final EIS has been revised to include this new analysis.

See Table E-3 (at the end of Section E.4) for other comments and responses relating to traffic and transportation.

E.4.6

Resource-specific Impact Analysis and Mitigation Measures

Detailed responses to resource specific comments are provided in Table E-4 at the end of Section E.4. Responses to general comments are addressed below.

1. Comment Summary: Chapters 3 and 4 fall short of “hard look” requirement by NEPA. Two overall concerns call into question the adequacy of the evaluation.

   1) Lack of a robust range of reasonable alternatives undermines the document’s assessment of environmental consequences. Most of the analysis is at too high a level to provide a basis for any meaningful comparison of impacts between alternatives; and the minimal and sometimes perfunctory evaluation and discussion of Alternatives B and C compounds the problem. The DEIS evaluates only VA’s preferred alternative in detail, giving cursory attention to the St. Joseph Site and the No Action Alternative.

   2) The inappropriate assumption that the sites under consideration would be developed anyway precludes an accurate assessment of the impacts of the proposed project. Without a true baseline from which to compare these impacts, the entire exercise of identifying environmental consequences is rendered meaningless.

   Related Comment: DEIS purports to extensively evaluate three alternatives. However, the detailed information in Section 2.0 of the DEIS deals almost entirely with the Brownsboro Site. The DEIS utterly fails to properly assess the St. Joseph Site. The St. Joseph hospital building architecture and site planning is identical to that of the Brownsboro Site. While that property is approximately 99 acres, the St. Joseph Site plan uses a 34.9 acre site plan developed for the Brownsboro Site.

   VA Response: In determining reasonable alternatives for analysis in the EIS, VA developed and implemented a sound and rigorous siting process, which resulted in the identification of two reasonable alternatives and the subsequent analysis of the two alternative sites (and the No Action Alternative) in the EIS.

   In keeping with NEPA and CEQ’s NEPA Implementing Regulations, VA endeavored to provide an equivalent level of detail and analysis of the two alternative locations in the EIS. However, in response to
comments, VA has modified the analysis of the alternatives in the final EIS in an effort to equalize the treatment of the alternatives as much as possible.

With respect to the site design that was used to analyze potential impacts at both the Brownsboro and St. Joseph Sites, at this early stage of planning – long before a final site selection has been made – it is appropriate to use the same preliminary plan for both sites rather than developing different designs and architectural renderings to reflect site-specific features of each alternative. It would be wasteful to have site-specific plans developed for each individual site when only one (or neither) will ultimately be selected. More importantly, such detailed designs would not provide any additional meaningful information regarding potential environmental impacts at the sites. While the specific site plan may be more specific to the preferred alternative (Brownsboro Site), the level of detail provided is sufficient for purposes of evaluating potential environmental impacts at both sites.

The two sites do vary with respect to certain features (e.g., available acreage, topography), as commenters have pointed out, and changes in design likely would be required to fully accommodate the site-specific features of the St. Joseph Site if this site were selected. However, such details would not be incorporated until final design of the St. Joseph Site was completed, prior to site construction, and not during the NEPA phase. This has been clarified in the Final EIS. VA also notes that the specific placement of the proposed VAMC on the St. Joseph parcel (Figure 2-7 in the EIS) is based on site-specific features (e.g., best for topography, drainage, offset from road and nearby residential areas, and this has also been clarified in the Final EIS.

In an effort to more accurately reflect project features applicable to both alternative locations, Section 2.2 in the Final EIS has been restructured to include a new section (2.2.1) that describes design features common to both Alternatives A and B. This also allows subsequent sections to focus on site-specific differences that have been taken into account for the two locations.

With respect to the analysis of impacts at the two sites, many of the impacts are similar between the two action alternatives because constructing and operating the same replacement VAMC on one of two greenfield sites would require the same ground disturbance activities, using the same pieces of heavy equipment, and resulting in the same air and noise emissions, etc. VA has revised Chapter 4 of the Final EIS to further strengthen the analysis:

- Consideration of impacts at a more local (neighborhood) level that better take into account site specific differences (e.g., parcel size and proximity to residences);
- Expansion of the discussion of potential impacts from a replacement VAMC at the Brownsboro Site to include comparison with a “no build” scenario for the site, in addition to the mixed use development scenario already addressed. The traffic impact discussion also now includes an analysis comparing traffic volumes under the replacement VAMC, the mixed use development scenario, and a no build scenario at the Brownsboro Site. This is consistent with the no build comparison made in the analysis of the St. Joseph Site.

With respect to the criticisms of the perfunctory discussions for Alternative C (No Action Alternative), no adverse impacts would be expected to occur at the existing Zorn Avenue VAMC since there are no proposed changes to the existing facility or to existing operations. Current discussions in the Final EIS are sufficient.
2. Comment Summary: It is unclear what methodology, if any, VA used to analyze the environmental impacts of the alternatives. The analysis of environmental impacts in an EIS requires use of a methodology to predict the effects of a proposed action on the environment. Other than an inadequate and underdeveloped matrix (p. xix), VA makes no attempt to use any other methodology such as the network method, an overlay method, or any type of modeling that was specific to a certain alternative. This is indicative of the EIS’s failure to evaluate an alternative besides the preferred alternative with any rigor. Because the data and analysis is not developed for any other alternative, there is no data or analysis to compare to the preferred Brownsboro Site. This is demonstrated by repeated statements that an impact is “similar to another site without going into any detail whatsoever that would account for the locational and environmental differences among alternatives. VA did not identify any methodologies used to compare the alternatives because it did not gather enough data to make a thorough comparison as required by NEPA.

VA Response: The beginning of each resource impact area section in Chapter 4 includes a brief discussion/description of the impact evaluation methodology used, i.e., evaluation criteria against which impact determinations are made. For many resource impact areas, a qualitative analysis is sufficient, often comparing quantitative data. In other cases, quantitative modeling was conducted (e.g., traffic and socioeconomics), as explained in Sections 4.10 (Socioeconomics), 4.13 (Transportation and Traffic), and Appendix B (Traffic Impact Study). In general, the level of analysis conducted and detail presented in a NEPA document should be commensurate with the potential for significant adverse impact, “rather than amassing needless detail (40 CFR 1501.1(b)). Not every resource area requires modeling to analyze potential impacts. Statements in the EIS indicating where impacts would be similar between alternative sites are based on the similarities in the proposed project construction and operation activities at both sites and the fact that both sites are greenfield/undeveloped sites located near residential communities. Many of the impacts are typical of large construction projects that can be addressed through effective mitigation, including best management practices.

In an effort to better differentiate between the two sites, VA has revised select discussions in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS to identify any locational and environmental differences, especially in the analysis of the St. Joseph Site. The discussion of mitigation measures has also been expanded in the Final EIS, both in the resource-specific discussions in Chapter 4 and in the mitigation chapter (Chapter 5).

The comparison made in the matrix referenced on p. xix refers to a summary comparison of impacts across all alternatives and resource areas. The same table is found in Chapter 2 where the CEQ NEPA regulations require an EIS to “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 among options by the decisionmaker and the public” (40 CFR 1502.14). The basis for the comparisons in Chapter 2 is provided in Chapter 4 relating to environmental impacts. VA has revised the impact summary table in Chapter 2 (Table 2-5) and the Executive Summary, to be consistent with the expanded discussion of impacts in Chapter 4 and further clarify the differences between the action alternatives.

3. Comment Summary: DEIS fails to address opposition to the Brownsboro Site by other government agencies. Kentucky Division of Water Quality preferred a site that was “already developed.” Louisville Metro Department of Public Works favored a downtown location or redevelopment of Zorn because “most of the issues possibly associated with the development of the greenfield site do not exist.” The
Draft EIS fails to rigorously explore these issues and failed to take into consideration the preferences of other government agencies that have a role in regulating the construction and operation of this project and site.

**VA Response:** VA recognizes that various federal, state, or local agencies may prefer a different site for a replacement VAMC than the one identified by VA. However, the decision to select reasonable alternatives for detailed analysis in the EIS following selection thorough siting process, as well as the decision to select the final site, is the responsibility of VA. Reasons for eliminating a downtown location from further consideration is addressed in Section E.4.4.2. Reasons that the VA is unable to redevelop the Zorn Avenue location for a new VAMC are provided in Section E.4.4.4.

### 4. Environmental Justice Related Issue:
VA notes that many of the comments relating to alternative locations (e.g., suggestions to locate in low-income neighborhoods of Louisville to help boost economy) and to increased traffic and access difficulties faced by Veterans trying to reach the proposed Brownsboro Site (e.g., those Veterans living in the lower income neighborhoods in the western and southern parts of town) cite environmental justice concerns as the basis for their comment.

**VA Response:** It appears that there is confusion as to what constitutes an environmental justice impact to be analyzed in the EIS. As described in Executive Order No. 12898 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations) and in subsequent CEQ guidance, an analysis of potential environmental justice impacts examines whether a disproportionate share of adverse human health or environmental impacts from implementing a federal action would be borne by minority or low-income populations. Such an analysis is neither an effort to identify areas that might benefit from federally funded projects, nor an effort to promote access to federal facilities by low-income or minority communities. Ease of access to a replacement VAMC for all Veterans is addressed in Section 4.13 (Transportation and Traffic), but it is not as a component of environmental justice.

As clarified in Section 4.15 of the Final EIS, environmental justice concerns addressed in a NEPA document typically relate to potential sources of exposure to environmental pollutants (air and water emissions from proposed project) such as nearby hazardous waste sites (e.g., waste and hazardous chemical facilities, hazardous waste treatment, storage and disposal facilities, risk management plan facilities, and other industrial facilities).

Pollution or impacts are relevant to environmental justice in that differences between groups have been indicated in exposures (to air toxics, contaminated water, lead based paint in older housing), susceptibility or health endpoints associated with the exposures.

Increased local traffic congestion can also be a concern for minority and low-income populations living nearby (in terms of air quality and noise impacts, safety concerns, etc.). As such, the primary concern is for those minority and low-income populations that live in the immediate vicinity of the site and could potentially experience a disproportionate share of the adverse project impacts. VA has expanded the environmental justice discussions in the Final EIS to include minority and low-income populations living in the immediate site areas (see revised Sections 3.15 and 4.15 of the Final EIS). This revision is also in response to public comment (see also detailed comments and responses in Table E-4 relating to environmental justice). Although the environmental justice analysis has been expanded, the overall
impact findings did not change. No adverse environmental (including health) effects from the proposed VAMC would be disproportionately borne by any minority or low-income communities.

As noted above, increased travel distance to reach a proposed new facility location is not considered an environmental justice issue, contrary to what many commenters raised as a concern in their comments on the Draft EIS. Executive Order 12898 does not suggest that an agency should locate proposed projects in areas to benefit minority or low-income populations. While some Veterans who live in minority or low-income areas in the western end of Louisville may have farther to travel to receive health care services, the proposed new location at Brownsboro is within the VA travel guidelines. VA would work with local public transit authorities to increase the number of available bus routes if staff and patient demand warrants it. It is also important to remember the purpose for the replacement VAMC, which is to provide better quality health care services in a new state-of-the-art facility for Veterans.

E.4.7

Out-of-Scope Comments

Comment Summary: The major out of scope comment categories on the Draft EIS included:

- VA history of cost overruns
- Terms, conditions, purchase price of Brownsboro property
- Use of Midlands/Brownsboro Site as Annex to nearby Zachary Taylor National Cemetery (which is full).
- Personal opinions and accusations of VA management and staff

VA acknowledges these comments and concerns but they do not relate directly to the EIS or the decisions it supports. VA does offer the following response relating to project cost concerns: VA would fully design the facility and conduct an independent cost estimate to confirm that the construction contract is within the target range. In addition, every project budget includes contingency based on a risk management evaluation. VA looks at root causes for issues on other projects to ensure those (A) we consider those in the design and planning process, and (B) that if there are issues where VA can't completely design out the risk, that VA allocates appropriate contingency for those things that might be unforeseen.

E.4.8

Detailed Comment Response Tables

Comments and responses are detailed in the following tables:

Table E-2: Proposed Action and Alternatives ................................................................. Page 36
Table E-3: Traffic and Transportation ...................................................................... Page 44
Table E-4: Comments Related to Specific Impacts .................................................... Page 53
Table E-5: Comment Letters from Agencies, Organizations, and Public Meeting Transcripts Page 94
Table E-6: Comment Letters and Forms from Crossgate Petition Excluding Website .......... Page 99
Table E-7: Individual Comments Submitted through the Website ......................... Page 103
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSED ACTION – VAMC REPLACEMENT AT BROWNSBORO SITE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happens if we need 3 x the number of beds because we have a huge attack, and we only have a limited bed space out here. If facility is downtown, we have options to lease or rent space from adjoining hospitals; we can use their equipment. This issue has not been discussed.</td>
<td>In the event of an unforeseen event that would require more beds than are available at the VAMC, VA would make arrangements with other hospitals in the area to provide the necessary care to Veterans. Proper care would be provided at whatever facility and location Veteran patients were placed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They say it’s 160 stories high [interpreted as meaning 160 fee high, not stories] - an 8 to 10 story building. That’s hospital numbers, not numbers for a normal building, which is about 12 ½ feet floor to floor. So we’re looking at a 12 to 15 story building sitting there. The other building is 105 stories high (also interpreted as 105 feet); that’s approximately 9 to 10 stories on a regular condition. Also looking at 2 parking garages - one eight stories and one six stories high. There’s not a parking garage outside of downtown Louisville that’s over 3 stories tall. Also putting in a laundry facility; asked Mr. Traxler if VA currently brings in laundry from other facilities - like Cincinnati - and do that here. Answer was “yes”. Facility we’re building is for a 50 to 70 year timeframe. What’s going to happen in that timeframe? We’ll have cars that drive themselves. Some of us aren’t thinking long-term; VA is worst at this. Proposed site so maxed out that there’s no expansion. Building 6 to 8 story parking garage because no room for regular expansion.</td>
<td>Proposed replacement VAMC would be 162 feet high which would result in a significant change in the viewseshed and character for the surrounding neighborhoods. This has been addressed in Section 4.2 of the Final EIS. VA response relating to concerns about site’s potential for expansion is provided in Appendix E, Section E.4.3. A significant benefit of the proposed design is that multi-story parking garages, in addition to accommodating all the required parking onsite, minimize the area of impervious surfaces (i.e., concrete) as compared to large surface lots. This allows more of the stormwater runoff to be managed by the site’s natural hydrology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B says size of hospital in 2015 was 1,286,731 square feet (not counting VBA building or two parking garages or other outbuildings). VA now reduced size to one thousand thirty five hundred (sic) square feet (not counting VBA or parking garages, etc.). Plus they’re closing 3 CBOCs.</td>
<td>VA has reduced the size of the hospital and recalculated trip generation data based on a total area of 1,030,500 square feet. This includes the VBA (estimated at approximately 130,000 square feet) but not the parking garages. It is consistent with the square footage estimates included in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. As explained in Chapter 2, VA downsized the proposed facility in 2016 by 21 percent compared to initial design concepts shared with the public. This reduced the north-south length of the Atrium concept by about 95 feet, reduced the height of the east bar by nearly 40 feet and the west bar by nearly 20 feet, and decreased the required parking structure capacity. The reduction was in response to updated projections of the expected VAMC workload.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, it is important to note that the proposed reduction in size and closing of the three CBOCs are not in conflict with VA’s stated purpose and need for the proposed replacement hospital. As further clarified in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS, the problem with the existing facility is that it cannot be brought up to the standards necessary to meet the current and future needs of modern healthcare cost effectively or without significant adverse impact to Veterans’ access to care. A new hospital would be designed and constructed with the necessary systems and flexibility to meet such needs, and with sufficient capacity to serve current and future demand (e.g., increased demand for outpatient services and decreased demand for inpatient care).

In summary, it is smaller than originally anticipated... but still bigger than the existing VAMC (816,000 SF). As noted elsewhere, and clarified in the Chapter 2 of the Final EIS, the new VAMC would have fewer beds because of reduced inpatient demand, due primarily to the increased outpatient demand and need for more clinical space.

Many local residents have expressed concern about the extent to which residential streets, and Carlimar Lane in particular, may be used to access the proposed Brownsboro Site during project construction and operation. It is a residential road that cannot support the volume of vehicles that might be involved. Residents have safety concerns associated with streets currently used as place to park cars and where kids play.

VA appreciates the concerns of local residents regarding potential use of Carlimar Lane, a small residential street at the south side of the Brownsboro Site, to access the Brownsboro location. It is a matter of safety compliance for the site to have alternative, emergency egress; and VA has been unable to identify any other alternative location to serve this purpose. However, VA is also committed to restricting its use to emergency situations only. Specifically, Carlimar Lane would not be used as a point of entry or egress during construction except in the event of an unexpected disruption of the Brownsboro entrance. As described in section 2.2.2.2 of the Final EIS, the Carlimar Lane gate would be locked and accessible only when emergency vehicles could not access the main entrance on Brownsboro Road (such as in the case of traffic accident or other road blockage).

Once constructed, the gate to Carlimar Lane would be locked during both project construction and operation. In the event the main entry/egress is inaccessible, VA would require its construction contractor to assist city officials and residents in close proximity to the site (e.g., the Crossgate and Graymoor-Devondale communities in particular) with proper directing of traffic to and from the site; this would include the use of appropriate temporary signage, and onsite construction supervisors who would provide instruction and pre-job briefings to employees and drivers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>However, it is important to note that the proposed reduction in size and closing of the three CBOCs are not in conflict with VA’s stated purpose and need for the proposed replacement hospital. As further clarified in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS, the problem with the existing facility is that it cannot be brought up to the standards necessary to meet the current and future needs of modern healthcare cost effectively or without significant adverse impact to Veterans’ access to care. A new hospital would be designed and constructed with the necessary systems and flexibility to meet such needs, and with sufficient capacity to serve current and future demand (e.g., increased demand for outpatient services and decreased demand for inpatient care).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, it is smaller than originally anticipated... but still bigger than the existing VAMC (816,000 SF). As noted elsewhere, and clarified in the Chapter 2 of the Final EIS, the new VAMC would have fewer beds because of reduced inpatient demand, due primarily to the increased outpatient demand and need for more clinical space. |

| Many local residents have expressed concern about the extent to which residential streets, and Carlimar Lane in particular, may be used to access the proposed Brownsboro Site during project construction and operation. It is a residential road that cannot support the volume of vehicles that might be involved. Residents have safety concerns associated with streets currently used as place to park cars and where kids play. |
| VA appreciates the concerns of local residents regarding potential use of Carlimar Lane, a small residential street at the south side of the Brownsboro Site, to access the Brownsboro location. It is a matter of safety compliance for the site to have alternative, emergency egress; and VA has been unable to identify any other alternative location to serve this purpose. However, VA is also committed to restricting its use to emergency situations only. Specifically, Carlimar Lane would not be used as a point of entry or egress during construction except in the event of an unexpected disruption of the Brownsboro entrance. As described in section 2.2.2.2 of the Final EIS, the Carlimar Lane gate would be locked and accessible only when emergency vehicles could not access the main entrance on Brownsboro Road (such as in the case of traffic accident or other road blockage). |

| Strobo: The Cities are concerned with the location of the emergency access road located on Carlimar Lane. Drivers are already rerouting through residential streets to avoid accidents on the main streets and increased traffic flow could put pedestrians at greater risk and also encounter difficulties navigating around parked cars on the residential streets. |
| The City would like VA to propose an alternative entrance to the Brownsboro Site that does not pass through or negatively impact current neighborhoods. |

| Once constructed, the gate to Carlimar Lane would be locked during both project construction and operation. In the event the main entry/egress is inaccessible, VA would require its construction contractor to assist city officials and residents in close proximity to the site (e.g., the Crossgate and Graymoor-Devondale communities in particular) with proper directing of traffic to and from the site; this would include the use of appropriate temporary signage, and onsite construction supervisors who would provide instruction and pre-job briefings to employees and drivers. |
Table E-2: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Other Comments on Proposed Action and Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| It also is VA’s understanding that emergency vehicle drivers are trained to navigate safely through traffic and would have no more difficulty accessing the VA Medical Center from Carlimar Lane than they would responding to an emergency at an address on Carlimar Lane. | During facility operation, waste would be removed by truck on a schedule based on amount generated similar to current operations on Zorn Avenue. Trucks would use the main Brownsboro entrance except in the event of an unexpected disruption to that entrance, in which case scheduled removals may be rescheduled if there is sufficient advance notice, or directed to the Carlimar Lane gate in the event of an emergency.  

VA campus police would also have jurisdiction onsite within the boundaries of the VAMC campus and would be used to monitor access (e.g., through security cameras they control) and enforce access restrictions once the VAMC is operational.  

Finally, VA would share project and transportation improvement updates with the surrounding neighborhoods as plans become more final, and work with residents to address traffic and related safety concerns.  

Additional detail related to the restrictions on the use of Carlimar Lane has been included in revised Chapters 2 and 4 of the Final EIS. |
| How will VA communicate with surrounding cities, residents, and business owners that will be impacted by construction? | This series of questions relates to the proposed action since the commenter is requesting details on how day-to-day activities would be implemented during project construction and operation. They may also relate to mitigation measures to help VA minimize impacts on the local residents. Either way, they are good questions and have been addressed in full in Table E-4 (Mitigation). |
| Will VA’s communication plan and actions rely on current, dated or pending policies/guidelines? | As a general response on some of the commenters concerns, VA would rely on the Louisville District of the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for management of completion of design and construction. USACE would require the construction contractor to coordinate with local utilities for advance notice of all utility cutovers that would impact the surrounding community and work to schedule those outages to avoid or minimize adverse impact. Communication would be through the utility |
| Will VA communicate in a manner consistent with that of a “good neighbor”? | |
| How will VA ensure cities, residents, schools and business owners impacted by construction are notified in advance and then updated when power outages occur that are related to construction activities? | |
| How will VA ensure cities, residents, schools and business owners impacted by construction are notified in advance and then updated when MSD services are interrupted that are related to construction activities? | |
### Table E-2: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Other Comments on Proposed Action and Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How will VA ensure cities, residents, schools and business owners impacted by construction are notified in advance and then updated when water outages occur that related to construction activities?</td>
<td>provider consistent with their policies and procedures. As there are no existing facilities on any of the alternatives being analyzed in the EIS (except the no action alternative), no significant hazardous waste removal is anticipated as part of construction, with the exception of minor quantities of construction debris generated as part of construction or associated with maintenance of construction equipment (for example, oils or lubricants), which while requiring compliance with environmental laws regarding proper disposal, would not typically require special public notice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will VA ensure cities, residents, schools and business owners impacted by construction are notified in advance and then updated when hazardous waste removal transports occur?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating to the Disposition of Zorn (of concern to many commenters): What is going to happen to the existing VA center? Can you guarantee us that the Zorn site will become a retirement home for soldiers if hospital is built at Brownsboro location?</td>
<td>The final disposition for the Zorn facility has not been determined and would be the subject of future studies and analysis. If authorization is provided for construction of a replacement VAMC, existing VAMC operations would continue until the new VAMC is operational and then would be transferred to the new facility. VA would conduct studies to determine if there is legitimate interest in reuse from other federal, state, or local agencies and/or public and private entities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA is not building this hospital for living veterans. The veterans that are sitting in this room tonight are not the people it’s going to serve. We are looking at 50 years out. So my question to the VA is quite simply: who are you building the hospital for? Is it for veterans that are going to be living the next decade? The next two or three decades? Or are you building something for wars for veterans that are yet to be veterans?</td>
<td>VA is building the hospital for current and future Veterans who need medical care and other services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES/ALTERNATIVE VARIATIONS (NON-LOCATION RELATED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBT: The DEIS provides no information on the relative costs of the alternatives, including property acquisition and both the direct cost of construction and operation, and indirect costs of the necessary infrastructure investments. While NEPA does not require a cost-benefit analysis, its requirement for a rigorous exploration and evaluation of alternatives on does require that all important aspects of those alternatives be examined, including their relative costs. The absence of such information deprives both the VA and the public the opportunity to evaluate a major, relevant criterion in determining the best solution for the healthcare needs of Louisville-area Veterans.</td>
<td>Section 4.10 of the EIS includes information on the proposed VAMC’s estimated construction costs because it serves as the basis for estimating the construction workforce and socioeconomic impacts. The construction costs have not been updated since the original analysis was conducted, however. As the commenter noted, a cost-comparison analysis of the considered alternatives is not a requirement of NEPA. However, VA has conducted its own extensive cost analyses throughout the NEPA process, beginning with early site selection activities, to help determine overall feasibility and viability for carrying certain sites forward for additional consideration and evaluation. These analyses also indicated a significant cost savings as a result of constructing a new VAMC on a relatively undeveloped location as compared to a downtown location for example.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-2: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Other Comments on Proposed Action and Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While cost is a consideration at every decision point, it is not the only basis for a decision. In carrying out its mission to determine the best solution for the healthcare needs of Louisville-area Veterans, VA will make its final decision based on a number of factors, including cost.</td>
<td>In 2009 VA commissioned a feasibility study that looked at the impact on cost and time to delivery of an option to split operations between downtown and the existing Zorn Avenue site. That model was not considered best in terms of cost or time to delivery and was eliminated as a potential alternative appropriate for study in the EIS. This is described more fully in Section E.4.4.4 of Appendix E and Chapter 2.3.3 of Final EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If state of the art facility is needed, perhaps a smaller “satellite” VA facility near existing medical complex downtown might be beneficial.</td>
<td>The preferred alternative is an accessible location within the acceptable area delineated by those who responded to VA’s solicitation for expressions of interest for willing offers of property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put hospital in location that is more accessible to Veterans. We have a lot of them coming in from and around Fort Knox. There’s going to be a new Veterans home down there that’s going to need accessibility to this hospital.</td>
<td>The preferred alternative is an accessible location within the acceptable area delineated by those who responded to VA’s solicitation for expressions of interest for willing offers of property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve on remote clinics already in place - to take some of stress off parking problem - rather than eliminate them. They are helpful and useful and work quite well.</td>
<td>The impetus for the project is not the availability of parking on the existing site and simply improving the remote clinics would not resolve the issues or meet the needs driving the requirement for replacing the existing medical center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we’re going to open a new Veterans hospital, we should probably build it in Kansas City, MO where they really need one desperately more than we do.</td>
<td>The scope of this EIS is for a replacement VAMC in Louisville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we’re going to move to another site, we should do new things that other VA hospitals have learned - like at Nashville where they have a parking lot that’s adequate and is located right next to Vanderbilt University Hospital where residents support veterans medical program come from. That works very well. We’re not doing that here. Why not?</td>
<td>Locating next to VA’s University of Louisville sharing partner is not a viable alternative. See related responses in Section E.4.4 of Appendix E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter challenges organizers to think about relocating the 100 beds in operation now on Zorn Avenue to some kind of a downtown substitute for the 4-7 years it would take for construction (tear down what’s there now on Zorn and rebuild)</td>
<td>Building or leasing temporary facilities downtown that can accommodate the VA mission and Veteran needs is not practical, would add significant additional cost, and would adversely impact VA’s mission and delivery of services over the near term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep existing Zorn Avenue facility for specific needs of veterans (e.g., prosthesis, trauma stress disorder). And use local/community hospitals or providers for more routine procedures and treatment (e.g., gallbladder, hernia repair).</td>
<td>VA’s mission is deliver high-quality and state-of-the-art healthcare to Veterans now and in the future. After considerable study, VA has determined that a replacement VAMC is critical to providing the quality of care Veterans need in the Louisville service area. Operating one facility for Veteran care, rather than several, will facilitate the provision of high-level of care Veterans need and deserve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-2: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Other Comments on Proposed Action and Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VA does not currently foresee a mission need that cannot be supported by other area facilities that would require keeping the Zorn Avenue site in VA’s local inventory once the replacement hospital is completed. If authorization is provided for construction of a replacement facility, VA will begin the process of performing reutilization studies to determine if there is interest from other federal, state, or local agencies and/or public and private entities to reuse the Zorn Avenue facility in accordance with applicable law and regulation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why not follow trend of Jewish, Norton and Baptist and move treatment center where people live and want to be served.</td>
<td>The preferred alternative is centrally located within VA’s Louisville service area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans should not have to drive 70 or 100 miles when they’re having problems. What they need is an insurance card that they can go to their local facility, commercial facility and get care. It’s that simple.</td>
<td>VA’s mission is deliver high-quality and state-of-the-art healthcare to Veterans now and in the future. After considerable study, VA has determined that a replacement VAMC is critical to providing the quality of care Veterans need in the Louisville service area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do we need VA hospital when all of these downtown hospitals and suburban hospitals can take care of routine medical issues? Can’t see that any veteran would not get good care if they were given cards to get their healthcare taken care of in their own community; it would eliminate the pollution and traffic in this area.</td>
<td>VA recognizes that care coordination requires continuity of service and integration with other organizations (especially Veteran Service Organizations), and federal, state and community-based partners. The Veterans Access, Choice and Accountability Act of 2014 has introduced new possibilities for serving Veterans and more information on this program and other community options available to Veterans (meeting certain criteria) is provided below. However, a dedicated system of health and social services for Veterans, such as the replacement VAMC, remains the central means for meeting Veterans health care needs. Programs such as the Veterans Choice Program have not replaced the VA system of Veterans healthcare facilities and at this time do not meet the purpose and need for the current project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure why we continue to build brick and mortar structures to service veterans. Let us have the choice where w want to go and be served</td>
<td>The Veterans Choice Program is a nationwide program, established in the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (“Veterans Choice Act”) that became law on August 7, 2014, and is slated to end when allocated funds are used or no later than August 7, 2017. The program includes access to health care at non-VA hospitals for rural veterans, as well as increases in staffing and facilities at existing VA medical centers. Veterans who live over 40 miles from nearest VA health clinic or who are unable to get an appointment in a reasonable time frame are able to receive “choice cards” allowing them to seek treatment from a non-VA facility. Veterans can go to other providers that accept Medicare, the military’s health program TRICARE, or at facilities run by the Department of Defense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about sustainability, let’s get out of the property business. I am currently a member of TRICARE. I can go anywhere I need to get the care I need to anytime and it doesn’t cost as much as actually owning a brick and mortar facility. And it’s something we can make happen today versus waiting for those time lines to give us best care we need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How about just giving them vouchers to be used with private facilities? Hospital situation in Louisville precarious enough; injection of patients into system might help stabilize Let us go out into the real hospitals for treatment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here is another suggestion: why not let the vets go to the hospital of their choice, the Doctor of their choice, etc. Then there would be no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-2: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Other Comments on Proposed Action and Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>need to build a hospital anywhere. Everyone would win. I am a Navy veteran of the United States Navy and Vietnam Veteran. I am retired, on social security and medicare, and because medicare doesn’t cover everything I have to pay for a supplement out of my own pocket. I would like to go to the VA Hospital but I hear there is a long time waiting to be seen. I don’t think that a veteran should have to wait to be seen. That is why I suggest letting us see the doctor who we want to see, no charge to us. At least have clinics where a veteran could go for just regular checkup and minor illnesses that doesn’t require hospitalization, for free</td>
<td>VA rolled out a new Medical Community Care Program in 2016, as part of the 2017 Medical Community Care appropriations account required by the Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015. This program will be simpler than past programs - to make community care easier to understand and administer, and to meet the needs of Veterans, employees and community providers. The Medical Services Appropriation rolls funds into the Medical Community Care Appropriation, and authorizes VA to furnish hospital care and medical services to eligible Veterans through contracts or agreements with certain eligible entities, as well as pay for care for eligible beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care for veterans is so much more than just physical act of caring for our bodies. The spirit of my generation is at stake. Nothing will be more relevant to these men and women who have tried to build communities across the globe than to allow them to build a community here in Louisville. And we can do that by strategic placement of this hospital where it provides the best economic impact, the best second and third order impact and is truly accessible for all. The current location as planned does not do that. This area does not need economic development or extra jobs. But if we place it in a more depressed area, we can change a community and you can give relevance to men and women who tried to that across the globe because they can do it at home. Give us opportunity to look at other course of action to do that.</td>
<td>VA’s primary mission is the service of Veterans. Community development, while certainly an important issue, is not the primary objective in selecting a location for VA facilities. VA’s primary concern in evaluating desirable locations for healthcare facilities includes the ability to facilitate an environment of care that does not compromise the health, welfare, or safety of its patients, staff, and visitors. Other important considerations include the proximity and/or availability of supporting amenities such as dining, shopping, or lodging. Economically depressed areas do not typically score well against criteria such as these which makes them less desirable compared to other locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need much smaller critical care VA hospital downtown for the critically ill veterans that can get help right away. Then we need to build what I call “super” clinics out in the neighborhood; Dixie Highway, right here, whatever. I was at one of those clinics in Florida. They did minor surgery. They did a number of things there that could be done not in a main hospital.</td>
<td>VA has carefully evaluated its mission need and determined that a replacement hospital is necessary to best serve the area’s veteran population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have good authority from some commercial and real estate people we shouldn’t even be talking about Brownsboro Site. I think there needs to be a study about that - and who made it possible for that - for that site to be bought out. The one person that benefits is the person that owned the property. Why was he able to get some people to bail him out of his</td>
<td>The Brownsboro Site was selected and purchased after completion of the Programmatic EA. The terms and conditions of that purchase are not within the scope of this EIS, which is examining the potential impacts of the construction and operation of a replacement VAMC at the Brownsboro Site (preferred) or the St. Joseph Site, and the No Action Alternative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-2: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Other Comments on Proposed Action and Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>financial problem? That’s the whole issue. We shouldn’t even be talking about that piece of property at all.</td>
<td>Please refer to the traffic study section of the Final EIS (Section 4.13 and Appendix B).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter asked if the Veterans or physicians were given current or projected traffic data based on the improvements of downtown traffic flows following completion of the bridge. Everyone deserves an answer to that question, especially the vets and physicians. Second question asked and never answered relates to the process - if project does go forward, residents of Louisville, veterans and employees of VA have a right to know that compliance will be the forefront of every action that’s taken from the minute the RFP is released for construction all the way through to the opening.</td>
<td>VA / USACE would comply with all applicable federal, state and local regulations and guidelines. VA / USACE would ensure that all required permits are obtained before any work that is covered by the permits begins and that all permit conditions and requirements are met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mayor of Louisville: VA mentions they could sell or repurpose the Brownsboro Site. First time VA has stated this. Commenter indicates there is no discussion as to what would trigger the VA to sell or repurpose; also points to other VA facility locations where VA has reconsidered location and in some cases selected different site even after announcement and purchase of preferred site. | VA would address this hypothetical situation (i.e., if VA were to decide to build the replacement VAMC on the St. Joseph site) in the ROD and explain the reasons why it selected the non-preferred site identified in the Final EIS. [GLENN]  
If it were determined that VA no longer had a need for the Brownsboro property, VA would undertake an evaluation of its ongoing need for the property. Depending on the finding VA could begin the process of excessing the property which would involve offering the property to other Federal agencies, State agencies, municipalities private entities, etc. Alternately, if a potential need was identified, VA could consider repurposing, although a subsequent NEPA evaluation may be required, depending on the use. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>VA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s the traffic stupid. This project is going to bring about an inordinate amount of vehicular traffic increases; 5,022 vehicles will enter and exit the facility daily. This is my main concern. It is the traffic (and associated pollution and noise) that is going to increase.</td>
<td>Traffic would increase with the construction of a new VA hospital. Conversely, if the hospital is not constructed, an alternative development would most likely occur on the property that would also increase traffic and have similar noise and pollution impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My concern is the traffic; it’s almost impossible at certain hours to get onto I-71; and it’s impossible because of the backup along Westport Road. You could find on a given day a backup that goes from I-71 all the way back to St. Matthews.</td>
<td>Traffic does back up from I-71 into the area of this project. The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet is currently working on a project prioritization model that will include widening of I-71 to mitigate this congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to Brownsboro location because of traffic. I witnessed the development there. It’s not improved. Traffic is just as bad as it was before they opened the Westport Road Interchange and they added the ramp.</td>
<td>Traffic counts performed following the opening of the Westport Road interchange in 2013 showed 33% less volume on the I-264 EB off-ramp to US 42 during the AM, Noon, and PM peaks combined compared to counts taken in 2008 prior to construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They say employment for some 3300 construction workers over 5 years. I noticed on screen tonight they expect 500 construction workers each year. Where are those people going to park in this area? I only know of one vacant lot and that’s across from Ballard High School; it’s a two land road (Herr Lane). They don’t need more traffic over there.</td>
<td>During the initial stages of construction, the contractor would have limited parking available onsite, but as construction progresses, the construction contractor would be required to obtain offsite parking and storage. VA would identify this requirement in its solicitation for construction and each prospective offeror would be required to identify their proposed locations which would be considered as part of the process of evaluating offers for the purposes of award. Finally, VA notes that the construction period, which was originally to be phased and extend for 6 years, has now been reduced to a four year period. While the total number of required construction workers has not changed, the average per year has increased from 554 to 830 given the reduced construction period timeframe. As described in revised Section 4.10 of the Final EIS, this average annual increase would still be negligible compared to the total number of employed workers within the Louisville MSA. In addition, since the majority of workers are expected to live locally and commute to the site from home, there would be no adverse effects (from this increase in average annual workers) on the existing housing market or community services. Regarding parking, as noted above, it would be the responsibility of the contractor to obtain the necessary offsite parking for those construction workers that are required at the site each day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When will the Cab (Transportation Cabinet) actually build the SPUI, that interchange? They’re notorious for putting things off. How long did they talk about building the bridges? 50 years?</td>
<td>The SPUI interchange is currently in the KYTC Approved Six Year Plan with funding for construction in FY 2020 (which begins in October 2019). The Interchange Modification Report and Environmental Document for that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-3: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Traffic and Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>VA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>project are in the process of being approved by the FHWA. Delays in project funding or time schedules are always possible through right of way acquisition and utility relocation.</td>
<td>Need to consider the medical personnel (hospital personnel, clerks, orderlies) that are going to have to figure out how to get out here if there isn’t good public transportation. It’s going to be inconvenient for a large number of people for how long - 80 years? If a doctor or a specialist has to see someone, they will have to drive 20 miles from downtown (here and back). It’s going to be hard to find people willing to do that. VA has numerous suburban hospitals that involve sharing agreements with healthcare partners who travel to provide services and care to veterans and their families. VA is confident that its patients, staff, visitors, and volunteers would have access to transportation, both public and private that would enable them to access the VA facilities and that VA’s professional partners would continue to support VA’s mission regardless of the alternative chosen. This was reinforced by physician statements at the Public meetings for the draft EIS that indicated that doctors would travel to see patients at the new hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to consider the medical personnel (hospital personnel, clerks, orderlies) that are going to have to figure out how to get out here if there isn’t good public transportation. It’s going to be inconvenient for a large number of people for how long - 80 years? If a doctor or a specialist has to see someone, they will have to drive 20 miles from downtown (here and back). It’s going to be hard to find people willing to do that. VA has numerous suburban hospitals that involve sharing agreements with healthcare partners who travel to provide services and care to veterans and their families. VA is confident that its patients, staff, visitors, and volunteers would have access to transportation, both public and private that would enable them to access the VA facilities and that VA’s professional partners would continue to support VA’s mission regardless of the alternative chosen. This was reinforced by physician statements at the Public meetings for the draft EIS that indicated that doctors would travel to see patients at the new hospital.</td>
<td>Trip generation for the new site is based on accepted Institute of Transportation Engineers methodology for hospitals based on square footage. The EIS traffic analysis includes the entire hospital size which covers any traffic from clinics in other areas of town. Both the existing and future 2025 conditions are analyzed in the traffic analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What hasn’t been taken into account for that site is all of the remote clinics that will be closed. Current VA site does not include the traffic from all those remote sites where veterans will be coming in and out. We add that to Brownsboro site and that has major impact for veterans. Transportation to and from for those veterans from those clinics now disbursed throughout the city. It’s going to change their whole lives in terms of getting necessary services. So it impacts veterans and surrounding community. Sufficient studies have not been done.</td>
<td>Traffic on US42, Brownsboro Road, US122, Herr Lane, and Watterson Expressway are extremely heavy. When first VA meetings were here, we went to meetings and they mentioned that they would probably have to put an access road from hospital over to Herr Lane so they would have trucks go in, buses, whatever needed to go in there. Herr Lane is 1.2 miles; that’s it. There are 3 schools on Herr Lane (Ballard, Wilder Elementary, St. Albert the Great); and Kammerer. Collectively, that’s 4,051 students. Two of them (Ballard and middle school) get out, but they start in morning about same time; then grade schools start around 3 (3 to 4). Even with access road from there, it would be tremendous traffic jam to handle that. This needs to be re thought before a horrible financial disaster happens to the VA. No access road from the proposed site to Herr Lane is proposed with the project. As part of the KYTC interchange improvement project, a second eastbound through lane is proposed to be added along Old Brownsboro Road to McDonalds where a second lane exists. Traffic counts used in developing traffic forecasts were taken on days when school was in session, so traffic from the schools is included in the forecasts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question for Mr. Lindeman (Transcript 1 comment). With regard to delay in traffic that building hospital would take if built in this area, what do you consider peak hour traffic out here (which you based estimates on)?</td>
<td>Palmer response at meeting: I believe it’s 7:30 to 8:30 in morning and something like 4:45 to 5:45. I’m just saying that’s what the - the highest volume is in those time frames. It doesn’t mean that there’s not high volumes outside of that. The actual peak hours in the count were from 7:15 AM to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table E-3: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Traffic and Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>VA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commenter’s response to Traffic Contractor Palmer’s response:</td>
<td>At this point, the VA has not determined the specific working hours of the staff at the hospital yet. The traffic analysis was performed conservatively assuming that the current peak hour of traffic would have the highest peak hour of traffic generation for the hospital added to it. This gives the most conservative results. It is possible that the hospital peak traffic would not line up directly with the peak background traffic which would only make the situation better. For example, if evening hospital traffic does leave at 3:00 PM to 4:00 PM as suggested, it would be well before the current peak traffic from 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is why this question is relevant. Hospital personnel come to work at 7 am; that’s one shift. The office personnel and admin staff come in at 8. Hospital as we see it estimates to 2,100 full-time equivalent staff people coming. They’re all going to be coming in between 7 in the morning and 8. From 6:30 to 8:30 this is a heavily congested area. And staff leave at 3 and again at 4. So from 3 to, let’s say 5, it’s going to be extremely busy with traffic. And that’s just for VA employees. We have patients and other families and deliveries - all these extraneous people who have to come to a hospital and add to the congestion. And will result in excessive pollution as cars wait to get in and out at traffic lights.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of big issues is access. I’m really concerned that of the 2100 employees, how many depend on public transit to do their jobs and to get to their jobs. There is not good transit service out here in this area you’re talking about. I don’t even know how a bus could fit into the traffic patterns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding accessibility, they are saying intersection is going to mitigate additional traffic. Although it’s been said that it is funded, we all know State of KY’s finances currently and probably in future - there’s a very good chance of that funding going away. And if they build a hospital and that doesn’t happen, it’s even worse for veterans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies actually really included the impact based on I-60 and I-264 and I-71. Right now, on any given evening on 264 east bound going onto I-71 at 4 or 5, will be backed up all way to Shelbyville Road. And that’s if there is NOT a problem on I-71. My understanding is that they’re going to expand ramp from 264 east to 71 to two lanes, but 71 is still only 2 lanes wide and there are no plans anywhere to expand that. So it’s just a nightmare getting in and out of there - morning and evening. Not fair to veterans sitting through that all the time. Say it wouldn’t significantly contribute to degradation of levels of service at US42 and KY22 but that’s because it’s already at a Level F. Nothing lower than</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table E-3: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Traffic and Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>VA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. Talk about other improvements (e.g., 4 lanes for KY22 but none of that is firm or planned. This is a rush to failure.</td>
<td>The SPUI interchange is currently in the Approved Six Year Plan with funding for construction in FY 2020 (which begins in October 2019). The Interchange Modification Report and Environmental Document for that project are in the process of being approved by the FHWA. Delays in project funding or time schedules are always possible through right of way acquisition and utility relocation. The KYTC and VA are coordinating for the interchange construction to be complete before the opening of the hospital in 2023.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When will Transportation Cabinet actually build? Or should I first say when will they get funding? When they let the bids and build the intersection that we need to desperately already? They’re saying 2019. They talked about the bridge for how many years? I think that intersection needs to be built before they even dig the first shovel of dirt.</td>
<td>The KIPDA approved transportation model includes the opening of the east end bridge as it is included in KIPDA’s approved transportation model. The VA will be a proponent to the KYTC to fund an additional interchange on I-71 at US 42 if practical and feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation of facilities at this site will result in large increase in traffic and other adverse impacts. We can’t seem to get that point across. I’ve spoken every time I’ve had the opportunity about this site and don’t think we’re being listened to</td>
<td>Traffic volumes would increase with the construction of the hospital. Similarly, if the hospital is not built an alternative development would also result in a similar increase in traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of ways to mitigate traffic haven’t been approved nor have other impacts, like people losing their homes along 22 and businesses being affected too. Traffic such that veterans and their caregivers are going to be sitting in gridlock trying to get in and out of facility; not in best interest of veterans. Also, don’t know if it’s been considered, but it seems like there will be an increase in traffic on I-71, 42 and 22 with all the people going to and from the East End Bridge that is set to open this winter. There’s no access to it from 42 so anybody who lives out there has to get to it either from the Snyder at 22 going north to the river or via 71. Accessibility is huge issue.</td>
<td>The KYTC proposed SPUI interchange construction is not expected to result in the acquisition of any homes along KY 22. Strips of right of way in front yards will be purchased, but no homes are expected to be acquired. Traffic forecasts for this project do take into account the opening of the east end bridge as it is included in KIPDA’s approved transportation model. The VA will be a proponent to the KYTC to fund an additional interchange on I-71 at US 42 if practical and feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility is huge issue. It creates additional risk of accidents and harm to those who live here, especially if ambulances and fire trucks and other emergency services can’t get to us when we need it.</td>
<td>The addition of lanes with the KYTC proposed project, as well as bike lanes on US 42 will improve the ability of emergency services to get through traffic during congested times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Brownsboro site because of traffic and pollution but also because of emergency vehicle entrance and how they would get in and out of that area with such traffic. And that area looks too small for such a big hospital and right next to busy freeway - that is loud and noise and polluted. Worst place to put a hospital.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give you an idea of the way they hope to change traffic - Highway 22, which is currently a 3-lane highway, they’re proposing four to five lanes; Highway 42, which is currently 4-6 lanes at the intersection, they’re talking 7 to 8 lanes. Lime Kiln Lane, which is currently 3 lanes, they’re turning into 5 lanes. Herr Lane, from Ballard High School over to Westport, which is currently 2 lanes, they’re</td>
<td>The KYTC does not currently have any six year plan projects for Lime Kiln Lane or Herr Lane. State funding is currently very limited. The interchange project is federally funded and is not being delayed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-3: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Traffic and Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>VA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>turning into 3 to 4 lanes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The funding that’s supposed to be committed for this - funding from the state - only occurs on two-year intervals. That’s the way the fiscal budget is set up for State of Kentucky. So 2019 they may have funding dedicated to it, but they do not have funding committed to it. And they may not for another 4-5 or 10 years. So committed funding is a bit of a fallacy. Public transportation out here is far worse than anything downtown or current Veterans location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that you all included this type of traffic either from a development or a hospital into those numbers. I applaud you. I hope you did because if you’re not going to build that interchange before you build this hospital, that’s a disaster. Nobody in this whole area will be able to move. Businesses in these areas will die.</td>
<td>KYTC and the VA have been coordinating on the scheduling of the interchange and hospital construction so that the interchange construction will be complete and open to traffic prior to the hospital opening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will not work on Brownsboro Road. If anyone in their right mind would drive out there at 3 pm when the nurses change shift, when Ballard gets off, the traffic will be a nightmare.</td>
<td>Your comment is noted. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I looked at the computer simulations on Brownsboro Road of 2025 properties and it’s just not credible. Afternoon traffic - based on what I’ve seen over past year, they must have done that at 1:30 in the afternoon or maybe 1:30 at night. There are just more cars there right now, not ten years from now.</td>
<td>Traffic simulations are based on counts taken in 2013 and the forecasts grow the traffic to 2025 based on historic growth rates and KIPDA model projections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA has made a sweeping miscalculation with respect to traffic. My experience on Rudy Lane alone at traffic hour (evening) is 50 minutes from the curve to get to 42.</td>
<td>Your comment is noted. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA needs to do a new study on traffic. It is 10 times worse in 2016 than it was in 2006. That was 10 years ago and doesn’t apply now. Your study is too dated.</td>
<td>Traffic study was performed in 2016 based on 2013 count data performed following the opening of the Old Brownsboro Road slip ramp and Westport Road interchange. The reference to 2006 was related to the proposed development plan that had been approved by Planning and Zoning in 2006, and which VA used in its mixed use development scenario analyzed for the Midland site. Traffic volumes were not based on 2006 levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB: Study’s analysis of design year conditions is flawed because VA inappropriately relied on a ten-year old Traffic Impact Study for the Midlands site prepared in 2006.</td>
<td>VA appreciates the updated transit access information and the additional adverse impact it could have on public transit access. VA would continue to work with TARC to support increased access if employee and patient demand warrants it. This information has been added to Section 4.13 of the Final EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor of Louisville: Notes significant reduction in transit access at new location (50%) - now only 6 morning trips and 6 afternoon trips on the #15 to this location; negatively impact VBA employees and veterans and workers who rely on TARC for transportation needs. Potential EJ issue for low-income veterans and also for handicapped veterans who may be disproportionately affected.</td>
<td>The traffic forecast was based on 2013 traffic counts and the KIPDA model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBT: The DEIS lacks any information from which to compare patient and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-3: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Traffic and Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>VA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>employee travel times for different potential relocation sites. The analysis in Section 4.13 considers only the impact to the public of traffic increases in the areas immediately surrounding the alternatives being evaluated (pp. 218-22, 224-25). Missing from this analysis is any discussion of how the location of various potential sites, and the traffic conditions in those areas, would affect the amount of time that employees and the Veterans receiving care would have to expend to travel to and from those locations, and the impacts increased travel time would have on those groups. SB: FBT: VA failed to assess the accessibility and traffic implications to Veterans and VA employees who access the site.</td>
<td>of the traffic network in Louisville. Specific origins and destinations of Veterans or employees, including those Veterans who reside in other parts of the 35-county service area, were not used in the model. This level of detail was not readily available and not necessary to support the decisions being made from this EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB: The traffic study does not provide a calibration of the existing conditions model. Even with flawed design year, the study shows levels of service and increased delays and queues that are unacceptable for the area.</td>
<td>The traffic model is the same used in the KYTC analysis of the interchange. That model was calibrated for travel times for some routes in the interchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB: A proper design year conditions analysis is needed to ensure the proposed design meets both the current design as well as the expected future year conditions.</td>
<td>A current year of 2015 was used and a design year of 2025 was used. All were based on traffic projections from 2013 field traffic counts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB: Traffic study is flawed for relying on US42 SPUI with a schedule not yet determined. Other projects listed are not in the Six Year plan Under current conditions, the highways and roads leading to and around the Midlands site have some of the longest delays volumes in Jefferson County, especially during the peak times. An increase in traffic, congestion, and delays would not only cause greater accessibility problems for veterans and VA employees and surrounding community but would also have substantial negative impacts on driver and pedestrian safety including increased crash rates. Of particular concern to the Cities, Northfield and Crossgate are directly adjacent to the site. Graymoor-Devondale is directly connected to the site via the proposed secondary access road at Carlmar Lane.</td>
<td>VA will advocate for projects not currently listed in the Six Year Plan that could help relieve congestion in the area and listed some examples. The interchange project is federally funded and is not being delayed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’re basing a lot of this on a 2006 traffic study. Norton Commons didn’t start in 2006. Oldham County, there’s a huge development. There are 2,000 people in Norton Commons that did not exist in 2006. Oldham County has been blossoming; they all drive down 42 and 22. I think we’re basing alot of this study on a super outdated … think about 60 years ahead of now what’s going to happen. Norton Commons is only half- halfway there, and there’s lots of other developments on the plan Earlier reference to 2006 study and it covered traffic for a planned development.</td>
<td>The traffic forecasts are based on counts performed in 2013. The only thing based on the 2006 study is the potential alternative development which is assumed to be similar if the VA leaves the Midlands site. Current ITE Trip Generation rates were used to develop trips based on a similar development to the Midlands proposed in 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Development Plan was approved on November 30, 2006 at a Special</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-3: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Traffic and Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>VA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is what the planning commission said and they did not recommend building there until they covered parameters. [reads] Staff recommends approval of the zoning change request, the forms district change request, and plan development, along with the associated binding elements - which the VA apparently doesn’t have, contain within this report - IF the traffic concerns are adequately addressed and sufficient detail be provided to the mass issues of mass and scale - you all haven’t done that yet. And what it was approved for - offices, singe-family residential, retail, restaurants, hotel, apartments and condominiums. Nothing about hospitals. 1.3 million square feet of hospital is not covered in residences or restaurants or even a hotel is not that big.</td>
<td>Meeting of the Planning Commission. The approved plan was based on the July 2006 URS traffic study that was used to estimate the alternative development. Further, as indicated in the Louisville Metro Planning &amp; Design Services Amendment to Certificate of Land Use Restriction, “…the Binding Elements and approved development plan in Docket No. 9-15-06 do not apply to the use of the Subject Property by the Federal Government…including the Department of Veterans Affairs, for any governmental purpose, including a VA hospital/medical center…”. Since the time of the Planning and Zoning approval in 2006 for the Midlands development, a Slip ramp has been added at US 42, auxiliary lanes have been added on I-264 north of US 42, and the Westport Road interchange has been completed and opened to traffic. The opening of the Westport Road interchange has resulted in a drop in traffic at the US 42 interchange. These improvements would likely make obtaining Planning and Zoning approval easier for a similar mixed use development on the same Midlands site now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other thing wanted to discuss was recommendation for the development more dense than single-family is contingent upon substantial improvement in the transportation system. Have we mentioned traffic before? Do you get the program? This may require a delay of office development until the completion of improvements such as Herr Lane extension, Westport Road exchange, etc. If VA had done due diligence, we wouldn’t be standing here.</td>
<td>VA’s estimated increase in FTEs by 2022 is associated with projections based on projected workload. VA is the leading expert in Veteran care and uses robust models to project workload demands and associated staffing requirements. VA notes that the number of VBA employees has also been added to the VAMC employee discussion in Section 4.10.3.2. Regarding the traffic impacts study, the estimate of daily traffic (vehicle trips) associated with the proposed VAMC is based on total square footage as used in ITE trip generation, and included both VAMC and VBA spaces. Data are not based on number of existing and projected VAMC/VBA employees as evaluated in the socioeconomic impact analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB: Basic data statements in regarding employee data traffic in EIS are unclear. VA projects increase of FTEs from 1,763 (2015) to 2,106 (2022), based on projected demand for health care services and not because or proposed replacement facility. The Cities request more information on how VA calculated the projected number of FTEs at the VAMC in 2022 and how these projections are factored into the traffic projections.</td>
<td>SB: Figure 4.1-2. Street view reflects no traffic (vehicles or pedestrians) or parked vehicles on Carlimar Lane and Bedford. This is not accurate view of these locations and for sake of presenting unbiased DEIS, VA should add photos of all traffic corridors during peak times and rush hour period specific to these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB: Figure 4.1-2. Street view reflects no traffic (vehicles or pedestrians) or parked vehicles on Carlimar Lane and Bedford. This is not accurate view of these locations and for sake of presenting unbiased DEIS, VA should add photos of all traffic corridors during peak times and rush hour period specific to these</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix E: Comment Responses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>VA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>corridors. Additionally, when including photos of proposed emergency entrance at Carlimar Lane, VA should include photos in DEIS of Carlimar Lane during both daytime and evening hours to ensure photos include cars parked on street and children at play. Including photos of empty streets and not of residential streets the VA intends to use demonstrate DEIS has used questionable information to create biased DEIS. Describe VA’s approach to ensuring DEIS is corrected and includes photos that more accurately reflect traffic and pedestrian volume at peak hour periods to each area.</td>
<td>from the photographs was not intentional. Section 4.1.2 addresses potential aesthetic impacts and Figure 4.1-2 shows the new viewshed with the proposed new VAMC; existing traffic conditions are not relevant to this particular analysis. If anything, the clear streets further support the potential for significant adverse aesthetic impacts from the VAMC facility itself on the adjacent community. The traffic conditions for this area are described in the Traffic Impact Study included in Appendix B of the Final EIS. That said, VA acknowledges the concerns of nearby communities (especially Crossgate and Graymoor-Devondale) related to increased traffic on their quiet streets, including associated safety concerns for children playing in the streets. No regular VAMC traffic is expected through the surrounding residential neighborhoods. All construction and operations traffic would be directed through the front entrance on Brownsboro Road. VA would install a gate-controlled emergency ingress/egress access drive to Carlimar Lane which would be used for emergency purposes only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential streets from Westport Road or Herr Lane to back emergency gate at Carlimar Lane will not support emergency vehicles when there is an accident for several reasons: Westport Road, Herr Lane and 264 interchange already suffer from numerous accidents each day that significantly impact traffic flow; drivers are already clogging residential streets to avoid these accidents. (2) on-street parking is allowed on all residential streets in Graymoor-Devondale. That said emergency vehicles would be required to navigate a route around parked vehicles. (3) most of streets don’t have sidewalks. Pedestrians, other drivers and emergency vehicles will all be at risk for accidents. Due to significant safety concerns the VA should abandon use of residential streets for emergency or any other access to Brownsboro site.</td>
<td>As described in sections 2.2.2.2 and 4.13, the Carlimar Lane gate would be used by emergency vehicles when access cannot be made from the main entrance on Brownsboro Road. It is VA’s understanding that emergency vehicle drivers are trained to navigate safely through traffic and would have no more difficulty accessing the VA Medical Center from Carlimar Lane than they would responding to an emergency at an address on Carlimar Lane. In addition, VA would require its construction contractor to assist residents and city officials in close proximity to the site (the Crossgate and Graymoor-Devondale communities in particular) with proper directing of traffic to and from the site; this would include the use of appropriate temporary signage, and onsite construction supervisors who would provide instruction and pre-job briefings to employees and drivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe in detail the circumstances, frequency, types of vehicles and agencies (federal, state, city) that will be allowed access to enter the VA site in the event</td>
<td>As indicated in section 4.13, the VA Medical Center Director and/or his designee would make determinations on what traffic would be allowed to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E-3: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Traffic and Transportation
Table E-3: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Traffic and Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>VA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of an emergency?</td>
<td>access/egress the gate at Carlimar Lane, but this would typically be limited to emergency response vehicles (ambulance, police, fire) when the main entry at Brownsboro Road was inaccessible (such as in the case of traffic accident or other road blockage) unless there was a catastrophic event that would require opening the gate to patient, staff, and visitor (including delivery) traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe in detail the definition the VA will use, enforce and report for “emergency access” to the Brownsboro site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What training and materials will be used to train VA employees during construction and ongoing operations to ensure use of Carlimar Lane gate is restricted?</td>
<td>As described in section 4.12.2.1, during construction, the construction contractor would not use the Carlimar Lane for access unless the access at Brownsboro Road is inaccessible. If use is necessary, due to the main entry being inaccessible, the contractor’s onsite supervisors would provide appropriate instruction to employees and drivers, as well as ensure appropriate temporary signage, as necessary, to properly direct traffic. During operation of the VA Medical Center, the Carlimar Lane entry would be controlled with a locked gate and authority to unlock and open the gate would rest with the VA Medical Center Director and/or his authorized designee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will VA share these training materials with federal, state and local agencies that provide services and protection to the residents in Graymoor-Devondale?</td>
<td>VA would coordinate closely with emergency service providers on a case-by-case basis depending on circumstances necessitating use of VA’s Carlimar Lane gate by emergency responders. While future training and/or written instructions may become necessary, VA is making no representation or commitment at this time to “train” or provide “training materials” to other agencies on when its gates would be opened or closed. Nor is VA committing at this time to making “reports” on utilization of its access/egress points. As described in section 4.12 and 4.13 of the FEIS, access or egress through the gate at Carlimar Lane would be at the discretion of the VA Medical Center Director or his authorized designee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assuming there will be no exits, how will VA monitor, track and then report entrances made through the “emergency entrance” at Carlimar Lane?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How and when will these reports be made available to other federal, state or local agencies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AESTHETICS</strong></td>
<td>EPA recommends FEIS include commitments to further minimize visual impacts to residents in the vicinity of the proposed facility. Residents have expressed concerns regarding the appearance of the proposed structures, the introduction of buildings and structures that are not in character with the residential area at Brownsboro. Residents have suggested means to further reduce impacts to their viewshed and neighborhoods that should be considered in the FEIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many commenters, especially residents who live adjacent to the proposed Brownsboro Site, have expressed concerns regarding the introduction and appearance of the proposed structures, at imposing heights, which are not in character with the residential area at Brownsboro and will block out sunlight and air flow to their one and two story homes.</td>
<td>VA recognizes that the aesthetic impacts from the proposed replacement VAMC, particularly on the adjacent Crossgate neighborhood, represents a significant change in character from the current development and would result in potentially significant adverse impacts on nearby property owners. VA has taken this into consideration in the facility design. In general, VA determined that, on balance, the greater setbacks and more open space afforded by a somewhat taller facility resulted in an overall site design that was more visually pleasing compared to lower heights with a larger building footprint on the site. VA has also incorporated many features in an effort to minimize visual effects to the extent possible. These are described more fully in Sections 2.2, 4.2 and 5.2 of the Final EIS and include the planting of trees (as landscape buffers), installation of a perimeter fence and lighting designs to minimize glare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIR QUALITY</strong></td>
<td>EPA: Louisville area currently in non-attainment for particulate matter (PM2.5). Project will be subject to Title V and New Source Review Permitting which will ensure the facility meets the Federal Clean Air Act Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA appreciates the information provided by EPA. This area’s non attainment status has been indicated in the EIS and the permitting requirements identified in EPA’s comment have been added to Section 4.2 of the Final EIS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY DEP: Kentucky Division for Air Quality Regulation 401 KAR 63:010 Fugitive Emissions states that no person shall cause, suffer, or allow any material to be handled, processed, transported, or stored without taking reasonable precaution to prevent particulate matter from becoming airborne. Additional requirements include the covering of open bodied trucks, operating outside the work area transporting materials likely to become airborne, and that no one shall allow earth or other material being transported by truck or earth moving equipment to be deposited onto a paved street or roadway. Please note the Fugitive Emissions Fact Sheet. Kentucky Division for Air Quality Regulation 401 KAR 63:005 states that open burning is prohibited. Open Burning is defined as the burning of any matter in such a manner that the products of combustion resulting from the burning are emitted directly into the outdoor atmosphere without passing through a stack or chimney. However, open burning may be utilized for the expressed purposes listed on the Open Burning Brochure. The Division would like to offer the following suggestions on how this</td>
<td>VA appreciates the information provided by the DEP and has added the reference to Air Quality Regulation 401 KAR 63:010 and KAR 63:005 to Section 3.3 of the Final EIS. Sections 4.2 and 5.2 of the Final EIS have also been revised to include the additional measures identified by the Department to help ensure maintenance with the NAAQS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>project can help us stay in compliance with the NAAQS. More importantly, these strategies are beneficial to the health of citizens of Kentucky. They include: utilizing alternatively fueled equipment; utilizing other emission controls that are applicable to your equipment; and reducing the idling time on equipment.</td>
<td>The 20-mile round trip distance is assumed to be an average round trip distance used in the Greenhouse Gas Emissions analysis relating to employee and patient transportation. It is heavily influenced by the daily commute of employees who are assumed to live within the Louisville metro area (e.g., distance from proposed Brownsboro location to I-265 outer loop is approximately 10 miles). Many patients in the service area that live greater distances from the VAMC, such as in the outlying counties, will continue to receive some, or perhaps even most, of their care at the CBOCs, making a trip to the VAMC the exception (certainly far less than daily) for those that live farther away. In light of these two points, an average 20-mile round trip seems reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor of Louisville: EIS states VAMC serves a 35-county region in Kentucky and Indiana and that for purposes of the air quality analysis, the average round trip to the site for patients and employees is estimated at 20 miles. It is not clear how this assumption was made, as the 35-county service region spreads well beyond this distance, stretching 137 miles southwest into Muhlenberg County, KY, 103 miles southeast to Adair County, KY, 70 miles to the northeast to Dubois County, IN and 76 miles to the northeast to Switzerland County, In.</td>
<td>VA also notes that the contribution of vehicles emissions from this single project to the GHG analysis is very small; this is included in Scope 3 of the GHG emission analysis included in Section 3.2 and 4.2 of the Final EIS. Increasing the distance to better accommodate all the Veteran patients who would drive in from throughout the service area for health care or benefits services would not significantly affect the GHG analysis which is dominated by emissions from electricity generation and usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville Metro Government’s Air Pollution Control District believes an Air Quality Analysis is warranted to understand the impact of traffic generated by proposed project on CO, emissions, and the creation of emissions hot spots for CO, particulate matter, and mobile source air toxics.</td>
<td>With respect to the request for an air quality analysis to assess the air quality impacts of traffic generated by the proposed project, including the creation of emission hot spots, it should be noted that the project is largely relocating an existing facility and function in the same general area/region such that the regional air quality would not be expected to significantly change. Thus traffic increases at the new location would be offset by traffic decreases at Zorn (~ 3.6 miles away from Brownsboro).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBT: The DEIS does not adequately analyze the impact on the region’s attainment status and overall air quality resulting from changes in the transportation network associated with each alternative.</td>
<td>Conducting quantitative air modeling for mobile source air toxics is a significant effort and VA does not believe the project would result in sufficient increases in air emissions over current levels to warrant a quantitative modeling effort. VA notes that no such modeling was required for the interchange transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB: DEIS does not adequately analyze effect on region’s CAA attainment status and overall air quality resulting from changes in transportation network associated with Replacement VAMC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix E: Comment Responses
### Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| project since volumes did not meet thresholds of concern. An analysis of particulate matter (2.4 microns), which was done for the interchange project, also did not indicate volumes of concern.                                                                                                                                  | VA’s position would also seem to be supported by EPA which has determined that vehicular air emissions from major roadways are generally reduced to near background levels within 500 to 600 feet of the source, as cited in Section 4.2 of the Final EIS.  
While this addresses potential regional air quality concerns, which are the level typically addressed in a NEPA document for a replacement facility, VA also acknowledges that there could be local hot spots of higher air emissions during periods of heavy traffic congestion, such as on homes within the neighborhood of Crossgate that are also located near Interstate-264 which also supports heavy volumes of traffic during certain times of day (e.g., with backs up between US 42 and I-71). 
Section 4.2 of the Final EIS has been revised as follows:  
(1) Expanded qualitative discussion to address the potential change in air emissions as compared to current baseline levels (undeveloped greenfield site as part of “no build/no development” scenario.  
(2) Expanded qualitative discussion to further clarify, on a qualitative basis, potential local air quality impacts on the adjacent neighborhoods, including potential health quality concerns associated with increased vehicular air emissions.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Air Pollution and the new EPA Ozone Standards  
The EIS does not adequately consider the impact of the increased air pollution due to increased traffic in the area. The proposed location already suffers from traffic congestion and the report points out that any new development in this area – whether it’s a hospital or a commercial development – will exacerbate this problem. The traffic analysis gives one section of the affected roadways a failing grade during morning and evening rush hour.  
The draft EIS only accounts for the inconvenience for individuals in cars using the road, it does not take into account the effect of increased air pollution.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | VA appreciates the wealth of health studies data provided by the commenter and recognizes the potential health effects from increased vehicular air emissions due to heavy traffic congestion in the area. VA also appreciates the Air Pollution Control District’s tracing of pollution levels.  
As commenters noted, air emissions related to traffic can impose serious health effects. The extent of such effects is dependent on the type and level of emissions and an individual’s proximity to those emissions. For example, potential health concerns appear to be limited to distances within 0.3 miles (500 meters) or less. On the other hand, there are also positive aspects to living near major roads. Proximity to roads can provide access to jobs, health care, food, and recreational activities.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pollution on neighborhood residents and hospital patients. The World Health Organization has named air pollution as the number one environmental public health risk. Cities around the world are taking steps to reduce car traffic as a source of air pollution. [Commenter SM-349 includes detailed summary of literature from the World Health Organization related to pollution studies and related studies linking specific pollution emissions to specific health effects (e.g., asthma, breathing disorders, cardiovascular disease, lung cancer, etc.).] These are all included in the full comment in Section E.6 under SM-349 (website comments) if other readers are interested.]</td>
<td>opportunities, among other benefits. Section 4.2 of the Final EIS has been revised to recognize the potential for adverse health effects from increased traffic and vehicular air emissions associated with the proposed replacement VAMC (including closing of 3 CBOCs that will require Veterans to now drive to new VAMC). However, VAMC project compliance with the emissions subject to NAAQS, which are set to protect human health, should help ensure that health effects are not significant. See also related response above. However, those residents who live next to the proposed replacement VAMC and also next to major highways (i.e., I-264 and I-71) that already experience heavy traffic volumes during certain times of day may experience more adverse effects. While VA does not believe that extensive quantitative modeling of the traffic in the larger area is a requirement for this project in this EIS, the public can obtain more detailed information from the EPA on how the Alternative sites at Brownsboro and St. Joseph and larger metro area compare to traffic proximity and volume at the state and national levels with respect to various air pollutants (e.g., ozone and PM2.5). Specifically, EPA uses its Environmental Justice Screening Tool (EPA 2015) to explore specific locations at a detailed geographic level. Environmental indicators typically are direct or proxy estimates of risk, pollution levels, or potential exposure (e.g., due to nearby facilities); estimates have a substantial uncertainty because emissions, ambient levels in the air, exposure of individuals, and toxicity are uncertain. Estimates are based on the most recent data available at the time of each indicator’s development. Overall, the tool can help ensure that certain areas are not overlooked and receive appropriate consideration, analysis or outreach (EPA 2015). Using this tool, it is possible to map the Brownsville and St. Joseph’s sites with respect to several environmental indicators to help understand where the impacts of existing pollution may occur. The environmental indicators that can be examined include: • Traffic Proximity and Volume Count of vehicles per day (average annual daily traffic) at major roads within 500 meters (or nearest one beyond 500 m) divided by distance in meters. Calculated from US DOT National Transportation Atlas Database. Source: Highway Performance Monitoring System, 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Traffic Proximity and Volume Count of vehicles per day (average annual daily traffic) at major roads within 500 meters (or nearest one beyond 500 m) divided by distance in meters. Calculated from US DOT National Transportation Atlas Database. Source: Highway Performance Monitoring System, 2014.*
Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Diesel Particulate Matter level in air (NATA Diesel PM). Diesel</td>
<td>• Diesel particulate matter level in air in micrograms per cubic meter. Source: EPA 2011 national Air Toxics Assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Particulate matter (PM2.5) levels in air, micrograms per cubic meter.</td>
<td>• Particulate matter (PM2.5) levels in air, micrograms per cubic meter. Annual average 2012. Source: EPA Office of Air and Radiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proximity to Risk Management Plan (RMP) Facilities within 5 km</td>
<td>• Proximity to Risk Management Plan (RMP) Facilities within 5 km divided by distance in km. Calculated from EPA RMP database (November 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Air Toxic Cancer Risk (NATA Cancer Risk) lifetime cancer risk from</td>
<td>• Air Toxic Cancer Risk (NATA Cancer Risk) lifetime cancer risk from inhalation of air toxics as risk per lifetime per million people. Source: EPA 2011 National Air Toxic Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Air Toxics Respiratory Hazard Index (NATA Respiratory HI)., sum</td>
<td>• Air Toxics Respiratory Hazard Index (NATA Respiratory HI)., sum of hazard indices for those air toxics with reference concentrations based on respiratory endpoints where each hazard index is the ratio of exposure concentration set by EPA. Source: EPA 2011 National Air Toxics Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of all the health effects from the various pollutants of concern:</td>
<td>This tool is available online at: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/ejscreen">https://www.epa.gov/ejscreen</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has there ever been any study recently done on the impact of the pollution</td>
<td>There have been studies done on the impact of pollution caused by vehicular emissions, although it is beyond the scope of this EIS to research and identify all studies done on this topic. See related responses above, including those identified in EPAs’ EJScreen Technical Memorandum referenced above, and all the WHO studies identified in Commenter SM-349 (see comment above) in Section E.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caused by the congestion of the cars? The pollution can get into the</td>
<td>The Final EIS (Sections 4.2 and 4.16 - cumulative impacts) has been revised to recognize that increased traffic can result in adverse health effects on nearby residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brain. This would be the last place we’d want to put a hospital, right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in/near area where you have created a high area of pollution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality: When a NEPA process EIS is performed all potential</td>
<td>See response above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental impacts must be scoped. This includes an (AQA) air</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality analysis for (CO) carbon monoxide. This is so very important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for quality of life issues when your &quot;right of way&quot; like KY 22 is so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close to the travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBT/SB: DEIS asserts that vehicle trips to and from a replacement VAMC</td>
<td>Specific origin-destination data for expected rips to and from a VAMC at the proposed Brownsboro site are not available and any estimates would be too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>campus would replace those occurring to existing VA facilities. This</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>simplistic conclusion fails to take into account differences in miles traveled by patients and employees for different alternatives. Nor does EIS consider how changes in traffic patterns due to relocation would affect performance of city-wide and regional transportation network in a way that could interfere with state implementation plan to achieve attainment status.</td>
<td>speculative to be meaningful. The types of decisions being supported by this EIS do not require taking into account site specific travel patterns in the impact analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB: DEIS fails to evaluate significant climate change and GHG emissions concerns and considerations. Other than cursory evaluation of greenhouse gas emissions that VA generically applied to VAMC facility without regard to location, VA failed to evaluate impacts on climate and climate change (presumably in accordance with recent CEQ guidance that is cited in the comment). At no time does VA evaluate GHG emissions on a specific alternative, not does VA evaluate GHG emissions from transportation other than generic indirect assumptions. VA should fully evaluate impacts to climate and climate change including utilizing one or more of CEQ’s recommended transportation GHG accounting tools.</td>
<td>As noted n the comment, CEQ guidance also states that: “Agencies should be guided by the principle that the extent of the analysis should be commensurate with the quantity of projected GHG emissions and take into account available data and GHG quantification tools that are suitable for and commensurate with the proposed agency action. The rule of reason and the concept of proportionality caution against providing an in-depth analysis of emissions regardless of the insignificance of the quantity of GHG emissions that would be caused by the proposed agency action.” In the case of the proposed action, the GHG emissions are considered to be very small and by the rule of reason noted in the CEQ guidance, do not warrant more detailed quantitative modeling. Nor would the results change if the analysis were expanded to include a more detailed accounting of GHG emissions from vehicle transportation associated with the proposed replacement VAMC, given that the major contributor is from energy generation and usage by the replacement facility and after taking into account the fact that the majority of travel will be replacing travel now taking place to and from the existing hospital on Zorn Avenue. Conducting substantive quantitative modeling would be typically reserved for larger scale Department of Transportation projects (e.g., construction or expansion of major highway). Another important point relative to GHG emissions and potential impacts on climate/climate change is that the potential region of impact usually includes a regional, national or even global basis. Hence, there is essentially no difference in impacts between alternative sites analyzed in this EIS. Finally, it should be noted that the proposed replacement VAMC would be largely relocating an existing facility and function within the same general area and region of impact for GHG emissions (whose impacts are typically evaluated on a large scale) such that potential GHG impacts would not be expected to significantly change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air quality will be impacted. It is already affected by the high level of auto emissions derived from the high number of cars using local roads. How will the addition of 3,000 more cars to the mix not up the anti?</td>
<td>The additional traffic associated with the proposed project would increase air emissions and the Final EIS has been revised to further clarify potential impacts from increased air emissions including potential health effects. See also related responses above regarding increased traffic and potential health effects. Planned traffic improvements by the KYTC should help alleviate much of the existing congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Brownsboro site been tested for environmental radon exposure? If so, what were the results?</td>
<td>The Brownsboro site has not been tested for radon. Testing would not be feasible until a building were in place. Radon gas can potentially accumulate in buildings (typically basements and crawl spaces). If radon were found to be present, mitigation units can be easily installed. A radon mitigation system would not be part of construction but the construction would facilitate its installation if necessary down the road. Section 5.4 of the EIS indicates that the building would be constructed to facilitate radon mitigation system in compliance with all applicable design and construction standards, if such a system is required to ensure that building occupants would not be exposed to radon in excess of 4 picocuries per liter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CULTURAL RESOURCES**

KY DEP: The State Preservation Office, Kentucky Heritage Council
Cultural resources assessments for the Brownsboro Site (Alternative A) were completed in 2012 and 2015. Our office accepted these results and agreed with the consultant that no further work was needed. Cultural resources assessment of the St. Joseph Site (Alternative B) was completed in 2012. Our office also accepted these results and agreed with the consultant that no further work was needed.

However, we have not received a Determination of Effects from the Veterans Administration concerning either of the principal project alternatives. Our response to the VA’s Determination of Effects should be included in the final version of the EIS.

Additionally, we would like to suggest a correction to the wording of the Executive Summary of effects to Cultural resources presented in Table: Summary of Impacts Analysis, on page xx. The recommendation for the St. Joseph site should indicate that there is “no effect” instead of ‘no adverse
**Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>effect'. No National Register eligible or listed properties will be affected by proposed construction activities at that site, and thus there are no historic properties to adversely affect.</td>
<td>continue to coordinate further with SHPO, as needed, to complete the Section 106 consultation process for the St. Joseph Site, and would take no action until the process is complete. In the event VA changed its preferred alternative to the St. Joseph Site, it would take immediate steps to complete the Section 106 consultation process for the St. Joseph Site prior to taking any further action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Hunter, Miami Tribe: The Miami Tribe offers no objection to the above-mentioned project at this time, as we are not currently aware of existing documentation directly linking a specific Miami cultural or historic site to the project site. However, as this site is within the contemporary homelands of the Miami Tribe, if any human remains or Native American cultural items falling under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) or archaeological evidence is discovered during any phase of this project, the Miami Tribe requests immediate consultation with the entity of jurisdiction for the location of discovery.</td>
<td>VA agrees to immediately contact Ms. Diane Hunter of the Miami Tribe and initiate consultation in the event any human remains or Native American cultural items falling under NAGPRA is discovered during any phase of the project. This has also been clarified in Section 4.3 of the Final EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB: DEIS does not comply with NEPA in its historic and archaeological analyses. EIS says no NRHP properties or eligible properties located onsite or immediately adjacent and that there are no known archaeological resources at Brownsboro site. However, there are significant archaeological resources at the Brownsboro site that will be affected by traffic, noise, and change in the character of the area from adding a million square foot facility. These include nearby Locust Grove, Zachary Taylor Cemetery, the Zachary Taylor house, Taylor-Oldham-Herr House and the Herr Rudy Family Houses. VA confirmed that prehistoric artifacts were present at Brownsboro site. NHPA requires a review in situation like this, notwithstanding Ky SHPO letter, where there is possibility that eligible NRHP artifacts will be destroyed. VA should complete a formal, comprehensive Section 106 review. Furthermore, letter from SHPO makes it clearly that there are archaeological materials that should be reviewed though VA counters that “no adverse effects to archaeological features or historic properties. … Most courts find that a property need not be formally determined eligible to be considered an “eligible property” for purposes of application of Section 106.</td>
<td>As stated in the EIS, and at the request of the KY SHPO, four National Register or National Historic Landmark sites located in the vicinity of the project but outside the APE were also assessed for potential effect from the project. These included the Zachary Taylor House, Zachary Taylor National Cemetery, the Taylor-Oldham-Herr House and the Taylor-Herr House. Each of these properties was reviewed in the field during the 2015 Cultural Historic Resource Survey, to ensure that potential effects to these historic properties from the proposed project were adequately accounted for. Because of the surrounding trees, residences/suburban development and the distance between the proposed project area and the other National Register and National Historic Landmark sites, it is anticipated that the proposed project would have no effect on those sites, or any other sites beyond 1,000 feet of the project area. The distance is sufficient to protect the properties from potential direct effects (e.g., physical destruction, deterioration, or damage; change of character of physical features). The visual screening is considered sufficient to protect the properties from potential indirect effects (e.g., change in historic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting. SHPO concurred with this finding in its April 8, 2015 letter and no additional consultation or action is required.</td>
<td>VA does acknowledge there could be some indirect effects from the project construction that could affect the historic feeling of a given property (e.g., construction noise, blasting) for some visitors. This potential for indirect effect has been recognized in Section 4.3 of the Final EIS. Such effects would be temporary, however. VA notes that the area already experiences heavy traffic congestion so additional congestion from project operation is not expected to alter the “feeling” any more than visitors might experience during certain times of day under current conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO’s letter dated April 8, 2015 does take exception to the Agency’s cultural resource consultant’s recommendation regarding Site JF 487 and its finding of not being eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A, B, or C. Rather, SHPO indicates that the site may be found to be eligible with additional research. However, SHPO also concurred with the finding of no potential for effect based on site location with respect to the proposed project. This has been clarified in the Final EIS and the impact finding of no effect has not changed.</td>
<td>Regarding confirmation of prehistoric artifacts at the Brownsboro site, Section 3.3 of the EIS has been revised to describe in more detail the results of previous surveys and their findings which conclude that the Brownsboro Site does not contain cultural resources listed, or eligible for listing, in the NRHP and recommended no further investigations. Section 3.3 has also been revised to clarify SHPO’s concurrence of no adverse effect for the one archaeological site identified. Finally, Section 4.3 has been revised to identify steps VA would take in the event unexpected artifacts are discovered during the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

FBT: Geology and Soils: The DEIS fails to adequately evaluate the potential adverse effects on geology and soils of alternatives considered. Section 3.4.2.2 identifies a potential sinkhole detected on site of Alternative A but section 4.4.2.1 does not discuss impact of this apparent sinkhole on construction or make a determination as to whether this sinkhole represents an adverse effect under Alternative A.  

While Figure 3.4-3 does show a LiDAR sinkhole located on the Brownsboro property, the supporting text clarifies that it is a potential sinkhole and this has been clarified in the figure legend in the Final EIS. LiDAR only detects elevation and depressions and does not confirm that it is an actual karst feature. Traditional soil borings, refraction microtremor testing, and a visual reconnaissance of the project site in 2013 indicated minor karst features in...
Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB: Section 3.4 of EIS depicts LIDAR assessed sinkhole at Brownsboro site, however, Section 4.4.2.1 does not discuss impact of this sinkhole on construction or determine how obvious karst issues at Brownsboro site would be addressed during construction and after. VA’s failure to actually evaluate the potential adverse effects of geology and soil problems is inconsistent with NEPA. Stating effects would be the same as “other similar areas” does not provide public with any information as to what those effects actually are or allow a meaningful comparison of alternatives. Because VA would be drilling 400 feet deep geothermal holes in karst terrain, this could exacerbate site stability and safety problems. VA has not indicated how it will mitigate this danger, which could result in subsidence, flooding of homes, damage to residential foundations, or flooding to the Watterson Expressway. VA should, at a minimum, implement and require more construction mitigation measures to prevent sinkhole development at the Brownsboro Site. “Cities” also request that measures to be taken during construction as described in DEIS (p. 176) be conducted before construction instead, so that the risk of karstic activity may be minimized.</td>
<td>isolated locations (URS/SmithGroup 2014), however, it was the opinion of a geotechnical engineer that karst features are minor and shallow enough that drilled piers (part of foundation) can easily be extended through these features. Geotechnical evaluation was performed by AMEC Environment and Infrastructure, Inc. (AMEC) a highly reputable geo-environmental firm with extensive local knowledge and expertise with land development in karst geologic settings. The Senior Principal Geotechnical Engineer for AMEC on this project has been practicing geotechnical engineering in the Louisville area for more than 30 years. The US Army Corps of Engineers, Louisville District - Geotechnical Engineers have reviewed AMEC's report and stated that it reflected a thorough evaluation of the risk associated with karst and groundwater issues for the Brownsboro site; and included a review of published geologic and water well information, application of local area knowledge, and implementation of an extensive site geotechnical drilling program (including sampling of the underlying bedrock materials). The report provides sound engineering recommendations for project design and construction phases to mitigate risk for karst issues. The AMEC geotechnical report indicates top of rock is approximately 5.3 to 18.5 feet below the existing ground surface. This means the karst development at this site is relatively shallow (due to the thin layer of soil overburden) and any karst features in this geologic setting would also be shallow. The voids in the underlying bedrock are small and do not lend themselves to large soil drop outs. The site is not underlain by large caverns that would allow for large depressions to suddenly develop. As indicated in the AMEC report, the risks related to karst issues at this site are manageable when compared to the adjacent properties. The entire community surrounding the Brownsboro site has been developed in the same geologic setting, which indicates the karst risk has been acceptable for previous site development for the adjacent land owners, business owners, transportation cabinet and public utilities. The borings advanced (~96 borings) as part of AMEC's investigation were located within the footprints of the proposed associated buildings; and review of the design indicates that the bottom of the piers take into account the variability in the rock structure. This has been further explained in Sections 3.4 and 4.4 of the Final EIS. With regard to &quot;drilling 400 feet deep...could exacerbate site stability and safety...&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
problems", the proposed geothermal wells will consist of small diameter boreholes drilled through the relatively thin surficial soil and into bedrock. This has been explained in more detail in revised Section 4.5 of the Final EIS. After pipe is placed into the drill hole, the space around the pipe is filled with a relatively impermeable cement-based grout. This grout fills the drilled borehole and blocks the flow of water into or out of the hole, effectively restoring the bedrock to its original condition. No part of the completed geothermal borehole installation around the closed loop pipe is open space. The grout acts as a barrier to groundwater flow, and typically contains a percentage of bentonite that imparts self-sealing properties to the grout. The proposed 400 ft geothermal wells would extend into either the Grant Lake Limestone or the Calloway Creek Limestone formations below the site which are recognized as stable bedrock. While the surficial units are subject to karst development due to exposure and weathering, the process of installing and operating geothermal wells should not exacerbate existing karst conditions, create unstable conditions, or cause basement flooding of nearby structures.

Based on the successes elsewhere in the county with similar karst activity, previous site-specific geotech findings for the Brownsboro site, and the availability of mitigation treatment methods that can be implemented if necessary, VA has determined that the presence of karst features would not be associated with an adverse effect due to the proposed action.

Section 4.4.2.1 Raising the issue of drainage changes that will create temporary increases in sedimentation in storm water draining without addressing the VA’s actions to mitigate and prevent these issues is a glaring omission of the DEIS.

What regulation/guidelines/policies will the VA reference and enforce to prevent runoff damage incurred by residents during construction and operation?

Who will have oversight over the VA to ensure all regulations/guidelines/policies are in compliance?

How will the public access compliance reports and violations made by the VA of any other subcontracted vendor?

Sections 4.4, 4.5, 5.4 and 5.5 of the Final EIS have been revised to provide more detail related to storm water management, related regulations VA would comply with, and steps VA would take to minimize drainage impacts. See also responses to related comments in the Hydrology Section of Table E-4 below.

VA would rely on the Louisville District of the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for management of completion of design and construction activities. They would ensure that all regulations, guidelines and policies are in compliance.

VA (and USACE) on its behalf, require all its contractors and employees to comply with applicable environmental laws and regulations. The public may inquire on reports of non-compliance by contacting the agencies to whom VA and/or its contractors must report violations such as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Kentucky Department for Environmental Protection (DEP),
## Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.4.2.1 (p. 176) While the DEIS includes a statement that “Procedures would be taken during construction to discover existing voids”, the EIS needs information to state their procedures and policies after the construction period. The term “procedures” is quite vague. It does not cite the agency that will provide the “procedures” or have the compliance monitoring and oversight. What current/pending policies/guidelines used to discover voids?</td>
<td>VA (and USACE on its behalf) requires the designer of record to employ sound engineering principles which require appropriate geotechnical investigations to support engineering approaches and decisions. Discovery of any existing voids not identified in such geotechnical investigations as those described in section 3.4 and 4.4 of the Final EIS, would occur across the during construction when ground disturbing activities occur across the entire site. Simply removing the existing vegetation on the surface is likely to reveal any existing voids, but beyond that proof rolling would be utilized to further test the soils for underlying voids. Proof rolling is a process for checking compacted soils for soft areas; soft subgrade spots can be mitigated prior to surface construction activities. As such there would be no need for continued searching once construction is complete. During construction, USACE would require a geotechnical engineer to be present to observe the excavation and rock removal to determine treatment methods to minimize the potential for karstic activity. VA would rely on the Louisville District of the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for management and oversight of design and construction of the replacement VAMC. There are no specific policies used to discover voids. There are construction specifications which require the contractor to notify the government of any unforeseen conditions and wait for direction. As stated above, the USACE would provide contractor oversight and ensure that a geo-technical (registered civil engineer is on site to observe earthwork activity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.4.1.2 (p. 176-177). Since the VA states in the DEIS “Adherence to this standard to the requirements of the Kentucky Revised Statute 350.420,” does this mean the VA will comply with the stronger of federal or state regulations? Why was this particular regulation singled out? If state policies/guidelines are stronger than VA’s, will the VA implement state policies/guidelines?</td>
<td>The referenced statute was singled out because it relates specifically to Kentucky regulations for blasting activities. However, on further review, VA determined that KRS 350.420 relates to blasting requirements for coal mining operations and has corrected the citation in the Final EIS to KRS 351.330 which relates specifically to blasting requirements for construction activities. Sections 4.4 and 4.7 (Noise) have been revised accordingly to reflect both the corrected citation and a slight change in associated requirements. Sections 5.4 and 5.7 also have been further revised to expand on the specific measures VA would take to minimize impacts from blasting. That said, VA notes that blasting is not...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anticipated to be required at the Brownsboro Site; the need for blasting at the St. Joseph Site is not yet known.</td>
<td>In the event blasting is required, VA would comply with all Federal and state regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.4.1.2 (p. 176-177) The last paragraph in Section 4.4.2.1 is too vague and unacceptable. The DEIS must state the short and long term actions the VA will take to minimize the impact of blasting as well as ponding, sedimentation and hazardous waste runoff suffered by residents in the area. As written in this section of the DEIS, one may think the VA will develop the “Contraction [? ] Best Management Practices” during the project based on permit requirements. Additionally the VA should state they would comply with stronger of federal, state or local governmental agency permit requirements. While it could be an assumption, the Best Management Practices should mandate that all permits are required and must be approved before the work covered by the permit begins. Lastly, the DEIS should state who will have oversight of the BMP and securing permits in a timely manner. What are VA’s short and long term plans to protect residents and business owners adverse outcomes related to blasting, ponding, water, sedimentation and hazardous waste runoff? How will the VA work with state and local agencies to ensure their “BMP” address all that would be impacted by vague or incomplete management practices? SB: Another concern for the Cities involves the impact of construction on the topography of the site and the exposed subsurface soils that would drain into the stormwater as a result of the grading. Disturbing subsurface soils</td>
<td>As stated in sections 4.4 and 4.5, VA does not anticipate the need for blasting at the Brownsboro site. Sections 4.4 and 4.5, and 5.4 and 5.5 (on Mitigation) of the Final EIS have been revised to further clarify steps VA would take to minimize impacts from blasting if determined necessary. In general, Chapter 4 has been revised to include more information relating to mitigation measures, and the reader is also referred to Chapter 5 that includes a detailed listing of mitigation measure VA would implement, organized by resource area. This includes how sedimentation and hazardous waste would be controlled; there would be no hazardous waste runoff. See also related responses to comments in the Hydrology (e.g., ponding) and Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials Sections of Table E-4. VA would rely on the Louisville District of the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for management of completion of design and construction activities. They would have oversight of best management practices and ensure that all permits are secured in a timely manner prior to the start of any work covered by those permits. USACE would also ensure that all regulations, guidelines and policies are in compliance. Their role and adherence to best management practices and applicable regulations has been further clarified in Chapters 2, 4 and 5 of the Final EIS. VA would apply for and comply with applicable environmental permits and regulations. The design, construction and management of the proposed replacement VAMC would be conducted in accordance with permit and regulatory requirements. These requirements include periodic inspections and reporting requirements to ensure management practices are followed and no violations occur. VA would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations during construction and operation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix E: Comment Responses
**Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and potential stormwater contamination are both grave concerns. VA must</td>
<td>A mitigation plan to address potential stormwater contamination would be developed as part of the permitting process (e.g., Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, Dust Control Plan). See related responses under Hydrology Section of Table E-4 below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>include mitigation plan regarding air quality and stormwater contamination during construction phase of project and rigorously explore alternatives, including other sites, that would have less impacts on air and water quality. DEIS states that during construction phase for Brownsboro site, measures must be taken to minimize runoff from site and an Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control Plan must be enacted to trap 80 percent of suspended solids that could runoff from the site. Cities are concerned with impact the other 20 percent of erosion and sediment that could contaminate stormwater during the construction phase. No control plans are currently in place to minimize these risks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During construction phase reference to the “Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control Plan must be prepared that details measures to trap 80 percent of the total suspended solids” leads to numerous questions: What happens to the other 20%? What happens to the 80%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[related individual comment] Geology and Soils (Section 4.5.2.1 p. 179)</td>
<td>As explained in Section 4.5 (Hydrology) of the Final EIS, an Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control Plan must be prepared that details measures to trap 80 percent of the total suspended solids that could come from the project site during construction.; these measures could include sediment trapping devices, temporary sedimentation basins, fabric fences, inlet protection measures to control the perimeter and construction entrances and other measures to control soil erosion and sediment and runoff from the site. The captured sediments would ultimately be reutilized or disposed of in accordance with established waste characterization and disposal practices. The remaining 20 percent of total suspended solids is not economical to capture and it would be carried out in runoff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SB: Cities concerned with impact of possible blasting on nearby buildings and houses during construction. They request additional details from VA regarding ways to mitigate and prevent damage to the nearby homes as well as the risk of future sinkhole activity during blasting. Cities also request VA to perform pre-blasting inspections and surveys on all structures within a five-mile radius of the Midlands site. | As stated in section 4.4.2.1 of the EIS VA anticipates most bedrock in confined areas to be removed using ripping tools and pneumatic hammers. During construction, a geotechnical engineer would be on site to observe excavation and rock removal and determine treatment methods to minimize the potential for karstic activity. Blasting is not anticipated at the Brownsboro Site, however, IF blasting were determined necessary, the construction contractor would be required to limit ground vibration, or peak particle velocity (PPV), to under 0.5 inches per second and to adhere to Kentucky Revised Statute 350.430 in order to avoid damage to nearby buildings and houses. The construction contractor would comply with state law and provide required notification and opportunity for affected property owners to request pre-blast survey/inspection. These requirements would be enforced by the US Army Corps of Engineers who would oversee construction. Adherence to state standards and mitigation measures VA has committed to should ensure that no nearby homes would be damaged. This is not a matter to be addressed in the EIS, but if homeowner did feel that their home suffered damage they have the right to make a claim against the U.S. and prove that the
Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government’s action caused the damage.</td>
<td>Regarding the request to conduct pre-blast surveys for a 5-mile radius, VA would comply with the applicable regulations which, as noted in the comment response above (see also revised Section 5.4 in the Final EIS, has been changed to reflect blasting requirements for construction; these require no pre-blast surveys. However, VA pre-blast surveys may be conducted for adjacent residents if determined to be necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blasting would be limited to such low velocity, that neighboring properties should not be affected. VA also notes that blasting is not likely to be required at the Brownsboro Site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - FLOODING

KY DEP: The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the replacement to the VA Medical Center in Louisville Kentucky has three alternatives for the project. Alternative A is located at 4906 Brownsboro Road. This alternative has no impacts to surface waters or wetlands. The nearest stream is almost a mile east of the project and should not be impacted in any way by the project. Best management practices should be used to avoid any runoff from the project area. Alternative B (St. Joseph Site) impacts two small wetlands and a stream that connects the two wetlands found in the northern portion of the project area. The stream is a tributary of a tributary of Floyds Fork; this stream is not a special use water. The entrance and the road connecting the final project to Factory Lane will cross these areas impact the unnamed tributary. The U.S. Army Corp of Engineers and the DOW’s 401 and 404 sections will determine what permits and/or mitigation may be required for the possible impacts to the wetlands and the stream. Alternative C (No Action) requires no building or construction and instead deals with continuing operations at the existing VA Medical Center. There are no impacts to any surface waters or wetlands and no comment for this alternative.

Each of the proposed sites are located in areas with high potential for karst development where groundwater is susceptible to direct contamination from surface activities. It is the recommendation of the Groundwater Section of

VA thanks the KY DEP for its comments related to hydrology and water quality. Section 4.5 has been revised to include information provided by the Department relating to potential impacts on nearby streams and wetlands for each alternative.

VA is aware of the requirements of 401 KAR 5:037 and the need to develop a Groundwater Protection Plan (GPP) for the protection of groundwater resources within that area. This requirement is addressed in Sections 4.5 and 5.5 of the Final EIS. The content and requirements set forth in 401 KAR 5:037 § 2 and § 3 related to preparation of GPPs have been added to Section 3.5.

VA is aware of the requirements of 401 KAR 5:037 and the need to develop a Groundwater Protection Plan (GPP) for the protection of groundwater resources within that area. This requirement is addressed in Sections 4.5 and 5.5 of the
Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the Watershed Management Branch that proposed sites be made aware of</td>
<td>Final EIS. The content and requirements set forth in 401 KAR 5:037 § 2 and § 3 related to preparation of GPPs have been added to Section 3.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the requirements of 401 KAR 5:037 and the need to develop a Groundwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection Plan (GPP) for the protection of groundwater resources within</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that area. 401 KAR 5:037 § 2 references the Scope and Applicability for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the proposed activities while § 3 refers to the Preparation of GPPs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB: DEIS does not comply with NEPA in its failure to adequately analyze</td>
<td>Section 4.5.2.1 and 4.5.2.2 of the EIS have been expanded to more fully describe the controls that would be implemented through design, construction, and operation that document how VA will comply with the requirements of section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) of 2007, which states: “The sponsor of any development or redevelopment project involving a Federal facility with a footprint that exceeds 5,000 square feet shall use site planning, design, construction, and maintenance strategies for the property to maintain or restore, to the maximum extent technically feasible, the predevelopment hydrology of the property with regard to the temperature, rate, volume, and duration of flow.” In effect, VA’s proposed design would ensure that the discharge rate of stormwater afterconstruction will be the same as before construction. Stormwater runoff from the site would not be managed through infiltration (due to karst conditions); and, in fact, the amount of water which is infiltrating the karst soil currently would be expected to be reduced under the proposed development. Rather, VA’s project proposes to control storm water runoff within the bounds of the alternatives analyzed in the EIS through the use of surface and subsurface detention systems that would detain the water and allow it to be discharged at a rate that matches existing conditions. Additionally, a natural features assessment of the Brownsboro Road site concluded no wetlands exist on the site and the site is not within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone thus, any restrictions related to such flood zones would not apply. Generally, in its current condition, the site drains from northeast to southwest and there is a limited amount of drainage towards the existing drainage ditch along the east boundary. As previously stated, VA’s design for stormwater management shall be governed by both the requirements of section 438 of EISA and the Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD), which limits the site discharge to the predevelopment discharge for the design storms (effectively the 25, 50 and 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the flooding that occurs on the site, in Crossgate, and in Graymoor-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devondale and the impact of stormwater runoff on neighbors of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands site. DEIS argument that there are no flooding problems because</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property is not within 100 or 500-year flood zone is incomplete. There</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are significant areas of Crossgate and Greymoor-Devondale that regularly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flood in relatively moderate rain events. There is a portion of land at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the entrance to Crossgate that is effectively marshland on a regular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basis. Cities believe that these properties could be jurisdictional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wetlands under CWA. The addition of large amounts of impervious surfaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Brownsboro Road site and potential disruption of groundwater flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caused by extensive excavation onsite would likely lead to exacerbated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flooding in surrounding cities and roadways. The DEIS does not plan for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these problems during construction phase or after construction. NEPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requires VA to make a basic effort to analyze this fundamental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental problem that will affect property values, health and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safety in areas contiguous to the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents need specific details relative to the site’s elevation of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 feet and the actions the VA will take during construction and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operation. A basic review of DEIS suggests that residents will be left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to deal with what the VA allows to run downhill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, in its current condition, the site drains from northeast to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>southwest and there is a limited amount of drainage towards the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing drainage ditch along the east boundary. As previously stated,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA’s design for stormwater management shall be governed by both the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements of section 438 of EISA and the Metropolitan Sewer District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MSD), which limits the site discharge to the predevelopment discharge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year storm event as defined by the MSD). As such, VA's design would direct storm runoff to a collection system; storing all storm water on site and discharging runoff to the western ditch along the Watterson Expressway at a rate no greater than the predevelopment rate. The fence along the east boundary of the site would allow for the placement of a drainage ditch along the east edge of the VA property that would collect direct runoff, including that from adjacent yards, to the collection systems on the VA site that become part of the VA site collection, storage and discharge of stormwater. Drainage from the site would not be directed towards, or through the perimeter fence on the site's east and south boundaries. This would improve drainage along the east and south property line and help protect adjacent properties from potential flooding concerns.</td>
<td>As described in section 4.5 of the EIS, VA’s proposed project would comply with section 438 of EISA and with MSD requirements, which requires the design, construction, and operation to maintain pre-development hydrology conditions. VA’s project would neither solve, nor exacerbate conditions in surrounding areas. The current topography of the Brownsboro road site, for example, generally falls from northeast to southwest. Because of the relatively flat nature of the site, runoff mostly is absorbed by the site and becomes groundwater. Based on the geotechnical conditions of the site, VA's design for the improved site would collect, store, and direct runoff to the west to be discharged at a rate that will not exceed the predevelopment rate, allowing minimal infiltration, but ensuring no difference in post development runoff discharge rate. This storm water would be controlled using approved engineering techniques for collection, storage, and discharge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding concerns about the plans to increase elevation, the proposed design would ensure that the runoff rate after construction would be the same as before construction. Essentially, the area where the buildings would be constructed would be elevated and the stormwater systems would be at lower elevations in the roadways to capture any runoff and direct it into the onsite detention systems.</td>
<td>VA has committed to not adversely impacting adjacent properties and MSD would require VA to improve the drainage along the east property line (see related response above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment letter included multiple overviews of their property and how storm/surface water has been directed toward their property (located in City of Windy Hills Jefferson County). Since improvements have been made to I-264, more surface water has been directed toward the tributary of the Muddy Fork of Beargrass Creek behind out house. Floodwater has entered first floor elevation on at least 5 houses on southwest side of 5814 to 5622 Bonfire Drive. This has occurred 3-4 times in last 10 years. The drainage swale behind our house handles more surface water than we have ever experienced in 40 years we’ve lived here. Presently most surface water from the VA site is directed toward the north and toward Westport Road. The drainage of Westport Road goes to Muddy Fork of Beargrass Creek. This can and has caused a lot of downstream flooding. Based on a C-J article dated April 12, 2012, the 36-acre Midlands property was to be purchased from Jonathan Ble within a short time. If built per data presented means that approximately 50% of the 35 acres will be covered over and not able to absorb rainwater. This water needs to go somewhere - and increases dramatically during heavy short duration rains - which can cause flash flooding. This is already happening without the VA hospital. I don’t agree with the findings</td>
<td>As section 4.5 of the EIS, VA’s proposed project would comply with section 438 of EISA and with MSD requirements, which requires the design, construction, and operation to maintain pre-development hydrology conditions. VA’s project would neither solve, nor exacerbate conditions in surrounding areas. The current topography of the Brownsboro road site, for example, generally falls from northeast to southwest. Because of the relatively flat nature of the site, runoff mostly is absorbed by the site and becomes groundwater. Based on the geotechnical conditions of the site, VA's design for the improved site would collect, store, and direct runoff to the west to be discharged at a rate that will not exceed the predevelopment rate, allowing minimal infiltration, but ensuring no difference in post development runoff discharge rate. This storm water would be controlled using approved engineering techniques for collection, storage, and discharge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>concerning storm water and surface water calculations.</td>
<td>Section 4.5 of the EIS describes VA’s proposed approach which would include surface and subsurface detention to control storm water and keep post development runoff to the same levels as those prior to development. This includes utilization of “green” dry basins which meet the definition of “green infrastructure”. Additionally, the AMEC geotechnical report did not identify any sink holes and indicates the site is not underlain by large caverns that would allow for large depressions to suddenly develop. Further, it indicates the risks related to karst issues at this site are manageable when compared to the adjacent properties. The entire community surrounding the Brownsboro site has been</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VA must undertake hydraulic studies to establish the base flood elevations associated with each directly impacted sinkhole, evaluate project alternatives that avoid or minimize impacting the sinkhole floodplains, and refrain from constructing on Midlands site unless it can be demonstrated there is no other “practicable alternative” to impacting the sinkhole floodplains and involve the public and Cities in this decisionmaking. VA must also comply with requirements to delineate the floodplains of sinkholes and only allow construction that avoids impacting sinkhole floodplains. VA must re-evaluate Midlands site with respect to propensity for flooding on site and on residential properties bordering south side of the site. DEIS fails to consider green infrastructure alternatives in design of stormwater systems as required by EO 11988.</td>
<td>developed in the same geologic setting, which indicates the karst risk has been acceptable for previous site development for the adjacent land owners, business owners, transportation cabinet and public utilities. Also, a base-flood assessment would not relate flooding to sinkholes. It would only determine, based on the area topography and the adjacent flooding facilities such as lakes, creeks, rivers, and streams, what the base-line flood elevation would be at specific locations within the site. Because there are no material adjacent streams, creeks, lakes or rivers, the base line information would not be relevant. Sinkholes for this location would be related to karst conditions of the site, which have been addressed in other areas of this response. VA’s design would include requirements (both design and construction and their requirements would be managed and enforced by the US Army Corps of Engineers) for controls to prevent flooding during construction through a detailed Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control (SESC) Plan to be approved by the regulating municipalities and agencies. Such measures would include temporary sedimentation basins, sediment traps, fabric fences and other measures to control SESC and runoff from the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strobo: Regarding site location on primarily limestone aquifers (at depth of 50 to 200 feet), Cities contend that no studies have been conducted regarding the environmental impact of disturbing these aquifers during construction activities such as blasting, digging and increasing grade levels. Only studies that have been conducted relate to surface water runoff and don’t factor in the presence of known perennial springs near the site. Some homes in area currently require one or more sump pumps to run almost continuously due to aquifers and active springs directly south of proposed construction site. Cities are concerned that construction activity will increase likelihood of flooding, which is already prevalent in neighborhood. More studies on locations of aquifers and springs, depth of such aquifers and impact that blasting and construction would have on subsurface conditions need to be performed.</td>
<td>Because of the geology of the Brownsboro Road site and its surrounding region, VA obtained a Karst Feature Survey in August 2012. VA also had groundwater monitored for six continuous months to investigate existing conditions, and in addition to traditional geotechnical borings, the Geotechnical Engineer of Record, AMEC, performed and analyzed nine lines of refraction micro-tremor (ReMi) tests. The ReMi testing results indicate minor karst features in isolated locations, though not of the scale that exists in southwestern Kentucky or Florida where large sinkholes are prevalent. VA's construction contract (to be developed, managed, and enforced by the US Army Corps of Engineers) would require that a Geotechnical Engineer be present during site work to observe conditions and determine whether mitigation is needed should one of those minor karst features be encountered or develop. Continuous monitoring of site work would facilitate real time observation of water and soil behavior that may not be evident during testing. As described in other responses, VA does not anticipate the use of blasting for site work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB: Increases in stormwater and sewer discharges at the site will exacerbate the problems associated with Louisville Metro’s combined sewer system which is currently under a consent decree to achieve compliance under</td>
<td>MSD has indicated that they have capacity to handle the estimated sanitary sewerage flow of 170,500 gallons per day from the facility, as well as a peak flow of 875,000 gallons per day (URS/SmithGroup 2014). MSD has indicated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWA. VA states that Metro Sewer District MSD) has assured it that there is sufficient capacity to deal with the increase in sewage and stormwater at the Brownsboro site, but VA is required to independently assess whether its construction and operation of replacement VAMC at Brownsboro Road would be consistent with the consent decree in place. Placing million square foot facility in residential suburban location with basic sewer and stormwater systems will exacerbate problems and lead to more sewage discharges into the Ohio River and tributaries.</td>
<td>they would reserve capacity for the proposed VAMC project and VA contractors continue to coordinate with the MSD on a regular basis regarding overall project status. This is included in Section 4.14 (Utilities) of the Final EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB: DEIS does not comply with NEPA in analysis of water quality. Commenter references several statements in DEIS related to existing watershed (high percentage impervious because of intense development and site located in upper Muddy Fork of the Beargrass Creek watershed and Metro Sewer District already classified overall pollution impact on watershed as moderate to severe due to poorly performing septic tanks and usage of lawn chemicals. DEIS also notes that north half to center of Brownsboro site are problematic due to collection of stormwater ponds and south half also drains into the Watterson Expressway right of way. Cities contend that more studies need to be conducted on stormwater drainage and the impact that the proposed VAMC would have on water quality of nearby surface waters because of likelihood of increased water pollution from stormwater runoff and discharges from VAMC site.</td>
<td>See related response above regarding capability of MSD to handle estimated sanitary sewerage flow, and other responses above related to VA’s plans related to site construction and operation activities (including geothermal well development, groundwater protection, and stormwater management). VA’s stormwater management measures would focus on managing onsite drainage. Stormwater collection would be provided by a combination of surface and sub-surface detention basins. The 100-year storm events would be addressed in accordance with the MSD Design Manual (MSD 2014b). VA notes that Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act requires federal agencies to reduce stormwater runoff from federal facility development projects to protect water resources. It requires consideration of site hydrology but not hydrology in total. It does not preclude development. Also, as required by Executive Orders (EOs) 13514 and 11988, Federal agency projects are required to include designs for sufficient stormwater management so as to not adversely affect the flood elevations or water quantity/quality in receiving waters. Post-project hydrology shall replicate pre-project hydrology through the appropriate engineering design and implementation of a proposed onsite stormwater management system. As such, no significant adverse water resources impacts are anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no way for site’s hydrology to be restored when VA is digging ten feet, adding fill and drilling 400 foot geothermal wells in property that is undisputed to have significant karstic properties, including extant sinkholes. If 35 acres are expected to be disturbed during construction, the Cities maintain that water quality from stormwater runoff will be impacted beyond what EIS deems “localized and negligible.” This is not good enough if there are significant problems associated with blasting and drilling. VA is not prepared for this scenario under the EIS.</td>
<td>Section 4.4 of the Final EIS addresses concerns associated with blasting activities, which VA does not anticipate being required at the Brownsboro site. They are also discussed in responses to comment in the Geology section of Table E-4 above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>basements.</td>
<td>Potential flooding issues for nearby homes is addressed in response to hydrology comments above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the VA follow current environmental regulations/guidelines or default to the outdated policies/guidelines used for the DEIS?</td>
<td>VA would comply with current federal, state, and local regulatory requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WILDLIFE AND HABITAT**

USFWS: EIS does not address potential indirect effects to northern long-eared bat that could occur due to habitat loss. FWS gives VA an option of utilizing the optional streamlined consultation framework for the northern long-eared bat. This comment applies to both the Brownsboro and St. Joseph site locations.

FWS also recommends an additional survey be conducted at the St. Joseph site for the running buffalo clover since the previous survey data is more than 4 years old.

Section 4.6 of the Final EIS has been revised to identify potential indirect effects on the northern long-eared bat due to habitat loss; and VA’s commitment to conducting additional surveys for the running buffalo clover prior to construction at the St. Joseph Site if it were selected for development.

In addition, VA opted to conduct, and has recently completed, northern long-eared bat (NLEB) 4(d) rule streamlined consultation for both the Brownsboro and St. Joseph sites, as described in Sections 3.6 and 4.6 of the Final EIS. A final 4(d) rule for the species was published on January 14, 2016. While this project may affect the NLEB, FWS has determined that there are no effects beyond those previously disclosed in the U.S. FWS’s programmatic biological opinion for the final 4(d) rule dated January 5, 2016. Any taking that may occur incidental to this project is not prohibited under the final 4(d) rule (50 CFR §17.40(o)). No further consultation is required.

**NOISE**

EPA: Primary source of noise will be from construction rather than operation. Construction noise will be adverse, short-term and potentially moderate in magnitude. Because Brownsboro is smaller site, surrounding community may experience more noise and vibration impacts than at St. Joseph.

EPA appreciates VA’s commitment to providing early information on construction activities and expected noise levels and duration to relevant stakeholders. Should blasting occur, pre-blast surveys will also be conducted for residents that request one within a half mile of the site. In addition, a mechanism for reporting construction related noise concerns should be established considering that the noise levels may approach / exceed the noise abatement criteria and that construction activities such as pile driving and blasting events may occur. FEIS should estimate the total project construction time (months, years) in order to help assess the general need for blasting is not anticipated at the Brownsboro Site and is not yet known for the St. Joseph Site. However, for high noise-level activities that may approach or exceed the noise abatement, VA has described the mitigation measures that would be implemented (see Sections 4.7 and 5.7) and they are consistent with the measures identified in EPA’s comment letter, including the need for VA to establish a mechanism for reporting construction related noise concerns. VA also notes that blasting requirements would be enforced by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers who would oversee construction.

VA has also revised the Final EIS (Chapter 2 and Section 4.7) to further clarify the proposed construction schedule per EPA’s request.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>magnitude and duration of the potential construction noise impact.</td>
<td>VA believes the noise impact analysis and modeling that supports it are NEPA compliant and sufficiently support the decisions made in this EIS. Baseline noise measurements were collected at the alternative sites. It is not possible to use real time site-specific data from construction and operation of the replacement VAMC as these activities have not yet occurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB and FBT: DEIS does not comply with NEPA and its analysis of</td>
<td>Blasting is not anticipated to be necessary at the Brownsboro location, but any blasting that might be conducted would be short term, infrequent, and the increased decibels associated with blasting would only last a few seconds. Nonetheless, the Final EIS recognizes the potential for adverse noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors (e.g., within 2 miles including school children). VA has identified an extensive set of mitigation measures that would be implemented in the event blasting were conducted including advance notification to potentially affected parties. This includes conducting a community outreach effort to local elected officials, businesses, and residents to provide early information and schedules on construction activities and expected noise levels and durations. See Sections 4.7 and 5.7 of the Final EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction noise and blasting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIS does not include any quantitative evaluation of the local noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impacts of the increase in traffic projected from the proposed project (e.g., 10,000 average daily traffic increase). Without quantifying expected traffic noise levels at either proposed location, there can be no useful comparison to current conditions as required under NEPA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding construction blasting, Section 3.7 maps noise sensitive land uses surrounding the alternative sites, but Section 4.7 does not contain any discussion of impacts of increased noise from proposed project on these sensitive receptors. DEIS does not address potentially incompatible noise levels associated with blasting on nearby schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are other deficiencies in EIS’s noise analysis, including, for example, use of outdated methodology and data, reliance on computer-based simulation programs rather than actual measurement on the ground, and failure to take into account the suburban and rural nature of the area, and failure to consider impacts on sensitive areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modeling showed minimal noise increases at the site boundary – and the sensitive receptors are all located beyond site boundary so would not be adversely affected. This has been further clarified in Section 4.7 of the Final EIS.

During operation, noisiest portions of proposed VAMC (e.g., central utility plant, emergency entrance, and service/delivery entrances would all be located on the west side of the facility, closest to the Watterson Expressway and not adjacent to a residential area.

VA acknowledges that the use of Carlimar Lane as a backup emergency entrance, such as by emergency vehicles (e.g., ambulance), may result in loud noises to residents on this street when access cannot be made from the main entrance on Brownsboro Road. Such an event is expected to be very infrequent, however. See related responses to comments regarding use of Carlimar Lane as a backup emergency entrance in Table E-3 (Traffic and Transportation). ######

**LAND USE**
Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another general concern relates to precedent. Do we have plans in the city for zoning, for variances? These are very important issues in our community especially in certain parts of this area over here where people might not want 30 stories in Holiday Manor or Prospect down the center[?]]. So if we do a variance here, what does that precedent lead to?</td>
<td>As stated in Section 3.8.3.1, a hospital is a conditional use that may be allowed by the land development code within any district. The code identifies the intent of a planned development district as described in the comments, but also allows for conditional uses such as hospitals. Although the federal government would not be required to obtain a conditional use permit, as stated in Section 3.8.2, VA concludes that the local requirements do allow for the possibility of this land use at this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBT: Brownsboro Site proposal is inconsistent with planned development zoning designation. DEIS identifies compatibility with existing and future land use designations and zoning design standards as basis to evaluate potential adverse land use impacts. Brownsboro site is currently zoned as planned development district to accommodate a proposed mix use development. Use of site for VAMC is not consistent with objective of planned development district to diversify and integrate new development into existing development. VAMC would represent single-use, non-diversified development that does not align with local land use authority’s plans for site. DEIS states that use that is “inconsistent with current or planned future land uses and community goals for land use” is an adverse land use impact, yet does not identify incompatibility of VAMC with planned development zoning district as an adverse impact.</td>
<td>Conformance with zoning requirements is described as “general” because VA and other federal agencies are not legally required to comply with local zoning at all, as stated in Section 3.8.2. However, VA’s intent is to voluntarily consider local zoning, incorporate specific requirements into design wherever feasible, and coordinate with local government regarding the specific zoning requirements that would ordinarily be applied to development of this parcel. The term characterizes VA’s approach to voluntarily considering local land use requirements in the absence of a specific regulatory requirement. Per Mayor’s comment about the PDD, VA did not consider the requirements of the Midlands PDD standards because, as the Mayor stated, they are specific to a development and therefore not applicable to the proposed VAMC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor of Louisville: Midlands development approved as Planned Development District in Louisville MPC Docket Number 09-015-06. Louisville’s zoning framework contains 2 sets of standards, Zoning Districts that govern use, and Form Districts that govern design and character. PDDs are special zoning districts adopted to govern specific development, and address use, design and character. The Land Development Code addresses the impacts of a PDD in Chapter 2 and states that were conflict, such as those contained in applicable Form District, the PDD standards supersede those standards. It does not appear that the EIS considered the application of the PDD standards approved for the Midlands in evaluating the impact of the proposed Replacement VAMC. Under Midlands Plan, the site would be fully developed but the majority of development would have consisted of buildings that were generally of the same character and scale as adjacent single family homes, with higher intensity, taller commercial buildings tucked in the northwest corner of the site nearest I-264. It is difficult to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| conclude that construction of development of scale of VAMC was         | VA understands and appreciates the public’s concerns associated with the proposed replacement VAMC not conforming to local planning and zoning ordinances and regulations. VA’s approach has been to voluntarily consider local land use requirements, to the extent possible, and VA has analyzed all areas required by NEPA. However, the fact remains that VA, as a government entity, is not subject to these requirements. The Louisville Metro Planning and Design Services Office also recognized this situation and granted a waiver to the VA in April 2012. This has been further explained in Section 4.8 of the Final EIS. Specifically, the Amendment to Certificate of Land Use Restriction made as of 23 April 2012, documents VA’s contact with the Louisville Metro Planning and Design Services office and documents that the “Binding Elements and approved development plan in Docket No. 9-15-06 do not apply to the use of the Subject Property by the Federal Government, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, including the Department of Veterans Affairs for any governmental purpose, including a VA hospital/medical center, for and during the time the Subject Property is used for a governmental purpose”.
| anticipated by the community following the approval granted in the     |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Midlands case. The two projects are substantially different in size,  |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| scope and scale.                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| SB: DEIS does not comply with NEPA when it fails to rigorously explore |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| the VA’s compliance with the Federal Property & Administrative Services |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Act, and fails to conform to local planning and zoning ordinances and    |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| regulations.                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| According to the Act, VA must contact the local land use officer and    |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| consider public comments. No indication that VA did this. Project also  |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| inconsistent with Louisville Comprehensive Plan. Height of buildings is |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| greater than that allowed by Comprehensive Plan.                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Rest of comment same as FBT comment relating to criteria and FBT and    |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Mayor’s comment about PDD violation                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| As far as setbacks go on the property, they’re talking about 100 feet   |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| from end where office building is, I think. They’re talking about 200   |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| feet of setback from City of Crossgate - 200 feet doesn’t help when    |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| you’re building                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| As described in Chapter 2 of the EIS, the VAMC campus would consist of   |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| a four-story east bar and a five story west bar, with the west bar being closest to the freeway and away from the residential neighborhood. The north deck parking |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a hospital 10-12 stories high - looming over 2 story and 1 story houses. Keep that in mind. They drawings are very misleading. FBT: DEIS fails to adequately address the adverse effect on adjacent residences from building heights that would significantly exceed zoning requirements. Section 4.8 acknowledges building the VAMC at either Brownsboro or St. Joseph site would violate the height limitations of applicable zoning form districts. For Brownsboro Site, the west bar would exceed maximum building height by 42 feet (33% exceedance). The south parking deck, which would extend well into the “transition zone” between the town center form district and the adjacent neighborhood form district, would exceed the height limit by almost half. These significant exceedances will cause considerable harm for neighboring residents. Proposed development would violate the required transition from town center development to neighborhood development, which was intended to protect residences from this type of harm. DEIS does not provide any meaningful evaluation or consideration of this adverse impact. St. Joseph alternative would also cause significant harm to neighboring residents, where proposed VAMC would exceed maximum allowable building height by more than a factor of four.</td>
<td>garage, closest to Brownsboro Road and the freeway, would be 9 levels and the south deck, closer to the residential areas, would be 6 levels. VA has included numerous features in the building and landscape design to give the replacement VAMC a clean, simple, calming and dignified appearance. However, VA also acknowledges that the proposed building heights do significantly exceed the applicable zoning form districts, and that development of this parcel into a multi-level hospital and parking garages would be a significantly adverse visual change to the local residents from its current appearance. Section 4.2 of the Final EIS has been revised to more clearly identify the potential for adverse visual impacts; this applies to both the Brownsboro and St. Joseph site alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBT: DEIS contains no evaluation of how the alternatives perform against the VA’s own land use criteria. Section 3.8.1.1 of DEIS identifies set of 4 principles developed by VA to achieve a balanced consideration and evaluation of land use, the built environment, cost, security, mission need, and competition on facility location decisionmaking (p.99). But remainder of DEIS ignores these criteria and provides no evaluation or comparison of how the alternatives perform against these metrics.</td>
<td>The alternatives evaluated under the EIS were identified through a rigorous and lengthy process that began prior to VA’s formal implementation of the Sustainable Locations Program. Nonetheless, VA’s process, which considered both developed and undeveloped sites as detailed in Section 2.1, resulted in the identification of alternatives that are consistent with the requirement of the Sustainable Locations Program to balance considerations with respect to land use, built environment, cost, security, mission need, etc. For example, both action alternatives, though differently situated, are potentially pedestrian-friendly, have the potential to accommodate multiple modes of transport, including walking, biking, public transit, etc., and are both adjacent to or near existing employment centers and/or suburban town centers. Each would maximize use of available public infrastructure including sewer, water, public transit, etc. to the extent practical. While it is true that the alternatives do not avoid development of green space, this negative aspect is balanced by the impact of cost and time to delivery which are significant mission considerations. Thus,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBT and SB: The evaluation criteria in Section 4.8.1 bear no similarity to those identified in Chapter 3. If VA had considered its own criteria it would become apparent that the preferred alternative satisfies none of the criteria. All of VA’s land use criteria point to a Downtown alternative, which VA dismissed prematurely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBT: DEIS improperly marginalizes impacts of the relocation alternatives by assuming speculative future development in the “no build” condition. DEIS prevents meaningful evaluation by failing to consider the true “no build” baseline. NEPA requires agencies to consider full environmental consequences of action by comparing effect of proposed action under different alternatives including the no action of no build alternative. [Compares “no build” to “no action” alternative – is it really?] If a federal agency such as the VA is to develop a site, NEPA requires that agency consider the full range of effects of that development on the previously undeveloped site [including no development]. VA acknowledges the impact of altering the character and use of vacant site to full development use would be major, but it then attempts to disclaim any responsibility for these major impacts by pointing to private mixed-use development previously proposed for site. First, land use and other impacts of proposed VAMC not same to those for mixed use development previously proposed for site. More importantly, VA required to evaluate and consider impacts of proposal against baseline of current site conditions. [think this is true since VA owns the site]. VA’s more limited discussion of land use impacts of ST. Joseph site suffers from same infirmity. VA’s failure to account for impacts of its own development is significant because it has biased VA’s decision-making toward selecting Greenfield site and discounting relative merits of redevelopment site downtown or another previously developed site.</td>
<td>The commenter makes a good point and the individual resource impact discussions in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS, including land use, have been revised to compare potential impacts form the proposed replacement VAMC to a no build/no development scenario at the Brownsboro location, as well as a mixed use development scenario. This allows for a comparison of impacts for both action alternatives, to existing greenfield conditions at both the Brownsboro and St. Joseph sites (assuming no development out to 2025).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FLOODPLAINS AND WETLANDS

Comments related to floodplains relate mostly to general flooding concerns associated with stormwater runoff and are addressed in the Hydrology section of Table E-4 above.

SOCIOECONOMICS

FBT: The socioeconomic analysis was performed at too high a level to permit any meaningful consideration of the effects of the proposal on local areas. Analysis in Section 4.10 conducted at level of Louisville MSA (8...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>counties in KY and 4 counties in southern IN). But not accounting for differences in socioeconomic conditions of specific areas within the MSA that could be impacted by the project in different ways, the DEIS fails to provide meaningful analysis of true socioeconomic impacts of proposal and alternatives considered in the DEIS. Nor does it allow for consideration of the potential socioeconomic benefits and drawbacks of locations that the VA dismissed prematurely. Different alternative locations may have adverse environmental and socioeconomic effects on different areas, and evaluating socioeconomics at the MSA level forecloses any meaningful evaluation of those differences within the region. The inevitable results of VA approach are that all alternatives will “look” the same, even if they are very different when viewed on a more local level.</td>
<td>are addressed at a regional, state, county and city level. Construction workers, for example, may commute from the site from outside Jefferson County; and the VA Louisville service area services Veterans that live within a 35-county area. That said, VA does recognize that some impacts are felt more locally and has expanded the description of the existing socioeconomic environment in Section 3.10 to identify the local population with a 3-mile radius of each alternative site, and median home values (owner occupied units) for neighborhoods surrounding each site location. It is beyond the scope of the EIS to address potential impacts (adverse and beneficial) from other alternative locations not considered in the EIS. The location of future VAMCs are determined based on regional needs and project-specific screening. VA undertook a sequential planning and screening process, seeking reasonable alternatives for the Proposed Action, as detailed in Section 2.1 in the EIS and explained in responses to comments relating to alternative site locations (Table E-2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBT: DEIS fails to address the proposal’s potential effects on property values in the surrounding areas. DEIS devotes only two sentences to potential impacts on property values. This meager discussion simply asserts, without support, that property values in the surrounding areas “are expected to remain essentially unaffected” by the operation of the VAMC at either location. This represents a failure to provide information and adequately evaluate the effects as NEPA requires.</td>
<td>Various factors can impact housing values and no study can guarantee there will be no fluctuation in local housing markets. VA seeks to avoid adversely impacting property values over time by being a good neighbor. VA’s proposed facility would have numerous positive attributes that would benefit its neighbors. Among those are a well-maintained, manicured, serene landscape intended to provide a healing environment; a full time police force with security monitoring and access control systems that would likely discourage crime in and around the area; a large building façade that would shield the adjacent neighborhood both from highway noise from the adjacent expressway and from occasional emergency vehicles which are routed to the side furthest from the neighborhoods; outpatient services that normally conclude by 6 PM providing a quieter environment than the adjacent commercial business district; etc. Other potential positive impacts can include potential demand from a cadre of relatively well-paid professionals, many of who, may desire to live near their work; increased utilization of local commercial businesses by patients, staff, and visitors which would likely increase local sales and sales tax revenue while attracting businesses and creating jobs, thus increasing demand for local housing, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB: DEIS does not comply with NEPA when it fails to rigorously explore the diminution of fair market values of neighboring properties. Home values of Crossgate, Northfield and Brownsboro Farm have already decreased since announcement of VA hospital’s location at Midlands site. DEIS states that there will be a positive economic impact resulting from construction of VAMC But it does not address diminution in property values in surrounding area. Under NEPA, VA should at least address diminution in fair market value of residential homes in the area pursuant to 40 CFR 1502.22.</td>
<td>Based on the above rationale, the Final EIS concludes (Section 4.10.3.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>concludes that property values are likely to remain unaffected and cites</td>
<td>supports references. However, the EIS also recognizes that some property values could decrease, especially in the immediately adjacent neighborhoods, how much of a decrease is too speculative to predict. Section 3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supporting references. However, the EIS also recognizes that some property values could decrease, especially in the immediately adjacent neighborhoods, how much of a decrease is too speculative to predict. Section 3.10 includes estimated home values in 2015 based on Census data to provide a general reference point.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development benefits for Brownsboro Site have not been</td>
<td>Concerns relating to property values on local neighborhoods have been addressed in Section 4.10 of the Final EIS and in the response above. Economic development benefits would be felt county wide and potentially farther, related primarily to new jobs for construction workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicated in any forum I’ve seen; in fact many neighboring property owners contend VA traffic will lessen their property values. The economic benefit in downtown location would be great. The long blighted East Broadway Corridor could be revitalized with new restaurants and services. There would be reinvestment in the surrounding neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know what city hasn’t shown leadership and provided an economic impact statement because when we talked about other sites (west of Ninth, Broadway and 18th, closer to county line), we could have a huge, positive economic impact for our community with massive infusion of federal infrastructure dollars. This is a great project that can have huge, positive ripple effect as opposed to driving down property values over here - which then reduces our - our tax base.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are we going to spend public money to develop an area that doesn’t need help; and then have to spend more public money to develop area that does need help - downtown and west of downtown, particularly west of Ninth Street. I’d like to see some jobs and spending take place down there.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Section 4.11.2.2 p. 210). Additional information is needed to explain the “increase in VA employees” totals as reported. Are these the numbers related to the current hospital site? Since there are varying reports on the number of beds for the hospital, how many inpatient beds are there at the current location and how many beds will be at the Brownsboro Site? [123 at current, I think, and 104 at proposed] Are the numbers reflected inclusive of all VA employees who will move to the Brownsboro Site? How many employees does the VA project to add once construction is completed and operations begin?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As stated in Section 4.10.3.2, the proposed facility would employ essentially the same number of employees as employed by the existing Robley Rex VAMC on Zorn Avenue and the three community-based outpatient clinics (CBOCs) that are located in the Louisville Metro area. The number of fiscal year (FY) 2015 full-time employee equivalents (FTEEs) was 1,763. An additional 400 FTEEs would be employed by the VBA. These numbers are associated with projections based on projected VAMC and VBA workload. The number of beds would be reduced from 123 at current facility to 104 beds at the replacement VAMC. This is based on VAMC workload projections that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the VA own or lease the site where the Regional Benefits Office is located? Does the VA own or lease the sites where the satellite clinics are currently located? How were additional staffing projections for the Benefits Office and satellite factored into traffic projections? [this may be traffic question]</td>
<td>include a decrease in inpatient (bed) demand and increased outpatient (clinic) demand. This has been clarified in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS. The increased outpatient clinical services are expected to more than offset reductions in staff from fewer beds. VA currently leases the sites where the Regional Benefits Office and the satellite clinics are currently located. This project would consolidate the benefits and clinical services and eliminate the leasing costs for the VBA and the CBOCs that would be consolidated into the new VAMC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB: Basic data statements in regarding employee data traffic in EIS are unclear. VA projects increase of FTEs from 1,763 (2015) to 2,106 (2022), based on projected demand for health care services and not because or proposed replacement facility. The Cities request more information on how VA calculated the projected number of FTEs at the VAMC in 2022 and how these projections are factored into the traffic projections.</td>
<td>VA’s estimated increase in FTEs by 2022 is associated with projections based on projected workload. VA is the leading expert in Veteran care and uses robust models to project workload demands and associated staffing requirements. VA notes that the number of VBA employees has also been added to the VAMC employee discussion in Section 4.10.3.2. Regarding the traffic impacts study, the estimate of daily traffic (vehicle trips) associated with the proposed VAMC is based on total square footage as used in ITE trip generation, and included both VAMC and VBA spaces. Data are not based on number of existing and projected VAMC/VBA employees as evaluated in the socioeconomic impact analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that houses in the area will be impacted by blasting. What will happen? What about impacts on property values? That impacts all of Louisville if our taxes become less? VA is not providing feedback.</td>
<td>As stated in section 4.4.2.1 of the EIS VA anticipates any bedrock encountered in confined areas to be removed using ripping tools and pneumatic hammers and would not require blasting. During construction, a geotechnical engineer would be on site to observe excavation and rock removal and determine treatment methods to minimize the potential for karstic activity. If blasting were determined necessary, the construction contractor would be required to limit ground vibrations, or peak particle velocity (PPV), to under 2.0 inches per second and to adhere to Kentucky Revised Statute 351.330 in order to avoid damage to nearby buildings and houses. If blasting is determined necessary, the construction contractor would comply with applicable federal and state laws for blasting and safety, provide advanced notification, and if determined necessary, provide an opportunity for immediately adjacent property owners to request pre-blast survey/inspection of structures. These requirements would be enforced by the US Army Corps of Engineers who would oversee construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities are limited near Brownsboro Site. Downtown, Veterans would be close to the many medical specialists and social services (Healing Place, Volunteers of America). Their visitors would be close to hotels and restaurants of all price ranges, plus easy access to churches, sporting events, theaters, museums and the Riverfront Park.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comment. VA acknowledges that amenities are more limited at the Brownsboro Site compared to a downtown location. However, a downtown location is not suitable for reasons explained in response to comments on alternative site locations. The discussion for eliminating the downtown location from further consideration has been expanded in Section 2.3 of the Final EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB: DEIS does not comply with NEPA in its analysis when it fails to acknowledge costs and resources required for fire protection. Other than general description of Lyndon Fire Protection District (p. 121), DEIS fails to evaluate added costs and resources of construction and operation of VAMC at Midlands site on Lyndon Fire District. On May 17, 2013, Mayor of Crossgate submitted comments to VA regarding fire protection among others. This was in direct response to letter from Russ Rakestraw Chef of Lyndon Fire Protection District to Senator McConnell (12/14/11) where Chief states “building a government complex that pays no property tax on a prime piece of commercial property would deprive our district of critically needed revenue. Additionally, such a facility would increase our workload due to fire alarm incidents, and possibly emergency medical responses.” Thereafter, Mayor of Crossgate received a letter from Chief Rakestraw and Lyndon Fire Protection District, which services the City of Crossgate, informing Mayor and others that due to budget constraints, the fire department needed to reduce its staff, resulting in an 11% decrease in suppression staff, which would “directly result in an increased loss of life and more significant fire damage resulting in higher amounts of property loss.” Reduced staff will also cause longer wait time for emergency medical service. DEIS fails to consider these fire protection restraints and comments from Mayor of Crossgate, including ability of fire protection districts to offer services to VAMC at Midland site...Failure to rigorously explore this issue is arbitrary and violation of NEPA and its implementing regulations.</td>
<td>The new VAMC buildings would have state-of-the-art fire prevention and protection equipment, such as detection and sprinkler systems. Routine monitoring and maintenance of equipment by VA staff and supplier contracts would continue to prevent the inadvertent tripping of alarms. It is anticipated that the current rate of two to three fire service responses per year (see Section 3.11.2.3) would not increase and could decrease due to newer facilities and equipment. While this would have only a minor effect on Lyndon Fire in terms of number of annual responses, VA acknowledges that it may require additional planning and training to effectively respond to emergencies at the new facility. Response by Lyndon Fire to the new VAMC for a structural fire, hazardous material incident, or technical rescue would be a cost recoverable service according to Lyndon Fire’s operational policies, and would not have an adverse effect on their budget capacity to provide these services. However, as the proposed replacement Louisville VAMC would be a federal facility constructed on federal property, all acknowledge that no property tax revenue would be generated by the Hospital to support the fire department. Based on recent discussions with the Lyndon Fire Protection District, they would be interested in any opportunity to receive compensation for services in the future; but do not oppose the construction of the facility at the Brownsboro Rd site. The Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) for all VA projects is ultimately the Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Operations and Management, with the Safety and Fire Protection Engineer acting as the VA Fire Marshal. However, the Lyndon Fire Protection District is committed to partnering with the Project Delivery Team to provide comments during design to ensure that the facility would be constructed to be compatible with local firefighting practices; and with the Louisville Metro's Suburban Services ability to respond effectively during an emergency. Current staffing levels are above previous years and the Fire District is part of Metro Louisville's Suburban Fire Services and they participate in a mutual aid agreement/process. In any incident necessitating response, Louisville Metro Safe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Communication Center would be the central receiving point for emergency service requests for fire, hazardous substance, medical, injury, and rescue intervention from the public and other agencies within the suburban services area. Dispatchers prioritize incidents for response based on severity and life-hazard; and would dispatch the closest service with the best applicable equipment (and availability) to respond to the incident. This process, along with the experience and professionalism of Lyndon Fire Protection District and the other Fire Protection Districts that make up the Suburban Services, ensure that the new VAMC, its patients, staff and visitors would receive timely services and be protected against loss of life and property damage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

EPA: DEIS uses a 10% threshold as meaningful greater criterion. EPA is concerned regarding how the criterion was applied and recommends using a mathematical calculation method for the meaningful greater criterion to yield consistent benchmarks that will be 10% higher than the reference population regardless of what the initial percent population value is. For example, under EPA’s recommended method, a meaningful change for a minority population of 17% would be 10% above that percentage, or 1.7 percentage points added to 16% (or 17.6%).

VA appreciates EPA recommended calculation method but believes that a percentage increase of only one or two percentage points above a reference population does not constitute a “meaningful greater” percentage. Rather, VA believes that a full 10 percentage point increase above the reference population, as described in Sections 3.15 and 4.15 of the Final EIS, is a reasonable estimate for determining “meaningful greater.” For reference, VA notes that the other criterion used to measure meaningful greater in EPA and CEQ guidance is a percentage of more than 50% minority and low income populations. In addition, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which has issued very detailed guidance on analyzing environmental justice impacts resulting from the construction and operation of new nuclear power plants, uses a 20 percentage point increase as the basis for determining a disproportionate share of impacts. VA considers its more conservative 10% increase is reasonable and has not changed the criterion. The Final EIS has been revised to clarify how the percentage was applied. The environmental justice analysis has also been expanded to identify whether a disproportionate percentage of minority and low income populations are found within the immediate project vicinity (e.g., 3 mile radius) using EPA’s EJSCREEN mapping tool.

FBT: The analysis of disproportionately adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations in the DEIS was performed at too broad a geographic scale to allow any meaningful evaluation of environmental justice impacts of the proposal. DEIS limited analysis to a county-wide level. As a result, the DEIS concluded that the only environmental justice communities in the Louisville VAMC service area were Butler and Carroll counties in

VA agrees that the EIS needs to include an analysis of potential minority and low income populations located closer to the alternative sites to determine whether a disproportionate percentage would be affected. VA has expanded the environmental justice discussions in the Final EIS to include minority and low-income populations living in the immediate site areas (see revised Sections 3.15 and 4.15 of the Final EIS). This has also been addressed in the group response to
Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky. However, there are significant pockets of minority and low income communities in Jefferson County as well as the other Kentucky and Indiana counties where employees and Veterans receiving care reside. If the environmental justice analysis had been done at the Census block level, or at least the zip code level, these communities could have been identified and the impacts on these communities have been evaluated. Thus the DEIS did not address the impact of locating all Veteran care in an area of high socioeconomic status, which has limited accessibility to Veterans in other parts of the service areas.</td>
<td>comments in Section E.4.6 of Appendix E. The overall impact findings have not changed, however. No adverse environmental (including health) effects from the proposed VAMC would be disproportionately borne by any minority or low-income communities. In response to concerns that the EIS did not address the impact of locating all Veteran care in an area with limited accessibility to Veterans in other parts of the service area, VA notes that increased travel distance to reach a proposed new facility location is not considered an environmental justice issue. As clarified in Section 4.15 of the Final EIS, environmental justice concerns addressed in a NEPA document typically relate to potential sources of exposure to environmental pollutants (air and water emissions from proposed project) such as nearby hazardous waste sites (e.g., waste and hazardous chemical facilities, hazardous waste treatment, storage and disposal facilities, risk management plan facilities, and other industrial facilities). Executive Order 12898 does not suggest that an agency should locate proposed projects in areas to benefit minority or low-income populations. While some Veterans who live in minority or low-income areas in the western end of Louisville may have farther to travel to receive health care services, the proposed new location at Brownsboro is within the VA travel guidelines. VA would work with local public transit authorities to increase the number of available bus routes if staff and patient demand warrants it. It is also important to remember the purpose for the replacement VAMC, which is to provide better quality health care services in a new state-of-the-art facility for Veteran. VA thanks the Mayor of Louisville who referenced EPA’s EJSCREEN tool in his comment and which VA used to expand on the environmental justice analysis for the alternative locations in the Final EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor of Louisville: EIS ruled out potential for an EJ impact on minority population because no county in its service area has a minority population of greater than 50%. The EIS additionally ruled out impacts to low income individual because, with the exception of one county, do not exceed 10% of the state or regional average. No other consideration of project-related impact to low income individuals and minorities was made. The US EPA’s EJ Screen tool can be used to examine many facets of EJ, including demographics, environmental factors and EJ factors such as proximity to traffic, and could have been used to gain a more comprehensive understanding of this issue. We recommend applying this tool and adding the results of this analysis to the EIS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strobo: VA’s conclusion that this project will have no environmental justice impacts is alarming, demonstrating a lack of awareness of impacts of this project on lower income and minority communities, which includes veterans, and on the overall community and on the overall community and environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA failed to comply with EO 12898 that requires VA “to the greatest extent practicable” to make “achieving environmental justice part of its mission.” This requires agencies to analyze the human health, economic and social effects of their actions, including effects on minority and low income communities, when this analysis is required under NEPA….Failure to consider sites in the urban core and the west end - predominantly lower income and minority communities and where the majority of veterans live….the VA has failed to comply with EO 12898 and its implementing guidance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBT: The environmental justice analysis did not evaluate the proposal’s impacts on veterans, a community whose needs are of particular concern for this project. CEQ guidance on evaluating environmental justice impacts explains that in identifying low-income or minority communities, “agencies may consider as a community either a group of individuals living in geographic proximity to one another, or a geographically dispersed/transient set of individuals (e.g., migrant workers, Native Americans), where either type of group experiences common conditions of environmental exposure or effect.” Veterans are precisely the type of geographically dispersed community who experience common conditions from a project of this nature, which is what the environmental justice provisions for NEPA documents were designed to address. The DEIs provides no demographic or geographic information concerning Veterans who will be served by the relocated VAMC. This information is critical to allow for an analysis of how potential relocation sites for the VAMC would impact the very community the facility is designed to serve. This is particularly the case for Veterans who are members of low-income or minority communities, which the DEIS fails to address.</td>
<td>VA thanks the KY DEP for its comment relating to solid waste and hazardous materials. All of the information contained in the comment is included in the Final EIS (Section 4.12). All vehicles transporting solid and hazardous waste would use the Brownsboro entrance as the primary point of entry and egress. Carlimar Lane, a small residential street at the south side of the property, would not be used as a point of entry or egress during construction except in the event of an unexpected disruption of the Brownsboro entrance. If the main entry/egress is inaccessible, VA would require its construction contractor to assist residents and city officials in close proximity to the site (and the Crossgate and Graymoor-Devondale communities in particular) with proper directing of traffic to and from the site; this would include the use of appropriate temporary signage, and onsite construction supervisors who would provide instruction and pre-job briefings to employees and drivers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KY DEP: All solid waste generated by this project must be disposed at a permitted facility. If underground storage tanks are encountered, they must be properly addressed. If asbestos, lead paint, and/or other contaminants are encountered during this project, they must be properly addressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB: Solid waste generation and disposal are a significant concern to the Cities’ residents. It is not clear from DEIS what routes will be used to transport solid waste and hazardous materials away from the facility. Residents are concerned that Graymoor-Devondale streets including Carlimar, Bedford, and Herr could be designated as routes for ingress and egress of hazardous waste. Due to traffic and safety concerns regarding use of trucks on narrow streets of neighborhoods, residents are apprehensive about not only traffic impact from construction vehicles, employees, contractors and disposal services, but also about the health impacts on public from exposure to hazardous materials. Cities request that VA not use secondary exit through Graymoor-Devondale for transport of any hazardous</td>
<td>VA thanks the KY DEP for its comment relating to solid waste and hazardous materials. All of the information contained in the comment is included in the Final EIS (Section 4.12). All vehicles transporting solid and hazardous waste would use the Brownsboro entrance as the primary point of entry and egress. Carlimar Lane, a small residential street at the south side of the property, would not be used as a point of entry or egress during construction except in the event of an unexpected disruption of the Brownsboro entrance. If the main entry/egress is inaccessible, VA would require its construction contractor to assist residents and city officials in close proximity to the site (and the Crossgate and Graymoor-Devondale communities in particular) with proper directing of traffic to and from the site; this would include the use of appropriate temporary signage, and onsite construction supervisors who would provide instruction and pre-job briefings to employees and drivers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>or solid waste.</td>
<td>Section 4.12 has been revised to clarify this information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid and Hazardous Waste (Section 4.12.2.2 p. 213. Graymoor-Devondale streets were built to support residential traffic needs only and will not support the weight of vehicles removing any types of waste from the site or any increase in traffic. Any construction vehicle, employee, regulatory or contractor as a means to enter or exit the site should NOT use Carlimar Lane. Instead, VA should establish a Construction Entrance/Exit with immediate access to the expressway prior to starting any construction activity at the site. Under no circumstances should VA allow travel through residential streets by their construction vendors, contractors, employees or regulators.</td>
<td>Once operation of the proposed new hospital began, hazardous waste would be removed by truck on a schedule based on amount generated similar to current operations on Zorn Avenue. Trucks would use the main Brownsboro entrance except in the event of an unexpected disruption to that entrance, in which case scheduled removals may be rescheduled if there is sufficient advance notice, or directed to the Carlimar Lane gate in the event of an emergency. As described in section 2.2.2.2, during normal operation, the Carlimar Lane gate would be locked and accessible only when emergency vehicles could not access the main entrance on Brownsboro Road (such as in the case of traffic accident or other road blockage). During construction, if the main entry were inaccessible, VA would require its construction contractor to coordinate with the local communities to assist residents and city officials with proper directing of traffic through the use of appropriate temporary signage, and onsite construction supervisors who would provide instruction and pre-job briefings to employees and drivers. See also related response above and revised Section 4.12 of the Final EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How and when will hazardous waste be removed from the site during construction and ongoing operations?</td>
<td>How and when will hazardous waste be removed from the site during construction and ongoing operations? See also related response above and revised Section 4.12 of the Final EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will VA assist residents and Graymoor-Devondale city officials with directing traffic trying to access the site during construction and ongoing operation away from residential streets?</td>
<td>During construction, if the main entry were inaccessible, VA would require its construction contractor to coordinate with the local communities to assist residents and city officials with proper directing of traffic through the use of appropriate temporary signage, and onsite construction supervisors who would provide instruction and pre-job briefings to employees and drivers. See also related response above related to waste transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid and Hazardous Waste (Section 4.12.2.2 p. 213. What route will vehicle and pedestrians use to transport construction and hazardous waste away from the construction site? What actions will VA take to ensure that during construction and operations to ensure vendors, employees, contractors and regulators do NOT access the Brownsboro Site by parking on residential streets?</td>
<td>As described in revised Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, after exiting the site to the north, the waste shipments would likely immediately access the interstate for delivery to the ultimate disposal/transfer location. See also related response above related to waste transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES SB: Concern over issues with MSD and sewers. VA Brownsboro will necessarily impact Louisville’s compliance with the consent decree. Even though significant amounts of sewer waste would be stored onsite, there will</td>
<td>As stated in Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, MSD has indicated that they have capacity to handle the estimated sanitary sewerage flow of 170,500 gallons per day from the facility, as well as a peak flow of 875,000 gallons per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix E: Comment Responses
### Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>still be impacts on wastewater and sewer loads during peak stormwater events.</td>
<td>(URS/SmithGroup 2014). MSD has indicated they would reserve capacity for the proposed VAMC project and VA contractors continue to coordinate with the MSD on a regular basis regarding overall project status. Therefore, VA foresees no issue with any consent decree. Further, VA’s design would separate sewerage from stormwater and would not impact sewerage flows during storm events; stormwater would be separated and directed to retention basins that would discharge to the ditch along the expressway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an email from Jim Holderman (representative of LG&amp;E/KU, Mr. Holderman stated that the Midlands site “provides the greatest challenge [among alternatives] to serve a level of 8 MVA” and that the LG&amp;E/KU “currently [does] not have the capacity available at the site.” “LG&amp;E/KU would have to acquire “additional [right-of-way], which would be difficult to obtain, and it would be the most expensive option. Additionally, we do not have means to provide a backup feed.” [Taken from December 22, 2010 email]. DEIS failed to take these utility and end electricity service difficulties into consideration, and failed to rigorously evaluate other alternatives in light of this information.</td>
<td>VA has budgeted for and anticipates funding certain design and construction costs for connecting or extending utilities up front, in accordance with accepted and customary industry practice and within the limitations of the governing utility contracts. While LG&amp;E would treat VA like any other potential electrical customer and extend service to the site mostly at their cost, in anticipation of recouping this investment through sale of electricity to VA, LG&amp;E has indicated it expects VA to pay some costs up front that would be rebated as electricity was consumed. Such costs include VA paying up to 25 percent of the cost of design and construction of an electrical substation which would serve as VA’s primary electrical source. It is worth noting that because the substation would serve more than just VA, LG&amp;E would not expect VA to pay the full cost and the additional increase in capacity/reliability would potentially be a beneficial impact to the surrounding area. LG&amp;E has also indicated it can meet VA’s requirement for a redundant, separate feed by extending feeders from an existing substation, though VA would be expected to pay 100% of the cost for these redundant feeders. While no agreements have been finalized at this point, and won’t be until VA completes the NEPA process and funding is appropriated for construction, VA does anticipate paying these up-front costs. Further, VA does anticipate that some of these costs would be rebated over time as utilities are consumed and the service provider recoups these capital investments through normal sale of utilities to VA. VA has no information to suggest that LG&amp;E or any other service provider would increase their rates to subsidize extending services to VA and VA is budgeting for and would pay the standard and customary charges necessary to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor of Louisville: EIS states that local utility provide LG&amp;E has committed to extending an additional service feed to the Preferred Site should the replacement VAMC move forward, and that LG&amp;E will fund the cost of extending this infrastructure. There is some concern, which may prove to be de minimis, that this means LG&amp;E will pass these costs along to its ratepayers. Given Louisville Metro Government’s recent intervention in a lawsuit related to LG&amp;E’s request for a rate increase, we would like to see more details about how extending additional service to the Preferred Sit will actually be funded so that we could better evaluate the potential impact to the city’s ratepayers, and particularly to low income customers, to ensure that an undue financial burden will not be created for these individuals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Don’t know if all additional costs were included for the hospital (obviously close to a billion), but there are infrastructure costs (electrical, sewage, etc.); I’m not sure how many of those costs are included in this or whether they’re expected to be borne by taxpayers in KY, Jefferson county and Louisville. | }
Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient utilities do not currently existing to serve the hospital. There is not enough electrical capacity or sewer line to easily tap into. Major new electric substation will need to be built and a long connection to a major sewer line, both likely to cause massive disruption of residential neighborhoods and many local businesses.</td>
<td>The potential impacts on utilities are fully described in Section 4.14 of the Final EIS (Utilities). The St. Joseph site does not currently have any utility connections. Connections to the existing water and sewer lines are found nearby at the Brownsboro Site. As stated in the EIS, the sanitary sewer connection would be at an existing manhole at the southwest corner of the site and no new trunkline in the Carlimar Lane right of way is required. The need for a new electric substation has also been described in Chapter 2 of the EIS and acknowledged in Section 4.14. LG&amp;E has made no firm commitment as to where they would build the new substation or which existing substation they would extend feeders from. While no site specific impacts from the substations can be analyzed in the EIS, Chapter 4 of the Final EIS has been revised to include a generic discussion of the types of impacts that are typically associated with substation construction and operation (i.e., relating to aesthetics, land use, and noise).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a cost/benefit analysis and/or feasibility study been performed at Brownsboro Site for proposed use of geothermal energy? If so, who performed the studies and what were the results? What is the long-term environmental impact of using geothermal energy at the Brownsboro Site?</td>
<td>If geothermal systems are retained in the final design, it would be because the use of geothermal systems would be expected to help reduce fuel consumption by the replacement VAMC and help reduce the GHG emissions from the Site. While VA has done preliminary geotechnical investigation of the site to satisfy NEPA to suggest that geothermal applications could potentially be implemented and would have no adverse impact to hydrology, soils, air, etc., more detailed study to determine whether to actually implement the technology in the final design would be performed during design. Such studies, which are beyond the scope of a NEPA analysis, would include, for example, cost/benefit analyses, thermal conductivity testing, detailed load calculations, etc. Geothermal technology is a proven and environmentally sound application that has documented environmental benefits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

FBT: Cursory analysis of cumulative impacts in the DEIS is too generic and limited to satisfy the requirement to evaluate incremental impact of the proposal when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Cumulative impacts analysis provides insufficient analysis of effects of proposal in context of other actions that also affect the same resources. The analysis only addresses two of the 15 categories of... | As described in other responses in Table E-4 and in Section E.4.6 of Appendix E, VA has revised the impact analysis in Chapter 4, for all resource areas, to include a comparison of impacts with a no build/development scenario at the Brownsboro location. The discussion of air quality impacts in Section 4.2 also now recognizes the potential for potential health effects from increased vehicular emissions in the area, particularly given both alternative locations are near... |
Table E-4: Detailed Comments and Responses Related to Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>environmental resources (land use and transportation/traffic). Asserts other impacts would be similar to current VA health care services or other new private and commercial developments that may occur to or near the alternative sites.” Even if the statement true, NEPA requires agencies to disclose what those impacts are, and how they fit into larger context of affected community. And for land use and transportation, DEIS sidesteps any meaningful evaluation of cumulative impacts based on same flawed, inappropriate assumption that development of sites at issue would occur under any circumstances so the impacts of VA’s actions need not be evaluated in detail. Limited analysis does not satisfy agency’s burden under NEPA.</td>
<td>existing highways that experience heavy volumes of traffic during certain times of day. The biggest impact area of concern for the proposed project is traffic, as identified by the public and because it has the potential for significant impact. In addition, the majority of cumulative actions identified for the area in Section 3.16 are also the types of projects that could further exacerbate traffic conditions (e.g., planned developments and highway projects). Therefore, it is reasonable for the discussion of cumulative impact to focus on this resource area, and other areas for which there is the potential for unavoidable adverse impact (e.g. land use). As indicated in the cumulative impact discussion (Section 4.16 of the Final EIS), the traffic impact study conducted for both alternative locations already assumes future growth in the areas (out to 2025). In addition, the KYTC included future roadway projects and projected growth and development, including the proposed Brownsboro Site VAMC campus and Providence Point’s planned nearby residential and mixed use development, in their traffic forecast model in selecting the SPUI design for the US 42 interchange improvement project. The foreseeable actions having a cumulative impact on transportation include KYTC’s build and no build scenarios for the US 42 interchange. Therefore, the potential cumulative impacts were accounted for in the analysis of transportation impacts for the operational phase of Alternative A. Regarding the St. Joseph site, where traffic is also a primary concern, VA has expanded the cumulative impact discussion to include a qualitative analysis of the cumulative impacts from the proposed VAMC in combination with the planned residential development on the parcel directly across from the proposed VAMC St. Joseph Site on Factory Lane (see revised Section 4.16).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MITIGATION**

| Traffic related 5.13 | During construction, traffic would likely be all day (7am – 9pm as noted). During operations (once the hospital opens), VA would seek to schedule deliveries off-peak (as noted). This typically would move service deliveries to mid-day hours, rather than early AM or late PM, because VA doesn’t have extensive off-shift employee levels. |

Regarding service and supply deliveries scheduled to avoid morning and evening peak hour traffic, does this mean residents in the area will be subjected to additional noise from heavy trucks during late night or early morning hours during construction and operations? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment</strong></th>
<th><strong>Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB: Cities request additional information regarding service and supply deliveries and request that restrictions be placed on deliveries to late morning and early afternoon hours only.</td>
<td>During construction, normal activities would be limited to 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Though unlikely, some potential activity, such as a utility cutover, could be scheduled for outside these hours to minimize adverse impact to surrounding neighborhoods. Once constructed, the VA Hospital would be a 24x7 operation, though the building would be designed to put the emergency room and loading dock areas on the west side of the hospital facing the expressway to shield the neighborhoods from noise and minimize any adverse impact associated with such activity. Traffic would be directed from the main entry immediately to the west side of the building making the noise impact no more obtrusive than expressway traffic on that side of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe VA’s feasible and practicable definition and subsequent implementation, monitoring and compliance with deliveries and scheduling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it be stated in contracts (services and products) with the VA vendors that vendors will not be allowed to use the Carlimar Lane entrance? Deliveries that add to traffic or noise and air pollution should be restricted to late morning - early afternoon hours only.</td>
<td>Yes. VA is committed to keeping access to the site from Carlimar Lane controlled and utilized only in emergencies. Carlimar Lane entry is only to be used in the event of some disruption of the Brownsboro entrance. It is a matter of life safety compliance that the site has an alternative, emergency egress. But VA does not expect to use Carlimar unless something unusual prevented Brownsboro passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since expansion of Brownsboro Road corridor as listed in DEIS is direct result of the VA hospital relocating the Brownsboro Site in a residential setting surrounded by residential streets, how will VA advocate for and help fund financial impact building and expanding the VA hospital and its additional services will have on KY residents?</td>
<td>VA has continued to coordinate with KYTC to provide information from studies it has conducted as well as kept KYTC informed of its progress throughout the NEPA process with the goal of trying to coordinate timing of construction to minimize adverse impact to both VA’s project and KYTC’s planned improvements. VA also intends to fund required signalization improvements at the main entry to the preferred alternative site and will coordinate with both KYTC and Louisville Metro to schedule and pay for this signalization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E.5 Index of Commenters

Tables E-5 through E-7 list all the commenters who submitted comments and assigns a commenter number; the order matches that of the individual comments presented at the end of this Appendix (Section E.6).

Table E-5:
1. Government Agencies (federal, state, local representatives)
2. Tribal Commenter
3. Other Organizations; this includes the two law firms representing citizen groups
4. Other - Miscellaneous; this includes related information on new alternative site locations provided internally through VA email and past correspondence in 2015 to Senator McConnell
5. Public Meeting Transcripts [individual commenters are named but no numbers assigned other than Transcript 1 or Transcript 2 (in two instances, the local representatives comments are included as part of the Transcripts)

Table E-6
6. (I) Individuals - in person drop off during public meetings (November 15, 2016)
7. (M) Individuals - submitted via mail
8. (EM) Individuals - submitted by email; this includes the Crossgate petition package (signatures and comments) as submitted by the Major of Crossgate, requesting for additional time to review the DEIS; these are included first and in bulk - not individually numbered)

Table E-7:
1. (SM) Individuals - submitted through website; note that a large number of these are anonymous and they appear at the end of the table.

To facilitate finding a particular commenter, each commenter’s name in Tables E-6 and E-7 is included alphabetically in the first column of the table, rather than by commenter number, which was generally assigned in order of receipt. The commenter number is identified in the second column and indicates where in Section E.6 of Appendix E the original comment (in its entirety) may be found. In many cases, the same person submitted comments on multiple occasions and/or in multiple forums (written letter), and so may have more than one commenter number assigned to them. Duplicate comments have NOT been included in Section E.6.

Table E-5, which includes government, tribal and other entities with substantive comments, includes a third column that indicates where within Appendix E the VA response(s) to each commenter’s comment(s) may be found. In some cases (e.g., multi-page letters with many comments and the individual comments provided in the meeting transcripts), the reader is referred to the individual transcript and/or comment letter in Section E.6 of Appendix E that identifies, for each comment, where the VA response in Appendix E may be found (section or table number).

Comments from individual citizens identified in Tables E-6 and E-7 fell into the following general categories which also dictate where the related responses may be found:
• General statements of opposition (and a few in support) - comment noted but no response necessary
• Requests to extend the public comment period (VA extended the comment period for 30 days; see VA response in Section E.2)
• Requests to consider a new alternative locations (VA response in Section E.4.4.1); this included a large percentage of the individual comments, many submitted as part of write-in campaigns (e.g., for the West End of Louisville, Bullitt or Hardin Counties, Radcliff); a representative listing of suggested locations is provided below.
• Traffic related concerns (addressed in Section E.4.5 and Table E-3)
• One of the major issues identified in Table E-1 (addressed in Section E.4)
• Resource-specific impact or analysis concerns (addressed in Table E-4)
• Out of scope (see Section E.4.7)
• Expression of opinion with no substantive comment (no response).

Also, as mentioned above, many of the individual comments have been captured in the responses to the wide-ranging set of comments submitted on behalf of the neighborhood “Cities” and Grow Smart Louisville. Individuals with substantive and extensive comments specific to the EIS have all been addressed although individual comment numbers are not specifically cited in the text.

In some cases, the issues cut across multiple sections of the EIS such that the reader may find a related response to a comment in more than one section or table in Appendix E. For example, comments relating to Veteran access, quality of care and Veteran preferences cut across several areas such as purpose and need, proposed action and transportation. Concerns about blasting are addressed in both geology and noise, and concerns about the use of Carlimar Lane may be addressed under the proposed action, traffic and solid waste, depending on the nature of the comment and the response. The detailed breakout by resource section in Table E-4 should help direct readers to VA responses that address their issues of concern. Note that all comment are included in their entirety in Section E.6 in order to be included as part of the official public record. Those requesting to be anonymous have had their names and contact information withheld and redacted from the comment letters.

**Representative List of Suggested Alternative Site Locations (this is not all inclusive)**

• Downtown, West End, South End of Louisville (general)
• Russell neighborhood on Ninth Street (references to sites Walmart and Food Port had previously considered
• 18th and Broadway
• River Ridge Center in Clark County
• Breckenridge location
• Land offerings by developers around Louisville
• Property switch with downtown offices of American Red Cross
• Old Iroquois Homes Housing Project (slated for demolition)
• Jewish Hospital downtown
• Beecher Terrace (slated for demolition)
• Clarksdale Housing Center
• Seventh and Algonquin
• Ole Waverly Hills (former TB facility)
• St. Catherine College Campus in Springfield, KY
• Bullitt County (land donation)
• Radcliffe Millpond Business Center (Meade and Hardin County Chambers of Commerce)

E.6 Individual Public Comments

The remainder of this appendix presents the public comments, received in written submissions and verbal testimony, on the Draft EIS and VA’s responses to the comments. Commenters’ submittals are presented in the order listed in the Tables E-5 through E-7. Given the inclusion of the full comments from every commenter, this Appendix is very large and has been provided on a CD. The files are further divided into multiple volumes to facilitate access to the information (and reduce file size for reviewing this Appendix electronically).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
<th>Where Comment Addressed in Appendix E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service Agency, Atlanta, Georgia (Joyce Stanley)</td>
<td>G001</td>
<td>Table E-4, Wildlife and Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4 (G. Alan Farmer)</td>
<td>G002</td>
<td>Primarily Table E-4 relating to resource specific impact areas (e.g., Aesthetics, Noise, Air Quality, Traffic, Environmental Justice); See individual comment letter for additional breakout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Department of Environmental Protection (Ronald T. Price)</td>
<td>G003</td>
<td>Primarily Table E-4 relating to resource specific impact areas (e.g., Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Water, Solid Waste). See individual comment letter for additional breakout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Louisville (Mayor Greg Fischer)</td>
<td>G004 [with attachments]</td>
<td>Primarily Table E-4 relating to resource specific impact areas (e.g., Air Quality, Land Use, Traffic/Transit, Utilities, Environmental Justice); and Alternative Sites See individual comment letter for specific breakout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Leet, District 7 Councilwoman (Louisville Metro Council)</td>
<td>Public Meeting Statements (see Transcripts 1 and 2 at end of this section) (individual speakers not assigned number) Public Meeting Statement Transcript 2 (statement read by Councilwoman Angela Leet)</td>
<td>See individual comment breakouts in Transcript 1 (pages 56-60] and Transcript 2 (pages 5-9) Concerns include flawed process, no real alternatives, consideration of Veteran preference, VA history with project overruns G005 includes past comments submitted on Draft Site Specific EA dated January 30, 2015 [previously submitted but duplicated for public record for this EIS].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Councilwoman Marianne Butler [statement read by Angela Leet during evening public meeting]</td>
<td>Public Meeting Statement Transcript 2 (statement read by Councilwoman Angela Leet)</td>
<td>See individual comment breakout in Transcript 2 (pages 9-10) Main topic: Consider another location - Old Iroquois Homes or 18th and Broadway [downtown with better access via mass transit] (Section E.4.4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk Hilbrecht, Mayor of Crossgate</td>
<td>G006 (with 4</td>
<td>Multiple topics on NEPA process,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E-5. Summary of Comment Letters on Louisville VAMC EIS by Government Agencies, Other Organizations and Public Meeting Transcripts
Table E-5. Summary of Comment Letters on Louisville VAMC EIS by Government Agencies, Other Organizations and Public Meeting Transcripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
<th>Where Comment Addressed in Appendix E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meade County Chamber of Commerce (Carole Logsdon) and email file transmitting it from Assistant Debra Masterson</td>
<td>G-008</td>
<td>Offer alternative site location at Millpond Business Center Radcliff Section E.4.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardin County Chamber of Commerce (Brad Richardson)</td>
<td>G-009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordell Lawrence Junior, Councilman for City of Glenview Hills</td>
<td>G-010</td>
<td>Opposed, West end (to help boost economy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tribes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Miami Tribe of Oklahoma (Diane Hunter)</td>
<td>T-001</td>
<td>Table E-4, Cultural Resources Confirms no impacts; request consultation if any discoveries made during any phase of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strobo-Barkley PLLC (Randy Strobo and Clay Barkley)</td>
<td>O-001 [formerly EM-001]</td>
<td>Request 60-day extension of the public comment period; 30-day extension granted. Section E.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost Brown Todd LLC (Timothy Hagerty) representing Grow Smart Louisville</td>
<td>O-002</td>
<td>Detailed Comment Letter (24 pages). Submitted in duplicate. See individual comment letter for specific...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table E-5. Summary of Comment Letters on Louisville VAMC EIS by Government Agencies, Other Organizations and Public Meeting Transcripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
<th>Where Comment Addressed in Appendix E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EM-097 (see Table E-6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>breakout; comments covered majority of concerns addressed throughout Appendix E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM-097 - follow up email to confirm receipt of comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strobo Barkley (Randy Strobo and Clay Barkley) representing the City of Crossgate, City of Graymoor-Devondale, City of Old Brownsboro Place, Northfield and Windy Hills (collectively “Cities”)</td>
<td>O-003</td>
<td>Detailed Comment Letter (64 pages). See individual comment letter for specific breakout; comments covered majority of concerns addressed in Appendix E. Comment package also included 26 Exhibits of various documents covering the project history from 2009 to 2016; They have not been included in the EIS although a listing of the Exhibits is included with the comment letter. The full set of exhibits will be included in the official Administrative Record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EM-071 in Table E-6 - VA copied on email from Randy Stobo to Ted Stone that includes comments from Mr. Stone (included in EM-071)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See also EM-071 in Table E-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY Health Policy Institute (Hasselbacher)</td>
<td>O-004</td>
<td>Attached print out of article commenter wrote for Institute’s Policy Blog - summarizing November 15, 2016 public meeting and major issues raised since the beginning. No response provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardrian Group (Teresa Bridgewaters)</td>
<td>O-005</td>
<td>Alternative location; provides information on the suggested 18th and Broadway Site Section E.4.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Fitzgerald, Director of Kentucky Resources Council</td>
<td>O-006</td>
<td>Incorporates by reference the comments from Grow Smart Louisville (O-002); questions NEPA process, purchase of site before NEPA completed and it prejudices the alternatives. Requests EIS be withdrawn. See individual letter for comment-response breakout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[also included in SM17-433; see table E-7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-5. Summary of Comment Letters on Louisville VAMC EIS by Government Agencies, Other Organizations and Public Meeting Transcripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
<th>Where Comment Addressed in Appendix E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VA internal email (Judy Williams) related to EmpowerWest Network (churches in West End of Louisville)</td>
<td>OM-002</td>
<td>Internal Louisville VAMC email with url link to Courier Journal Article about EmpowerWest Network (churches) - speaking out for locating VAMC in their neighborhood to revitalize Western Louisville. Not direct comment submittal but related to responses in Section E.4.4.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA internal email (Judy Williams) related to donated land from Bullitt County</td>
<td>OM-003</td>
<td>Internal Louisville VAMC email with url link about Bullitt County Judge Executive wanting to donate land to VAMC. Not direct comment submittal but related to response in Section E.4.4.1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Meeting Transcripts

| Transcript 1: November 15, 2016; 1-3 pm session; Louisville, KY Public Meeting Transcript | TR1 (37 speakers) | Comment responses are found in Appendix E as indicated next to individual comments identified in the transcript. In many cases, as noted in VA's response, the comment also resulted in revisions to the Final EIS. |

In order of presenters:


| Transcript 2: November 15, 2016; 6-8 pm session; Louisville, KY Public Meeting Transcript | TR2 (25 speakers) | Comment responses are found in Appendix E as indicated next to individual comments identified in the transcript. In many cases, as noted in VA's response, the comment also resulted in revisions to the Final EIS. |
Table E-5. Summary of Comment Letters on Louisville VAMC EIS by Government Agencies, Other Organizations and Public Meeting Transcripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
<th>Where Comment Addressed in Appendix E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(in order of presenters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Leet (included Ms. Leet’s reading of statement by fellow Metro Councilwoman Marianne Butler; John Hicks, Fred Johnson, Rob Givens, Joe Burden, Larry Hilton, Pat Roles, Marsha Hicks, Larry Kirschenbaum, Kirk Hilbrecht, Richard Estes, Shelby Taylor, Michael Yeager, Kara Estes, Mike Vairin, Mr. Keane, Alan Birch, Sharon Hilbrecht, Joe Malloy, Jim W., Irene Yeager, Jeff Stewart, Pat Roles, Joe Malloy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-6. Summary of Comment Letters and Comment Forms from Individuals and Crossgate Petition excluding Website

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I1-I20 INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS DROPPED OFF AT PUBLIC MEETING</strong></td>
<td>M001 - M021</td>
<td>MAIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>I-001</td>
<td>Chandler, David</td>
<td>M-002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>I-002</td>
<td>Chandler, Jackie</td>
<td>M-010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>I-003</td>
<td>DePree, Susan</td>
<td>M-005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>I-004</td>
<td>Duggins, James</td>
<td>M-014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brennan, Dr. Joseph</td>
<td>I-005</td>
<td>Halbleib, Walter Thomas (Sr)</td>
<td>M-009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown et al (Christina Lee, Dr. Kathleen Lyons, John Stough, Keith Runyon, Eric Gunderson, Sharron Hilbrecht, Gill Holland.</td>
<td>I-006</td>
<td>Harmon, Gay</td>
<td>M-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cachran R.H.?</td>
<td>I-007</td>
<td>Hurd, Phyllis</td>
<td>M-017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke, Jacqueline</td>
<td>I-008</td>
<td>Jacobs, Elmer</td>
<td>M-018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehrlich, Juliet</td>
<td>I-009</td>
<td>Logan, Laurie</td>
<td>M-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder, Gary</td>
<td>I-010</td>
<td>Louis, Hunter</td>
<td>M-006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Shirley</td>
<td>I-011</td>
<td>Mattingly</td>
<td>M 021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcie Suter</td>
<td>I-012</td>
<td>McArthur, James B. “Scotty”</td>
<td>M-011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery, Margie</td>
<td>I-013</td>
<td>Norcross, Kathleen</td>
<td>M-015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery, Schu</td>
<td>I-014</td>
<td>Ridge, Raleigh</td>
<td>M-008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow, Dave</td>
<td>I-015</td>
<td>Roles, Alan</td>
<td>M-013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shostle, Jan</td>
<td>I-016</td>
<td>Roth, Bonnie</td>
<td>M-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer, Tom</td>
<td>I-017</td>
<td>Shipley, L.P.</td>
<td>M-007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talamini, Kate and Susan Deprce</td>
<td>I-018</td>
<td>Stidham, Stephanie</td>
<td>M-019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer, H</td>
<td>I-019</td>
<td>Thompson, Rogin</td>
<td>M-020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James</td>
<td>I-020</td>
<td>Wirth, Ralph and Deborah</td>
<td>M-012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wooley, Loretta</td>
<td>M-016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Crossgate Petition to Extend Comment Period**

Hilbrecht, Kirk (Mayor of Crossgate)

Following submittals of the petition were numbered but are

EM-009

Crossgate petition package submitted on several different dates in early December 2016 - each submittal added on to the list of signatures and comments provided previously. EM-009 package dated [submital on 12/7/16] was one of the final ones and is included in
Table E-6. Summary of Comment Letters and Comment Forms from Individuals and Crossgate Petition excluding Website

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter Duplicate to the Above and not included in Appendix E:</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate to the above and not included in Appendix E:</td>
<td>Appendix E; package includes:</td>
<td>EM-031 appears to include an updated (final) set of comments submitted previously on 12/7/16 (included in EM-009); provided through change.org on 12/13/17</td>
<td>EM-031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM-004 - Submittal on 12/1</td>
<td>EM-008 - Submittal on 12/3</td>
<td>EM-009 - Submittal on 12/7</td>
<td>EM-031 - Submittal on 12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM-010, EM-035 and EM-036 duplicate each other and duplicate 12/3 submittal; EM-033 and EM-034 signatures and comments submitted 12/5</td>
<td>EM-010, EM-035 and EM-036 duplicate each other and duplicate 12/3 submittal; EM-033 and EM-034 signatures and comments submitted 12/5</td>
<td>EM-031 - Submittal on 12/13</td>
<td>EM-031 - Submittal on 12/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Comments from EM-004, EM-008, EM-010, EM-033, EM-034, EM-035, and EM-036 are NOT included in Appendix E since they contain duplicate material. These numbers are therefore skipped. EM-001 was also renumbered as O-001 and has been skipped.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamke, Ann</td>
<td>EM-002</td>
<td>Martin, Barbara</td>
<td>EM-058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelon, James</td>
<td>EM-055</td>
<td>Martins, Pedro</td>
<td>EM-021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherton, Allan</td>
<td>EM-075</td>
<td>Mattingly, Bud</td>
<td>EM-065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baber, Elizabeth</td>
<td>EM-093</td>
<td>Maurer, Doug</td>
<td>EM-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baber, Liz</td>
<td>EM-003</td>
<td>McArthur, L.</td>
<td>EM-096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilz Pinky</td>
<td>EM-044</td>
<td>McCormick, Fran</td>
<td>EM-022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilz, Pinky</td>
<td>EM-048</td>
<td>McDowell, Patty</td>
<td>EM-106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Commenter Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Commenter Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue, Bruce</td>
<td>EM-054</td>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td>EM-024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain, Michael</td>
<td>EM-105</td>
<td>Meyer, Larry and Bev</td>
<td>EM-023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher, Doug</td>
<td>EM-107</td>
<td>Milhalovic, Joan Sue</td>
<td>EM-056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callander, Laurie</td>
<td>EM-101</td>
<td>Miller, Bob</td>
<td>EM-060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carney, Daniel</td>
<td>EM-041</td>
<td>Miller, Hal</td>
<td>EM-092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casher, R.J.</td>
<td>EM-090</td>
<td>Moorman, Dr. George</td>
<td>EM-046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb, Jackie</td>
<td>EM-005</td>
<td>O'Connor, Frances</td>
<td>EM-040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb, Jackie</td>
<td>EM-039</td>
<td>Ohlman, Roger</td>
<td>EM-025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowles, Jim</td>
<td>EM-007</td>
<td>Peters, Mary D</td>
<td>EM-038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowles, Jim</td>
<td>EM-053</td>
<td>Pike, Glenn</td>
<td>EM-095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del grande, Patti</td>
<td>EM-077</td>
<td>Pruitt, Joe Paul</td>
<td>EM-078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drobney, David C.</td>
<td>EM-042</td>
<td>Quinlan, Scott</td>
<td>EM-112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[letter from Charles Estes, Jeffrey Daus, Christopher Smrt, and Roger Green officers - Military Order of World Wars]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa [no last name]</td>
<td>EM-069</td>
<td>Quiroga, Chloe</td>
<td>EM-026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, Kristen</td>
<td>EM-074</td>
<td>Randy Strobo</td>
<td>EM-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farris, W Dan</td>
<td>EM-108</td>
<td>Rawls, Andrew B</td>
<td>EM-111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenwick, Lou Ann</td>
<td>EM-109</td>
<td>Rice, Jerry</td>
<td>EM-027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzgerald, Tom</td>
<td>EM-087</td>
<td>Schutt, Rita</td>
<td>EM-091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foresman, Susan</td>
<td>EM-051</td>
<td>Schwartz</td>
<td>EM-050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster, W. Sterrett MD</td>
<td>EM-110</td>
<td>Shaikun, Michael</td>
<td>EM-067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[email says Virginia]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher, Melinda</td>
<td>EM-049</td>
<td>Sheehan, Bridget</td>
<td>EM-088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guennouni, Cynthia</td>
<td>EM-011</td>
<td>Sheridan, Mary P.</td>
<td>EM-073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagerty, Timothy</td>
<td>EM-097</td>
<td>Spiegel, Stephanie</td>
<td>EM-052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halbleib</td>
<td>EM-012 Dupicate of M-009</td>
<td>Staab, Liz</td>
<td>EM-057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hale, Paula</td>
<td>EM-085</td>
<td>Stiebling, Frederick</td>
<td>EM-061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haleil, Dave K</td>
<td>EM-080</td>
<td>Stiebling, Theresa</td>
<td>EM-081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, Jeff</td>
<td>EM-013</td>
<td>Stone Edward (Ted) via Strobo email</td>
<td>EM-071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock, John</td>
<td>EM-098</td>
<td>Stone, Ted</td>
<td>EM-028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen, Charles</td>
<td>EM-014</td>
<td>Sutton, Carole</td>
<td>EM-076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-6. Summary of Comment Letters and Comment Forms from Individuals and Crossgate Petition excluding Website

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmeling, Bryan</td>
<td>EM-103</td>
<td>Sutton, Sharon</td>
<td>EM-094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilbrecht Sharron</td>
<td>EM-059</td>
<td>Taustine, Lloyd</td>
<td>EM-099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duplicates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Emanuel</td>
<td>EM-082</td>
<td>Trainer, Carol Rawert</td>
<td>EM-030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Harold Trainer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman, Anne Stanley</td>
<td>EM-015</td>
<td>Troutman, Sara</td>
<td>EM-102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoskins, Albert B</td>
<td>EM-072</td>
<td>Vail, Robert</td>
<td>EM-047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Cap”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huber, James</td>
<td>EM-016</td>
<td>Wachowski, Charley</td>
<td>EM-079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hysinger, Edward</td>
<td>EM-063</td>
<td>Wiggins, Denis</td>
<td>EM-068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins, Katie</td>
<td>EM-017</td>
<td>Williams, Robert</td>
<td>EM-037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Cathy</td>
<td>EM-070</td>
<td>Williams, Sarah</td>
<td>EM-043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolly, Tom</td>
<td>EM-018</td>
<td>Wilson, James</td>
<td>EM-029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaikis, John</td>
<td>EM-062</td>
<td>Winnette, Yvette</td>
<td>EM-083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kareem, Kenneth</td>
<td>EM-086</td>
<td>Winnette, Yvette</td>
<td>EM-084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearney, Len</td>
<td>EM-113, EM-114, EM-115</td>
<td>Worden, Billy</td>
<td>EM-089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Carolyn</td>
<td>EM-104</td>
<td>Yeager, Michael</td>
<td>EM-032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirschenbaum, Larry</td>
<td>EM-019</td>
<td>Zirnheld, Shawn</td>
<td>EM-064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledwig, Daniel</td>
<td>EM-020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubeach, Michael</td>
<td>EM-066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lybbert, Michael</td>
<td>EM-045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-7. Individual Comments Submitted through the Website

*NOTE: A large number of comments were provided anonymously; these are included at the end of the table and their comments included in Section E.6 (but no commenter information provided).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM35-SM461</td>
<td>Note commenter numbering begins with 035.</td>
<td>Abrams Anticia</td>
<td>SM-261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adams Alison</td>
<td>SM-126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Albert Sharon</td>
<td>SM-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen Mabel</td>
<td>SM-195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amick Richard</td>
<td>SM-123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aronhime Barbara</td>
<td>SM-353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Atcher Steve</td>
<td>SM-183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bailey Amy</td>
<td>SM-455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bainter Chandler</td>
<td>SM-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bakken Karen</td>
<td>SM-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barber John</td>
<td>SM-425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barker Ken</td>
<td>SM-169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bayne Nathan</td>
<td>SM-075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bergin Walter</td>
<td>SM-427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black White Michelle</td>
<td>SM-090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boone Christopher</td>
<td>SM-117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bouhl Robert</td>
<td>SM-068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brashear Carol</td>
<td>SM-146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Breunig Matthew</td>
<td>SM-394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brewer Thomas</td>
<td>SM-176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bridgewaters Teresa, President TMG - The Mardrian Group, Inc.</td>
<td>SM-054 [also O-005]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Broecker Carla</td>
<td>SM-101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Broecker Leslie</td>
<td>SM-088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burkart Linda</td>
<td>SM-356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bybee Marty</td>
<td>SM-098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cardwell Steve</td>
<td>SM-391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carey Brandin</td>
<td>SM-156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carey Mary</td>
<td>SM-417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carney Daniel</td>
<td>SM-173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chandler Vicki</td>
<td>SM-460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cherry Clifton</td>
<td>SM-132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chesser Deanna</td>
<td>SM-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>SM-323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>SM-447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-7. Individual Comments Submitted through the Website

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark Tonia</td>
<td>SM-342</td>
<td>O’Cull Alicia</td>
<td>SM-389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole Ashley</td>
<td>SM-209</td>
<td>O’Cull Shamrock</td>
<td>SM-372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins Mr. and Mrs. R.L.</td>
<td>SM-337</td>
<td>O’Dea Timothy</td>
<td>SM-243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colocho Rene</td>
<td>SM-190</td>
<td>Obryan Tammy</td>
<td>SM-340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colvin Ashley</td>
<td>SM-386</td>
<td>Ochoa Ruben</td>
<td>SM-266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combs Veronica</td>
<td>SM-349</td>
<td>Oliveira Jessica</td>
<td>SM-139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conley Nana</td>
<td>SM-319</td>
<td>Olorunsola Carol</td>
<td>SM-222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coomes Kelly</td>
<td>SM-320</td>
<td>Orr Marc</td>
<td>SM-069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington Daniel Ray</td>
<td>SM-287</td>
<td>Osbourne Sherri</td>
<td>SM-456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford Will</td>
<td>SM-116</td>
<td>Panek James</td>
<td>SM-166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSanctis Ann</td>
<td>SM-076</td>
<td>Park Karen</td>
<td>SM-161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domena Jonathan</td>
<td>SM-047</td>
<td>Parker Holly</td>
<td>SM-143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drobney David</td>
<td>SM-185</td>
<td>Parker William</td>
<td>SM-191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drury Christian</td>
<td>SM-361</td>
<td>Parker William - blank</td>
<td>SM-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drury Dell</td>
<td>SM-317</td>
<td>Parrish Steve</td>
<td>SM-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger Chris</td>
<td>SM-181</td>
<td>Perito Anthony</td>
<td>SM-248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edlin Derek</td>
<td>SM-387</td>
<td>Phelps Steven</td>
<td>SM-316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder James</td>
<td>SM-073</td>
<td>Phillips Donna</td>
<td>SM-102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(comment appears to include letter from John L. Roberts, MD Vice Dean for Graduate Medical Education and Continuing Medical Education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esterle Matthew</td>
<td>SM-239</td>
<td>Phillips Sam</td>
<td>SM-301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finerson Phillip</td>
<td>SM-256</td>
<td>Pittman Dewayne</td>
<td>SM-279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzgerald Tom, Director of Kentucky Resources Council</td>
<td>SM-433 [also O-006]</td>
<td>Plummer David</td>
<td>SM-228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsman Thomas</td>
<td>SM-187</td>
<td>Quartermous Deborah</td>
<td>SM-168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Kent</td>
<td>SM-283</td>
<td>Rakutt Joseph</td>
<td>SM-376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadansky Bruce</td>
<td>SM-070</td>
<td>Raque Noelle</td>
<td>SM-344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadansky Courtney</td>
<td>SM-066</td>
<td>Rawlings Lori</td>
<td>SM-437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gannon Rocky</td>
<td>SM-201</td>
<td>Ray Mark</td>
<td>SM-039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatz Robert</td>
<td>SM-288</td>
<td>Reed Mary</td>
<td>SM-048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerstle Kelly</td>
<td>SM-205</td>
<td>Reynolds Kelly</td>
<td>SM-370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Givens Neil</td>
<td>SM-368</td>
<td>Reynolds Robert</td>
<td>SM-409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godshall Margaret</td>
<td>SM-354</td>
<td>Rhea Clark</td>
<td>SM-273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gootee George</td>
<td>SM-199</td>
<td>Richards Steven</td>
<td>SM-272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gozia L. Michael</td>
<td>SM-431</td>
<td>Riley-Lydan Collette</td>
<td>SM-446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratto Dominic</td>
<td>SM-077</td>
<td>Riney Rhonda</td>
<td>SM-440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graven Kenny</td>
<td>SM-035</td>
<td>Robison Barbara</td>
<td>SM-138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Commenter Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Commenter Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwall David</td>
<td>SM-398</td>
<td>Robison Liz</td>
<td>SM-137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwell Karen</td>
<td>SM-348</td>
<td>Robison Liz</td>
<td>SM-448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Celia</td>
<td>SM-257</td>
<td>Rosen Lawrence</td>
<td>SM-158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith Ralph</td>
<td>SM-258</td>
<td>Rosendaual Carol</td>
<td>SM-237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grote Albert</td>
<td>SM-311</td>
<td>Routt Carolyn</td>
<td>SM-225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarnieri Ann</td>
<td>SM-040</td>
<td>S. Jessica</td>
<td>SM-052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guzman Sylvester</td>
<td>SM-196</td>
<td>Scanlan Linda</td>
<td>SM-165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Heather</td>
<td>SM-383</td>
<td>Schecter Ben</td>
<td>SM-401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Michael</td>
<td>SM-355</td>
<td>Schecter Bob</td>
<td>SM-385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock Bryan</td>
<td>SM-100</td>
<td>Schmidt Steven</td>
<td>SM-115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlan Debra</td>
<td>SM-277</td>
<td>Schmitt Shirley</td>
<td>SM-097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlan Debra Richards</td>
<td>SM-037</td>
<td>Schulmann Joan</td>
<td>SM-359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>SM-134</td>
<td>Schwartzlose II John</td>
<td>SM-095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrod Debbie</td>
<td>SM-335</td>
<td>Sego Diane</td>
<td>SM-198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harter Heather</td>
<td>SM-219</td>
<td>Seyal Sara</td>
<td>SM-112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harty Amy</td>
<td>SM-226</td>
<td>Shea John</td>
<td>SM-096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartzell HJames</td>
<td>SM-186</td>
<td>Sketo Donna</td>
<td>SM-084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harzell Janet</td>
<td>SM-215</td>
<td>Smith Amanda Glass</td>
<td>SM-341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Angela</td>
<td>SM-294</td>
<td>Smith Ashley</td>
<td>SM-318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haydon Neil</td>
<td>SM-366</td>
<td>Smith Jim</td>
<td>SM-044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hembree Tonya</td>
<td>SM-144</td>
<td>Smith Karen</td>
<td>SM-381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hembree Tonya</td>
<td>SM-365</td>
<td>Smith Mark</td>
<td>SM-246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Mary</td>
<td>SM-371</td>
<td>Smith Tona</td>
<td>SM-426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herald Craig</td>
<td>SM-363</td>
<td>Squires Lizi</td>
<td>SM-172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilbrecht Sharron</td>
<td>SM-250</td>
<td>Stanley Joyce</td>
<td>SM-080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley Charles</td>
<td>SM-184</td>
<td>Stewart Alison</td>
<td>SM-051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogg Tim</td>
<td>SM-457</td>
<td>Stidham Chuck</td>
<td>SM-157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood Lisa</td>
<td>SM-326</td>
<td>Stone Edward</td>
<td>SM-213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoom Desmond</td>
<td>SM-336</td>
<td>Sullivan Robert</td>
<td>SM-111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Joyce</td>
<td>SM-420</td>
<td>Swan Christine</td>
<td>SM-063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard Terry</td>
<td>SM-451</td>
<td>Taylor Alec</td>
<td>SM-062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huckaby Thomas L</td>
<td>SM-245</td>
<td>Thissen James H</td>
<td>SM-275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HuckabyThomas and Patrice</td>
<td>SM-089</td>
<td>Thomas Jennifer</td>
<td>SM-276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humke Kurt</td>
<td>SM-194</td>
<td>Thompson Tyler</td>
<td>SM-045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Jennifer</td>
<td>SM-331</td>
<td>Thurman Troy</td>
<td>SM-454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsberger Kathi</td>
<td>SM-422</td>
<td>True David</td>
<td>SM-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurt Deborah</td>
<td>SM-407</td>
<td>Tuell Nancye</td>
<td>SM-064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing Virginia</td>
<td>SM-405</td>
<td>Tungate Phyllis</td>
<td>SM-332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Pam</td>
<td>SM-099</td>
<td>Vezeau John</td>
<td>SM-189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaber Jennifer</td>
<td>SM-252</td>
<td>Vowels Terry</td>
<td>SM-249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins Nancy</td>
<td>SM-152</td>
<td>Walker Robert</td>
<td>SM-133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Commenter Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Commenter Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Fred</td>
<td>SM-036</td>
<td>Ward Sheila</td>
<td>SM-269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Ingrid</td>
<td>SM-038</td>
<td>Warren Manning</td>
<td>SM-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson James</td>
<td>SM-244</td>
<td>Waters Stephen</td>
<td>SM-280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson James</td>
<td>SM-247</td>
<td>Whalen Richard</td>
<td>SM-042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson James [signed Tommy]</td>
<td>SM-297</td>
<td>Watkins Barbara</td>
<td>SM-151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Larry</td>
<td>SM-124</td>
<td>Watkins Suzanne</td>
<td>SM-461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Reynolds</td>
<td>SM-121</td>
<td>Weeter Gregory</td>
<td>SM-333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Della</td>
<td>SM-231</td>
<td>Whaley Charles</td>
<td>SM-091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Louise</td>
<td>SM-259</td>
<td>White Pam</td>
<td>SM-227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>SM-258</td>
<td>White Robert S</td>
<td>SM-235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlee</td>
<td>SM-403</td>
<td>Wilcox Stan</td>
<td>SM-411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keene Mary</td>
<td>SM-360</td>
<td>Wilcox Stan</td>
<td>SM-412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keene Mary</td>
<td>SM-362</td>
<td>Williams Branigan</td>
<td>SM-180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keiting Shannon</td>
<td>SM-230</td>
<td>Williams Ralph</td>
<td>SM-178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelien Rev Brett</td>
<td>SM-177</td>
<td>Williams-Pardon Robin</td>
<td>SM-314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller Rebecca</td>
<td>SM-429</td>
<td>Wilson Minnie</td>
<td>SM-087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Karen</td>
<td>SM-445</td>
<td>Winnette Yvette</td>
<td>SM-251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krish Charles</td>
<td>SM-061</td>
<td>Winnette Yvette</td>
<td>SM-302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Cordell Junior</td>
<td>SM-082</td>
<td>Wohlford Tim</td>
<td>SM-050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[also G-010]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leach John</td>
<td>SM-135</td>
<td>Worden William</td>
<td>SM-270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leightty Sharon</td>
<td>SM-254</td>
<td>Yarmouth Aaron</td>
<td>SM-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Hayley</td>
<td>SM-329</td>
<td>Young Kellie</td>
<td>SM-217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Ramona D.</td>
<td>SM-078</td>
<td>Zahradnik Greg</td>
<td>SM-072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopez David</td>
<td>SM-163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopez David</td>
<td>SM-164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisse Marco</td>
<td>SM-292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-041</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-043</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-046</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-049</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-053 [blank]</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-057</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-058</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-059</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-060</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-065</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-067</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table E-7. Individual Comments Submitted through the Website

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-079</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-081</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-083</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-085</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-093</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-103</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-104</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-106</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-107</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-109</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-113</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-114</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-118</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-120</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-122</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-125</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-127</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-128</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-129</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-145</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-147</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-148</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-149</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-150</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-154</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-155</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-159</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-162</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-167</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-170</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-171</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-174</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-175</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-182</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-188</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-193</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-197</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-200</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-202</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-204</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-206</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-207</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-7. Individual Comments Submitted through the Website

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-208</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-210</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-212</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-214</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-216</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-218</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-221</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-224</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-229</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-232</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-233</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-238</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-240</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-241</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-242</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-253</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-255</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-260</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-262</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-263</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-264</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-265</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-267</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-268</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-271</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-274</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-278</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>SM-459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copies of submitted comments follow on pages 109 through 1080. A unique serial number has been added to the first page of each submitted comment for ease of cross-referencing the comment to the tables in this appendix.
Judy Williams  
Robley Rex VAMC  
Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office  
800 Zorn Avenue  
Louisville, Kentucky 40206  

Re: Comments and Recommendations on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Replacement Robley Rex Veteran Medical Center - Louisville, Kentucky  

Dear Ms. Williams:  

The U.S. Department of the Interior (Department) has reviewed the above-referenced Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to replace the existing Robley Rex Veteran Administration (VA) Medical Center. The DEIS evaluates the potential environmental impacts associated with three alternative locations in Jefferson County, Kentucky. Alternative C is a “no action” alternative that includes the existing medical facility; therefore, we have no comments regarding this alternative. We provide the following comments and recommendations related to federally-listed species for your consideration. 

Alternative A - Brownsboro Road Site (preferred alternative)  

The Brownsboro Road site is a 34.9-acre vacant parcel of land that is predominately covered by grasses. There are a few scattered trees within the parcel boundary. The VA has determined that the Brownsboro Road site has the potential to impact the Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), running buffalo clover (*Trifolium stoloniferum*), and Kentucky glade cress (*Leavenwothia exigua var. lacinata*). We reviewed habitat information for the site in 2011 and determined there was no suitable habitat for the Indiana bat, running buffalo clover, or Kentucky glade cress. The site is exposed to full-sun and the few scattered trees are less than 5” dbh. Since the 2011 habitat evaluation, the northern long-eared bat has been listed as a threatened species with an associated 4(d) rule. No habitat evaluation for the northern long-eared bat has been provided to our office.  

The VA has addressed potential impacts to the northern long-eared bat by committing to winter tree clearing (October 1 to March 31) or conducting a presence/absence survey for the species.
Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center (VAMC) – ER 16-0617

The project area is in known northern long-eared bat summer habitat; therefore, a presence/absence survey would not be feasible at this location. We agree that this tree clearing restriction would avoid direct impacts to northern long-eared bats that could be using the site during the summer, but does not address the potential indirect effects that could occur due to habitat loss. Therefore, we recommend that the VA evaluate the trees within the project area to determine if they are suitable for northern long-eared bat utilization. If the trees are suitable, the VA should assess the potential for indirect effects to the species that could result from loss of roosting and foraging habitat. If no suitable roost trees are identified, then we would not consider suitable habitat for this species to be present.

The VA may also choose to address potential impacts to the northern long-eared bat by utilizing the optional streamlined consultation framework for the northern long-eared bat. This framework allows federal agencies to rely upon the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s January 5, 2016, intra-Service Programmatic Biological Opinion (BO) on the final 4(d) rule for the NLEB for section 7(a)(2) compliance. https://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/mammals/nleb/s7.html.

Alternative B - St. Joseph Site

The St. Joseph Site is a 99.0-acre parcel that consists of unimproved agricultural lands that includes a small patch of forested habitat and a forested stream corridor. The VA has determined that the St. Joseph site has the potential to impact the Indiana bat, northern long-eared bat, running buffalo clover, and Kentucky glade cress.

The St. Joseph Site is in potential Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat habitat. A site assessment in 2012 determined that this location contains suitable roosting and foraging habitat for both species. The VA has addressed potential impacts to the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat by committing to winter tree clearing (October 1 to March 31) or conducting a presence absence survey. The Department agrees that this tree clearing restriction would avoid direct impacts to the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat that could be using the site during the summer, but does not address the potential indirect effects that could occur due to habitat loss. Therefore, we recommend that the VA assess the potential for indirect effects to these species that could result from loss of roosting and foraging habitat. In addition, because the site is in potential habitat for both species, a presence/absence survey is appropriate at this location. If probable absence of Indiana bats and northern long-eared bats is supported by an approved survey, trees within the project area may be removed at any time of year, without negatively impacting these species. If these species are captured and/or detected during survey efforts, additional coordination with our office would be necessary.

The VA may also choose to address potential impacts to the northern long-eared bat by utilizing the optional streamlined consultation framework for the northern long-eared bat. This framework allows federal agencies to rely upon the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s January 5, 2016, intra-Service Programmatic Biological Opinion (BO) on the final 4(d) rule for the NLEB for section 7(a)(2) compliance. https://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/mammals/nleb/s7.html. It should be noted that this streamlined consultation form is only applicable to the northern long-eared bat and not appropriate for addressing impacts to the Indiana bat.
Kentucky glade cress is limited to a specific area south of I-265 and east of I-65 in Jefferson County and is therefore not expected to occur at this location. A survey for running buffalo clover was conducted in 2012 and no running buffalo clover was identified; however, because the survey is more than four years old and running buffalo clover has been identified at nearby locations, the Department recommends an additional survey for this species.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on the DEIS. If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Carrie Allison at (502) 695-0468, ext. 103. I can be reached via email at joyce_stanley@ios.doi.gov or at (404) 331-4524.

Sincerely,

Joyce Stanley, MPA
Regional Environmental Officer

cc: Christine Willis - FWS
    Michael Norris - USGS
    Anita Barnett – NPS
    OEPC - WASH
Ms. Judy Williams  
Robley Rex VAMC  
Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office  
800 Zorn Avenue  
Louisville, Kentucky 40206

Re: EPA Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center, Louisville, Jefferson County, Kentucky, CEQ No: 20160248;  
ERP No: E81042

Dear Ms. Williams:

Pursuant to Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, has reviewed the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Proposed Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center (VAMC). The DEIS evaluates the environmental consequences of the VA’s proposal to construct and operate a new 104-bed hospital, diagnostic and treatment facilities, Veterans Benefits Administration regional office, and other improvements. The proposed facilities will increase the VA’s capacity to meet Louisville Veteran’s healthcare needs.

The DEIS examines three alternatives, a No-Action alternative and two Action alternatives sites for the construction of the VAMC. Alternative A and Alternative B involve replacing the existing VAMC Campus and relocating the facility to the 34.9-acre Brownsboro Site or the 99-acre St. Joseph Site. Alternative C, the No-Action Alternative is the continued operation of the existing 47-acre Robley VAMC. The DEIS identifies Alternative A (the Brownsboro Site) as the preferred alternative and Alternative C (No Action) as the environmentally preferred alternative.

This letter provides the EPA’s DEIS recommendations on the proposed VAMC construction project. EPA’s comments on aesthetic, noise, air, environmental justice, and sustainability measures, and are located in the detailed comments. These comments should be considered in the overall siting and design of the facility, where practicable.

Based on our review of this project, EPA has assigned a rating of EC-1 (Environmental Concerns, Adequate Information) to the DEIS. Consequently, we recommend that every effort should be made to minimize the impacts to surrounding communities and incorporate resource conservation and pollution prevention strategies into the design, siting, and operation of the proposed FCC.
We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on the DEIS. If there are any questions regarding our comments, you may contact Ntale Kajumba at (404) 562-9620 or kajumba.ntale@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

G. Alan Farmer
Director
Resource Conservation and Restoration Division

Enclosure
EPA Detailed Comments on the DEIS for the Replacement of Robley Rex VMAC

 Alternatives

The proposed project examines three alternatives including a No Action Alternative. The two Action Alternatives involve relocating the VAMC to different locations, the Brownsboro Site or the St. Joseph Site. Both the Brownsboro Site and St. Joseph Site increase the VA’s capacity to address the healthcare needs of area veterans. The EPA notes that the DEIS identifies the Brownsboro Site (Alternative A) as the VA’s preferred alternative. The Brownsboro Site is currently owned by the VA and it is more accessible to the interstate and to a partner hospital. Five alternatives were initially considered during the initial assessment, but the DEIS provides a rationale for the eliminating two of those alternatives from further consideration.

 Visual/Aesthetics

The proposed project will noticeably affect the visual character or scenic quality of the existing landscape at both the Brownsboro Site and the St. Joseph Site. According to the DEIS, the buildings will have an adverse visual effect because they will obstruct or detract from a scenic view or will introduce visual elements that are out of scale or character with the surrounding area. The visual impact associated with the Brownsboro and the St. Joseph sites range from major to negligible depending on the observer.

Recommendation: The EPA recommends that the FEIS include commitments to further minimize visual impacts to residents in the vicinity of the proposed facility. Residents have expressed concerns regarding the appearance of the proposed structures, the introduction of buildings and structures that are not in character with the residential area at Brownsboro. Residents have suggested means to further reduce impacts to their viewshed and neighborhoods that should be considered in the FEIS.

 Noise and Vibration

Noise and vibration impacts are predicted for the No Action and the proposed Action Alternatives. Background noise levels are also included in the document for each of the alternative sites. The DEIS indicates that noise sensitive land uses exist within the projects vicinity including schools, cemeteries, parks and residential receptors. The primary source of noise and vibration will occur as a result of constructing, then operating the VAMC. According to the DEIS, construction noise will be adverse, short-term and potentially moderate in magnitude. The preferred Brownsboro Site (Alternative A) is a smaller site than St. Joseph Site, therefore the surrounding community may experience more noise and vibration impacts than at St. Josephs.

Comment/Recommendation: The EPA appreciates the VA’s commitment to providing early information and schedules on construction activities and expected noise levels and duration to relevant stakeholders. Should blasting occur, pre-blast survey’s will also be conducted for residents that request one within one-half mile of the site. In addition, a mechanism for reporting construction-related noise concerns should be established considering that the noise levels may approach/exceed the noise abatement criteria and that construction activities such as pile driving and blasting events may occur. The FEIS should estimate the total project construction time (months, years) in order to help assess the general magnitude and/ duration of the potential construction noise impact.
Air Quality

The document assesses existing air quality conditions in terms of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for criteria pollutants. The EPA has set National Ambient Air Quality Standards for six principal "criteria" pollutants. These pollutants are particle pollution (often referred to as particulate matter), ground-level ozone, carbon monoxide, sulfur oxides, nitrogen oxides, and lead. The proposed project is located in Louisville, an area which is currently designated by the EPA as nonattainment for particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$).

Comment: The EPA notes that the project will be subject to Title 5 and New Source Review permitting which will ensure that the facility meets the Federal Clean Air Act requirements.

Traffic

Traffic volume in the project area would increase as a result of the proposed project. According to the DEIS, the VA Traffic Impact Study indicates that approximately 10,000 vehicles per day will be added to the road due to the VAMC's relocation to the Brownsboro Site or the St. Joseph Site resulting in additional delays and increase travel times. Measures are discussed that would reduce some of the proposed impacts including roadway widenings, intersection improvements, extended bus routes, vehicle sharing and only using exists into neighborhoods during emergencies.

Comments: Given that traffic and transportation is a key issue for residents and the VAMC, the EPA recommends sustained coordination with the local Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, the Transit Authority of River City and other relevant stakeholders to address some of the proposed transportation improvements needed to support the VAMC. Efforts to continue to work with neighboring residents to ensure that traffic from the facility does not intrude onto surrounding neighborhood streets should be a made.

Environmental Justice

The DEIS includes an environmental justice section. The environmental justice analysis is conducted using the 1997 Council for Environmental Quality’s (CEQ) Environmental Justice Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act. The environmental justice analysis includes the use of the 50% Criterion and the Meaningfully Greater Criterion to compare data from the counties in the Louisville VAMC Service Area to the reference population at the State.

Recommendation: Based on our review, the EPA notes that the Meaningfully Greater Criterion is used as part of the assessment, but we have concerns regarding how the criterion was applied. The DEIS used a 10% higher threshold, but the manner in which it is calculated can mean that minority or low-income populations may not be appropriately identified. In the DEIS, it appears that 10% threshold is simply added to a reference population (i.e., 10% threshold +16.3% poverty reference population = 26.3% poverty threshold). However, the way the threshold should be used to yield consistent benchmarks involves taking 10% of 16.3% poverty, which is 1.63 and then adding that to 16.3% resulting in a benchmark of 17.93%. The EPA recommends using this mathematical calculation method for the Meaningfully Greater Criterion to yield consistent benchmarks that will be 10% higher than the reference population regardless of what the initial percent population value is.
Green Infrastructure and Pollution Prevention

Incorporation and Use of Green Infrastructure Concepts: Green building practices are considered that provide an opportunity to create environmentally-sound and resource-efficient buildings by using an integrated approach to design. Given the severe drought levels facing Lexington, Kentucky http://www.plantmaps.com/interactive-kentucky-drought-monitor-map.php and the national energy policy, resource conservation measures that minimize impacts from major federal facilities are important. The DEIS indicates that the exterior of the buildings will be designed to meet the leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Silver certification for healthcare facilities.

Comment: The EPA supports the VA’s commitment to ensure that the exterior of the buildings will be designed to meet the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Silver certification for healthcare facilities. We also note the provision highlighted in the DEIS from the VA’s Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan which includes “approaches for reducing energy use and cost, finding renewable or alternative energy solutions and using recycled and sustainably produced materials.”
Judy Williams  
Robley Rex VAMC  
800 Zorn Avenue  
Louisville, KY 40206  

Re: SERO 2016-17  
Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center, Louisville, KY  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  

Ms. Williams,  

The Energy and Environment Cabinet serves as the state clearinghouse for review of environmental documents generated pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Within the Cabinet, the Commissioner’s Office in the Department for Environmental Protection coordinates the review for Kentucky state agencies.  

We received your correspondence dated October 28, 2016. Your letter requested a review of the “Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center, Louisville, KY.” The following comments are submitted in reference to this project.  

Comments from the Division of Water:  
The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the replacement to the VA Medical Center in Louisville Kentucky has three alternatives for the project. Alternative A is located at 4906 Brownsboro Road. This alternative has no impacts to surface waters or wetlands. The nearest stream is almost a mile east of the project and should not be impacted in any way by the project. Best management practices should be used to avoid any runoff from the project area. Alternative B (St. Joseph Site) impacts two small wetlands and a stream that connects the two wetlands found in the northern portion of the project area. The stream is a tributary of a tributary of Floyds Fork; this stream is not a special use water. The entrance and the road connecting the final project to Factory Lane will cross these areas impact the unnamed tributary. The U.S. Army Corp of Engineers and the DOW’s 401 and 404 sections will determine what permits and/or mitigation may be required for the possible impacts to the wetlands and the stream. Alternative C (No Action) requires no building or construction and instead deals with continuing operations at the existing VA Medical Center. There are no impacts to any surface waters or wetlands and no comment for this alternative. Questions should be directed to Alicia Jacobs, Water Quality Branch, (502) 782-6987, Alicia.Jacobs@ky.gov.

Table E-4, Hydrology and Water Quality
Each of the proposed sites are located in areas with high potential for karst development where groundwater is susceptible to direct contamination from surface activities. It is the recommendation of the Groundwater Section of the Watershed Management Branch that proposed sites be made aware of the requirements of 401 KAR 5:037 and the need to develop a Groundwater Protection Plan (GPP) for the protection of groundwater resources within that area. 401 KAR 5:037 § 2 references the Scope and Applicability for the proposed activities while § 3 refers to the Preparation of GPPs. Questions should be directed to Sean Vanderhoff, Watershed Management Branch, (502) 782-7119, Sean.Vanderhoff@ky.gov or Section Supervisor David Jackson, (502) 782-6986, DavidA.Jackson@ky.gov.

Comments from the Division of Waste Management:
All solid waste generated by this project must be disposed at a permitted facility. If underground storage tanks are encountered, they must be properly addressed. If asbestos, lead paint, and/or other contaminants are encountered during this project, they must be properly addressed.

Comments from the Division of Air Quality:
Kentucky Division for Air Quality Regulation 401 KAR 63:010 Fugitive Emissions states that no person shall cause, suffer, or allow any material to be handled, processed, transported, or stored without taking reasonable precaution to prevent particulate matter from becoming airborne. Additional requirements include the covering of open bodied trucks, operating outside the work area transporting materials likely to become airborne, and that no one shall allow earth or other material being transported by truck or earth moving equipment to be deposited onto a paved street or roadway. Please note the Fugitive Emissions Fact Sheet.

Kentucky Division for Air Quality Regulation 401 KAR 63:005 states that open burning is prohibited. Open Burning is defined as the burning of any matter in such a manner that the products of combustion resulting from the burning are emitted directly into the outdoor atmosphere without passing through a stack or chimney. However, open burning may be utilized for the expressed purposes listed on the Open Burning Brochure.

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 State Preservation Office, Kentucky Heritage Council
Cultural resources assessments for the Brownsboro Site (Alternative A) were completed in 2012 and 2015. Our office accepted these results and agreed with the consultant that no further work was needed. Cultural resources assessment of the St. Joseph Site (Alternative B) was completed in 2012. Our office also accepted these results and
agreed with the consultant that no further work was needed. However, we have not received a Determination of Effects from the Veterans Administration concerning either of the principal project alternatives. Our response to the VA's Determination of Effects should be included in the final version of the EIS.

Additionally, we would like to suggest a correction to the wording of the Executive Summary of effects to Cultural resources presented in Table: Summary of Impacts Analysis, on page xx. The recommendation for the St. Joseph site should indicate that there is 'no effect' instead of 'no adverse effect'. No National Register eligible or listed properties will be affected by proposed construction activities at that site, and thus there are no historic properties to adversely affect.

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
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR  
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

GREG FISCHER  
MAYOR

December 15, 2016

Robley Rex VAMC  
Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office  
ATTN: Judy Williams  
800 Zorn Avenue  
Louisville, KY 40206

RE: Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center

Dear Ms. Williams,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Veteran’s Administration’s (VA’s) most recent evaluation of the October 2016 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared for the Replacement VA Medical Center (Replacement VAMC) in Louisville. Our region’s Veterans are true public servants dedicated to protecting this country and our freedom, and they deserve access to the most advanced and excellent health care in the nation. I fully support the construction of a new best-in-class facility that brings together the most advanced health care with the most comprehensive access to benefits and other services for our Veterans.

The goal of this letter is to raise some issues that left unaddressed could impede the success of the Replacement VAMC. I strongly believe that it is best to address these issues at this point in the process rather than dealing with unintended consequences that could delay this important project in the future. I appreciate the opportunity to share these concerns with you in the spirit of encouraging the accelerated development of a Replacement VAMC that can serve the current and future needs of our Veterans while promoting responsible, sustainable and compatible development for the community. These concerns pertain to land use, traffic, air quality, environmental justice, utilities, and transit access to the Preferred Site, as described in the EIS.
Land Use. The EIS concludes that the land use impact of the VAMC will range from negligible to major, but that these impacts will be mitigated in various ways and are therefore acceptable. This conclusion is based on the expectation set through development approvals granted in the Midlands zoning application, which created the expectation that the Brownsboro site would be fully developed. It is also based on the conclusion that the VAMC substantially complies with most aspects of the Town Center Form District in which the Brownsboro site is located. The EIS focuses on building height as a marker of compatibility and states that the Town Center allows buildings up to 120 feet tall.

The Midlands development was approved as a Planned Development District ("PDD") in Louisville Metro Planning Commission Docket Number 09-015-06.1 Pursuant to the Land Development Code, Louisville’s zoning regulations, this approval functions as a unique set of zoning standards that apply to any development of the property. Louisville’s zoning framework contains two sets of standards, Zoning Districts that govern use, and Form Districts that govern design and character. Planned Development Districts are special zoning districts adopted to govern a specific development, and address use, design and character. The Land Development Code addresses the impact of a Planned Development District in Chapter 2, Part 8, and states that where Planned Development District standards adopted for a property conflict with otherwise applicable land use standards that would otherwise apply to a property, such as those contained in the applicable Form District regulations, the Planned Development District standards supersede those standards.

It does not appear that the EIS considered the application of the Planned Development District standards approved for the Midlands in evaluating the impact of the proposed Replacement VAMC. For example, the Midlands plan included one- and two-story residential units along the residential east and south property boundaries, and taller buildings, including a hotel, in a very small area closer to I-264. Maximum building height was limited to 75 feet in a small area along I-264, with the majority of the site limited to 45-foot building heights and 35-foot building heights located closest to adjacent residences. The Replacement VAMC plan includes an 83-foot tall parking garage next to the most densely developed residential area to the south of the property, a 162-foot main building, a 102-foot tall secondary building, and a 115-foot parking garage on the north side of the property.

The Midlands plan anticipated a mix of 309 multi-family residential units with a 150-room hotel and approximately 202,000 square feet of commercial space. Though the site would have been fully developed, the majority of the development would have consisted of buildings that were

---

1 See attachment hereto for relevant materials related to this approval.
generally of the same character and scale as adjacent single-family homes, with higher intensity, taller commercial buildings tucked in the northwest corner of the site nearest I-264. By way of comparison, the Replacement VAMC is expected to contain over 1 million square feet of space. **It is difficult to conclude that the construction of a development of the scale of the Replacement VAMC was anticipated by the community following the approval granted in the Midlands case. The two projects are substantially different in size, scope and scale.**

**Traffic.** The EIS includes a traffic impact study that recommends improvements to various area intersections to reduce congestion that will result from the estimated 10,000 average daily trips associated with the Replacement VAMC. The EIS concludes that area traffic conditions will be better with the construction of the Replacement VAMC than without it, and lists a number of area road projects that the VA will advocate for in an effort to reduce impacts to already-congested roads following the construction of the Replacement VAMC.

However, as many as six (6) of these projects are not funded and are not listed on the state’s Six-Year Road Plan, the document that sets forth Kentucky’s transportation funding priorities and guides the implementation of roadway improvement projects.2 The schedule for constructing the Single-Point Urban Interchange at U.S. 42 and I-264, which would have the greatest impact on area intersection functionality of any of the road improvements mentioned in the EIS, has not yet been developed. Without this critical improvement, there are eight (8) intersections functioning at Level of Service (“LOS”) “F”3 in the morning commute and ten (10) functioning at LOS “F” during the evening commute.

The Courier-Journal reported on December 10, 2016, that the intersection at U.S. 42 and I-264 is currently the second most congested intersection in the city, and that U.S. 42 between Lime Kiln Lane and Seminary Woods, just east of the proposed Replacement VAMC, is currently the ninth most congested area in the city.4 An estimated 1,750 employees will be located at the Replacement VAMC, and an additional 400 employees will work at the Veterans Benefits Administration which will be consolidated at this site. While work hours may be staggered to avoid a situation in which large numbers of employees are reporting to work or leaving their shifts at the same time, Louisville Metro Government’s Department of Public Works has expressed concern that the provision of only one site entrance for the Replacement VAMC will

---

2 See attachment hereto for a list of these projects.
3 “Level of Service” is a term that refers to a qualitative measurement of traffic conditions. It is used to describe the relative ease of traffic flow in a particular area. Level of Service “F” is the lowest Level of Service, and refers to very congested traffic conditions. It is often characterized by the formation of lines of traffic waiting to pass through intersections and unstable or unpredictable vehicular speeds with cycles of stop and go traffic.
4 A copy of this article is attached for reference.
cause additional congestion and traffic stacking, particularly during morning and evening commute times as employees enter and exit the site.

The VA’s traffic impact study supports concerns of increased area congestion. The document projects that, following construction, during the morning commute, the intersection of U.S 42, KY 22 and Northfield Road functions at either a LOS E, with an average time of 60 seconds for a vehicle to pass through the intersection, or LOS F, with a projected wait time of 126 seconds, depending on the construction of other area roadway improvements. The same intersection functions at LOS F during the evening commute, with an average time it will take for a vehicle to pass through this intersection ranging from 133 seconds to 152 seconds, depending on the construction of additional area roadway improvements. By contrast this intersection currently functions during the morning commute at LOS E with a wait time of 69 seconds, and during the evening commute at LOS D, with a wait time of 40 seconds.

Public Works has expressed additional concern that the area considered in the traffic impact study was not large enough to fully capture area traffic conditions, and that data used to create traffic projects is from 2013. In particular, there is no information in the traffic impact study concerning the impact of the Replacement VAMC on traffic moving from west to east through the U.S. 42/I-264 interchange, and on other area drivers who routinely travel through the area around the Preferred Site. Public Works strongly recommends using recent data to analyze traffic conditions to reflect current conditions, and is willing to help VA access more recent data that may be available from consultants who have studies these intersections as part of other area development projects. Public Works also recommends expanding the scope of the traffic study to understand impact to area drivers passing through key area intersections to create a more complete picture of traffic conditions after construction of the Replacement VAMC.

**Air Quality.** The EIS states the Replacement VAMC serves a 35-county region in Kentucky and Indiana, and that for purposes of air quality analysis, the average round trip to the site for patients and employees is estimated at 20 miles. It is not clear how this assumption was made, as the 35-county service region spreads well beyond this distance, stretching 137 miles southwest into Muhlenberg County, Kentucky, 103 miles southeast to Adair County, Kentucky, 70 miles to the northeast to Dubois County, Indiana, and 76 miles to the northeast to Switzerland County, Indiana. Louisville Metro Government’s Air Pollution Control District believes an Air Quality Analysis is warranted to understand the impact of traffic generated by the proposed project on carbon monoxide (CO), emissions, and the creation of emissions hot spots for CO, particulate matter, and mobile source air toxics.
Environmental Justice. The EIS ruled out the potential for an environmental justice ("EJ") impact on minority populations because no county in its service area has a minority population of greater than 50%. The EIS additionally ruled out impacts to low income individuals because, with the exception of one county, service area poverty rates do not exceed 10% of the state or regional average. No other consideration of project-related impacts to low-income individuals and minorities was made. The US EPA’s EJ Screen tool can be used to examine many facets of EJ, including demographics, environmental factors and EJ factors such as proximity to traffic, and could have been used to gain a more comprehensive understanding of this issue. We recommend applying this tool and adding the results of this analysis to this EIS.

Utilities. The EIS states that local utility provider LG&E has committed to extending an additional service feed to the Preferred Site should the Replacement VAMC move forward, and that LG&E will fund the cost of extending this infrastructure. There is some concern, which may prove to be de minimis, that this means LG&E will pass these costs along to its ratepayers. Given Louisville Metro Government’s recent intervention in a lawsuit related to LG&E’s request for a rate increase, we would like to see more details about how extending additional service to the Preferred Site will actually be funded so that we could better evaluate the potential impact to the city’s ratepayers, and particularly to low income customers, to ensure that an undue financial burden will not be created for these individuals.

Transit. The EIS states that VA will work with TARC, the regional transit authority, to re-route the #15 bus through the VAMC at the Brownsboro site. It should be noted that there are only six morning trips and six afternoon trips on the #15 to this location. This is a more than 50% decrease in transit access compared to what is available at VA’s current location, and a substantially significant decrease in access to the Veterans Benefits Administration ("VBA"), which is currently on Main Street in Louisville’s Central Business District.

The VBA provides a range of benefits and services to Veterans, service members and their families, including compensation, education, insurance, access to loans and financial services, pension, fiduciary services, education and vocational training. We understand that many of these services may be provided electronically or over the phone, and that Veterans may have representatives who act on their behalf to engage with the VBA. However, we have concerns that a reduction in transit access to the services provided by the VBA at the Replacement VAMC may have a disproportionate impact on low-income and mobility-restricted Veterans who may be representing themselves to access benefits, and on VBA employees who may rely on TARC for their transportation needs.
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Citizens have reported concerns that the consolidation of three (3) outpatient clinics currently located in Louisville at the Replacement VAMC may cause additional hardship to individuals who must travel across town to receive care that they are accustomed to receiving closer to home. All three of these clinics provide primary care, but specialty services are offered at one Louisville location (women’s preventative care). Many Veterans may be using transit to access the outpatient clinics, and may find it challenging to use this form of transportation to access the Replacement VAMC at the Brownsboro site.

I understand that site selection for a project of the scope and scale of the Replacement VAMC takes into consideration many factors, including the most important, which is to serve the needs of our regional Veterans.

The EIS mentions that VA could sell the Brownsboro site or use it for another purpose should it choose to move forward with a replacement VAMC in another location. No prior document has included a similar statement. There is no discussion of what would trigger the VA to consider repurposing or selling the Brownsboro site, but in several communities where VA has planned to construct a new VAMC, including Las Vegas, Denver, and Orlando, it has reconsidered and in some cases chosen another site even after the announcement and purchase of a preferred location. Should the VA decide that the Preferred Site in Louisville is no longer suitable for its needs in constructing the Replacement VAMC, my team and I believe we have other sites worthy of VA’s consideration.

I am thankful that the VA has multiple care facilities in Louisville and remain committed to seeing a Replacement VAMC expeditiously built in Louisville to serve our regional Veterans and to ensure that they receive the highest quality health care and services available.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Greg Fischer
Mayor

Attachments
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SPECIAL MEETING

PUBLIC HEARING

DOCKET NO. 9-15-06VW

NOTE: Commissioner Adkins returned to hear this case.
NOTE: Commissioner Blake stated that he was not present for the October 26, 2006 night hearing; however, he reviewed the CD recording of that hearing.

(CONTINUED FROM OCTOBER 26, 2006 NIGHT HEARING)

Change in zoning from R-4 Single Family Residential and OR-2 Office/Residential to PD Planned Development and waivers to omit the 30-foot Landscape Buffer on Brownsboro Road and a form district change from Neighborhood Form District to Town Center Form District on property located at 4906 Brownsboro Road and 2000 Warrington Way (Tax Block W003, Lots 17 and 94), and being 37.97 acres total (32.57 acres in Louisville Metro; 5.38 acres in the City of Graymoor-Devondale).

Owner/s: Hildebrand I, LLC
f/k/a Blue Fenley Blue Properties, LLC
4969 US Hwy 42  Suite 100
Louisville, KY  40222

Browenton Limited Partnership
4969 US Hwy 42  Suite 100
Louisville, KY  40222

Applicant: Fenley Real Estate
4969 US Hwy 42  Suite 100
Louisville, KY  40222

Engineer: AGR Engineering, Inc.
Attention: Mr. Pat Howard
13029 Middletown Industrial Boulevard  Suite 100
Louisville, KY  40223

Attorney: Glenn A. Price Jr.
Greenebaum, Doll & McDonald
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3500 National City Tower  
Louisville, KY 40202  

Area: 32.57 acres  

Form District: Neighborhood  
Zoning District: R-4 and OR-2 to PD & Neighborhood Form District  
Existing Use: Vacant, offices, single-family residential  
Proposed Use: Retail, restaurant, hotel, apartments, condominiums  

Jurisdiction: Louisville Metro  
Council District: 16—Kelly Downard  
Case Manager: Stephen Lutz, AICP  

Notice of this public hearing appeared in The Courier Journal on September 28, 2006, a notice was posted on the property, and notices were sent by first class mail to those adjoining property owners whose names were supplied by the applicants.  

The staff report prepared for this case was incorporated into the record. The Commissioners received this report in advance of the hearing, and this report was available to any interested party prior to the public hearing. (Staff report is part of the case file maintained in Planning and Design Services offices, 444 S. 5th Street.)  

The following spoke in favor of this request:  

Glenn Price Jr., Greenebaum Doll & McDonald, 3500 National City Tower, 
Louisville, KY 40202  

Stephen Rusie, Dunaway Engineering, 3404 Stony Spring Circle, Louisville, KY 40220  

Stephen Fenley, 4969 US Highway 42, Louisville, KY  

J. Kevin McCurran, 1807 Grantham Court, Louisville, KY 40222 (signed in but did not speak)
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The following spoke in opposition:

Anne Stanley Hoffman, 1809 Warrington Way, Louisville, KY 40222

Kyle T. Hubbard, 2000 One Riverfront Plaza, Louisville, KY 40202

Jill Mueller, 4101 Woodstone Way, Louisville, KY (signed in but did not speak)

Diane Buster, 8901 Swan Hill Road, Louisville, KY 40241 (signed in but was not present to speak.)

The following spoke neither for nor against:

Hugh Osbourne, 1814 Warrington Way, Louisville, KY 40222

Michael F. Tigue, 2500 Brown & Williamson Tower, Louisville, KY 40202

AGENCY TESTIMONY:

Dawn Warrick, Assistant Director for Planning and Design Services, presented the case on behalf of Stephen Lutz. She said that, at the last hearing, the Commission had requested that the many sets of proposed binding elements be resubmitted to staff to consolidate these into one workable set. She said that, based on the phasing plan that is depicted in the binding elements being presented today's hearing, in addition to the other binding elements, staff does recommend approval of the rezoning, the Form District change, and the concept plan. She discussed some issues that had arisen over these binding elements.

Commissioner Jones asked about binding element #21. Ms. Warrick said that the City of Crossgate had decided that it was most appropriate for the entire property line be treated the same, instead of leaving it up to each individual property owner as to whether they wanted a fence or landscaping. The representatives of the City of Crossgate will work with the developer to make sure that one treatment is universally applied. Mr. Jones said he approved of the Korfhage landscape plan. He asked that a compromise accomplishing both mitigation and landscaping be found. He wanted the fence continuance all the way around the perimeter and the landscaping shown on the original plan.
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Regarding binding element #26, Commissioner Blake asked what kind of construction work could be done on the site before the construction contract is awarded for the construction of the Westport Road/I-264 interchange. Ms. Warrick said site work could be done, but no building permits could be issued for the buildings until the Westport interchange contract is awarded.

Commissioner Carlson asked staff's opinion on the binding elements. Ms. Warrick said the binding elements as they are now are acceptable. She said she hoped that these binding elements address at least some of the concerns of the opposition.

Commissioner Howard asked how the binding elements are going to help the level of traffic service in the area, which is already at "F". Ms. Warrick said that, the way this project was evaluated was not solely on a level of service criteria. This project was evaluated comprehensively. She discussed this in more detail, and how the phasing will work in the future. Commissioner Blake discussed possible future protections for residents regarding traffic.

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY OF PROPONENTS:
Glenn Price, attorney for the Applicant, first responded to Commissioner Mike Jones' comments on Binding Element #21 regarding the Korfhage Landscaping Plan and stated that the Korfhage plan, or one substantially the same as the Korfhage plan, would be implemented on the Fenley property; and that the Applicant would supplement that plan with additional buffering as worked out with the City of Crossgate for those residents of Crossgate that abut the project. (See Binding Element #21 regarding supplemental buffering for some of the Crossgate residents, like fencing, etc.)

Stephen Rusie, a planner with Dunaway Engineering, assisted Mr. Price with a detailed description of the landscape plan. He said the Korfhage landscape plan could be replaced with fencing, depending on what the City of Crossgate wanted along their perimeter.

Stephen Fenley, the applicant, said he had met with representatives from the City of Crossgate to work out this compromise landscape/buffering plan. He said it was agreed that, if an individual Crossgate resident wanted a fence along their property line, they could have that in addition to the already-planned landscaping.
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

NOVEMBER 30, 2006

SPECIAL MEETING

PUBLIC HEARING

DOCKET NO. 9-15-06VW

Commissioner Jones said he wanted what was originally agreed to, which was the Korfhage landscape plan carried out around the entire perimeter of the project. Mr. Fenley agreed to that, and said that if a neighbor wants a fence in addition, they are willing to agree to that also.

Mr. Price then explained Binding Elements #26 and #27 regarding phasing of the development; Binding Element #28 regarding the construction and bonding for the round-about; and Binding Element #29 regarding the Applicant's contribution to the US 42 ramp improvement project.

Mr. Price stated that the Applicant had worked with staff in negotiating the final draft of the Binding Elements and felt as though everyone was happy with the outcome. He reiterated that he feels that the applicant's project presents an example of new urban development with mixed uses and connectivity.

Mr. Price presented the color development plan and stated that the project now met mobility standards and the other elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

In answer to Commissioners Carlson's and Blake's questions about Binding Element #26 regarding phasing, Mr. Price explained that the Applicant would be able to proceed with site work prior to the trigger date of the awarding of the construction contract for the Westport Road/i-264 interchange, but that the Applicant would not be able to pull building permits prior to that trigger date. He also stated that the Applicant was not sure what that date would be because the awarding of the contract had not been definitely set by the state yet.

Michael Tigue, also an attorney for the Applicant, further explained that the Applicant was the one taking the risk regarding the award date, because if the awarding of the contract was pushed back, the Applicant's project would be pushed back as well. He further explained Mr. Price's comment that the Applicant would, however, be able to proceed with infrastructure and utility work, but that the project would not be able to go vertical until the trigger date.

Stephen Fenley, the Applicant, in answer to Commissioner Adkins' question regarding what percentage of the 60% phasing would put traffic on the roadways prior to the opening of the Westport Road interchange, stated that all of the 60% could be built provided that staff approves the proposed uses and required evaluations to be presented by Applicant at that time through detailed plans.
Anne Stanley Hoffman asked Mr. Price about the traffic analyses and asked who would be doing the analyses and what those analyses would be compared with. She said there is additional traffic now moving into the corridor, due to other projects that have been approved. She is referring to binding elements #27B and #26C. Mr. Price explained that the subsequent required traffic evaluations would be prepared by a traffic consultant hired by the Applicant and satisfactory to the Transportation Department staff. Ms. Warrick said that, when a detailed plan is presented for Phase I, Planning staff can evaluate specific uses to see if the trip generations match what they have currently in the traffic study done on July 2006. Traffic and air quality analysis will be examined at the future date.

Hugh Osborne asked about protection from construction debris, trespassers, etc. during the construction phase. Mr. Price explained that if the additional buffering he preferred was a fence in addition to the plantings, then he needed to communicate that to the mayor of the City of Crossgate, because the Applicant was to work through the City of Crossgate regarding the additional buffering along that perimeter of the site.

J. Kevin McCurran was called to speak but declined.

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY OF OPPONENTS:
Kyle Hubbard, the representative for BRAD and others who are opposed to this development, said the current failing service level of this Brownsboro Road area is enough to deny this project until better traffic improvements are made. He said there is enough evidence to prove that this project will worsen traffic. He discussed nearby areas that still have to be improved in order to effect traffic in this neighborhood. He suggested tying phasing of the project into benchmarks of the Westport Road interchange improvements. He said the people he represents believe the infrastructure should be present before a rezoning is approved. He said the applicant’s proposed contribution of $120,000 is too small to offset the needed improvements to the interchange areas.

Commissioner Jones asked how a traffic study paid for by the opposition would be any more independent than one paid for by the applicant. Mr. Hubbard explained how the traffic engineer was selected.
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There was discussion about what “60%” of trip capacity meant and when it would be allowed.

Mr. Hubbard was asked if any of his clients in this case were developers. Mr. Hubbard said no.

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY OF THOSE NEITHER FOR NOR AGAINST:
No one spoke. (Hugh Osbourne signed up under this category, but asked his question during the “Summary of Proponents” time period when he cross-examined Mr. Price.)

REBUTTAL:
Michael Tigue, in answer to Kyle Hubbard’s statement that the whole project was tied to the Westport Road interchange, pointed out that was not so because other Binding Elements addressed additional elements such as the bonding for the round-about, the contribution to the ramp improvements, future traffic studies and evaluations, etc.

Glenn Price reiterated what Michael Tigue had said, and added that in the practical world, this traffic was not going to appear all of a sudden. As with any development, the traffic would build over time as it would take time for the various elements of the project to be completed and start generating traffic.

An audio/visual recording of the Planning Commission hearing related to this case is available in the Planning and Design Services offices. Please contact the Customer Service staff to view the recording or to obtain a copy. The recording of this hearing will be found on the CD of the November 30, 2006 proceedings.

In a business session subsequent to the public hearing on this request, the Commission took the following action.

Form District Change

On a motion by Commissioner Blake, the following resolution was adopted:
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WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Finds that a proposed change of form district from Neighborhood to Town Center as applied to a 37.95-acre tract known as 4906 Brownsboro Road and 2000 Warrington Way is appropriate for the reasons stated in these Findings of Fact; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Finds that the existing form district is Neighborhood, which is defined by the Comprehensive Plan (Community Form/Land Use Guideline 1.B.3) as being characterized by predominantly residential uses that vary from low to high density and that blend compatibly into the existing landscape and neighborhood areas; that high density uses are limited in scope to minor or major arterials and to areas that have limited impact on the low to moderate density residential areas; that the Neighborhood Form contains diverse housing types in order to provide housing choices for differing ages and incomes; that new neighborhoods are encouraged to incorporate these different housing types within a neighborhood as long as the different types are designed to be compatible with nearby land uses; that these types may include, but not be limited to, large single-family developments with cul-de-sacs, neo-traditional neighborhoods with short blocks or walkways in the middle of long blocks to connect with other streets, villages and zero-lot line neighborhoods with open space, and high density multi-family condominium-style or rental housing; that the Neighborhood Form may contain open space and, at appropriate locations, civic uses, and neighborhood centers with a mixture of uses such as offices, retail shops, restaurants and services at a scale that is appropriate for nearby neighborhoods; that the Neighborhood Form should provide for accessibility and connectivity between adjacent uses and neighborhoods by automobile, pedestrian, bicycles and transit; that neighborhood streets may be curvilinear, rectilinear or in a grid pattern and should be designed to invite human interaction; that streets are connected and easily accessible to each other, using design elements such as short blocks or bike/walkways in the middle of long blocks to connect with other streets; that examples of design elements that encourage this interaction include narrow street widths, street trees, sidewalks, shaded seating/gathering areas and bus stops; and that placement of utilities should permit planting of shade trees on both sides of the streets.

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the subject property is not appropriately located within the Neighborhood Form District due to its immediate proximity to Interstate 264 (the Watterson Expressway) together with
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noise, light and visual nuisances emanating from the expressway; and because
the property is also bounded on the north by high intensity commercial uses and
an arterial roadway (Brownsboro Road) carrying high volumes of traffic; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the description and
function of the form district to which it is proposed the subject property should be
attached is Town Center, which is defined by the Comprehensive Plan
(Community Form/Land Use Guideline 1.B. 5) as being a traditional and
preferred form, larger in scale than the neighborhood center, which forms a focal
point of activity; having an identifiable core and often located at a historic
crossroads or the intersection of a major thoroughfare(s) and a collector roadway
with connections to surrounding neighborhoods through walkways, local streets
and residential collector streets; that the amount of floor space in town centers is
usually between 100,000 and 400,000 square feet reflecting a market area
designed to serve a population of between 25,000 to 75,000; that the town center
form typically has a compact mixture of moderately intense uses including
shopping, restaurants, offices and residences; that the Town Center may (but is
not required to) include civic uses, such as libraries, government offices, police or
fire stations and religious facilities; that buildings are generally close to and
oriented towards the street; that these characteristics strengthen the role of the
Town Center as a community focal point; that the Town Center should have a
high level of pedestrian amenities; that more intense uses in the Town Center are
located in close proximity to the major thoroughfare, and the intensity of use
gradually declines toward the adjacent neighborhoods; that since Town Centers
may be easily disrupted by new forms of development the harmony and
compatibility of infill and redevelopment in town centers should receive special
attention; that the establishment of new town centers requires a high level of
planning and design; and that the creation of new town centers (such as The
Midlands) should be encouraged because as a Town Center it is in keeping with
the goals, objectives and policies of the form district and the Comprehensive
Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That The Midlands is
proposed near the crossroads of US 42 and Brownsboro Road; that these
arterial/major roadways will provide connections from The Midlands to residential
areas west of the Watterson Expressway, north of US 42, and east and
southeast of the site, including residential areas within the cities of Crossgate
and Graymoor/Devondale which allows for the serving of the requisite population
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base; and that The Midlands proposal will allow for an expansion of the existing Town Center; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposed Midlands development is compatible with the proposed Town Center Form District because the design of the proposed development consists of an entrance focal point at the roundabout, and that the focal point concept is carried axially through the roadway network within The Midlands; that The Midlands is designed as an urban infill development with a specific emphasis on mixed uses in a complex pedestrian-friendly environment; that it will include a small scale civic open space plaza which will be a functional amenity for residential uses within the development and in connected surrounding residential land uses; because on-street parking will be provided and will serve to slow traffic movement within the development; because parking lots will be located behind buildings; because building placement will be at or near the right-of-way/easement line (allowing for sidewalk location) and will be oriented toward the street; and because the proposed Planned Development (PD) District incorporates a high level of planning and design; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposed Midlands development is compatible with existing building and land uses on contiguous land all as shown in the pattern book prepared by Dan Fultz & Associates, Architects, of record; because commercial uses are located immediately north of The Midlands; because single-family residential uses located within the cities of Crossgate and Graymoor/Devondale and lie both immediately and generally to the east and south; because the protection of these adjacent single-family areas is accomplished by siting one- to two-story duplex units adjacent to these areas and by extensive landscaping and buffering which will be maintained through funded maintenance agreements of the businesses and residents in The Midlands; and because the more intense land uses in the development are located further from the adjacent residential areas, with the most intense being nearer to I-264 and the Brownsboro Road portion of the site nearer the roundabout; and

WHEREAS, The Commission finds that the proposal has received preliminary approval from Louisville Metro Department of Inspections, Permits and Licenses, Louisville Metro Department of Public Works, and the Metropolitan Sewer District; and
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WHEREAS, The Commission finds the proposal to be in conformance with all other applicable guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Louisville Metro Planning Commission does hereby RECOMMEND to the legislative council of the Louisville/Jefferson County Metro Government that the change in Form District from Neighborhood Form District to Town Center Form District on property described in the attached legal description be APPROVED.

The vote was as follows:

YES: Commissioners Carlson, Adkins, Wells-Hatfield, Blake, Jones, Queenan, Abstain, Hamilton, and Howard.
NO: No one.
NOT PRESENT: No one.
ABSTAINING: Commissioner Ernst.

Zoning

On a motion by Commissioner Blake, the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Finds That the proposed zone change (map amendment) from R-4 Single Family Residential District and OR-2 Office Residential District to Planned Development (PD) District conforms to the requirements of KRS 100.213 because it is in agreement with the Comprehensive Plan for Louisville and Jefferson County ("Cornerstone 2020"), and its applicable Goals, Objectives, Guidelines and Policies, for the reasons stated in these Findings of Fact; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposal conforms to Town Center Goal D1, Goal D3, Objectives D3.1, D3.2, Goal D4, Objective D4.1, Community Form Guideline 1 and all applicable Policies adopted thereunder, including Policy 1.B.5 because the site and the development is a new development designed with an urban setting, having an identifiable core with connections, including pedestrian connections, to surrounding neighborhoods; because the proposed development will contain between 100,000 and 400,000 square feet of commercial, office, and hotel uses in a compact mixture of moderately intense uses, including shopping opportunities, restaurants, offices and residences; because small-scale civic open space/plaza uses are incorporated into the development; because the mixed use portion of the
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...development allows for medium density residential use with services and transit facilities within walking distance of homes; because the development is easily accessible via all modes of transportation; and because a variety of housing opportunities will be provided in The Midlands as shown on the Concept Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposal conforms to Town Center Objective D4.2, Centers Guideline 2 and all applicable Policies adopted thereunder, including Policies 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 2.15, and 2.16 because the development meets the definition of an activity center and is an expansion of the adjacent activity center (i.e., the existing Town Center in the immediate vicinity of the site, consisting of the commercial area between US 42 and Brownsboro Road; because a sufficient support population will support the uses in The Midlands since the development is located adjacent to the residential cities of Crossgate and Graymoor/Devondale with immediate access to populations via a connection at Brownsboro Road and a connection to the south of the development at Carlimar Lane; because Brownsboro Road serves as the gateway to the development and is a major artery of northeast Jefferson County; because the motoring public uses Brownsboro Road and nearby US 42 as arteries providing easy access to additional support populations; because The Midlands is a compact development allowing for efficient land use and cost-effective investment in infrastructure with a mixture of compatible land uses; because alternative modes of travel are encouraged through the use of sidewalks throughout the development; because a vibrant sense of place will be encouraged through appropriate building design, focal points and distinctive architecture; because the development proposes residential and office uses above first floor retail and in multi-use buildings; because a series of focal points will be developed around a public plaza and along axial corridors; because the design of the site will encourage shared parking and access among land uses and between buildings; because utilities will be located underground in common easements to facilitate maintenance; because existing above-ground utilities near the entryway to the development will be buried; because parking lots are generally located behind buildings to minimize visual impact to the streetscape and enhance pedestrian movement; and because the development is intended to be accessible for transit vehicles and pedestrians, and will be readily accessible via automobile and bicycle; and

30
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WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposal conforms to Town Center Goal D2 and Objectives D1.1, D2.1, D2.2, and D4.3, Compatibility Guideline 3 and all applicable Policies adopted thereunder, including Policies 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 3.12, 3.21, 3.22, 3.23, 3.24, 3.25, and 3.28 because the development is compatible with the Town Center Form District, and is also compatible with the adjacent single-family neighborhood to the east on Warrington Way in the City of Crossgate and in Graymoor/Devondale; because the development will provide a unique shopping opportunity for the adjacent residential communities; because a high level of architecture will be provided for in the development; because building materials will be predominantly brick, stone, stucco and glass, which will be a desirable and compatible combination of materials; because residential structures abutting existing residences along Warrington Way will be 2 stories in height; because landscape areas with vegetative buffers will be provided along the perimeters of the property bordering Warrington Way, Winsford Place, Crossmoor Lane, and Carlimar Lane; because the residential component of The Midlands will serve as a transitional land use between the existing residential vicinity and the more intense mixed use areas contemplated on the Concept Plan; because the proposed residential development in The Midlands is compatible with adjacent residential development due to comparable height, mass and scale of buildings and density; because appropriate landscaping will be provided; because the Air Pollution Control District has indicated that the development is consistent with acceptable ambient air quality standards; because the proposed roundabout device will allow for continual movement of traffic from and to US 42, Brownsboro Road and through and to The Midlands; because noise nuisances are not anticipated to occur as a result of development; because the proposal will comply with all applicable lighting limitations established by the Land Development Code; because landscape areas and vegetative buffers will serve to prevent or mitigate visual intrusions into surrounding residential areas; because the character of the Brownsboro Road corridor will be enhanced by the installation of the roundabout with its planting features and by burying existing above-ground utilities at and near the roundabout; because the proposed residential condominiums and apartments and those residential units located within the mixed use areas of the development will provide for a variety of housing types; because the higher density residential uses will be located away from the surrounding single-family area, and are also located closer to The Midlands activity center and near anticipated transit facilities in The Midlands; because the development will comply with all codes relating to access for persons with disabilities; because
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setbacks, building heights, and loading and delivery areas will meet Town Center requirements of the Land Development Code; because in the event a parking garage is proposed for The Midlands it will be situated away from abutting residential areas, and will have architectural features which will integrate it into the development; and because a sign plan will be developed at the time of approval of each detailed plan; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposal conforms to Town Center Objective D2.5, Open Space Guideline 4 and all applicable Policies adopted thereunder, including Policies 4.1, 4.3, and 4.7 because diverse open space in the form of plazas, civic spaces, and outdoor seating areas is provided within the mixed use sections of the development, providing public gathering space and focal points; because required open space will be provided within the multi-family residential portion of the development; because walking paths throughout open space areas will provide recreational opportunities; and because maintenance of open space in excellent condition will be provided for by the developer, and by the property owners’ association(s); and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposal conforms to Natural Areas and Scenic and Historic Resources Guideline 5 and all applicable Policies adopted thereunder, including Policies 5.1 and 5.6 because the development will avoid substantial changes to the topography of the land and no development will occur on wet or highly permeable soils or on severe or unstable slopes; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposal conforms to Economic Growth and Sustainability Guideline 6 and all applicable Policies adopted thereunder, including Policy 6.6 because the retail commercial component of the development is located in an activity center with immediate access to arterial roadways and an interstate; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposal conforms to Circulation Guideline 7 and all applicable Policies adopted thereunder, including Policies 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.9, 7.10, 7.13, and 7.16 because even though the development will provide additional traffic volumes to Brownsboro Road and surrounding roadways these volumes will be mitigated by the installation of a roundabout device, which will facilitate continuous movement to and from Brownsboro Road, to and from The Midlands, and to and from US
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42; because adequate right-of-way will be dedicated from the development site for the construction and operation of the roundabout; because it is anticipated that as the development grows transit service will be provided within the development; because adequate transit service via Transit Route #15 is presently available to serve the site; because the mixed use nature of the development is designed to reduce the necessity for multiple automobile trips between land uses; because joint and cross access will be provided in the development, and a unified access and circulation pattern will be provided through the internal roadway network; because parking facilities will be provided pursuant to the minimum requirements of the Land Development Code; because the Applicant has agreed to make a financial contribution to Louisville Metro Public Works to assist in defraying the cost of the Eastbound US 42 Ramp Improvement at I-264; because the Applicant has agreed to tie the issuance of building permits for a detailed plan to a limited first phase of The Midlands; because the improvements to the "roundabout" traffic device will be bonded to guarantee necessary improvements of alterations to the roundabout; and because detailed district development plans for subsequent phases of The Midlands must be accompanied by traffic and air quality analyses prior to approval; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposal conforms to Town Center Objectives D2.4, D4.4, Transportation Facility Design Guideline 8 and all applicable Policies adopted thereunder, including Policies 8.3, 8.6, 8.9, 8.10, and 8.11 because the proposal respects the scenic corridor of Brownsboro Road by establishing a primary focal point at the entrance to the development, which is the beginning point of the parkway; because the roundabout, and its center planting area will enhance the parkway, as will the elimination of existing above-ground utilities, which will be buried; because the proposed streetscape promotes the sense of community within the proposed Midlands Town Center; because parking facilities in The Midlands will be adequate and appropriately placed and will not adversely affect the pedestrian environment of the development; because entrance features together with the detailed architectural design of the buildings framing the roundabout will further serve to enhance the appearance of the parkway; because appropriate street connections are provided south to Carlimar Lane; because there will be no access though areas of significantly lower intensity or density which would create significant nuisances; because adequate sight distances will be provided for; and because internal circulation patterns providing for safe movement of vehicles and
pedestrians will be provided, all as indicated by the preliminary approval of the Transportation Section as shown on the Concept Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposal conforms to Town Center and Objective D2.3, and Mobility Strategy Goal H3 and H4, Mobility Strategy Goal I1, and Objective I12.1, Goal I2, Goals I3, Objective I3.1, Goal I5, Goal I7 Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Guideline 9 and all applicable Policies adopted thereunder, including Policies 9.1, 9.2, and 9.4 because adequate vehicular and pedestrian connections are provided between the residential areas of the development and the commercial and office areas of The Midlands, and between the surrounding and nearby residential areas and the commercial and office areas of The Midlands; because sidewalks will be constructed throughout the development providing pedestrian connections throughout the development and adjacent residential areas; because the higher density and intensity uses within the development will support public transportation systems, and it is anticipated that additional public transit will serve the development; because appropriate bicycle parking will be provided in the mixed use portion of the development and bicycle storage facilities will be provided throughout the development; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposal conforms to Livability Strategy Goal B1 and Objectives B1.1 and B1.8, Flooding and Stormwater Guideline 10 and all applicable Policies adopted thereunder, including Policies 10.1, 10.3, 10.6, 10.7, 10.9, 10.10, and 10.11 because the proposal has received the approval of the Metropolitan Sewer District ("MSD") indicating that through the use of on-site detention post-construction runoff rates will not exceed pre-development rates based on a fully developed watershed; because the use of multi-story buildings and possible parking structures will serve to minimize impervious surface areas, thereby reducing stormwater runoff potential; because the "through" drainage capacity will be preserved; and because vehicular access will be provided above the level of the 100-year flood; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposal conforms to Livability Strategy Goal E1, Water Quality Guideline 11 and all applicable Policies adopted thereunder, including Policy 11.3 because construction will adhere to MSD best practices and shall be conducted in compliance with all applicable codes relating to erosion and sediment control,
and an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan ("EPSC") shall be submitted to MSD for approval prior to site disturbance; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposal conforms to Mobility Strategy Goal C1 and Objective C1.1, Air Quality Guideline 12 and all applicable Policies adopted thereunder, including Policies 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 12.7, and 12.8 because as indicated in the Staff Report for Docket 9-15-06W the Air Pollution Control District has reported no exceedences of the ambient air quality standards for carbon monoxide resulting from the development provided the roundabout functions properly, which the Planning Commission deems likely since the Applicant has agreed to post a bond to ensure that all necessary improvements or alterations are made to the roundabout; because the utilization of the roundabout device will facilitate traffic movement on US 42 and on Brownsboro Road to prevent the "spot" accumulation of carbon monoxide; because the mixed use development is designed to reduce the number of necessary vehicle trips between land uses; because the higher density and intensity of the proposal will assist in promoting mass transit; and because sidewalks are provided throughout the development to provide an alternative to motorized transportation; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposal conforms to Landscape Character Guideline 13 and all applicable Policies adopted thereunder, including Policies 13.2, 13.4, 13.5, and 13.7 because native plant species will be utilized wherever possible within landscaping areas provided throughout the development; because an enhanced level of landscaping will be provided within perimeter areas, especially areas adjacent to single family areas within the cities of Crossgate and Graymoor/Devondale; because the development will provide tree canopy as required by the Land Development Code and trees will be preserved around the perimeter of the development wherever possible; because although a waiver has been applied for landscaping along the Brownsboro Road frontage of the site, the Brownsboro Road parkway will be protected by the high level of landscaping and building design proposed for The Midlands; and because landscape enhancements, lighting controls and sign controls will be employed to protect the parkway character; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposal conforms to Infrastructure Guideline 14 and all applicable Policies adopted thereunder, including Policies 14.2, 14.3, 14.4, 14.6, and 14.7 because the
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proposal constitutes an urban infill development in an area served by existing utilities; because sewer service will be provided for by MSD facilities; because an adequate supply of potable water and water for fire-fighting purposes is available to the site from the Louisville Water Company; because utilities will be located underground and utility easements will be designed to provide access for maintenance and repair and to minimize negative visual impacts and common utility easements will be provided wherever possible; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the proposal conforms to Community Facilities Guideline 15 and all applicable Policies adopted thereunder, including Policy 15.9 because the site will be adequately served by the Lyndon Fire Protection District; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That although the subject property was identified by the US 42 Corridor Study adopted in the mid-1980's as being appropriate for office and single-family use that this Corridor Study is now significantly dated; and that the “form” (design and function) of the proposed Town Center Form was not widely available or recognized in the 1980’s, and now the Town Center Form District should be considered the preferred form for the subject property; and

WHEREAS, The Commission finds that the proposal has received preliminary approval from Louisville Metro Department of Inspections, Permits and Licenses, Louisville Metro Department of Public Works, and the Metropolitan Sewer District; and

WHEREAS, The Commission finds the proposal to be in conformance with all other applicable guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Louisville Metro Planning Commission does hereby RECOMMEND to the legislative council of the Louisville/Jefferson County Metro Government that the change in zoning from R-4 Single Family Residential and OR-2 Office/Residential to PD Planned Development on property described in the attached legal description be APPROVED.

The vote was as follows:

YES: Commissioners Carlson, Adkins, Wells-Hatfield, Blake, Jones, Queenan, Abstain, Hamilton, and Howard.
NO: No one.
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NOT PRESENT: No one.
ABSTAINING: Commissioner Ernst.

General Development Plan

On a motion by Commissioner Blake, the following resolution was adopted:

**RESOLVED**, That the Louisville Metro Planning Commission does hereby **APPROVE** the District Development Plan for Docket No. 9-15-06VW, subject to the following binding elements:

**Binding Elements**

1. The development shall be in accordance with the approved Planned Development District Concept plan, all applicable sections of the Land Development Code (LDC) and agreed upon binding elements unless amended pursuant to the Land Development Code. Any changes/additions/alterations of any binding element(s) shall be submitted to the Planning Commission and City of Graymoor-Devondale for review and approval; any changes / additions / alterations not so referred shall not be valid.

2. Prior to development (includes clearing and grading) of each site or phase of this project, the applicant, developer, or property owner shall obtain approval of a detailed district development plan in accordance with Chapter 11, Part 6. Each plan shall be in adequate detail and subject to additional binding elements.

3. The development shall not exceed the trip generation (gross) numbers as stated in the July, 2006 URS traffic study that were based upon the following maximums:

- **Office:** 66,400 s.f. (does not include existing 37,800 s.f. Browentont office building)
- **Commercial:** 119,550 SF
- **Restaurant:** 17,000 SF
- **Hotel:** 150 Rooms
- **Residential:** 192 Apartments
- **117 condos**
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4. Signs shall be in accordance with the Master Sign Plan to be submitted prior to the consideration of the first detailed district development plan.

5. No outdoor advertising signs, small freestanding signs, pennants, balloons, or banners shall be permitted on the site.

6. Construction fencing shall be erected when off-site trees or tree canopy exists within 3' of a common property line. Fencing shall be in place prior to any grading or construction to protect the existing root systems from compaction. The fencing shall enclose the entire area beneath the tree canopy and shall remain in place until all construction is completed. No parking, material storage or construction activities are permitted within the protected area.

7. Before any permit (including but not limited to building, parking lot, change of use, site disturbance, alteration permit or demolition) is requested:

   (a) The development plan must receive full construction approval from Louisville Metro Department of Inspections, Permits and Licenses, Louisville Metro Public Works and the Metropolitan Sewer District.

   (b) The property owner/developer must obtain approval of a detailed plan for screening (buffering/landscaping) as described in Chapter 10 prior to requesting a building permit. Such plan shall be implemented prior to occupancy of the site and shall be maintained thereafter.

8. A certificate of occupancy must be received from the appropriate code enforcement department prior to occupancy of the structure or land for the proposed use. All binding elements requiring action and approval must be implemented prior to requesting issuance of the certificate of occupancy, unless specifically waived by the Planning Commission.

9. The applicant, developer, or property owner shall provide copies of these binding elements to tenants, purchasers, contractors, subcontractors and other parties engaged in development of this site and shall advise them of the content of these binding elements. These binding elements shall run with the land and the owner of the property and occupant of the property shall at all times be responsible for compliance with these binding elements. At all times during development of the site, the applicant and developer, their heirs, successors; and assignees,
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contractors, subcontractors, and other parties engaged in development of the site, shall be responsible for compliance with these binding elements.

10. The materials and design of proposed structures shall be substantially the same as depicted in the pattern book as presented at the October 12, 2006 Planning Commission meeting.

11. At the time a building permit is requested, the applicant shall submit a certification statement to the permit issuing agency, from an engineer, or other qualified professional stating that the lighting of the proposed development is in compliance with Chapter 4 Part 1.3 of the land development code and shall be maintained there after. No building permits shall be issued unless such certification statement is submitted. Lighting shall be maintained on the property in accordance with Chapter 4 Part 1.3 of the land development code. Lighting shall be maintained on the property in accordance with Chapter 4 Part 1.3 of the land development code.

12. All street name signs, traffic control signs and pavement markings shall conform with the manual on uniform traffic control devices (MUTCD) requirements and be installed prior to construction of the first residence or building on the street and shall be in place at the time of the bond release. (The address number shall be displayed on a structure prior to requesting a certificate of occupancy for that structure.)

13. The Master Declaration of Restrictions shall provide that the roads are private and that the City of Graymoor/Devondale is not responsible for road repair (including curbs and sidewalks) or snow removal.

14. Construction access to the site. (a) Construction vehicles, including construction equipment and vehicles carrying construction-related equipment and materials (altogether “construction vehicles”) shall not utilize Warrington Way or Carlimar Lane. Access for construction vehicles shall occur solely via Brownsboro Road.

(b) This Binding Element shall not apply to mail delivery, parcel delivery, sanitation and recycling, landscape vendors, ambulatory and EMS, school buses, and fire and police.
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15. The lane striping and signage at the confluence of Public Road “B” and Warrington Way and Private Road “B” as is required by law which shall be maintained in good condition by Applicant/Owner.

16. Construction Days and Hours. On Lot 5 no construction activity shall be permitted on Sundays or national holidays. No construction shall be allowed Monday through Friday before 7 AM or after 6 PM and Saturday before 9 AM or after 6 PM.

17. During all phases of construction of infrastructure and buildings signs shall be placed:

(a) at the perimeter of the site at Brownsboro Road, requiring all construction traffic and equipment to access the development site via Brownsboro Road;

(b) at the perimeter of the site at Carlmar Lane stating: "No construction traffic access to The Midlands."

(c) Notwithstanding (a) and (b) it is understood that sanitary sewer tie-in and utility tie-in in the right-of-way or easement of Carlmar Lane shall be permitted to occur immediately south of the development.

18. Within 120 days of final zoning approval, Developer shall post a bond in the amount of $10,000 for an 8-year term to accommodate the cost of one or more traffic-calming devices determined to be necessary by the City of Graymoor/Devondale for the purpose of preserving traffic safety on any affected street within Graymoor/Devondale deemed by the City to be impacted by The Midlands.

19. Carlmar Lane Barricade. A barricade shall be placed across the southern edge of the development where Carlmar Lane is to be connected to The Midlands, as shown on the Concept Plan. The barricade shall remain in place until construction of seventy-five percent of the buildings within The Midlands (buildings with common walls shall count as one building) have been completed, or until such other time if prior to the completion of the construction of the infrastructure as agreed to by the City of Graymoor/Devondale.
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*20. Tree protection fencing shall be erected adjacent to the rear and/or side yards of any immediately abutting property. Applicant agrees to monitor/ patrol fencing once per week for the duration of construction activities.

21. Adjacent property owners within the City of Crossgate may request that a 6-ft tall solid wood fence be installed along and within their property lines prior to any ground or construction work. The requests for the fence shall be coordinated with the City of Crossgate and shall be made within 6 months of legislative approval of the rezoning. The Korfhage Perimeter Landscape plan or a similar plan that is consistent with the intent of the Korfhage perimeter landscape plan shall be approved by Planning & Design Services staff and shall be implemented prior to occupancy of any structures along the perimeter of the development that are adjacent to the City of Crossgate.

22. Disturbed soil. (a) Applicant shall irrigate any soil disturbed by construction which is not covered by vegetation provided such soil has not been exposed to rain within 10 prior days.

(b) Applicant will seed any disturbed ground that is not under active construction activity to control possible air born dust.

*23. Upon the completion of the reconstruction of Warrington Way the applicant shall maintain Warrington Way at its intersection with Brownsboro Road and to a point south where a new stub street extends through the Browenton office building property which connects from the west. Applicant shall be responsible for snow removal, road maintenance and drainage in these areas.

24. No vehicular access from Haverhill Road. No vehicular access to or from Haverhill Road from or to the development shall be permitted.

25. A TARC stop or TARC stops with benches and a shelter or shelters will be provided within The Midlands development. The location of the stop/shelter or shelters shall be determined with TARC representatives at the time of detailed development plan review.

*26. A detailed district development plan, for the first phase of this project, may be issued building permits no sooner than the awarding of the construction contract for the Westport Rd./I-264 interchange. This plan shall:
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(a) Be in accordance with the approved concept (general) plan.

(b) Represent not more than 60 percent (60%) of the development as based on the total average PM peak hour trips (gross generated trips as shown on p. 2 of the Traffic Impact Study dated July 7, 2006 prepared by URS Corp.)

(c) Be accompanied by a traffic analysis based on the actual uses shown on the plan in comparison to the projected traffic generation presented in the July 2006 traffic study presented by the applicant.

*27. A detailed district development plan, for any subsequent phase(s) of this project shall:
(a) Be in accordance with the approved concept (general) plan.

(b) Be accompanied by traffic and air quality analyses, completed per Transportation Plan Review (DPDS) and APCD requirements, and based upon the actual uses and projected trip generations.

*28. Access to the development through the roundabout, except for construction vehicles, shall be controlled with the use of barricades or other devices approved by Metro Public Works prior to the final approval and acceptance of the installed infrastructure.

Prior to construction approval for any phase of the development which includes construction of the roundabout, the developer shall post a bond in favor of the Louisville Metro Department of Public Works for the purpose of guaranteeing improvements or alterations necessary to the roundabout or Brownsboro Road that may be necessary once the roundabout has been installed and is in operation. The amount of the bond shall be based on a cost derived from a design, proposed by the developer and approved by Metro Public Works, including signal installation cost for metering the roundabout. The bond shall be released at such time as the development generates 80% of the PM peak hour traffic anticipated to be generated based on the maximum square footage, number of rooms and dwelling units listed in Binding Element 3. The percentage of traffic shall be derived using the data found in the most recent edition of the ITE Manual.

*29. Contribution to Eastbound US 42 Ramp Improvement. (a) Within 90 days of final zoning approval by the Louisville Metro Council the Developer shall contribute
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$120,000 toward KTC Item 5-256.00 – Ramp Congestion Improvements. This shall be paid to Louisville Metro Public Works.

(b) In the event of an appeal is filed challenging successful zoning approval Developer’s contribution obligation shall not commence until the zone change has been sustained by a court of competent jurisdiction with all further time for appeal having lapsed.

*30. Right-of-way necessary for future improvements to the I-264/US 42 interchange (as determined by KTC during review of a detailed development plan) to accommodate a one-lane 25 MPH slip ramp from I-264 to Brownsboro Road, shall be dedicated by the developer at the time of approval of detail district development plans for all phases of this project.

The vote was as follows:

YES: Commissioners Carlson, Adkins, Wells-Hatfield, Blake, Jones, Queenan, Abstain, Hamilton, and Howard.
NO: No one.
NOT PRESENT: No one.
ABSTAINING: Commissioner Ernst.

Waiver

On a motion by Commissioner Blake, the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Finds That a waiver of the 30-foot parkway buffer along Brownsboro Road and related plantings has been requested as applicable to The Midlands development and its associated concept plan and overall development proposal; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the waiver will not adversely affect adjacent property owners because the site is proposed as an expansion to the existing Town Center Form District to the north and east, and the site will be designed be a pedestrian friendly streetscape oriented to the roundabout and other existing commercial properties near the Brownsboro Road;
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and because the existing development in this area is developed without the 30-foot buffers in a more Town Center form of development; and defining a compact, pedestrian friendly environment along roadways; because this plan is compatible with the existing office building to the north, all in compliance with the following applicable Guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan: Community Form Guideline 1.B.5; Centers Guideline 2.4; Centers Guideline 2.12; Compatibility Guideline 3.1, and all other applicable Goals, Objectives, Guidelines and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan all of which The Midlands is compliant with and all as set out in the Findings of Fact supporting the zone change, which Findings are hereby adopted in these Findings; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the extent of waiver of the regulation is the minimum necessary to afford relief to the Applicant because if the 30-foot buffer is provided then it will require the buildings to exceed the 15-foot maximum setback required by the Town Center Form District; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the Applicant has incorporated other design measures that exceed the minimums of the district and compensate for non-compliance with the requirements to be waived (net beneficial effect) because the design of the center meets the criteria for urban development with buildings close to the road which are pedestrian accessible; because the buildings form a "street wall" around this portion of the roundabout; because a masonry wall will extend out from the building to extend this street wall concept and will screen any parking that may be visible from Brownsboro Road; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the strict application of the provisions of the regulation would deprive the Applicant of the reasonable use of the land or would create an unnecessary hardship on the Applicant because providing the 30-foot buffer that would conflict with the Form District requirement that the buildings be set back no more than 15-feet from the right-of-way line; and
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WHEREAS, The Planning Commission Further Finds That the waiver will not violate the Comprehensive Plan because the Town Center Form District is located north and northeast of the site; because the Applicant has proposed a change of form district to Town Center as applied to this site, which the Planning Commission has endorsed; because the proposed waiver does not violate the Comprehensive Plan considering the location of the entrance features surrounding the roundabout together with buildings placed near street edges will facilitate the continuity of the town center design concept, and

WHEREAS, the Commission further finds that the waiver is the minimum necessary to provide relief to the property owners and is in conflict with the 15-foot maximum setback required by the Town Center Form District; and

WHEREAS, the Commission further finds that the applicant has incorporated other design measures to compensate for the inclusion of the waiver; and

WHEREAS, the denial of the waiver would deprive the applicant of the reasonable use of the land and create an unnecessary hardship on the applicant; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Louisville Metro Planning Commissioner does hereby GRANT a Waiver pursuant to LDC Chapter 10 Part 3.5.A.1 to omit the 30-foot Landscape Buffer on Brownsboro Road to allow a building to encroach into the right-of-way.

The waiver(s) are as specified in the Committee's resolution and do not waive any other regulation.

The vote was as follows:

YES: Commissioners Carlson, Adkins, Wells-Hatfield, Blake, Jones, Queenan, Abstain, Hamilton, and Howard.
NO: No one.
NOT PRESENT: No one.
ABSTAINING: Commissioner Ernst.
THE MIDLANDS
DESIGN OVERVIEW

SITE ENTRANCE

DESIGN INTENT:
To develop this acreage into a community that provides goods, services, and amenities on a scale that encourages pedestrian interaction. The architectural character is to reference the massing, detail, and vocabulary of historic cities and streetscapes of Europe, without replicating any one style.

As one moves west to east, the development layout modulates from an ‘urban streetscape’ of retail, offices, and larger scale public parking facilities, to the ‘Town Center’, that is a pedestrian streetscape of sidewalk cafes, people watching, gathering, and window shopping. As one moves further east, they transition to the residential neighborhood, with street corner retail that provides convenience services for the local residents. Two scales of residential neighborhoods surround a large green space, reflecting pool, and garden pavilion. A series of ‘Rowhouse’ buildings line the street, to form a ‘walled avenue’ that might be found in many older urban neighborhoods. On the north side of the ‘lawn’ is a neighborhood of attached single family houses with backyards, garages, and the personal sense of space that is characteristic of homes in the adjoining cities of ‘Crossgate’ and ‘Graymoor’ Devondale.

OVERVIEW:
- Designed as a ‘Town Center’
- Retail at the street level
- Offices and residential units on the upper levels.
- Roundabout traffic control also establishes an entrance identity for the development
- Buildings are held tight to the street, separated by wide sidewalks.
- Non-gated, stone entrance off roundabout provides a ‘Town Gateway’ for both pedestrian and vehicles.
- Avenues, storefronts, walks, and streetscapes are designed to reinforce and encourage pedestrian activity.
- Cars and trucks are to take a secondary role.
- Buildings are proposed as a flexible design so that adjustments to market demands can be made. Upper floors the buildings can be constructed as either office space or residential depending upon the demands of the market, and within the limits of available parking.
THE MIDLANDS
‘TOWN CENTER’

STREET ELEVATION

‘TOWN CENTER’

BUILDINGS:
- The buildings along the main entry drive and surrounding the main plaza will contain retail, commercial, and food service businesses at street level. Upper floors of these buildings are reserved for offices and ‘loft’ style apartments.
- The facades of these buildings are designed to appear as though they were built over time, with no particular style in mind. The end result shall resemble a ‘European’ city block.
- Acceptable materials shall include; brick, stone, stucco, wood, standing seam copper and metal, simulated slate, asphalt shingles, wood and metal storefront systems, and/or as approved by the developer.

STREETS:
- The streetscape shall be one that caters to the pedestrian and allows for easy access throughout the site. Traffic is to be encouraged through the development, but at a reduced speed.
- Mixed use of paving and strong presence of pedestrian activity to slow traffic down.
- Use of pavers at crosswalks and at intersections, and cobbles or stamped concrete at the main plaza area. The texture of these materials will help reduce traffic speed.
- Encourage on street parking (helps create activity on the sidewalk).

SIDEWALKS:
- Sidewalk activity is to be encouraged. Create an atmosphere that draws people in to shop, browse, stroll, or dine.
- Concept of ‘walking in comfort’. Wide sidewalks in town center, tree lined walks along park like common areas.
- Trees and other plantings MUST have a strong presence. Famous pedestrian streets all over the world have this quality. Large species trees, such as the ‘London Plane’ shall be planted at intervals that create the desired interweaving canopy.
- Trees provide reasonable protection from the elements, and shade and coolness when it is hot. They also provide a visible and psychological transition between the sidewalk and the street.

SIDEWALKS, CONTINUED:
- Sidewalk benches, bike racks, and lamp posts of some type should be provided at regular intervals. A multitude of sidewalk amenities creates a people friendly environment that can accommodate a variety of activities.
- Cafes, coffee shops, and other retail stores shall spill out onto the sidewalks. This creates an obstacle for people walking, which slows the pace down and promotes window shopping.
- Signs, awnings, and glass storefronts reinforce a sense of activity and variation of amenities.
- Newspaper stands, or other kiosks are scattered throughout the site in public areas and the main plaza area.
- Two water feature elements surrounded by benches at each end of the main plaza create gathering spots and site markers.

LEGEND
- Existing office
- Rowhouse w/ Corner retail
- Office/ Retail/ Retail
- Rowhouse
- Hotel
- Duplex
THE MIDLANDS
BUILDING HEIGHT LIMITATIONS

Structures placed within each zone shall conform to the following restrictions:

ZONE 1: 35°

ZONE 2: 45°

ZONE 3: 75°

NOTE:
Height measurement is taken from mean grade to center of roof or parapet, as provided for by the land development code.
THE MIDLANDS

HOUSING TYPES

LOFTS:
- Loft units are located above retail along Main Street and encircling the town center.
- These units are all accessible through a series of lobby spaces.
- The interior character of the loft units shall include brick masonry party walls, open (minimally) floor plans, with tall ceilings, large windows, and a balcony space.
- Exterior materials shall be consistent with the overall building character.

ROWHOUSE:
- Block building design as if a collection of individual buildings, with varying styles, usage of materials, and each having its own identity.
- Parking design maintains the urban character, with on-street, integral garages accessed from rear "alley" and carriage house buildings.
- Developed as a neighborhood street.
- Building fronts are pushed to the sidewalk line, thus creating a "walled avenue."

DUPLEX:
- Single family in scale and appearance.
- Each unit has a side entry attached garage with paved motor court access off the street.
- Material to be stone, brick, or stucco, with wood siding, Hardiplank, or shake accent panels.
- Windows are painted wood or clad with simulated divided lights. No vinyl windows are to be used.
- Exterior trim to be painted wood or wood composite material.
- Roof to be dimensional fiberglass shingles. Accent roofing to be standing seam copper or painted metal.
- Roof facades materials to be consistent with street facade. No vinyl or aluminum siding to be used.
- An attached screened porch and hard surfacing, grade level terrace can be provided as elements of the rear yard.

CONCEPTUAL DUPLEX GROUPING (street elevation)
THE MIDLANDS
AXIS / GREENSPACE

PLANTING:
- A green space, especially in the recreational area, shall have a pathway, visually and physically, for pedestrian safety and comfort. A well-defined and clear pathway throughout the site shall be provided with clear and unobstructed views to the surrounding areas.
- A green space around the perimeter of the site shall be planned as an integral part of the overall park design. This green space shall contain shrubs, trees, and other vegetation that provide shade, as well as visual and structural interest. It shall enhance the aesthetic appeal of the site, and provide a buffer between the site and the surrounding neighborhoods and the expressway.
- A pedestrian path shall be provided to connect the pedestrian to any area in the development, and to allow for ease of movement throughout the site and along the existing sidewalks.

PEDIMENT WALK:
- A paved pedestrian path, approximately 75% of the site taken from the pedestrian walkway, shall be provided at varying degrees of elevation to enhance the pedestrian experience. This path is intended to connect the pedestrian walkway to any area in the development, and to allow for ease of movement throughout the site and along the existing sidewalks.

Submitted Comments
April 2017
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Page 161
THE MIDLANDS
PARKING LAYOUT

PARKING

- **ON STREET**: Parallel and pull-in parking adjacent to retail stores and services.

- **SURFACE PARKING**: Integral planting to break down the perceived scale of the lot, and to provide shade cover and screening.

- **ELEVATED DECK PARKING**: For straight line walk in to connected 2nd & 3rd floor residential units.

- **FREESTANDING GARAGES**: Multi-family use building designed as outbuildings or 'carriage house' character.

- **ATTACHED GARAGES**: Private garage space integral with each of the duplex units.

- **INTEGRAL BUILDING GARAGES**: First floor pull-in garage serving adjacent first floor units, or upper floor units accessible through common lobby space.

CONCEPTUAL PARKING STRUCTURE ELEVATION

CONCEPTUAL PARKING STRUCTURE VIEW
THE MIDLANDS

FENCING

General: Area separation fencing and walls are discouraged around the development. Broad scale separation barriers impede the assimilation of the new neighborhood into the old.

DEVELOPMENT:

- Where required, development separations with the 'Crossgate' and Graymoor/Devondale neighborhoods shall be constructed of natural materials such as stone, brick, wood, or a combination of these materials.
- Height to be limited to 6' above grade and generally follow the slope of the land.
- Fencing adjacent to the 'Crossgate' and Graymoor/Devondale neighborhoods shall include a landscape buffer of varied vegetation sufficient in quality to provide a visual barrier.

TOWN CENTER (utilities fencing):

- Utilities fencing is restricted to the 'Town Center', retail, office, and hotel area. Limited use acceptable for multifamily/retail area. No use within the 'residential only' area.
- Utilities fencing to be constructed of natural materials in heights necessary to block equipment. Access gates shall be wood or metal and constructed to screen view, similar to enclosure.
- Landscaping may be added in addition.

RESIDENTIAL:

- Area enclosure fencing for residential units to be restricted to rear yards.
- Fencing to be an open picket or lattice style in wood, a natural ston/brick wall, or a combination of the two. Minimum of one gate leading to common space.
- Walls and fences shall be 4' in height or less.
- No personal area enclosure fencing will be permitted in the multi-family "rowhouse" area.

GARDEN AREA:

- Natural stone walls and 'ruined' walls shall be part of the park walking space. Walls are used as separation from traffic, landscape boundaries, and as architectural elements and 'found objects' within the development.

SIGNAGE

- Street markers, way finding signage can be post, building or common space architectural feature mounted. Character of signage to be consistent in theme (not necessarily identical) throughout the development.
- Signs attached to buildings shall be integrated into storefronts, or overhead projecting 90 degrees to storefront and suspended from metal or wood bracket. Variation in signage is encouraged for contribution to the character of the development.
- Anchor building signage above 1st floor level. It is envisioned that signage in zone 3 will be located at or above the highest floor level. No sign shall be directly visible from Crossgate or Graymoor/Devondale.

WATER DETENTION

- There are three detention basins located throughout the site, as shown in the plan. These detention basins are to be designed to mask their true function. The built result shall blend into the park like setting.
Attachment: Recommended Road Projects Not Listed in Kentucky’s Six-Year Road Plan

- Widen KY 22 to five lanes
- Widen Herr Lane to three or five lanes to improve the connection between U.S. 42 and Westport Road
- Convert the U.S. 42 intersection with KY 22 and Northfield Drive to right-in/right-out as recommended in the 2011 scoping study for the U.S. 42 interchange.
- Relocate the U.S. 42/KY 22 intersection to Glenview Avenue and construct a connector road, as explored in the 2011 scoping study for the U.S. 42 interchange.
- Consider adding an interchange along I-71 at the U.S. 42 underpass
- Consider a direct connector between KY 22 and I-264 westbound using a flyover ramp.
Is your area a traffic jam in the works?

Martha Elson, @MarthaElson_CJ 2:37 p.m. EST December 10, 2016

(Part: Marty Pearl/Special to The C-J)

Pattie Toler has lived off Westport Road for nearly 20 years and is convinced traffic has only gotten worse during that time — despite an extensive widening project completed six years ago that was intended to relieve congestion.

"Traffic is terrible," said Toler, who lives in The Coves subdivision between Hurstbourne Parkway and I-265. "I don't see how it could possibly get any worse."

Nevertheless, she's watching more traffic in the making as about 356 new apartments go up next door at the new Paddock at Sawyer Park development, a 25-acre site that used to have trees and one home. Already, there's bumper-to-bumper traffic weekdays between 4:30 and 6 p.m. along Westport heading to Freys Hill Road, she said.

It's one of at least half a dozen areas in Louisville where traffic is expected to increase as a result of development, and motorists may want to beware — especially during the holiday season when traffic can be more clogged than usual. A recent traffic analysis by the Kentuckiana Regional Planning & Development Agency has identified 10 "hotspots" that already are the most congested in Louisville.

While Westport didn't make the top 10 — which was topped by Preston Highway between Cooper Chapel Road and the Gene Snyder Freeway — some see a connection between Westport and the second-most congested site on KIPDA's list: Brownsboro Road near the I-264/Watterson Expressway. That spot is near where land was purchased for a new VA medical center.

Backups on I-264 in the Brownsboro Road area are said to make it even more difficult to get from the Westport interchange to I-71, north of the Brownsboro interchange. The Brownsboro Road stretch also is close to the ninth-most congested site on KIPDA's list — US 42 from Lime Kiln Lane to Seminary Drive.

On Westport west of Hurstbourne Parkway, about 224 or so apartment units also have opened recently at the Springhouse Apartments development near the city of Plantation, and in the nearby small city of Langdon Place, a developer has proposed about 18 condominiums and one house on either side of a historic home on Weissinger Road near Goose Creek Road.
The Paddock at Sawyer Hill nears completion at 9910 Westport Road. 11/23/16 (Photo: Marty Pearl/Special to The C-J)

Despite the nearly 600 residences planned within a two-mile stretch on Westport, state Transportation Cabinet officials say the road can handle it — regardless of perceptions by residents that it's overloaded — and there are no plans for improvements to the road. It's a busy thoroughfare that was widened to five lanes, with a center turning lane, from Hubbards Lane in St. Matthews to Hurstbourne Parkway starting in about 2004, after more than 20 years of planning and discussion.

But a new interchange was completed about the same time at Westport and I-264, adding more traffic to Westport — which some say offsets improvements from the road widening. Toler contends the widening project was "obsolete before it even got finished," and a transportation official had said during the planning process that it could be a "wash" because of the added traffic.

Problems are all over

Residents of the small Irish Hill neighborhood near downtown along Lexington Road and Payne Street have similar concerns about traffic that will follow a massive high-rise development proposed by developer Kevin Cogan at Lexington and Grinstead Drive/I-64, across from Cherokee Park. It would add hundreds of new apartments, offices, condominiums and hotel rooms.

One suggestion made at a neighborhood meeting about the proposal held by development representatives was to allow only a right-turn-in and right-turn-out traffic pattern around the block, given that dodging rush hour traffic would be "nearly impossible." Irish Hill resident Lisa Dettlinger also asked the developer to take the neighbors into account and consider, "How does density affect traffic and water quality?" Anita Streeter, a Crescent Hill resident, remembers a time before the interstate went through when "it was a much more commercial area," which could become the case again.

While that could be a long way off, if the development is ever built, residents along Westport and the Southpointe Commons site on Bardstown Road are looking at more traffic in the immediate future.

Construction could begin any time on the 363,000-square-foot development, which would have a big box anchor, restaurants, cinemas complex and a library or community center. Not only is more traffic anticipated as a result, but that stretch of Bardstown between the Snyder and Brentlinger Lane is already the sixth-most congested hotspot on KIPDA's list, with more than 43,000 vehicles on a typical day.
Southpointe Commons would be next to Bates Elementary, 7601 Bardstown, and a new road is planned leading past Bates to help with school traffic access.

Farther west on Preston Highway, which runs parallel to Bardstown, a short commercial stretch of Fern Valley Road from I-65 to Holiday Towers Boulevard, is the seventh-ranked site on KIPDA's list. Jesse Hazel, a graphic designer at the Courier-Journal, used to drive to work from the Jeffersontown area to Fern Valley Road and down I-65 and remembers big tie-ups in that stretch, especially around 5 p.m., on his way home.

Springbark Drive looking East will run behind the Paddock at Sawyer Hill apartment complex connecting Hickory Hills and The Coves subdivisions. 11/23/16  (Photo: Marty Pearl/Special to The C-J)

Among the factors were heavy traffic going west on Fern Valley to UPS and traffic merging from I-65 onto Fern Valley in a section with two traffic lights and backups related to attempted left turns. It was a "real rough area," and he used to time his arrival there to avoid 5 p.m., he said.

When the large Paddock apartment complex is finished on Westport, "traffic is going to be a major concern," said Jackie Richardson, who lives in a home in the back part of the city of Hickory Hills, on the other side of the Paddock development from The Coves. An access road link has been built for emergency vehicles to connect the Coves and Hickory Hills near her home, and residents will be allowed to use it — but not new apartment dwellers, she said.

Left turn? Forget it

Along Westport at the entrance to Hickory Hills, not only are left turns nearly impossible at times, but even right turns sometimes can be "extremely difficult," Richardson said. "When you consider 356 apartments and the traffic, that makes an already bad situation worse."

While there have been questions about getting an additional traffic light along Westport, "neither (apartment) location will have traffic volumes that come close to warranting a signal at this time," said Andrea Clifford, a spokeswoman for the state Transportation Cabinet in Louisville. "But obviously we can monitor them as they grow." Both apartment locations will benefit from the Westport left turn lane, and the Paddock site will require a right turn lane, Clifford said.

"Westport was designed to carry a lot of traffic," she said in an email. "During peak hours (morning and afternoon commutes), it is congested and speeds are low. Access to the highway is more difficult when
it's congested, but crashes are typically less severe due to the low speeds. During off-peak times, it operates well below capacity, which is why motorists' speeds are up into the 50s."

New apartment complexes "develop over time," she added. "They do not produce the peak volumes right after they start taking residents," Clifford said.

When a traffic study was done years ago for the widening, it made projections about future traffic volumes based on trends and current and future development. "When the decision was made to make Westport five lanes with an interchange, there was not enough traffic on the existing two lanes to warrant five lanes," Clifford said. "So yes, there was good planning on our part, seeing how the area has grown."

Valerie Wait, a management representative for the Springhouse Apartments, which opened in mid-August and are supposed to be completed in December, said people there "haven't had problems with getting in and out."

"High traffic" occurs only at certain times, and "that's all over Louisville," she said. "Between 5 and 6, it definitely is busier. ... (But) we still leave every day at 5 or 6 o'clock and we're still are able to get out."

Next door along Westport at Portland Christian School, which moved its grade school there six years ago and its high school more recently from the Portland neighborhood in west Louisville, an exit sign near Westport reads: "Right turn only 7:30 to 8:30 a.m. and 2:30 to 3:30 p.m. For your safety and the safety of our children." A left turn is not considered safe, because parents are coming in at those time, and there may be backups on Westport, said Rick Folden, director of facilities at the expanding school.

Springbark Drive looking West will soon connect the neighborhoods of Hickory Hills and The Coves behind the Paddock at Sawyer Hill apartment complex. 11/23/16  (Photo: Marty Pearl/Special to The C-J)

Traffic can be a problem, but it's also a sign the area is popular, which is a boon to the school. The school now has 478 students in pre-school through high school, compared to about 217 on average at the Portland location, Folden said. "There's been tremendous growth in this area. That's one of the reasons we were really excited about getting in this facility."
Impact of VA hospital

Going the other direction, Joseph Brennan, a Hickory Hills resident, said he can already envision traffic backing up even more on Westport and I-264 if the VA hospital is built on Brownsboro and more traffic is generated because of the several hundred thousand visits expected there each year. From Hickory Hills, "It's impossible after 5 o'clock to come west on Westport to get to I-71" via I-264, Brennan said at a recent meeting about an environmental impact study of the potential hospital sites held at Christ Church United Methodist on Brownsboro.

Brenda Paul, who lives near Brownsboro Road, said she took care of her brother, a veteran, for 30 years before he passed away in 2013 and that he received care at the current VA site on Zorn Avenue. They had to negotiate the intersection at U.S. 42/Brownsboro Road and I-264 to get there. "We sat through five and six lights," she said. "It's a nightmare trying to get through that intersection."
The 10 worst spots

The Kentuckiana Regional Planning & Development Agency, which coordinates Louisville-area highway-improvement planning, found that the most congested location in Jefferson County is on Preston Highway, between Cooper Chapel Road and the Gene Snyder Freeway.

Here are the top 10, in order, congested locations cited by KIPDA:

1. Preston Highway between Cooper Chapel Road and the Gene Snyder. (This could be alleviated with the widening of Cooper Chapel near Preston.)

2. Brownsboro Road near the Watterson Expressway. The area is where the replacement Robley Rex V.A. Medical Center is planned.

3. Shelbyville Road from Ten Pin Lane to the Watterson.

4. Dixie Highway from Rockford Lane to Gagel Avenue.

5. Frankfort Avenue at the confluence with Lexington Road/Breckenridge Lane.

6. Bardstown Road from Brentlinger Lane to the Gene Snyder.

7. Fern Valley Road from I-65 to Holiday Towers Boulevard.

8. Bardstown Road from the Gene Snyder to Outer Loop.

9. U.S. 42 from Lime Kiln Lane to Seminary Drive.

10. U.S. 42 from River Road to Ky. 329 (Covered Bridge Road).

Traffic jam tips

► Walk, ride a bicycle or take public transportation.

► Consolidate errands into one trip.

► Don't surge ahead.

► Give yourself space.

► Avoid gawking.

► Drive a different route.

► Avoid peak traffic times.

► Plan routes.

► Maintain proper following distance.
► Keep your speed constant, avoiding unnecessary braking or acceleration.

► Avoid changing lanes too quickly or cutting too closely in front of people.
Robley Rex VAMC  
Attn: Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office  
800 Zorn Avenue  
Louisville, KY 40206.

January 30, 2015

Dear VAMC Activation Team Office,

My name is Councilwoman Angela Leet and I represent over 25,000 constituents of Louisville Metro’s District 7. I also hold a Master of Engineering from the J.B. Speed School of Engineering at the University of Louisville and worked full time as a licensed environmental engineer in the state of Texas for nearly 10 years. I have spent a great deal of time listening and talking to the residents of District 7 and today I write to you on their behalf.

This letter represents a response regarding the Draft Environmental Audit (EA) dated December 15, 2014.

Based upon a review of the EA, it is clear that the conclusions regarding the traffic impacts of the proposed VA Louisville VA Hospital Replacement Project (“the Project”) were based upon faulty and/or incomplete information related to existing and projected traffic volumes, as a result, I am requesting that the VA undertake a supplemental traffic study to consider the complete known traffic data prior to making the determination as to whether to issue an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). The EA fails to provide sufficient evidence and analysis for determining the appropriateness of a FONSI. The failure to undertake an EIS would be irresponsible to the surrounding community, unlawful, and in violation of 38 CFR 26.6.

The VA’s specific criteria for Typical Classes of action that normally do require an EIS are:

1. Section 38 CFR 26.6(a)(1)(ii) Acquisition of land in excess of 10 acres for development of a VA medical center facility. The 36-acre site will be used to construct an 800,000 square foot medical facility, plus two multistory parking garages.

2. Section 38 CFR 26.6(a)(2)(ii) An increase in average daily vehicle traffic volume of at least 20 percent on access roads to the site or the major roadway network. The EA, section 3.13.3 Environmental consequences, indicates a 39% and 31% increase in traffic at Hwy 22 & I264 VA entrance and a 9% and 13% increase at US Hwy 22 & US Hwy 42.
during the morning and evening peak hours, respectively. The weighted increase for both locations is 19% and 26%, respectively.

You will note there are significant flaws including lack of transparency and calculation issues concerning the presented traffic analysis as follows:

(a) No assumptions/criteria used in the traffic study are provided (i.e.; traffic count in and out of the current Zorn location that should include employees, visitors, patients, ambulatory traffic, deliveries, daily totals, peak hour totals, and non-peak totals.)

(b) Peak evening hour for the US Hwy 22 & I-264 entrance reflect 4 pm to 5 pm.

(c) Traffic study should factor additional traffic count from the consolidation of the current downtown administration office and outpatient clinics at Shively, DuPont, & Newburg.

(d) Traffic study should factor additional traffic count from the planned development at the corner of Brownsboro & Lime Kiln/Herr lane that will include 519 upscale apartment units.

(e) Traffic study does not include year 2023 when the hospital starts operation.

(f) Current ADT at Hwy 22 & I264 VA entrance shows 21,400 increasing to 24,300 by 2040. However, just the addition of VA employees alone will increase traffic by 2,500 to 5,000 in and out of the VA on the first day of operation.

(g) Based upon the 917 in VA traffic in a 1 hour peak period equates to 21,600 trips a day and if reduced by 50%, 10,800 trips a day, which increases ADT at the US Hwy 22 & I-264 by 50%.

(h) The analysis should also factor and analyze non-peak hours.

(i) Page 62 states “the proposed action would significantly contribute to the degradation of the LOS at the Hwy 22 and I-264 intersection, but mitigates it with KYTC improvements but provides no conclusive substantial evidence.

Why does the EA neither provide criteria used in the analysis, nor analyze information available as outlined in a-e above? The failure to utilize this information can only lead to the conclusion that the EA fails to provide sufficient information and analysis upon which FONSI can be supported.

(3) Section 38 CFR 26.6(a)(2)(iii) Probable conflict with, or significant affect on, local or regional zoning or comprehensive land use plans. The EA, section 3.8 Land Use, concludes the new facility will “generally” be consistent with the comprehensive plan and existing zoning. The prior developer incorporated high end residential patio homes backing up to bordering homes, upscale restaurants, retail, significant green space, and walking paths that complimented the character of the surrounding community. VA building heights are NOT IN COMPLIANCE and the facility will definitely NOT compliment the character of the community or offer a community feel. The intent of the Jefferson County’s Land Development Code 2.8.1 Planned Development (PD) District is to promote diversity and integration of uses and structures in a planned development through flexible design standards that:
* Create new development that is livable, diverse, and sustainable;
* Promote efficient and economic uses of land;
* Respect and reinforce existing communities, integrating new development with existing development to ensure compatibility;
* Provide flexibility to meet changing needs, technologies, economics, and consumer preferences;
* Promote development patterns and land uses which reduce transportation needs and which conserve energy and natural resources;
* Lower development and building costs by permitting smaller networks of utilities and streets and the use of shared facilities;
* Protect and enhance natural resources;
* Promote the development of land that is consistent with the applicable form district;
* Encourage a variety of compatible architectural styles, building forms, and building relationships within a planned development; and
* Preserve the historic development patterns of existing neighborhoods.

_Why does the EA conclude the new facility will “GENERALLY” be consistent with the comprehensive plan and existing zoning when it is clearly in contradiction with the above PD zoning intent?_

**ADDITIONAL EA FLAWS**

Socioeconomics, section 3.10, page 54. The EA states, “The PEA analysis concludes that the development at the project site would not have adverse socioeconomic effects, therefore, no additional site-specific impact analysis for the Proposed Action is necessary”. However, the March 2012 PEA does not analyze any surrounding site-specific data and is based upon state, county, and city demographics only which is flawed.

The EA acknowledges issues during construction such as noise disruption, visual and land disturbance, and potential negative impact to property values, but states it will be temporary or short-term. However, assuming the project progresses on time and on budget will take 6 years to complete. This is a long-term impact to the surrounding community, not a short-term or temporary impact. Furthermore, conclusions are flawed if significance is avoided by terming an action temporary.

The EA uses a “No Action” alternative for impact analysis, which appears to be an improper baseline.

Many mitigations pertaining to traffic, zoning, and property values, for instance, lack supporting backup data and analysis to conclude a FONSI. Conclusions are vague and words such as “generally” are used throughout the report.

**CONCLUSION**

Per NEPA regulations, “A Federal agency must prepare an EIS if it is proposing a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.” The proposed almost 1 million square foot Medical Facility is a major Federal Action that will
significantly impact a densely populated residential community at a highly congested location.

The EA, upon which the FONSI will be based, fails to consider impact of the addition of thousands of cars a day to an area recognized for its gridlock under current conditions.

For these aforementioned reasons and in an effort to ensure the best medical care for our Veterans and the health and safety of all Louisvillians, I respectfully request that an EIS be completed.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Angela Leet
District 7 Councilwoman
Ms. Williams and the VAMC Activation Team,

The DEIS is flawed and either a new EIS should be conducted or the VA ought to consider a new location for the Robley Rex VAMC.

Concerns regarding the VA NOT following the NEPA process:

- The VA did not follow the NEPA process. The VA purchased the site at Brownsboro Road without completing an EIS, as required by law.

- The VA's choice of site was predetermined, resulting in a biased EIS.

Concerns not properly addressed by the DEIS:

- Fire support in the area will be negatively impacted. All fire support will be allocated to 'a hospital'. Lyndon Fire can not support the surrounding neighborhoods and the proposed hospital. SEE ATTACHED LETTERs and PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED (and unaddressed) COMMENTS/CONCERNS.

- The residents of Crossgate (120 households) vehemently oppose the VA Hospital build for the reasons cited well as within the attached resolution. SEE ATTACHED RESOLUTION.

- The DEIS lacks the sufficient data to support the claimed need for additional VAMC capacity in the Louisville area or to evaluate the potential alternatives to address that need.

- The DEIS does not provide criteria for evaluating alternative sites for a new VAMC.

- The DEIS does not provide justification for closing the three CBOCs or consolidating the Veterans Benefits Administration office.

- The DEIS does not contain any reasonable alternative sites. One of the site evaluated in the DEIS (Zorn Avenue) is not considered a viable site, and the other site (the St.Joseph property) was already sold to another developer.

- The DEIS does not provide adequate analysis of the quality of care for veterans at each site and their ability to receive care in a timely manner. The Brownsboro site will actually have substantial negative impacts to veterans, as the distance from Louisville’s downtown medical campus and the U of L medical campus puts the health and lives of veterans in further risk when emergency care is needed.
November 12, 2012

TO: Mr Joseph Werner MHA, FHFI  
Senior Project Coordinator  
Robley Rex Veterans Affairs Medical Center  
800 Zorn Avenue, Louisville KY 40206  
Phone: 502-287-4000 Ext 55160

FROM: The City of Crossgate  
c/o Mayor Kirk Hilbrecht  
P.O. Box 6423  
Louisville, KY 40206

SUBJECT: The City of Crossgate’s Concerns and Requested Considerations Regarding the new Robley Rex VA Hospital Build.

Mr. Werner,

Thank you in advance for agreeing to meet with me, the Mayor of Crossgate.

Attached to this letter is the City of Crossgate’s cumulative list of concerns and requested considerations we, as tax-payers, would like addressed by the Department of Veteran Affairs.

We also would like to have at lease one Crossgate elected-Representative meet with the VA’s planners, designers and architects to review plans and provide input in advance prior to any design plan reaching final completion.

I am forwarding this same list to our local, state, and federal elected officials, as well as VA Headquarters in Washington D.C.

I am hoping that the VA will be able to address these questions and concerns in a reasonably short time-span, as planning for this complex has been well-underway for almost 12 months.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the same.

Regards,

[Signature]

Mayor Kirk Hilbrecht  
khilbrecht@crossgateky.org
THE CITY OF CROSSGATES’ CONCERNS REGARDING
THE VA HOSPITAL MEDICAL COMPLEX BUILD

* DURING CONSTRUCTION
What will be the 'normal working hours for construction of this VA Hospital Medical Complex? What is the VA’s plan for mitigating dust and debris from lofting into the Crossgate neighborhood? Will the construction include blasting during the VA Hospital build? If so, what is the VA’s plan to protect the City of Crossgate from home/foundation damage? Will the VA pay for damage to the homes of Crossgate caused by the build of the VA Hospital Medical Complex? If blasting is necessary will the VA survey all buildings in the City that may be impacted in advance of the blasting, so there is baseline of conditions of those buildings?

BINDING ELEMENTS
Will the VA be bound by the same binding elements previously placed on the Midlands property?

* BRICK WALL
At least an 8 to 10 foot BRICK wall on the property adjacent to the Crossgate neighborhood is requested. In addition, the brick wall should be set back from property line in accordance with agreed plan with commitment by VA to maintain plantings and landscaping on the City’s side of the BRICK WALL. In addition the City requests that the entire site be fenced/walled to discourage vehicular and foot traffic through the Crossgate neighborhood.

* FLOODING ISSUES
Where is the surface water from the VA Hospital Medical Complex going to drain? Will the VA develop its property to help the City of Crossgate mitigate its current water drainage issues?

* PARKING ISSUES
How many parking garages will be built? Will they be above ground or below ground? How many parking spaces does the VA anticipate needing? How will the VA keep patrons from parking in the Crossgate neighborhood, as the patrons currently do at the Robley Rex campus? What is the location and size of all parking garages and surface lots?

* SECURITY/SAFETY ISSUES
How will the VA be protecting the VA Hospital Medical Campus from malicious, heinous and terroristic activities and threats? Can the City of Crossgate expect the same protection from the VA Security Forces? How will the VA ensure that the residents of Crossgate will be safe from construction workers, patients and visitors of the VA Hospital Medical Complex? Who is accountable for the personnel on the VA Hospital Medical Complex? Will the VA install security cameras for surveillance of key locations involving the Crossgate neighborhood?

* CRIME/THEFT INCREASE
Will the VA help protect the City of Crossgate from the potential increase in criminal activity in this area?

* The items marked with an asterisk and highlighted in yellow are the items the City of Crossgate City requests written commitments from the VA the City believes are not negotiable.
* ACCESS
Where will the 2 required egress routes and 2 required ingresses for the VA Hospital Medical Complex be located, exactly? Will the Graymoor-Devondale streets be used for emergencies? Where will all access points in and out of VA property be located, for pedestrians and vehicles?

UTILITIES
How big will the power plant be for the new VA Medical Hospital Complex? How will this power plant be fenced off to prevent the children from Crossgate and adjacent neighborhoods from being injured by this power plant? Will this power plant be a burden to the current power grid of Crossgate? Will all onsite utilities be underground? How will they impact the City? Does VA anticipate connection to any utilities presently located in the City, and if so what will the impact be on the City?

PUBLIC TRANSIT
How many more TARC and Greyhound bus routes will be added to this area? Where will the TARC and Greyhound bus shelters be located?

BUILDING STRUCTURE LOCATION AND HEIGHTS
How many floors will the new VA Medical Hospital have? How many buildings will the VA Medical Complex house? What is the expansion plan of the VA medical complex? Will the hospital be closer to the Highway or to Crossgate? Could it be closer to the highway, further from the neighborhood? Where will the water tower be located? Could it be further from the neighborhood as not to be an eyesore? Where will the power station be located? Could it be further from the neighborhood as not to be an eyesore? Where will the parking garages be located? Could it be further from the neighborhood—or NOT facing the neighborhood—as not to be an eyesore? Where will the garbage storage containers be located? Could it be further from the neighborhood—or NOT facing the neighborhood—as not to be an eyesore? Where will the delivery docks be located? Could it be further from the neighborhood—or NOT facing the neighborhood—as not to be an eyesore?

What are the proposed dimensions of all proposed buildings/structures?

TAX AND PROPERTY VALUE IMPACTS
Traditionally, how has a VA Hospital Medical Complex affected property taxes or home values due to its proximity to a neighboring city and/or other services brought into an area where a VA Hospital Medical Complex was not before?

TRAFFIC/TRAFFIC PATTERNS/TRAFFIC DELAYS
What is the VA’s plan for expanding pedestrian sidewalks? What is the VA’s plan for emergency routes or emergency traffic? What is the VA’s shift change plan as not to compete with the current morning/afternoon/evening traffic patterns of the local elementary/middle/high school students, as well as the working citizens of this area?

* The items marked with an asterisk and highlighted in yellow are the items the City of Crossgate City requests written commitments from the VA the City believes are not negotiable.
* LIGHTING ISSUES – SIGNAGE ISSUES
What is the VA’s plan on mitigating light noise for this area?

What is the proposed location, size, color, lighting, etc. for all proposed signage on buildings and on VA site?

NOISE
What is the VA’s plan for mitigating noise from:
- Shift changes?
- Deliveries
- Garbage pickup
- Emergency vehicles
- Operations of all buildings and facilities

* LANDSCAPING FOR NEIGHBORHOOD
What is the VA’s plan for masking the VA from the Crossgate properties adjacent to the VA Hospital Medical Complex?

What is the VA plan for landscape buffering & setbacks, as effects the City?

* FEDERAL JURISDICTION
Will the VA Hospital Medical Complex be under local, state or federal jurisdiction? If a crime is committed in the Crossgate neighborhood and the perpetrator egresses onto the VA Hospital Medical Complex, who has jurisdiction to apprehend the perpetrator?

What is VA plan for providing security personnel for its facilities?

* The items marked with an asterisk and highlighted in yellow are the items the City of Crossgate City requests written commitments from the VA the City believes are not negotiable.
WHEREAS, the Veterans Administration has proposed to build a new Hospital in Louisville; and

WHEREAS, the Veterans Administration has purchased land near the junction of the Watterson Expressway and Brownsboro Road, known as the Midlands, as a proposed building site for the proposed VA Hospital; and

WHEREAS, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet has evaluated the current traffic situation in the Brownsboro corridor, adjacent to and surrounding the region within 5 miles of the Midlands property, as an "F" in acceptable traffic flow; and

WHEREAS, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet projected traffic patterns after millions of dollars of traffic mitigation construction and the anticipated traffic from the Midlands VAMC maintaining an "F" rating in regards to acceptable traffic flow; and

WHEREAS, this tremendous traffic will refuse veterans and family members adequate, timely and potentially life-saving access to this new VA Medical Campus, and

WHEREAS all veterans suffering from stroke, or requiring invasive cardiac care, are transported to other hospitals for that care and transport times can be critical to the outcome for veterans; and

WHEREAS, inpatient transfers from the current VA Hospital to downtown hospitals numbers in the hundreds every year and will be hindered by this traffic issue, and

WHEREAS, the geographic isolation of the VA Hospital from the downtown medical center and medical school impairs the availability of physicians, including specialized physicians, to provide services to the veterans; and

WHEREAS the Louisville and Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD), Louisville Gas and Electric, Lyndon Fire Department and the Graymoor-Devondale Police Department all expressed their grave concerns of their independent abilities to adequately service the VAMC at the Midlands property, and

WHEREAS, most VA Hospitals are located in downtown urban settings close to university hospitals including Atlanta (Emory), Cincinnati (Univ. of Cincinnati), Indianapolis (Indiana Univ.), Nashville (Vanderbilt Univ.), Lexington (Univ. of Kentucky), Memphis (Univ. of Tenn., Memphis), St. Louis (St. Louis Univ., Washington Univ.), East Tennessee (East Tennessee State Univ.), Cleveland (Case Western Univ.), Baltimore (Univ. of Baltimore),

WHEREAS, personnel and support services for Veterans are more accessible, and more likely to positively impact the health and quality of life of Veterans at a downtown location; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the City of Crossgate opposes the Midlands location for construction of a new VA Hospital; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the City of Crossgate supports a location for the proposed VA hospital adjacent to the University of Louisville Medical Center.
Dear Robley Rex VAMC Executives and Leaders,

Attached to this document are several items of concern regarding the pending Brownsboro VAMC build that the neighbors of Crossgate brought up during our last Crossgate City Council Meeting on Monday, May 13th 2013.

Below is a summation of their concerns:

Traffic (see attached pictures). The current traffic pattern of the Brownsboro corridor is hellacious, horrendous and unbearable. A police officer has been hired by Northfield to direct traffic in the mornings through the Old Brownsboro and HWY 42 intersection. Currently, bus traffic and emergency vehicles struggle to move through this choke point during peak traffic (currently 0730 – 0930 and 1500 – 1830 daily, regardless of school).

Q: What is the VA’s plan to mitigate the estimated 3,500 additional daily VA-related vehicles to be added to this daily traffic debacle?

Lyndon Fire Department (see attached letter). On April 23rd 2013, each of our City Council members received this letter stating that the Lyndon Fire Department staffing will be cut back due to budget constraints. We are concerned that the reduction in fire support will impact the fire department’s ability to serve our community in times of fire.

Q: How might this impact the VA’s fire planning?

Fire. On May 2nd 2013, the Thomas Jefferson Unitarian Church barn/storage structure burned down (see pictures). This structure sits less than 300 feet from the houses of Crossgate. The Lyndon Fire Department arrived 15 minutes after they were called, but were not able to put out the fire themselves. A second engine was called (Harrod’s Creek). By the time the second engine arrived, it was determined that the structure was a total loss and should be a controlled burn until extinguished.

Q: Does the VA have a specific fire contingency and how will this plan impact or prioritize fire services of the surrounding neighborhoods?

Brownsboro VAMC Grounds. The land purchased by the VA for their proposed VAMC is currently overgrown. The fire hydrant is currently obscured by tall grass (see pictures). There also is a structure on this property that is an eyesore.

Q: What is the VA’s plan to tend and maintain their purchased property prior to construction? How often will it be mowed?
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VA Hearings. On May 7th 2013 the House Committee on Veteran’s Affairs Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations (O&I) held a hearing regarding the VA Construction Policy: Failed Plans result in Plans that Fail.  

Speaking on behalf of Jefferson County and American Tax payers, we are all concerned that this proposed VAMC build will succumb to the same problems as the VA’s previous developments.

Q: What are your thoughts regarding the hearing as it relates to the proposed build? Is this what Kentucky has to look forward to?

Again, these are the questions, concerns and words--often verbatim--of the neighbors from Crossgate.

Thank you for your consideration and attention to the same.


Kirk Hilbrecht
Mayor of Crossgate
khilbrecht@crossgateky.org
DIRECT LINE:  502-592-9267

Check out our website at: http://www.crossgateky.org
Traffic

Q: What is the VA’s plan to mitigate the estimated 3,500 additional daily VA-related vehicles to be added to this daily traffic debacle?

Police Officer hired by Northfield to direct traffic out of their neighborhood.
April 23, 2013

Mayor Kirk Hilbrecht
1900 Crossgate Lane
Louisville, KY 40227

Dear Mayor Hilbrecht;

In the recent past we have been vocal in our need for relief from the current tax law that constrains our operating budget, and have worked diligently to explore avenues which would lead to service and revenue increases to no avail.

We’re now writing to inform you that, in light of our budget issues, we will reduce our staffing by three (3) positions effective July 1, 2013. These positions were vacated through member retirements, and have remained filled through temporary staffing as the FY 2012/2013 budget allotted for these salaries. However, due to increasing labor costs, we simply cannot continue to fill these positions in the upcoming budget year. This reduction results in an overall 11% decrease in our suppression staff.

While it may not seem like a significant reduction, this reduction in staffing will have a direct impact in our service delivery. While we will strive to maintain the customer service model we’ve worked so hard to establish, the manner in which we perform our service tasks will ultimately be diminished. This will impact us most significantly on the fire ground, based solely on the fact that it takes a minimum number of firefighters to perform certain tasks related to extinguishing a fire. When the number of firefighters is reduced, it takes longer to complete these important aspects of the job of firefighting, which translates to longer times of controlling and extinguishing fires. This could directly result in an increased loss of life and more significant fire damage resulting in higher amounts of property loss.

The National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST) conducted a landmark study that was released in 2010 which showed that the size of a firefighting crew has a direct impact on the fire service’s ability to protect lives and property in residential fires. The study clearly showed that four-person crews were able to complete 22 essential firefighting and rescue tasks 25 percent faster than three-person crews.

This staffing reduction will also have a direct result on our Emergency Medical Response (EMS). Effective July 1, we will reduce the types of EMS calls we will respond to, and thus, will be responding only on runs categorized as ‘ECHO’ runs. These types of calls consist primarily of incidents involving cardiac arrest and/or respiratory arrest, as well as calls involving significant trauma. What this means for the community is that they may experience a longer wait time for emergency medical service involving other various types of illness or injury.

– Always Ready to Answer Your Call … Because a Life may Depend on It –
As previously stated, we have worked diligently to create a number of viable solutions that would avert this matter. All of these potential solutions would have increased the level of service we provide to our customers while giving us the opportunity to generate additional revenue. While these solutions have been submitted to Metro Government, to date we have not received the support we need to avert these service delivery shortfalls.

While we will do anything we can to reduce the impact of a fire and the damage it may cause, our ability to do so is limited by the number of firefighters we have. It is our ultimate goal to provide these services in a manner which is effective, but also safe for our members.

Yours in service,

M. Russell Rakestraw
Fire Chief
Fire

Q: Does the VA have a specific fire contingency and how will this plan impact or prioritize fire services of the surrounding neighborhoods?

May 2, 2013, the Thomas Jefferson Unitarian Church barn burned to the ground. This structure is adjacent to the Crossgate neighborhood. Picture taken from a Crossgate neighbor’s back yard.
Brownsboro VAMC Grounds

Q: What is the VA’s plan to tend and maintain their purchased property prior to construction? How often will it be mowed?

The fire hydrant is obscured by the tall grass on the VA’s property.
Q: What are your thoughts regarding the hearing as it relates to the proposed build? Is this what Kentucky has to look forward to?
• The DEIS does not adequately compare alternatives in regard to access issues for both veterans and employees.

• The DEIS does not adequately evaluate the impact on air quality.

• The DEIS does not adequately evaluate the impact on traffic-related noise.

• The Brownsboro site does not fall within the planned development zoning designation as determined by Metro Louisville government.

• The DEIS provides no real analysis on the transportation network of the area and travel times for veterans and physicians to and from the site.

As far as VAMC sites, the current location of the Robley Rex VAMC on Zorn Avenue is a viable option. The cost to refurbish is millions less than it is to build a new facility.

Land owners and interest groups around the Louisville Metro have offered to DONATE their land to the VA (Reed Benet-50 acres for ’Hero Homes’; Radcliff-147 acres; Bullitt County-42 acres; and Louisville’s West End).

Land. For Vets. For Free.

These areas WANT the VA hospital for all the right reasons: benefiting the vets; benefiting the area.

These offers MUST be reviewed, as part of the EIS, by your own regulations.

As a veteran, I want the best possible healthcare for me and my brothers and sisters in arms.

The Brownsboro site is NOT the right location for this world class facility.

Respectfully,

Kirk Hilbrecht


--

Kirk Hilbrecht
Mayor of Crossgate
khillbrecht@crossgateky.org
Voice-to-text number: 502-265-6864

Check out our website at: http://www.crossgateky.org

EMAIL DISCLOSURE: Email is intended solely for the correct addressee(s). If an email was sent to you in error, please notify us by replying to the email or by
telephoning 502-265-6864.
The City of Crossgate reserves the right to monitor both sent and received emails.
DATE: 31 January 2015

TO: Veterans Administration

FROM: Mayor of Crossgate, Kirk Hilbrecht

RESPONSE TO THE Draft Site-Specific Environmental Assessment (EA)

The City of Crossgate believes that the proposed build of the new VA Medical Complex scheduled on the former Midlands Property, adjacent to the Crossgate neighborhood, Louisville, Ky, 40222 requires a full Environmental Impact Statement be completed prior to the projected VA hospital build.

We are submitting Crossgate’s previously submitted resolution in regards to this proposed hospital build, our previously submitted City Concerns, along with Metro Council woman Angela Leet’s letter to VA and another developer’s letter to Senate Majority Leader, Mitch McConnell.

Without a doubt, a hospital build in the Brownsboro corridor during the construction and operation of a VAMC will severely constrict the already-overburdened and area already-identified as a ‘FAIL’ in congestion by the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet.

The KTC believes that spending a proposed $9million and rerouting traffic in this area will only result in a “D - ” rating in traffic flow.

This is unacceptable for our Veterans and the Citizens of Crossgate.

The Citizens of Crossgate have also expressed several concerns that, to date, have gone unanswered or unaddressed since 2012 and again in 2013 (see attached letters). Again, this is unacceptable.

We have asked time and time again for simple answers to simple question but have received no responses other than, “We have received your inquiries”.

Again, this is unacceptable.

The Veteran’s Administration is funded by tax-payer dollars and ought to be accountable to the same.

The Citizens of Crossgate, the Commonwealth and the United States are MORE THAN DUE an adequate response to our questions.

You owe us and our veterans –like myself – more answers that we’ve been provided thus far.

We expect answers to our inquiries and demand that the VA, a tax-payer funded organization responsible for taking care of our national treasure—our veterans—comply with the rules they are mandated to follow.
If you are unable accept the mantel of responsibility given to you to do the same, please step aside and allow those with integrity and responsibility to both our veterans and tax payers to pave the way to a common-sense veteran-care solution in Louisville.

Thus far, this new VAMC travesty has neither been honorable nor conceived with the best intentions of veterans and tax-paying citizens.

We all deserve more.

Do your job so our Veterans can do theirs with the knowledge that they, too, will be taken care of in the future.

Sincerely,

Kirk Hilbrecht
Mayor of Crossgate

Army and Air Force Veteran
Attached is a Letter of Support for the VA Medical Center relocating to Millpond Business Center in Radcliff.

Debra Masterson
Executive Assistant
Meade County Area Chamber of Commerce
PO Box 483
Brandenburg, KY 40108
270-422-3626
Meade County Area Chamber of Commerce  
270-422-3626  
79 Broadway  
P.O. Box 483  
Brandenburg, Kentucky 40108  

January 10, 2017

Louisville Replacement Hospital Committee

As the Director, Meade County Chamber of Commerce, I wholeheartedly support locating the Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center to the Millpond Business Center in Radcliff.

The VA Center proposed for Brownsboro Road is not a welcome addition to that area, and will be vexed with the same traffic congestion and inability to expand which makes the site no more suitable than its present location on Zorn Avenue.

The Millpond Business Center is a spacious area with plenty of space for parking and expansion. It is in a pleasant veteran and military friendly location, easy to access, and located closer to those veterans who will be utilizing the facility.

I appreciate this opportunity to voice my support.

Sincerely,

Carole Logsdon  
Executive Director
From: Robin Hildesheim
To: Louisville Replacement Hospital Comments
Cc: brad@hardinchamber.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Louisville Replacement Hospital Comments
Date: Tuesday, January 10, 2017 10:07:33 AM
Attachments: image001.png
image002.jpg
Hospital Replacement Ltr.pdf

Robin L. Hildesheim
Information Specialist/Administrative Assistant
111 West Dixie Avenue
Elizabethtown, KY 42701
270.765.4334 ext 100
270.737.0690 FAX
robin@hardinchamber.com
www.hardinchamber.com
Position art.jpg

Appendix E
Jan. 10, 2017

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express the Hardin County Chamber of Commerce’s strong support for locating the replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center at the Millpond Business Center in Radcliff, Ky.

The City of Radcliff has offered to provide 50 free acres for the initial development of the center, and an additional 97 acres are available for expansion at the Millpond Business Center. While land is an undeniably valuable incentive for the VA, locating in Radcliff offers the medical center and the people it means to serve much more.

As home to Fort Knox, Hardin County has a powerful tradition of supporting active duty military, spouses and veterans. Our families, businesses and countless other organizations are always quick to answer the call when our military and veteran community has a need, making our community an ideal home for the VA medical center.

Additionally, Hardin County has enjoyed steady growth as more and more businesses are attracted to this central location and our easy access to Interstate 65 and the Bluegrass and Western Kentucky parkways. That same accessibility will greatly serve the 100,000-plus veteran population that could be served at a relocated VA medical center.

Further, not long ago, state and local governments invested nearly $300 million in infrastructure to support Fort Knox’s growth in the last round of BRAC. Those investments have certainly benefitted the communities surrounding Fort Knox, as they will benefit veterans who would travel to the Millpond Business Center site. Plus, ample land for parking will allow the VA to offer added convenience to its patients.

Hardin County not only boasts a low-traffic, easy commute, but our community also offers a safe and tranquil environment, which is especially ideal for combat veterans with behavioral health needs.
Lastly, our region has a proactive workforce system that is ready to support employers with their talent needs.

For all these reasons, the Hardin County Chamber of Commerce, representing more than 700 member businesses and organizations, applauds the City of Radcliff and sincerely supports the city's proposal to locate the replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center to the Millpond Business Center.

Thank you for your consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss Hardin County's qualifications as the site of the replacement medical center.

Sincerely,

Brad Richardson
President and CEO
**PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

**Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cordell G Lawrence Jr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>3011 Lightheart Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cordell.lawrence82@gmail.com">cordell.lawrence82@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:**
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**
Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Good Morning,

My name is Cordell Lawrence Jr. and I am resident of Glenview Hills. I was recently elected as a councilman for the City of Glenview Hills. Neighbors frequently share how passionate they are about relocating the VA hospital to a location that will do the greatest good for Veterans as well as those who suffer from devastating poverty and poor health. We also often forget that Veterans frequently suffer from both poverty and poor health.

The current proposed site is surrounded by the cities of Northfield, Glenview Hills, Glenview, Crossgate, Windy Hills and Indian Hills, which are among the most affluent neighborhoods in our region, while the West End is by far the most economically disadvantaged neighborhood in our region. Additionally, when Veterans clearly indicate via official surveys that the current proposed location is neither desired nor practical it is time for strategic longterm planning to come into play in order for alternative sites to be considered. While our community is eternally grateful for the influx of federal dollars to construct the new VA hospital, we also must inform the VA that they are missing what us in the community clearly see as a strategic error that's on the fast track. It is our duty to speak up and inform the VA that they are making a misguided decision that will impact our entire community for generations to come.

- Where can a nearly 1 billion dollar investment do the greatest good? The West End
- Where can a nearly 1 billion dollar investment break the cycle of devastating poverty and poor health? The West End
- Where can a nearly 1 billion dollar investment tear down decades old physical and psychological barriers? The West End
- Where can a nearly 1 billion dollar investment employ neighbors that currently suffer from devastating unemployment? The West End
- Where can a nearly 1 billion dollar investment become a magnet for longterm and sustainable economic development? The West End
- Where can a nearly 1 billion dollar investment create a world class hospital located near the majority of veterans? The West End
- Where can a nearly 1 billion dollar investment change the trajectory of generations of Americans within our community? The West End

The location of this hospital is a golden opportunity to chart the course for improving our entire community that only comes along a precious few times in one’s lifetime.

Please do not take this decision lightly. It's time for innovative and strategic thinking to deliver the greatest good for our Veterans and our community.

Sincerely,

Cordell Lawrence Jr.
Councilman
Glenview Hills City Council
Dear Ms. Williams:

Aya, kikwehsitoole – I show you respect. My name is Diane Hunter, and I am the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for the Federally Recognized Miami Tribe of Oklahoma. In this capacity, I am the Miami Tribe’s point of contact for all Section 106 issues.

The Miami Tribe offers no objection to the above-mentioned project at this time, as we are not currently aware of existing documentation directly linking a specific Miami cultural or historic site to the project site. However, as this site is within the contemporary homelands of the Miami Tribe, if any human remains or Native American cultural items falling under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) or archaeological evidence is discovered during any phase of this project, the Miami Tribe requests immediate consultation with the entity of jurisdiction for the location of discovery. In such a case, please contact me at 918-541-8966, or by email at dhunter@miamination.com to initiate consultation.

The Miami Tribe requests to serve as an interested party to the proposed project. In my capacity as Tribal Historic Preservation Officer I am the point of contact for consultation.

Respectfully,

Diane Hunter
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Miami Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 1326
Miami, OK 74355
O-001

November 14, 2016

Attn: Judy Williams
Rohley Rex VAMC
Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office
800 Zorn Avenue
Louisville, Kentucky 40206

Re: Replacement Rohley Rex VA Medical Center

Comment period extension request for the VAMC Draft EIS

Dear Ms. Williams,

This firm represents the City of Crossgate, which is located on Kentucky Route 22 (Brownsville Road) directly adjacent to the proposed Replacement Rohley Rex VA Medical Center (VAMC) site. This letter is to request that the Department of Veteran Affairs (VA) extend the public comment period by sixty (60) days beyond the existing December 12, 2016 deadline for the VAMC’s Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The DEIS is far too long and complex to be adequately reviewed by December 12, 2016, especially in light of the impacts to the City of Crossgate and other adjacent stakeholders including the veterans the VMAC will serve, cities, individuals, local governments and agencies, businesses, churches, and schools because of the proposed project. Given the consequences of this proposed project to those stakeholders and to ensure that the rights of those subject to the impacts are fully protected, it is necessary to review the draft EIS in great detail to develop comments.

Pursuant to Executive Order 13563 and 40 CFR §1503.1(a)(4), which are the NEPA regulations requiring active solicitation of public comments, agencies must afford interested persons and the public a meaningful opportunity to comment on agency actions such as environmental impact statements and analyses that affect them. The VA should know from past experience with DEIS/EIS comment periods of other proposed VA Medical Centers across the United States that a good deal of time is necessary to adequately review and analyze a DEIS. Our ongoing review at this time indicates that it will take at least sixty (60) more days than the VA is currently providing to adequately evaluate this information, most especially the impact on transportation and traffic in the proposed area. Anything less than that amount of time will significantly hinder our ability to comment meaningfully.

Received 11/16/2016
Emailed to Ms. W. on 11/18/2016
It is critical that the process for commenting on the documents be handled in a way that facilitates maximum transparency and public participation. Therefore, in the interest of providing parties impacted by the proposed project a meaningful opportunity to comment, we request that the comment period for the DEIS be extended by 60 days beyond the existing December 12, 2016 deadline.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Randy Strobo
Clay Barkley
STROBO BARKLEY PLLC
Please find attached the comments of Grow Smart Louisville on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed new Robley Rex VA Medical Center in Louisville, Kentucky. These comments are also being submitted by U.S. Mail.

Please let me know that these comments have been received and included in the project record.

Thank you in advance,

Tim Hagerty

Timothy J. Hagerty
Attorney at Law | Frost Brown Todd LLC

400 West Market Street | 32nd Floor | Louisville, KY 40202-3363
thagerty@fbtlaw.com | www.frostbrowntodd.com

NOTICE: This electronic mail transmission is for the use of the named individual or entity to which it is directed and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. It is not to be transmitted to or received by anyone other than the named addressee (or a person authorized to deliver it to the named addressee). It is not to be copied or forwarded to any unauthorized persons. If you have received this electronic mail transmission in error, delete it from your system without copying or forwarding it, and notify the sender of the error by replying via email or by calling Frost Brown Todd LLC at (513) 651-6800 (collect), so that our address record can be corrected.
December 28, 2016

Rolley Rex VAMC
Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office
Attn: Judy Williams
800 Zorn Avenue
Louisville, KY 40206

Re: Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center
Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Ms. Williams:

This letter presents comments on behalf of our client, Grow Smart Louisville, concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement: Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center, Louisville, Kentucky (October 2016) (the “DEIS”). Because of fundamental flaws in the DEIS and the process leading to the selection of the so-called Brownsboro Site as the preferred alternative for the construction of a new Veterans Affairs Medical Center (“VAMC”) in Louisville, Kentucky, the Department of Veterans Affairs (“VA”) should withdraw the DEIS, re-evaluate its site selection process, and prepare a new Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) that meets the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”).

Grow Smart Louisville is a local non-profit, volunteer organization working to promote smart growth in Louisville/Jefferson County, Kentucky.¹ Grow Smart Louisville works to educate citizens on the different phases of development; to advocate transparency through the planning and design process; and to facilitate communication between developers and citizens to create the most positive outcome for all parties involved.

Grow Smart Louisville has been actively involved in the public discussion concerning the proposed new VAMC for over four years. Grow Smart Louisville first provided comments to the VA identifying concerns about the VAMC replacement process in November 2012, when it requested that the VA prepare an EIS for the proposed Replacement Robley Rex VAMC (the “Project”). That request was made

¹ Grow Smart Louisville is the assumed name of Citizens for Smart Growth, Inc., a Kentucky nonprofit corporation in good standing.
necessary after the VA sought to satisfy its obligations under NEPA through the preparation of a more abbreviated Programmatic Environmental Assessment ("PEA") – despite clear requirements to the contrary in the VA’s own NEPA regulations. See 38 C.F.R. § 26.6(a)(1)(ii). Grow Smart Louisville is pleased that the VA eventually recognized the need for an EIS – although not before acquiring the Brownsboro Site in 2012 and then publishing a draft tiered EA in 2014, which purported to evaluate the Brownsboro Site. At the commencement of the EIS process, Grow Smart Louisville submitted comments to the VA identifying numerous flaws in the decision-making process leading to the selection of the Brownsboro Site and raising multiple environmental, social, and economic issues for consideration in the EIS. However, the recently published DEIS shows that the VA did not heed those concerns or take the opportunity to revisit its flawed decision-making process.

Grow Smart Louisville has carefully reviewed the DEIS and has prepared the following detailed comments concerning the analysis and conclusions contained therein. The following are some of the primary concerns identified during this thorough review:

- The Purpose and Need statement of the DEIS lacks sufficient, detailed data to evaluate the need for action, to identify a reasonable range of alternatives, or to assess those alternatives in a meaningful manner.
- The Purpose and Need statement does not provide any basis or criteria to evaluate and compare potential new VAMC sites.
- The DEIS does not evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed action, and inappropriately dismisses viable options, such as a Downtown alternative, without detailed analysis.
- The DEIS gives preferential treatment to the VA’s preferred alternative, and effectively ignores all other alternatives.
- The DEIS does not provide a rigorous exploration and objective evaluation of all reasonable alternatives, and ignores the effect of each alternative on the quality of care for Veterans in the Louisville area.
- The flaws in the DEIS reflect a fundamental bias toward the Brownsboro Site that has tainted the entire decision-making process.
- The DEIS does not constitute a good faith, “hard look” at the environmental consequences of the proposed action and all reasonable alternatives to that action.
- The evaluation of land use and socioeconomic impacts in the DEIS is particularly flawed, preventing any meaningful comparison of the alternatives and their effects on factors such a property values, access to public transportation, socioeconomic conditions, and quality of care for Veterans.

Itemized concerns above are addressed as part of detailed comments that follow.
For these reasons, and the detailed comments that follow, Grow Smart Louisville respectfully requests that the VA withdraw the DEIS, re-evaluate its tainted decision-making process, and issue a new EIS that meets the requirements of NEPA. And the VA must do so with all due care and all due haste, in order to provide a long-delayed solution to the very real healthcare needs of Louisville-area Veterans.

I. Purpose and Need

The Purpose and Need statement set forth in Section 1.2 of the DEIS lacks sufficient, detailed data to evaluate the need for action, to identify a reasonable range of alternatives to address that need, or to assess the performance of those alternatives in a meaningful, comparative manner. NEPA requires that each EIS contain a statement of the “underlying purpose and need to which the agency is responding in proposing the alternatives including the proposed action.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.13. This requirement is important because it helps the federal agency answer three questions: “First, what is the purpose of the proposed project? Second, given that purpose, what are the reasonable alternatives to the project? And third, to what extent should the agency explore each particular alternative?” Habitat Educ. Ctr., Inc. v. U.S. Forest Serv., 593 S. Supp. 2d 1019, 1026-27 (E.D. Wis. 2009). The “purpose and need” of the proposed action determines the universe of alternatives that the agency must consider. Citizens Against Burlington v. Busey, 938 F.2d 10 (D.C. Cir. 1991). The Purpose and Need statement contained in the DEIS does not satisfy these important requirements, and therefore undermines the practical utility and legal sufficiency of the entire DEIS.

- The DEIS lacks sufficient data to support the claimed need for additional VAMC capacity in the Louisville area or to evaluate potential alternatives to address that need.

While Section 1.2 of the DEIS includes limited data regarding the anticipated increase in the number of Veterans in the Louisville area enrolled to receive VA healthcare and the expected increase in outpatient clinic stops, the DEIS does not provide any specific data or analysis to demonstrate why those general increases justify the construction of a replacement VAMC or why they dictate the specific size, composition, and location of the proposed replacement VAMC. For example, the DEIS provides no information on current or forecasted utilization rates at the existing Robley Rex VAMC, the types of services that are currently provided or will be needed in the future, or any patient service backlogs currently being experienced, or expected to occur, at the VAMC or the associated Community Based Outpatient Clinics (“CBOCs”) that the VA proposes to replace. Section 1.2 of the DEIS simply says that the current VAMC and CBOCs are “operating at maximum capacity and are unable to accommodate the projected increase in the regional Veteran population.” It provides no guidance on what current and future needs must be met in any replacement VAMC. NEPA requires more than unsupported assertions.
Without more detailed information, the DEIS does not provide a sufficient basis to evaluate the magnitude or nature of any additional capacity needed at the VAMC, nor does it provide a reasonable basis to identify and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives for providing that needed capacity. The DEIS also does not contain information on other needs related to patient service, beyond general capacity needs, that any new or expanded VAMC must address. The courts have made clear that a Purpose and Need statement must contain sufficient information to allow an agency, such as the VA, to identify and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the agency’s proposed action. That information also must sufficiently inform the public of the purpose of the agency’s proposed action, so that the public can understand the information in the EIS. Section 1.2 of the DEIS, which is only one page long and contains almost no data, is wholly insufficient to justify and evaluate the VA’s proposal to spend nearly one billion dollars on this major infrastructure investment. The DEIS must be revised to include adequate information to identify the precise nature and extent of the need for action, and to reasonably evaluate the pros and cons of alternatives intended to address that need, including the VA’s preferred alternative (the Brownsboro Site).

- The limited data included in the Purpose and Need statement are inconsistent and lack sufficient explanation.

The limited information provided in Section 1.2 to justify the Purpose and Need for the VA’s proposed action is inconsistent and confusing. For example, page three of the DEIS states that 60,943 Veterans in the VA’s Louisville service area were enrolled to receive care in Fiscal Year 2014, with enrollment expected to increase to more than 68,000 by Fiscal Year 2024 (a period of ten years). However, the description of the existing Robley Rex VAMC on page one of the DEIS states that 59,000 Veterans are currently enrolled to receive care, and that enrollment is expected to increase to 65,000 in the next ten years (i.e., by 2026). These numbers are clearly inconsistent. The numbers of current and estimated future annual visits listed on pages one and three of the DEIS, respectively, are also inconsistent. These inconsistencies undermine the credibility of the DEIS analysis, especially because the DEIS provides no other meaningful data to evaluate the nature or magnitude of the need for a new VAMC and related facilities in the Louisville area.

Similarly, the DEIS states that a new VAMC is needed to provide additional capacity to meet increasing enrollments and facility visits. However, the DEIS also states that the Robley Rex VAMC currently has 123 inpatient beds (DEIS, p. 3), but that the proposed replacement VAMC will have 104 inpatient beds (DEIS, p. 17). No explanation is provided for this apparent reduction in capacity, which seems entirely counterintuitive. Again, without a detailed statement of the nature and magnitude of the capacity needs and other requirements for the Louisville-area VAMC and its associated facilities (including reasonable projections of those needs in the future), it is impossible to reasonably evaluate both the need for action and the alternatives that the VA has evaluated to address that need. The VA must not only withdraw and revise the
DEIS to provide sufficient data to support its Purpose and Need statement; it must ensure those data are consistent and credible. The current DEIS fails that test.

- The DEIS does not provide any basis or criteria to evaluate potential new VAMC sites.

While the DEIS identifies a number of reasons why renovating or making major additions to the existing Robley Rex VAMC is not reasonable, and thus constructing a new VAMC on a new site is preferred (see DEIS, p. 2), the Purpose and Need statement does not provide any criteria for evaluating new sites. Such criteria are essential to understand and evaluate the nature and magnitude of site needs (acreage, configuration, location, accessibility, etc.). They are also essential to identify a reasonable range of alternative sites and to evaluate the relative ability of each such site to meet the identified needs. As it stands, Section 1.2 of the DEIS makes the case, at best, that a new VAMC at a new location is needed, but it does not identify any criteria for evaluating what that site should be or how to compare the various site options to arrive at the most beneficial and environmentally sound decision.

Moreover, Section 1.2 does not actually provide a reasonably detailed explanation for the contention that there are “limited options to expand” at the current site. The factors listed on page two of the DEIS primarily focus on the difficulties in renovating the existing hospital infrastructure to meet current design criteria. That discussion also states that there “is no appreciable vacant space on campus for expansion,” but does not describe the total size of the property, the amount of space that is actually needed to construct a replacement VAMC on-site, or the reasons (other than parking difficulties) that such an expansion is not possible. The reasons may seem self-evident to the VA, but NEPA requires more – a full, fact-based assessment of all relevant factors. Section 1.2 does not provide the necessary information for such an assessment.

- The Purpose and Need statement contains no justification for the need to close and relocate three CBOCs, or to consolidate the Veterans Benefits Administration regional office with the VAMC.

The VA’s proposed action includes relocating three Louisville-area CBOCs and the Veterans Benefits Administration (“VBA”) regional office to the location of a new VAMC. But the DEIS, and Section 1.2 in particular, contain no meaningful discussion of the reasons for closing those existing facilities or the criteria for determining where any new CBOCs or a new VBA office should be located. The DEIS simply states that they are over capacity, with limited options for expanding to meet existing needs (DEIS, p. 2), and that the VA “determined that it would be advantageous to co-locate functions of the [VBA] regional office on the proposed new campus.” (DEIS, p. 13) Thus, the DEIS assumes that the replacement facilities – the CBOCs and the VBA office – should be co-located with the proposed new VAMC. NEPA requires more.
Even assuming that the existing CBOCs and VBA regional office cannot be expanded at or near their current locations – for which Section 1.2 provides paltry evidence – it is not a foregone conclusion that they should be relocated to the site of a new VAMC. The Purpose and Need statement contains no information about important issues relevant to the locations of these facilities, including the need to have CBOCs located throughout the community in order to provide convenient outpatient services to area Veterans. Indeed, it is no coincidence that they are called “community based” outpatient clinics: logic dictates that basing these clinics in the community means operating them at multiple locations, rather than having a single location for outpatient services that may be inconvenient to a large number of Louisville-area Veterans. Ultimately, regardless of the merits of relocating the CBOCs to a single location or leaving them dispersed through the community, the Purpose and Need statement simply contains no information to guide the VA’s decision-making regarding where those facilities should be located, or what other factors should be considered in making that decision. Section 1.2 is similarly deficient with respect to the purported need to relocate the VBA regional office to the site of a new VAMC.

This issue is not simply academic. The decision to consolidate the relocated CBOCs and VBA regional office with the replacement VAMC at the proposed Brownsboro Site may have significant effects on the location, size, and configuration requirements for that facility. It may also have significant effects on the quality of care provided to Louisville-area Veterans, as well as the social, economic, and environmental costs imposed on those Veterans, VA employees, and the community at large, as a result of the consolidation of all of these facilities. Such a consolidation may or may not prove to be correct in the final analysis, but as it stands, the DEIS provides an insufficient basis to even perform that analysis. The DEIS must be revised to explain the purpose and need for closing and relocating the existing CBOCs and VBA regional office, and to provide clear, justified criteria for evaluating any alternatives intended to address that need. Without such information, neither the VA nor the public can evaluate whether relocating the CBOCs and the VBA regional office is a good thing, or where any such relocated facilities should be located (including at the site of a replacement VAMC).

II. Alternatives

The evaluation of alternatives in Section 2.0 of the DEIS is fundamentally flawed and fails to “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives,” as required by NEPA. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(a). The President’s Council on Environmental Quality has described the alternatives section as the “heart” of the EIS. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14. It must “sharply defin[e] the issues and provid[e] a clear basis for choice among options by the decisionmaker and the public.” Id. Each reasonable alternative must be afforded detailed, substantial treatment “so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(b). This requirement has also been recognized emphatically by the courts since the earliest days of NEPA’s implementation.
In an early, landmark decision, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit observed that the alternatives requirement is designed:

to ensure that each agency decision maker has before him and takes into proper account all possible approaches to a particular project (including total abandonment of the project) which would alter the environmental impact and the cost-benefit analysis. Only in that fashion is it likely that the most intelligent, optimally beneficial decision will ultimately be made.

*Calvert Cliffs Coordinating Comm. v. Atomic Energy Comm’n*, 449 F.2d 1109 (D.C. Cir. 1971). The DEIS fails for several reasons to meet even the barest, minimal requirements for a sufficient alternatives analysis under NEPA.

- **The DEIS does not contain a “reasonable range of alternatives” and thus undermines the requirement for a rigorous exploration and objective evaluation of all reasonable alternatives.**

Section E.4.4.1

Despite the magnitude of the proposal — construction of a new VAMC, with associated facilities, on a large greenfield site, costing nearly one billion dollars — the DEIS evaluates an astonishingly small number of alternatives in detail. In fact, the reality of the “analysis” presented in Section 2.0 of the DEIS is that the VA gave meaningful, detailed attention to only one alternative — its preferred alternative, the Brownsboro Site. All other alternatives were either dismissed prematurely without detailed analysis (e.g., the Downtown and Fegenbush alternatives), given a cursory analysis dressed up as a detailed analysis (i.e., the St. Joseph site), or ignored altogether (any number of potential alternatives that were never even pursued). This lack of a sufficiently robust range of alternatives undermines all of the remaining analyses in the DEIS, including the evaluation of the environmental consequences of the alternatives in Section 4.0.

- The Downtown and Fegenbush alternatives were inappropriately dismissed without detailed evaluation.

Section E.4.4.2

The Downtown and Fegenbush alternatives were initially dismissed as part of the screening process for the 2012 PEA. Regardless of whether the exclusion of those alternatives was appropriate in the context of an Environmental Assessment, their exclusion was clearly not justified once the VA decided to prepare a full-blown Environmental Impact Statement. As noted previously, NEPA requires that an EIS contain a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed action, and that each reasonable alternative be afforded detailed, substantial treatment in the EIS. Section 2.0 of the DEIS does not establish a reasonable basis for excluding either the Downtown or the Fegenbush alternative from detailed evaluation, and thus, the DEIS is fatally flawed.

Section 2.3.1 lists four factors that “indicated that the Fegenbush Site is not a reasonable alternative.” (DEIS, p. 35). Those include the presence of two known
archaeological sites, requiring consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act ("Section 106"); biological surveys indicating the potential (but not confirmed) presence of endangered species; a need for additional electrical infrastructure; and the existence of relatively fewer amenities and a greater distance to the nearest major highway, as compared to other greenfield sites. While each of these items is a legitimate basis for further evaluation, none of them — individually or collectively — is a sufficient basis to conclude that the Fegenbush site is so problematic that it does not even warrant a closer evaluation in the EIS.

Considerations such as the need for Section 106 consultation, additional endangered species surveys and consultation, construction of infrastructure, and proximity to amenities and transportation facilities are regularly evaluated and weighed in the NEPA process. None of them rises to the level of a “deal-stopper,” as a legal or practical matter. Without more detailed information on each of these items (beyond the cursory information contained in the DEIS), neither the VA nor the public can evaluate their relevance to the overall determination of the best site for a replacement VAMC. Section 2.3.1 manifestly fails to demonstrate that the Fegenbush site is not a reasonable alternative or that it did not at least warrant a detailed evaluation within the EIS.

Section 2.3.2 similarly fails to make a convincing or legally sufficient case for excluding the Downtown Site from detailed evaluation in the EIS. As with the Fegenbush Site, the DEIS identifies a handful of challenging factors that purportedly make the Downtown Site unreasonable, including the need to assemble multiple parcels, concerns about historic properties, historical environmental concerns, and traffic congestion in the area. However, while these factors may make the Downtown Site less desirable, they do not make it unreasonable. Rather, they should have been taken into account along with all other “pros and cons” of the Downtown Site in a full-blown EIS analysis. Because both the Downtown Site and the Fegenbush Site would clearly meet the Purpose and Need and offer certain benefits over the other alternatives, they should have been evaluated in detail in the DEIS. Their absence constitutes a fundamental flaw in that document and in the VA’s decision-making process.

- The DEIS also omits consideration of other viable sites that constitute reasonable alternatives, including sites that require assembly of multiple parcels and sites located within the urban core of Louisville.

The VA’s failure to consider a reasonable range of alternatives appears to stem from an undue reliance on an initial site identification process that sought “expressions of interest from potential offerors of previously undeveloped property that might satisfy its need.” (DEIS, p. 9) That process, which yielded 20 initial sites, unreasonably restricted the VA’s consideration of potential locations for a replacement VAMC. The result was an undue emphasis on large, single-owner greenfield sites in the suburban portion of Louisville/Jefferson County. The VA failed to make a good faith effort to identify other
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potential sites in the Louisville area, especially in the urban core, that might require some parcel assembly or that are not otherwise currently being offered for sale by a single owner, but that might be obtained with reasonable effort.

The VA request seeking potential offerors of “previously undeveloped property” led inevitably to a focus on large, single-owner greenfield properties. Indeed, the requirement for the properties to be undeveloped foreclosed anything but greenfield properties. And by seeking to identify potential sites through such a solicitation, the VA essentially predetermined that it would only be considering single-owner sites – as it is highly unlikely, if not unheard of, for a group of property owners to assemble and offer multiple properties as a group. And, of course, locating a greenfield property (single-owner or otherwise) of sufficient size (25 acres or more) in the Louisville area ultimately, and inevitably, leads to the identification of properties outside the urban core. Thus, the VA effectively excluded any meaningful consideration of urban properties (except the Downtown Site, discussed below), regardless of the ability of such sites to otherwise meet the Purpose and Need for action. This unreasonably narrow focus constitutes a flaw in the VA’s NEPA analysis, and undermines the legal sufficiency of the DEIS.

The VA’s cursory treatment of the Downtown Site further demonstrates this site bias. The VA only considered the Downtown Site because it was offered to the VA by the University of Louisville and the City of Louisville. (DEIS, p. 10) And the Downtown Site was not afforded a detailed evaluation in the DEIS, being dismissed, among other reasons, because of the need to assemble multiple parcels. But the reality is that many large public and private projects requiring multiple parcel assembly have been successfully constructed in the urban core of Louisville in recent years, including the KFC Yum! Center and the new Omni Hotel complex. Moreover, the effective exclusion of all urban sites (other than the Downtown Site, which was dismissed cursorily) eliminated the VA’s ability to evaluate the relative merits of such sites in terms of quality of care, socioeconomic impacts, access to transportation, economic development, and other important considerations. Whether such a site would have ultimately proved to be the preferred alternative is beside the point; the total exclusion of any such sites from detailed analysis in Section 2.0 of the DEIS makes that document fundamentally flawed.

The VA’s failure to think broadly and creatively enough in identifying reasonable alternatives is demonstrated not only by its failure to consider the Downtown and Fegenbush sites in detail. It is also seen in any number of potential sites that have been identified by local elected leaders and members of the public – including members of Grow Smart Louisville – but overlooked by the VA. Those potential sites include the former Philip Morris manufacturing site at 18th and Broadway in West Louisville; the property located at 30th and Broadway in West Louisville, location of the formerly proposed Food Port; the area currently occupied by the Beecher Terrace Housing Project, just west of Ninth Street in West Louisville, which is slated for demolition; and the area currently occupied by the Iroquois Homes Housing Project, along Taylor Boulevard in Southern Louisville, which is also slated for demolition. Each of these latter areas would
not only provide a site of sufficient size, but the location of a new VAMC in each area would place the facility closer to the “center of gravity” of the Louisville-area Veteran population and would provide an opportunity to stimulate economic growth and revitalization in areas targeted by Metro Louisville for such growth. Again, the merits of these sites may be debated, but the exclusion of such options from the DEIS analysis is a critical flaw in the VA’s NEPA compliance efforts.

- Despite its claims to the contrary, the DEIS evaluates only the VA’s Preferred Alternative in detail, giving cursory attention to the St. Joseph Site and the No Action Alternative.

Although the DEIS purportedly evaluates three alternatives in detail – the Brownsboro Site, the St. Joseph Site, and No Action – the detailed information in Section 2.0 relates primarily to the Brownsboro Site alone. This cursory treatment of the other two alternatives undermines the legal sufficiency of Section 2.0, which is required to afford each alternative detailed, substantial treatment.

On first glance, Section 2.0 appears to contain significant detail. However, on closer examination, the vast majority of that detail, found in Section 2.2.1 (“Alternative A – Replacement VAMC at Brownsboro Site”), solely concerns the detailed plans for the VA’s preferred alternative, the Brownsboro Site. (DEIS, pp. 15-30) The DEIS presents 15 pages of information describing how the Brownsboro Site will be developed, with detailed diagrams and color drawings, and specific information on building systems, layout, operations, etc. In contrast, Alternative B – the St. Joseph Site – is described in just over two pages, with the statement that the site organization, detail of facilities, and design concept would be similar to those described for the Brownsboro Site. (DEIS, pp. 31-33) About a page of differentiating factors are presented, but the overall treatment is cursory and something of an afterthought. The information on the St. Joseph Site is insufficient to provide a basis for a meaningful comparison of that alternative with the VA’s preferred alternative, or with the no action alternative.

The presentation of the No Action Alternative is even more brief, occupying one-half page. No information is provided regarding how the facility would operate if the VA takes no action and the VAMC remains at the existing location. (DEIS, p. 33) The information presented is insufficient to support a meaningful, robust evaluation of alternatives, including the option of doing nothing, as NEPA requires.

- The inclusion of the relocated CBOCs and VBA regional office in the VA’s proposed action may have prejudiced the consideration of alternatives.

As mentioned previously, the proposed action includes the relocation and consolidation of three CBOCs and the VBA regional office at the location of the
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proposed replacement VAMC. Section 1.2 of the DEIS does not provide any criteria or other factors to evaluate the alternatives with respect to the location and operation of the CBOCs and VBA office. The DEIS merely mentions the “convenience” of the VA – though not Veterans themselves, or those employed by the VA – in consolidating those facilities with the VAMC. And Section 2.0 provides no meaningful information or analysis of the three alternatives with respect to the location and operation of the CBOCs and VBA office. The inclusion of those elements in the proposal may have a substantial effect on the identification of the most desirable alternative, including identifying which alternative provides the overall highest quality of care to Veterans. The omission of any analysis of the relative merits of the options for closing and relocating the CBOCs and the VBA regional office is a serious flaw in the DEIS that must be fixed.

- Section 2.0 of the DEIS does not contain a rigorous exploration and objective evaluation of all reasonable alternatives, as required by NEPA.

The NEPA regulations make clear that the alternatives section is the “heart” of the EIS. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14. It not only must describe a reasonable range of alternatives; it must rigorously explore and objectively evaluate those alternatives. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(a). That exploration and evaluation includes both a consideration of how well each alternative meets the project’s Purpose and Need, and a rigorous discussion of their relative environmental impacts. Section 2.0 provides neither.

- The DEIS does not identify or utilize a meaningful set of criteria to evaluate the relative merits of the alternatives.

As noted previously, Section 1.2 of the DEIS, the Purpose and Need statement, does not identify any meaningful set of criteria by which the alternatives should be evaluated. And although a modestly detailed set of criteria are set out in Section 2.1, those criteria only appear to have been applied in the initial screening of alternatives during the PEA process. Neither they nor any other criteria are applied in the so-called detailed evaluation of alternatives found in the remainder of Section 2.0. Those criteria include factors such as location (within 15 miles of the University of Louisville Healthcare Center), size (at least 25 acres), access (primary road access, etc.), utilities (readily available), and environmental (“relatively free from environmental concerns”). (DEIS, p. 9)

While the criteria identified in Section 2.1 are somewhat lacking in specificity for a project of this magnitude – e.g., the cost criterion says a site needs to be able to be developed to suit VA’s needs in a “cost effective manner” – those criteria at least provide some framework for evaluating alternatives. Unfortunately, the only subsequent evaluation of the ability of the alternatives to meet the project Purpose and Need is a one-word “yes” or “no” in Table 2-4. (DEIS, p. 39) This does not satisfy NEPA. Ironically, a review of those criteria suggests that alternatives excluded from detailed review,
including most notably the Downtown Site, would have scored very highly should the VA have applied the Section 2.1 criteria within its EIS analysis.

- The DEIS provides no information on the relative costs of the alternatives, including both direct costs of construction and operation, and indirect costs of necessary infrastructure investments.

The DEIS is also shockingly lacking in any information or analysis of the relative costs of each of the alternatives, including the costs of property acquisition, construction, and operation, as well as indirect costs of infrastructure and other investments made necessary by each alternative. While NEPA does not require a strict cost-benefit analysis, its requirement for a rigorous exploration and evaluation of alternatives does require that all important aspects of those alternatives be examined, including their relative costs. That necessity is even greater for a project such as this, with an estimated price tag of nearly one billion dollars. The DEIS provides no information on the estimated direct costs of the project. Nor does it provide any meaningful information on the indirect costs that will be imposed on Veterans and the community at large from pursuing each of the alternatives. The absence of such information deprives both the VA and the public the opportunity to evaluate a major, relevant criterion in determining the best solution for the healthcare needs of Louisville-area Veterans.

- The DEIS does not evaluate the effect of each alternative on the quality of care for Veterans.

The most central and essential factor in deciding where to locate a replacement VAMC should be the quality of care provided to Louisville-area Veterans. But the DEIS provides absolutely no analysis of quality of care as it relates to the options evaluated in detail or the other reasonable alternatives, such as the Downtown Site, that the VA dismissed without detailed evaluation. The absence of that analysis is perhaps the most fundamental flaw in the DEIS, as it threatens the quality of care for thousands of Veterans in the Louisville area.

As GSL has stated repeatedly in comments provided to the VA for the past four years, quality of care should be of paramount concern. The stated mission of the VA is to serve and honor the men and women who are America’s Veterans and to provide world-class health care to eligible Veterans. The preferred location for the new VAMC, the Brownsboro Site, will actually be a detriment to Veterans’ health care. For example, the increased distance from Louisville’s downtown medical campus puts Veterans’ lives at risk in emergency situations where specialty care is needed. That is why the Kentucky Medical Association opposed the Brownsboro Site.

With the building of the new VAMC, the VA would close all of its local CBOCs in Louisville/Jefferson County, increasing travel times and distances for Veterans forced
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to travel to Louisville’s East End and potentially increasing their wait times as they are forced to utilize the new VAMC for their primary care. Moreover, the preferred site is 14 acres smaller than the existing VAMC site, and has no room to expand. Choosing a site with insufficient capacity for future expansion is shortsighted and unfair to our future Veterans.

Finally, the Brownsboro Site is located in a heavily congested area where the roads, as graded by the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, currently score Ds and Fs. Veterans should expect increased inconvenience in accessing medical care as a result of traffic delays. Moreover, the proposed hospital will be nearly 10 miles from the University of Louisville Hospital, the VA’s affiliated health care provider, impacting access to physicians and medical students who have traditionally volunteered their services to Veterans.

Despite these factors that will negatively affect quality of care – factors particular to the Brownsboro Site and not likely to occur at a Downtown location – the DEIS entirely omits any discussion of quality of care, or the respective ability of the alternatives to fully meet Veterans’ healthcare needs. Of course, that discussion can be helpful only if it is included in the DEIS in the first place and if it evaluates a full range of reasonable alternatives, including at least one downtown alternative. Without such an analysis, it is hard to imagine how the VA could claim that it has arrived at a reasonable conclusion based on a robust and good faith analysis of the alternatives. The DEIS must be withdrawn and revised to evaluate the issues that matter the most.

- The alternatives section does not rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives.

The comparative evaluation of the environmental consequences of the alternatives in Section 2.0 is cursory and inadequate. That evaluation is presented entirely within Table 2-4, found at the end of Section 2.0 (DEIS, pp. 39-45) Rather than a detailed, narrative summary and comparison of the likely environmental consequences of the alternatives, Table 2-4 contains abbreviated summaries relatively lacking in detail. Moreover, most of the entries for Alternative B, the St. Joseph Site, simply state “Impacts similar to Alternative A [the Brownsboro Site].” This is not the sort of rigorous exploration and objective evaluation required by NEPA. Consequently, Section 2.0 is inadequate and cannot serve as a basis for a reasoned project decision by the VA.

- The flaws in the DEIS’s alternatives analysis reflect a fundamental bias toward the Brownsboro Site that has tainted the entire DEIS and requires the NEPA process to be re-started in a manner that eliminates the inherent bias of the current VA decision-makers.

The entire DEIS is unlawfully prejudiced by the inappropriate and premature decision of the VA to purchase the Brownsboro Site prior to preparation and publication.
of an EIS. The NEPA regulations make clear that an agency shall not take any action that would “limit the choice of reasonable alternatives” prior to completion of the NEPA process and issuance of a Record of Decision. 40 C.F.R. § 1506.1(a)(2). As the courts have consistently held, this requirement is designed to ensure that the agency shows good faith objectivity in its NEPA review of a proposed action. By making a multi-million dollar commitment to the Brownsboro Site before the EIS process was even commenced, the VA foreclosed its ability to conduct a good faith, impartial analysis of the alternatives. That conscious decision undermines the entire DEIS.

The VA selected the Brownsboro Site based on the insufficient PEA. In spite of clear warnings that the PEA was insufficient and an EIS was required, the VA purchased the Brownsboro Site in 2012 for $12.9 million (approximately $3 million more than the value at which the property was appraised less than two years prior). The VA then commenced a “master planning process for the proposed VAMC campus” on the Brownsboro Site, completing that process in April 2013. (DEIS, p. 13) The plan included a detailed layout of the campus facilities and structures, and was followed by further refinement through a “conceptual design process.” All of this work was performed before the VA even admitted that NEPA required the preparation of an EIS for its proposed action, and that the previous PEA was insufficient under NEPA. Consequently, when the EIS process finally commenced in 2015, the VA had already invested millions of dollars and years of planning in the Brownsboro Site.

That substantial investment in the VA’s preferred site manifested itself in a bias that pervades the DEIS and helps to explain many of the deficiencies listed above. That bias is reflected in the inadequate range of alternatives evaluated in detail in the DEIS, including the cursory dismissal of the Downtown and Fegenbush sites and the refusal to consider any sites that require the assembly of multiple parcels or that are located in the urban core. It is reflected in the disproportionate attention paid to the details of the Brownsboro Site plan in the DEIS, with only passing attention paid to the other two alternatives allegedly evaluated in detail. And it is reflected in the lack of any real exploration, evaluation, or comparison of those alternatives in Section 2.0 or elsewhere in the DEIS. It is clear that the representatives of the VA leading this effort have known what they wanted for several years, and the DEIS is mere window dressing on their already concluded decision-making process.

---

2 Notably, a September 2015 report by the VA’s Office of Inspector General found that the VA’s Office of Acquisition, Logistics, and Construction (“OALC”) did not establish a just compensation amount for the Brownsboro Site, as required by law and regulations, and also did not ensure that the requirements of 49 C.F.R. § 24.104 were met. See “Review of Land Purchase for the Replacement Hospital in Louisville, Kentucky,” VA Office of Inspector General, Office of Audits and Evaluations (Sept. 17, 2015), at 6. The VA did not obtain a review appraisal to determine the fair and reasonable amount to pay for the property, and did not provide supporting documentation for the $3,055,000 (or 31%) increase in the purchase price between December 2010 and February 2012. Id. These egregious oversights further demonstrate the cavalier attitude and disregard for the law taken by the VA officials overseeing this process.
NEPA requires more than this DEIS offers. Regardless of whether the Brownsboro Site is the best option for Louisville-area Veterans, or whether it is the most environmentally preferable site, or simply the path of least resistance for the VA, NEPA requires a rigorous exploration and objective evaluation of all reasonable alternatives. At this point, through its prior commitment of resources and financial and emotional investment in its preferred alternative, the VA has demonstrated that it is incapable of performing the kind of good faith, objective review that NEPA demands. Thus, the DEIS should be withdrawn, the decision-making process should be revisited, and the VA should identify new decision-makers (either within the VA or in a sister federal agency) who can oversee a fair, honest, and open review of all reasonable alternatives for providing Louisville-area Veterans the best possible health care in the most effective and environmentally friendly manner. Those Veterans deserve it, and the law requires it.

III. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

An agency preparing an Environmental Impact Statement to comply with NEPA is required to take an objective, good-faith “hard look” at the environmental consequences of its proposed action, and the alternatives to that action, in order to “inform the public that it has indeed considered environmental concerns in its decisionmaking process.” Earth Island Institute v. U.S. Forest Serv., 351 F.3d 1291, 1300 (9th Cir. 2003). The “hard look” requirement requires not only identifying and disclosing what the direct and indirect impacts would be, but also discussing their significance. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.16(a), (b).

Chapters 3 and 4 of the DEIS, which discuss the relevant resources and the effects of the proposed action and its alternatives on those resources, fall well short of this “hard look” requirement. In addition to the specific deficiencies outlined below, two overall concerns call into question the adequacy of the agency’s evaluation of environmental consequences. First, the lack of a robust range of reasonable alternatives in the DEIS undermines the document’s assessment of environmental concerns. By artificially limiting the alternatives under consideration, the DEIS cannot provide the rigorous exploration and evaluation of environmental impacts that is required by NEPA. Most of the analysis in these chapters is at too high a level to provide a basis for any meaningful comparison of impacts between alternatives. And the minimal, at times perfunctory, evaluation and discussion of Alternatives B and C compounds that problem. Second, the inappropriate assumption that the sites under consideration would be developed anyway precludes an accurate assessment of the impacts of the proposed project. Without a true baseline from which to compare these impacts, the entire exercise of identifying environmental consequences is rendered meaningless.
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Air Quality

- The DEIS does not adequately analyze the impact on the region’s attainment status and overall air quality resulting from changes in the transportation network associated with each alternative.

The DEIS asserts that vehicle trips to and from a replacement VAMC campus would replace those occurring to existing VA facilities. (DEIS, p. 167) However, this simplistic conclusion fails to take into account the differences in miles traveled by patients and employees for the different alternatives. Nor does the EIS consider how changes in traffic patterns due to a relocation would affect the performance of the city-wide and regional transportation network in a way that could interfere with the state implementation plan to achieve attainment status.

Geology and Soils

- The DEIS fails to adequately evaluate the potential adverse effects on geology and soils of the alternatives considered.

Section 3.4.2.2 identifies a potential sinkhole detected on the site of Alternative A (DEIS, p. 69); however, section 4.4.2.1 does not discuss the impact of this apparent sinkhole on construction or make a determination as to whether this sinkhole represents an adverse effect under Alternative A. The DEIS asserts that “[t]he risk from development of this site does not appear to be any greater than development in other similar areas of Jefferson County.” (DEIS, p. 176) Simply stating that effects would be the same as “other similar areas” does not provide the public with any information as to what those effects actually are, or allow a meaningful comparison of alternatives (such as to Alternative B, where no potential sinkholes are present).

Noise

- The DEIS does not contain any meaningful analysis of the traffic-related noise impacts at either of the alternative sites evaluated.

Although the VA Traffic Impact Study estimates that approximately 10,000 average daily traffic (ADT) would be added to the roadways near either of the new VAMC locations considered (DEIS, p. 217), the DEIS does not include any quantitative evaluation of the local noise impacts of this increased traffic. The DEIS simply asserts, without support, that traffic-related noise impacts “may increase…but would not be expected to increase disproportionately from current levels.” (DEIS, p. 195) Absent any effort to quantify expected traffic noise levels at either proposed location, there can be no meaningful comparison to current conditions, as required under NEPA.
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- The DEIS does not evaluate the impacts to the noise-sensitive receptors identified in the vicinity of the alternative sites.

Section 3.7 identifies and maps noise-sensitive land uses surrounding the Brownsboro and St. Joseph sites. (DEIS, pp. 94-96) But Section 4.7 contains no discussion of the impacts of increased noise from construction, operation, and traffic on these sensitive receptors.

**Land Use**

- The DEIS contains no evaluation of how the alternatives perform against the VA’s own land use criteria.

Section 3.8.1.1 of the DEIS identifies a set of four principles developed by the VA to achieve “a balanced consideration and evaluation of land use, the built environment, cost, security, mission need, and competition on facility location decision-making.” (DEIS, p. 99) But the remainder of the DEIS completely ignores these criteria, and provides no evaluation or comparison of how the alternatives perform against these metrics. The evaluation criteria listed in Section 4.8.1 bear no similarity to those identified in the prior chapter. (DEIS, p. 197) Had the VA actually considered its own land use principles outlined in Section 3.8.1.1, it would become apparent that the preferred alternative satisfies none of the criteria. The Brownsboro Site is not “pedestrian-friendly, near existing employment centers, accessible to public transit, ... [or] existing central cities.” The location does not “promote transportation choice,” nor is it “accessible to a diverse range of employees and visitors.” It does not “promote infill development” or represent a “previously used or underused site[]], including historic districts.” Finally, this location does not “[f]oster protection of the natural environment by avoiding development of green space.” Indeed, all of the VA’s land use criteria point to a Downtown alternative, which the VA dismissed prematurely, as discussed in more detail above.

- The DEIS improperly marginalizes impacts of the relocation alternatives by assuming speculative future development in the “no build” condition.

The DEIS prevents a meaningful evaluation of the alternatives’ impacts on land use by failing to consider the true “no build” baseline. NEPA requires federal agencies to consider the full environmental consequences of their actions by comparing the effect of the proposed action on various resources under different alternatives, including the “no action” or “no build” alternative. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(c). The VA cannot escape its obligation to evaluate the impacts of building such a large project on a previously undeveloped site by simply asserting that the site would be developed by others in the absence of VA action. Doing so defeats NEPA’s purpose of requiring federal agencies to conduct a rigorous evaluation of the direct and indirect environmental impacts of their proposed actions and to disclose those impacts to the public. Of course, it is possible that
any vacant land may later be developed by others, but if a federal agency such as the VA is the one to develop it, NEPA requires that that agency consider the full range of effects of that development on the previously undeveloped site.

The VA acknowledges in the DEIS that “the impact of altering the character and use of a vacant site to full development use would be major” – but it then attempts to disclaim any responsibility for these major impacts by pointing to a private mixed-use development that had previously been proposed at the Brownsboro Site. (DEIS, p. 197) First, the land use and other impacts of the proposed VAMC are not equivalent to those of a mixed-use development. But more importantly, the VA is required to evaluate and consider the impacts of its proposal against the baseline of the current site conditions, regardless of whether a speculative future private development could have some of the same impacts. The VA’s more limited discussion of the land use impacts of the St. Joseph Site suffers from the same infirmity. The VA’s failure to account for the impacts of its own development is significant because, as discussed above, it has biased the VA’s decision-making toward selecting a greenfield site and discounting the relative merits of a redevelopment site Downtown or at another previously developed site.

- **The Brownsboro Site proposal is inconsistent with the planned development zoning designation.**

The DEIS identifies “compatibility with existing and future land use designations and zoning design standards” as the basis to evaluate potential adverse land use impacts. (DEIS, p. 197) The Brownsboro Site is currently zoned as a planned development district to accommodate a proposed mixed-use development, The Midlands, which was to include condominiums, apartments, a hotel, restaurants, offices, and retail space. (DEIS, p. 100) Use of the site for the VAMC is not consistent with the objective of the planned development district to diversify and integrate new development into existing development. The VAMC would represent a single-use, non-diversified development that does not align with the local land use authority’s plans for the site. The DEIS states that a use that is “inconsistent with current or planned future land uses and community goals for land use” is an adverse land use impact (DEIS, p. 197), yet it does not identify the incompatibility of the VAMC with the planned development zoning district as an adverse impact.

- **The DEIS fails to adequately address the adverse effect on adjacent residences from building heights that would significantly exceed zoning requirements.**

Section 4.8 of the DEIS acknowledges that building the VAMC at either the Brownsboro or the St. Joseph site would violate the height limitations of the applicable zoning form districts. (DEIS, pp. 197-200) For the Brownsboro Site, the west bar would exceed the maximum building height by 42 feet, a 33 percent exceedance. The south parking deck, which would extend well into the “transition zone” between the town

---
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center form district and the adjacent neighborhood form district, would exceed the height limit by almost half. These significant exceedances will cause considerable harm for neighboring residents. The proposed development would violate the required transition from town center development to neighborhood development, which was intended to protect residences from this type of harm. The DEIS does not provide any meaningful evaluation or consideration of this adverse impact. The St. Joseph alternative would also cause significant harm to neighboring residents, where the proposed VAMC would exceed the maximum allowable building height by more than a factor of four.

**Socioeconomics**

- The socioeconomic analysis was performed at too high a level to permit any meaningful consideration of the effects of the proposal on local areas.

The socioeconomic analysis presented in Section 4.10 was conducted at the level of the Louisville Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), which encompasses eight counties in Kentucky and five counties in Southern Indiana, with a population of over one million. (DEIS, p. 203) By not accounting for differences in socioeconomic conditions of specific areas within the MSA that could be impacted by the project in different ways, the DEIS fails to provide a meaningful analysis of the true socioeconomic impacts of the proposal and the alternatives considered in the DEIS. Nor does it allow for consideration of the potential socioeconomic benefits and drawbacks of locations that the VA dismissed prematurely. Different alternative locations may have adverse environmental and socioeconomic effects on different areas, and evaluating socioeconomics at the MSA level totally forecloses any meaningful evaluation of those differences within the region. The inevitable results of the VA’s approach is that all alternatives will “look” the same, as many of their effects will likely be the same when viewed at the MSA level – even if they are very different when viewed on a more local level.

- The DEIS fails to address the proposal’s potential effects on property values in the surrounding areas.

The DEIS devotes only two sentences to the potential impacts of the project on property values in the areas surrounding the two sites under consideration. This meager discussion simply asserts, without support, that property values in the surrounding areas “are expected to remain essentially unaffected” by the operation of the VAMC at either the Brownsville or St. Joseph Site. (DEIS, p. 206) This represents a failure of the DEIS to provide information and adequately evaluate the effects of the VA’s proposed action, as NEPA requires.

- The generic socioeconomic analysis also does not allow for a meaningful comparison among alternatives, especially with respect to access issues for employees and the Veterans they serve.
Robley Rex VAMC
December 28, 2016
Page 20

Simply looking at socioeconomic impacts on the entire Louisville MSA in the aggregate misses key differences between the various potential locations within the area. The DEIS contains no information regarding socioeconomic conditions in subsets of the Louisville MSA, particularly as it relates to distribution of the veteran population. One key difference among the alternatives (those evaluated in the DEIS and those dismissed prematurely) is the level of access for the employees and the Veterans the facility would serve. The DEIS contains no information regarding the geographic distribution of Veterans in the 35-county service area of the VAMC and the CBOCs. Without this information, the VA and the public cannot evaluate what effect reduced proximity and fewer public transportation options would have on the Veteran population, particularly those who do not live in the relatively high-property-value East End. Public transportation options are very limited at the Brownsboro Site, and non-existent at the St. Joseph site, whereas the Downtown area represents a hub of public transit. And providing Veterans the option of receiving care at CBOCs dispersed throughout the geographic area, as opposed to in one centralized (but not central) location, is an important component of access to care that the DEIS completely disregards.

**Community Services**

- The DEIS fails to address the impact of proposed relocation sites for the VAMC on the standard of care provided to Veterans and their ability to receive care in a timely manner.

The DEIS makes no mention of the impact of reduced proximity of the Brownsboro and St. Joseph Sites to the University of Louisville Hospital, the VA’s affiliated health care provider, or to other downtown hospitals and specialty service providers. The Dean of the University of Louisville School of Medicine has expressed concerns about the distance between the proposed location and specialty services needed by Veterans that require transfers to hospitals downtown. In addition, because a majority of the physicians providing care at the VAMC are faculty at the University of Louisville who also practice at the Downtown Medical Center, increasing the travel time for these physicians means less time they can spend in the care of Veterans.

**Transportation and Traffic**

- The DEIS provides no analysis of the impacts of the proposal on the overall transportation network in the area.

The DEIS limits its analysis of the traffic impacts of the project to the roads connecting the proposed site and Interstate 264. (DEIS, p. 217) But these roads cannot be viewed in isolation. An increase in traffic to the area at this magnitude would have significant and wide-ranging impacts on the functioning of the larger surface transportation network. Congestion in the immediate vicinity of either of the sites evaluated in the DEIS would create spillover effects to drivers on the nearby interstates.
and other local roadways. Without an assessment of these larger-scale impacts to traffic, the limited transportation and traffic information presented in the DEIS is not sufficient to permit a reasoned evaluation of the alternatives and other potential sites.

- The DEIS lacks any information from which to compare patient and employee travel times for different potential relocation sites.

The analysis in Section 4.13 of the DEIS considers only the impact to the public of traffic increases in the areas immediately surrounding the alternatives being evaluated. (DEIS, pp. 218-22, 224-26) Missing from this analysis, however, is any discussion of how the location of various potential sites, and the traffic conditions in those areas, would affect the amount of time that employees and the Veterans receiving care would have to expend to travel to and from those locations, and the impacts increased travel time would have on those groups.

- The traffic analysis for Alternative A is fundamentally flawed because it does not use a true “no build” baseline to assess the impacts of the proposal.

The traffic impact study conducted for the proposed Brownsboro Site evaluated two primary scenarios for the 2025 design year: with the addition of the VAMC (the “build” scenario), and without the VAMC at that site (the “no build” scenario). (DEIS, p. 220) However, in the “no build” forecast, the study assumes the existence of a speculative mixed-use development at that site instead of analyzing the true “no build” condition. This approach artificially inflates traffic projections for the “no build” condition and conceals the true impacts to the transportation network that are attributable to the VAMC. The possibility that the site could be developed by someone other than the VA does not relieve the VA from its obligation under NEPA to conduct a full and fair evaluation of the impacts of its proposed project.

- Inconsistency in the traffic analysis methodology used for Alternatives A and B skews the projected impacts in favor of Alternative A.

As discussed above, the traffic impact study improperly included a speculative mixed-use development in its “no build” traffic projections for the Brownsboro Site. But for the St. Joseph Site, which has also been the subject of private proposals for mixed-use development, the study did not include this additional traffic in the “no build” condition. (DEIS, p. 224) As a result, the projected effect on local traffic appears much greater for Alternative B than Alternative A, when in fact, this difference is primarily attributable to the inconsistent methodology used for each site. Only the Alternative B traffic analysis reflects the true potential impact of the addition of the VAMC to local traffic. Had the traffic forecasts for Alternative A been conducted properly, the significant adverse traffic impacts of that proposal would have been demonstrated.
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Environmental Justice

- The analysis of disproportionately adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations in the DEIS was performed at too broad a geographical scale to allow any meaningful evaluation of environmental justice impacts of the proposal.

In determining how minority or low-income populations could be affected by the proposed project, the DEIS limited its analysis to the county-wide level. (DEIS, p. 234) As a result, the DEIS concluded that the only environmental justice communities in the Louisville VAMC service area were Butler and Carroll counties in Kentucky. However, there are significant pockets of minority and low income communities in Jefferson County as well as the other Kentucky and Indiana counties where employees and Veterans receiving care at the VAMC reside. If the environmental justice analysis had been done at the census block level, or at least the zip code level, these communities could have been identified and the impacts of the proposal on these communities could have been evaluated. Because the DEIS did not do this, it did not address the impact of locating all veteran care in an area of high socioeconomic status, which has limited accessibility to Veterans in other parts of the service area. Moreover, for the two counties that were identified as environmental justice communities, the DEIS simply asserts that there would be no adverse impacts to these communities because the impacts of the relocation would be limited to the vicinity of the selected location in Jefferson County. (DEIS, p. 234) This simplistic conclusion is not borne out by the facts, and ignores issues important to the Veteran community at large, particularly with respect to access and quality of care concerns.

- The environmental justice analysis did not evaluate the proposal’s impacts on Veterans, a community whose needs are of particular concern for this project.

The Council on Environmental Quality’s guidance on evaluating environmental justice impacts in NEPA documents explains that in identifying low-income or minority communities, “agencies may consider as a community either a group of individuals living in geographic proximity to one another, or a geographically dispersed/transient set of individuals (such as migrant workers or Native Americans), where either type of group experiences common conditions of environmental exposure or effect.” Veterans are precisely the type of geographically dispersed community who experience common conditions from a project of this nature, which is what the environmental justice provisions for NEPA documents were designed to address. The DEIS provides no demographic or geographic information concerning Veterans who will be served by the relocated VAMC. This information is critical to allow for an analysis of how potential

---

relocation sites for the VAMC would impact the very community the facility is designed to serve. This is particularly the case for Veterans who are members of low-income or minority communities, which the DEIS fails to address.

Cumulative Impacts

- The cursory analysis of cumulative impacts in the DEIS is too generic and limited to satisfy the requirement to evaluate the incremental impact of the proposal when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.

The cumulative impacts analysis in the DEIS provides an insufficient analysis of the effects of the proposal in the context of other actions that also affect the same resources. The analysis only addresses two of the fifteen categories of environmental resources evaluated in Chapters 3 and 4: land use, and transportation and traffic. (DEIS, p. 235-36) For the other resources, the DEIS simply asserts that impacts to those resources would be “similar to current VA health care services or to other new private and commercial developments that may occur on or near the alternative sites.” (DEIS, p. 235) Even if that statement was accurate, NEPA still requires agencies to disclose what those impacts are, and how they fit into the larger context of the affected community. And for the two categories of resources the DEIS does address in this section, the document sidesteps any meaningful evaluation of cumulative impacts based on the same flawed, inappropriate assumption that development of the sites at issue would occur under any circumstance, so the impacts of the VA’s actions need not be evaluated in detail. This limited analysis does not satisfy the agency’s burden under NEPA.

For all the foregoing reasons, Grow Smart Louisville respectfully requests that the VA withdraw the legally deficient DEIS, revisit its decision-making process to conduct a full and good faith review of all reasonable alternatives, and issue a new DEIS that meets both the spirit and the letter of NEPA. This community and its Veterans deserve no less.

Very truly yours,

Timothy J. Hagerty

cc: Senator Mitch McConnell
    Senator Rand Paul
    Representative John Yarmuth
    Representative Jeff Miller
Representative Mike Coffman
Governor Matt Bevin
BG (Ret) Norman E. Arflack
Mayor Greg Fischer
Councilwoman Angela Lect
January 11, 2017

Attn: Judy Williams
Robley Rex VAMC
Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office
800 Zorn Avenue
Louisville, Kentucky 40206

Re: VAMC Draft EIS Comments Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center; Cities’ Request to Withdraw the DEIS and Re-evaluate with a Full Range of Reasonable Alternatives and to Comply With NEPA and its Implementing Regulations

This firm represents the City of Crossgate ("Crossgate") (pop. 230), the City of Graymoor-Devondale (pop. 3000), the City of Old Brownsboro Place (pop. 455), the City of Northfield (pop. 1000), the City of Windy Hills (pop. 2500) (collectively “Cities”), with a combined population of over 7,000 citizens. These comments are also submitted on behalf of Neighborhood Planning and Preservation. These cities and communities are located adjacent to the proposed Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center ("VAMC") site. We are submitting these comments on behalf of the Cities concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("DEIS") for the proposed Replacement Robley Rex Veterans Affairs Medical Center ("VAMC").

The Cities are requesting the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs ("VA"):  

1. Withdraw the DEIS;
2. Re-evaluate their site selection process to include a full range of reasonable alternatives that includes urban sites;
3. Prepare a new Environmental Impact Statement with full participation of the veterans and community;
4. Correct the inadequacies in the DEIS’s analysis on the impacts to veterans and the site alternatives with a discernible methodology that compares a full range of reasonable alternatives;
5. Comply with relevant Executive Orders;
6. Update its own NEPA implementing regulations; and
7. Otherwise meet the requirements of the NEPA as outlined in the Comments below.
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I. FACTUAL AND LEGAL BACKGROUND

A. FACTUAL HISTORY OF THE REPLACEMENT ROBLEY REX VAMC DECISION PROCESS

The following recaps the history of the Replacement Robley Rex VAMC decision making process from the perspective of the Cities and its citizens. The sequence of events highlights the premature acquisition of the Midlands site prior to completion of the NEPA environmental review process.

A determination was first made by the VA on May 7, 2004 to conduct a six-month study to determine the best way to replace the 52-year-old Robley Rex VA Medical Center in Louisville, Kentucky off Zorn Avenue.\(^1\) VA officials found that the hospital was overcrowded, outdated, and the VA was allegedly unable to expand the current site. The VA, through the Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services ("CARES") process, recommended further studies needed to be conducted for the replacement of the medical center.\(^2\) Later that month, on May 27, 2004, an investment partnership was formed between Blue Equity, LLC and former co-developer, Fenley Real Estate, and the partnership paid $4.96 million to Margaret Hildebrand and her brother, Henry, to purchase 36 acres of residential-zoned farmland near Brownsboro Road and the Watterson Expressway ("Midlands site").\(^3\) The Jefferson County Property Valuation Administrator, determined the property tax assessment for the Midlands site at $4.96 million.\(^4\)

A polling firm mailed questionnaires to stakeholders requesting their input on a future site location for the replacement facility. Responses were compiled from January 25, 2005 to June 30, 2005. During that same period, on April 29, 2005, a handful of veterans spoke out at a public hearing to voice their opinions concerning Louisville's need for improved health care facilities for veterans.\(^5\) The veterans also expressed concerns regarding traffic and parking if a new facility would be built downtown. The VA then issued its Stage 1 Summary Report in August of 2005 for the replacement Louisville VAMC, which included the building sizes, services provided, and capital and operating costs for the new facility in comparison with the existing Zorn Avenue Robley Rex VA Medical Center. In late 2005, U.S. Representative Anne Northup imposed a deadline on the VA to make a decision regarding the site of new hospital by June 1, 2006.\(^6\)

---

2 VA Fact Sheet, February 8, 2013 (Exhibit 2).
3 Chris Ott, VA Hospital site pleases some, puzzles or upsets others (March 11, 2012)
   http://www.hnpx.uky.edu/dips/xt7dr785jn65/data/70131_KY20120311A13NB.pdf.
4 Louisville Courier Journal, Timeline for Midlands VA Hospital land purchase, (February 23, 2014)
5 Chris Ott, VA Hospital site pleases some, puzzles or upsets others (March 11, 2012)
   http://www.hnpx.uky.edu/dips/xt7dr785jn65/data/70131_KY20120311A13NB.pdf.
6 Id.
Representative Northup expressed a preference for the new VAMC to be built downtown near the University of Louisville’s Medical School and Hospital, which includes the region’s only Level 1 Trauma Center. The VA began conducting public hearings in late 2005 regarding its plans to build a new hospital.

In June of 2006, the CARES Stage 1 Study was published, validating the need for a VA replacement medical center in Louisville and on June 30, 2006, Secretary of Veterans Affairs R. James Nicholson held a news conference in Louisville announcing the decision to build a new medical center to replace the existing facility. The press release announcing the decision stated that “[o]nce a preferred site in Louisville is selected, VA will conduct the necessary due diligence for property acquisition and request congressional approval before the new facility can be built.” Secretary Nicholson, Representative Anne Northup, Senator Mitch McConnell, and Representative Ron Lewis held a press conference in Louisville announcing a new facility that would break ground in two to four years. Although a site had not been selected, it was announced during the press conference that the location would likely be downtown.

In February of 2007, the Louisville-Metro Council and the City of Graymoor-Devondale approved a zoning change for the Brownsboro Road property to planned-unit development, allowing for mixed-uses, including retail and residential uses. That same month, the VA issued its Fiscal Year Construction and 5-Year Capital Investment Plan. The proposed new Louisville VAMC ranked in priority. In March of 2007, the firm URS Smith Group was selected to complete work on the new Louisville VAMC once the public funds were secured.

In February of 2008, Mayor Jerry Abramson and the University of Louisville President, James Ramsey, submitted a proposal to the VA for a downtown hospital. According to the new Fiscal Year Construction and 5-Year Capital Investment Plan, issued in February of 2008, Louisville VAMC ranked in priority. The priority ranking

---

7 The medical literature shows a direct and indisputable link between decreased mortality rates and proximity to Level 1 Trauma Centers and vice versa. The association of trauma center closures with increased inpatient mortality for injured patients. J Trauma Acute Care Surg. 2014 Apr; 76(4): 1048. (“Our results show a strong association between closure of trauma centers...and increased mortality for patients with injuries who have to travel further for definitive trauma care.”).
8 VA Fact Sheet, February 8, 2013 (Exhibit 2).
10 VA Fact Sheet, February 8, 2013 (Exhibit 2).
11 Chris Ott, VA Hospital site please some, puzzles or upsets others (March 11, 2012) http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/11/nyregion/louisville.html?_r=0.
12 VA Fact Sheet, February 8, 2013 (Exhibit 2).
13 Id.
15 VA Fact Sheet, February 8, 2013 (Exhibit 2).
appears to have decreased that year because of Hurricane Katrina's destruction of the New Orleans VA hospital. In September of 2008, the VA approved preliminary funding for the replacement Louisville VAMC.\textsuperscript{16} Construction began on the Westport Road interchange to the Watterson Expressway in October 2008. In late 2008, one of the co-developers who had originally committed to the Midtown development project at the Brownsboro Road site, Fenley Real Estate, dropped out of the project.\textsuperscript{17}

In March of 2009, the VA commenced a traffic study pertaining to the replacement Louisville VAMC. In April of 2009, VA Secretary Shinseki requested an additional public forum for veterans to attend and provide input on the replacement Louisville VAMC. On April 6, 2009, a public meeting was held at the Clifton Center to discuss three potential site options, including a downtown location.\textsuperscript{18} Many veterans were not pleased about the proposed downtown location and wanted the medical center to stay at the Zorn Avenue location.

In July 2009, the M. Davis and Company ("MDAC") completed a survey regarding veteran preferences for the replacement Louisville VAMC. MDAC conducted a survey of 537 veterans served by the current Louisville VAMC to determine the preference regarding the location of a new VA medical center in Louisville, with the result overwhelmingly supporting the existing Zorn Avenue site. Bob Morley, facility manager at the Robley Rex VA Medical Center, stated on August 24, 2009 that a decision would be made on the location of the new facility sometime that year.\textsuperscript{19} He also stated that studies regarding the site search had commenced in June of 2009 and would end in late October of 2009.\textsuperscript{20} In October of 2009, $75 million was appropriated by Congress for real estate acquisition, master planning, design, and preliminary site development of a replacement Louisville VAMC.\textsuperscript{21} That same month, a feasibility study regarding the replacement of the Louisville VAMC was completed.\textsuperscript{22}

In January of 2010, Secretary Shinseki was briefed on the Louisville option and he requested that a more comprehensive analysis be conducted respecting potential greenfield site options.\textsuperscript{23} A Request for Proposal ("RFP") was issued on January 17, 2010 for a

\textsuperscript{16} Id.
\textsuperscript{18} VA to hold public forum on hospital site selection, Louisville Business First (April 1, 2009), http://www.bizjournals.com/louisville/stories/2009/03/30/daily35.html.
\textsuperscript{20} Id.
\textsuperscript{21} VA Fact Sheet, February 8, 2013 (Exhibit 2).
\textsuperscript{22} Id.
\textsuperscript{23} Secretary Shinseki letter to U.S. Rep. Coffman.
parking garage to be built at the Louisville VAMC. The plan was later cancelled.\(^{24}\) On April 7, 2010, the VA issued a request for available greenfield sites for the hospital.\(^{25}\) Secretary Shinseki gave his approval for the exploration of options outside of Downtown Louisville and focusing on greenfield sites.\(^{26}\)

In April 2010, the downtown location was still being considered for the new hospital although progress on the project slowed regarding site selection due to a lack of funding.\(^{27}\) On April 10, 2010, a press release expressing the VA’s interest in procuring land for a replacement VAMC was published locally on FedBizOpps. The advertisement sought proposals for a minimum of 25-acres in Jefferson County, Kentucky, and was posted on April 10, 2010, and ran for a three-week period. Secretary Shinseki stated in his letter to U.S. Representative Coffman that the "purpose of this site selection process was to identify the Greenfield site best-qualified to serve as a potential location for the proposed VAMC."\(^{28}\)

On April 19, 2010, another RFP was issued for the procurement of a parking garage to be built at the Louisville VAMC. The plan was later cancelled.\(^{29}\) The Westport Road interchange to the Watterson Expressway was completed and opened on April 29, 2010. From May 11 to May 13, 2010, a site selection survey was conducted by the VA Site Selection Board.\(^{30}\)

On June 22, 2010, Senator Mitch McConnell sent a letter to Secretary Shinseki with a proposed VA timetable. In August of 2010, Secretary Shinseki authorized a due diligence study on the top three greenfield sites, the downtown site, and the existing Zorn Avenue VAMC.\(^{31}\) The Department of Veterans Affairs then issued its NEPA Interim Guidance for Projects on September 30, 2010, which specifically states, "Remember: No demolition, construction or earthmoving can begin (which clearly demonstrate a final decision regarding an action) before NEPA analysis and decisions are completed. Other example project related prohibitions prior to completion of the NEPA analysis including purchasing property or awarding of construction contracts."\(^{32}\)

\(^{24}\) See Department of Veterans Affairs, RFPs for Design-Build Parking Garage (Exhibit 8). This is the first of many canceled RFPs for parking facilities at the VAMC site. The Cities were only able to access a few of the RFPs due to the inability to search for those documents on the U.S. GSA’s FedBizOpps.gov website.

\(^{25}\) Chris Ott, VA Hospital site pleases some, puzzles or upsets others (March 11, 2012)

\(^{26}\) Ben Adkins, VA seeking more site options for new Louisville facility, Louisville Business First (April 7, 2010), http://www.bizjournals.com/louisville/stories/2010/04/05/daily30.html. (Exhibit 6)

\(^{27}\) Id.

\(^{28}\) Letter from VA Secretary Shinseki to U.S. Rep. Coffman. (exhibit 5)

\(^{29}\) Department of Veterans Affairs, RFP for Design-Build Parking Garage (Exhibit 8).

\(^{30}\) Letter from VA Secretary to Rep. Coffman. (Exhibit 5)

\(^{31}\) VA Fact Sheet, February 8, 2013 (Exhibit 2).

\(^{32}\) Department of Veterans Affairs, NEPA Interim Guidance for Projects, September 30, 2010. (Exhibit 7). See 38 CFR 26.7(b)(6) ("The major decision points for VA actions, by which time the necessary environmental documents must be completed, are as follows: (6) Land acquisition for development. Prior to the Secretary’s
On December 10, 2010, the first appraisal was conducted on the Midlands site. The appraisal determined the value of the property to be $9.6 million; $7.5 million for the 22.3 commercial acres and $2.1 million for the 14.5 residential acres. The appraisal was not released publicly. The appraiser has since stated that the appraisal was a draft, but there is no indication that it was marked accordingly. A second appraisal by the same appraiser valued the identical property at $12.9 million on February 29, 2012. See infra.

In March 2011 the VA began its NEPA review of the Robley Rex Replacement VAMC proposal. The review included five sites for the VAMC: the Midlands site, St. Joseph’s, Fegenbush Lane, Downtown, and Zorn Avenue. On March 10, 2011, another RFP was issued for the procurement of a parking garage to be built at the Louisville VAMC. The plan was again cancelled. The VA held another public meeting on May 11, 2011 at the Clifton Center to present proposals for three greenfield sites, while still maintaining that they were considering the downtown and Zorn Avenue sites. On August 5, 2011, Congress awarded $13 million for improvements and $10 million in upgrades for the Zorn Avenue Louisville VAMC. On September 21, 2011, 100 parking spaces were leased at the Zorn Avenue Ramada Hotel parking lot to be used for employee parking at the VAMC. After repeated attempts, Senator McConnell again asked for a decision from the VA to be finalized regarding the location of the replacement Louisville VAMC. The VA responded that the decision would be made in September 2011. In a letter from Senator McConnell to Secretary Shinseki, dated October 1, 2011, the Senator requested that the VA speed up the selection process without openly showing interest in any specific site location. On November 10, 2011, Secretary Shinseki formally announced the preferred site as the Midlands site, with the St. Joseph’s site as the second preferred site. Blue Equity held a public meeting on November 17, 2011 regarding the replacement VAMC’s potential location at the Midlands site.

On December 11, 2011, another RFP was issued for the procurement of a 500-car parking garage to be built at the Zorn Avenue Louisville VAMC with an estimated cost of $10 million. The plan was again cancelled.

acceptance of custody and accountability (for Federal Lands), or acceptance of offer to donate or contract for purchase (for private lands)."
32 VA Fact Sheet, February 8, 2013 (Exhibit 2).
33 Department of Veterans Affairs, RFPs for Design-Build Parking Garage (Exhibit 8).
34 Chris Ott, VA Hospital site pleases some, puzzles or upsets others (March 11, 2012) http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/03/11/kentucky-va-hospital-site_n_1262554.html.
35 Terry Boyd, Insiders blow hot: Louisville VA hospital project NOT going to Fort Knox (September 21, 2011) (Exhibit 9).
36 Letter from Mitch McConnell to Secretary Shinseki, (October 1, 2011) (Exhibit 10).
37 VA Fact Sheet, February 8, 2013 (Exhibit 2).
38 Department of Veterans Affairs, RFPs for Design-Build Parking Garage (Exhibit 8).
The Kentucky Department of Transportation held a public meeting at Ballard High School on the traffic issues within the a five-mile radius of the Midlands site on December 15, 2011. During the meeting, the impact of the proposed VA Hospital relocation on local traffic was not discussed. A traffic study was conducted by URS Smith Group, the consulting group hired by the VA, on December 23, 2011. The traffic study compared the numbers from the 2006 study for mixed commercial and residential use to the 2011 traffic study for mixed commercial and residential usage. In 2006, the estimated traffic was 5,877 vehicles per day. In 2011, the number dropped to 3,978 vehicles per day, which reflected the updates to the new Westport Road interchange that had been completed. The traffic estimate for the VA Hospital is 3,780 vehicles per day.

On January 11, 2012, Blue Equity released a preliminary Traffic Report on the Midlands Development Site which compared the traffic count for the Midlands mixed-use development with the relocated hospital. The preliminary report showed that the VA Hospital relocation to Brownsboro Road would create less traffic than Blue's original mixed-use Midlands project.

On January 23, 2012 and again on February 29, 2012, more RFPs were issued for the procurement of another parking garage at the Zorn Avenue site. Both plans were again cancelled. Also on February 29, 2012, a second appraisal was prepared for the Midlands site. This time, the property was valued at $12.9 million. This appraisal was criticized by the VA Inspector General both on the appraisal value of the property and the method by which the VA acquired the property.

In March 2012, the Draft Programmatic Environmental Analysis ("PEA") was published. On March 10, 2012, Senator McConnell announced that Secretary Shinseki would determine a final replacement Louisville VAMC site by Spring 2012.

On March 12, 2012, the City Council of Crossgate (the neighborhood adjacent to the Midlands site) held a meeting at Thomas Jefferson Unitarian Church, with over one hundred people attending. The agenda included a discussion by the VA officials about their plans for the new hospital. The VA was unable to provide answers to basic questions concerning alternatives, timelines, impacts, noise, and accessibility and traffic.

The VA held a public meeting at Kammerer Middle School on April 18, 2012 to discuss the draft PEA study. Approximately 600 people attended the meeting. The

---

41 Technical Memorandum from Paul Slone to Jonathon Blue and Bill Northcut (December 23, 2011) (Exhibit 11).
43 Department of Veterans Affairs, RFPs for Design-Build Parking Garage (Exhibit 8).
45 VA Fact Sheet, February 8, 2013 (Exhibit 2).
46 Bruce Schreiner, McConnell: VA may pick hospital site this spring (March 10, 2012) (Exhibit 12).
meeting was very disorganized, the PA system did not work, and once again, the VA officials were unwilling to answer basic questions about the VAMC proposals. The public had concerns about the size of the proposed replacement Louisville VAMC sitting at the Midlands site, the number of vehicles that would travel in and out of the site, and the impact on already strained local roads.

On April 29, 2012, the PEA public comment period closed. Sometime that month, the VA Office of Construction and Facilities Management ("CFM") commenced the space planning process for the Brownsboro Road site. On April 30, 2012, URS Smith Group was officially selected by the US Department of Veterans Affairs to provide full architectural and engineering services for the development of the new VAMC.

The City of Crossgate held a public meeting concerning the proposed VAMC at the midlands site on March 12, 2012. The meeting was open to the general public. Present at the meeting were the Mayor of Crossgate, several council members, and about 30 members of the public. VA staff was also present, but were unable to answer many of the questions asked by the audience. The audience raised many issues of concern, including accessibility and traffic, stormwater, diminution of the fair market values of property, lighting, and noise.

On May 24, 2012, another RFP was issued for the procurement of a parking garage at the Zorn Avenue VAMC. The plan was again cancelled.

In May 2012, the Contractor, URS Smith Group, began the master planning process at the Brownsboro site. The Final PEA was published on June 8, 2012 with a finding of "no significant impact."

On June 10, 2012, and before the SEA or the EIS was completed, the VA agreed to pay $324.9 million for the purchase of the Midlands site and, a month later, the deal was finalized. Secretary Shinseki announced the Brownsboro site’s formal selection for the replacement Louisville VAMC. On June 19, 2012, reconstruction of the Brownsboro Road exit from the Watterson Expressway began. On June 21, the VA completed the traffic study of the area (after discovering flaws in the first traffic study).

---

48 VA Fact Sheet, February 8, 2013 (Exhibit 2).
49 Id.
50 URS/Smith Group Press Release, April 30, 2012 (Exhibit 13).
51 City of Crossgate Meeting Minutes, March 12, 2012 (Exhibit 14).
52 Department of Veterans Affairs, RFPs for Design-Build Parking Garage (Exhibit 8).
53 VA Fact Sheet, February 8, 2013 (Exhibit 2).
55 VA Fact Sheet, February 8, 2013 (Exhibit 2).
On June 28, another RFP was issued for the procurement of a parking garage at the Louisville VAMC.\textsuperscript{56} The plan was again cancelled.

By July 2012, the site planning for the Brownsboro Road site was anticipated to be completed.\textsuperscript{57} On July 10, 2012, the Federal Government paid $12.9 million for the Brownsboro Road property. The press release described the property as 34.5 acres even though the Jefferson County PVA listed the property as 36.7 acres. The remaining 2.2 acres was deeded to the State of Kentucky by Blue Equity for the slip ramp which was set to be opened in October 2012. That same month, the public reacted to the price paid for the Brownsboro site. As mentioned above, the property was appraised in 2010 for $9.6 million. In 2012, the property was appraised for $12.9 million. The Inspector General and several legislators took issue with the overvalued appraisal of the property, and the VA’s arbitrary acquisition of the property at that price.

On August 15, 2012, the VA hosted another public meeting held at the Clifton Center.\textsuperscript{58} Approximately 400 people attended the meeting. The master planners of the Midlands site, Oculus, Inc., and the architect, Perkins + Will, presented the preliminary master plan. The consultants were slightly more prepared than the VA officials from the April 18 meeting, but the results were the same. When questioned regarding the size of the site and surrounding buildings, the consultant said, “It would be cozy.” Again, the VA was unwilling to give answers to many of the questions raised by the public, including many veterans.

On October 9, 2012, Metro Council member Ken Fleming held a town hall meeting to seek feedback from residents in the 7th District about their concerns regarding the replacement VAMC. On October 25, 2012, the slip ramp from the Watterson Expressway to Brownsboro Road opened. Another VA public meeting was held on November 14, 2012 at the Clifton Center to update veterans and the public about the Midlands site. Approximately 300 people attended the meeting. Again, the VA was unwilling to answer many of the questions and concerns of the public. Many of the veterans and citizens in the audience remained frustrated because of the failure to get informative answers from the VA after attending public meetings with the VA on March 12, April 18, and August 15, 2012. The Master Plan for the Brownsboro Road site was completed in November 2012.\textsuperscript{59}

On February 8, 2013, the Mayor Greg Fischer held a meeting at the Zorn Avenue Louisville VAMC and the VA Fact Sheet was distributed.\textsuperscript{60} The design was underway as of February and the design phase was expected to last approximately 24-30 months.\textsuperscript{61} In April

\textsuperscript{56} Department of Veterans Affairs, RFPs for Design-Build Parking Garage (Exhibit 8).
\textsuperscript{57} VA Fact Sheet, February 8, 2013 (Exhibit 2).
\textsuperscript{58} Id.
\textsuperscript{59} Id.
\textsuperscript{60} Id.
\textsuperscript{61} Id.
2013, Representative Coffman wrote to Secretary Shinseki requesting an unredacted copy of the contract for the Brownsboro Road site.\textsuperscript{63}

On May 13, 2013, another RFP was issued for the procurement of a parking garage at the Louisville VAMC.\textsuperscript{64} Valet parking was considered in the request this time. The plan was again cancelled.\textsuperscript{65}

A letter from Secretary Shinseki to Representative Coffman on June 30, 2013 set out a timeline for the sequence of events for the new hospital’s construction.\textsuperscript{66} The letter from the Secretary states specifically that “[t]his land was purchased to serve as the location of the replacement VA Medical Center in Louisville, Kentucky” and contained a compact disc with the requested documents.\textsuperscript{67}

On November 3, 2013, the Kentucky Medical Association endorsed the construction of the medical complex downtown and opposed the selection of the Midlands site. See Section III, infra. The VA currently refers veterans with acute medical problems to the Rudd Heart and Lung Institute, the James Graham Brown Cancer Center, and the Frazier Rehabilitation Center. Throughout 2013, the VA continues to remodel and build at the Zorn Avenue site including renovations to the back entrance of the hospital to improve access, a free-standing drug treatment building was added to the site, and satellite parking area was added at the Ramada Hotel parking lot. Plans for a parking garage at the Zorn Avenue site continued to be cancelled. On January 17, 2014, a Parking Solicitation Proposal for leasing parking spaces from Mellwood Avenue was proposed for the Zorn Avenue Louisville VAMC.\textsuperscript{67}

In February of 2014, major national news stories began to circulate regarding falsified wait times for veterans at Arizona VA facilities. That same month, hearings were conducted by the Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs regarding the falsified wait times. The goal of the hearing was to hold the VA accountable for its failures in caring for veterans. On February 26, 2014, Representative Coffman wrote to Secretary Shinseki requesting the appraisals for the land purchased for the replacement Louisville VAMC at Brownsboro Road.\textsuperscript{68} On March 5, 2014, U.S. Representative Coffman (Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations), asked why there was a 31% increase between the first and second appraisal for the Midlands site. Representative Coffman noted that the value within 14 months jumped from $9.6 million to $12.9 million. Representative Yarmuth also joined in the questioning stating, “It is critical that not only is the VA a good steward of taxpayers’ dollars, but that the community have confidence in this project. Therefore, I request that you (the acting VA Inspector General

\textsuperscript{62} Letter from Representative Mike Coffman to Secretary Shinseki (April 22, 2013) (Exhibit 15).
\textsuperscript{63} Department of Veterans Affairs, RFPs for Design-Build Parking Garage (Exhibit 8).
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\textsuperscript{68} Department of Veterans Affairs, X-Lease - Parking Spaces (January 15, 2014) (Exhibit 8).
\textsuperscript{69} Letter from Representative Coffman to Secretary Shinseki (February 26, 2014) (Exhibit 16).
Richard Griffin) investigate the actions taken thus far by the VA" in the Louisville replacement project.

On March 7, 2014, Grow Smart Louisville suggested to the VA that the Brownsboro site be used as a VA Cemetery in concert with the nearby Zachary Taylor Cemetery down Brownsboro Road, as the Zachary Taylor Cemetery is closed to new interments. The only interments that are being accepted are subsequent interments for veterans or eligible family members in an existing gravesite. The VA has failed to address this suggestion or other alternative uses for the Midlands site, other than stating “The Brownsboro Site has not been improved or developed by VA and could be used by VA for another purpose or sold should VA choose another site for the proposed VAMC.” DEIS at 3.

On April 16, 2014, almost two years after the Midlands site was purchased, a Public Scoping Meeting was held at the Clifton Center to present the site-specific Environmental Assessment (“SEA”). The consultant present at the meeting was Labat Environmental Inc. who were conducting the environmental assessment of the proposed VAMC. When the consultant was asked by the audience what they thought of the Brownsboro site, she responded that “it’s interesting.” Public comments were due on the SEA on April 25, 2014, while previous comments were not made available.

On May 31, 2014, Secretary Shinseki resigned after pressure from Congress related to substandard timely care and false records covering up related timelines. The Oversight Committee criticized the VA for poor management, lack of accountability and falsifying testimony and evidence.

The 5th District Highway Office of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet sent out a news release on July 7, 2014 to residents in the Highway 42 corridor. The release invited residents to a Public Information Meeting to take place on July 24th seeking public input on the plans to improve the interchange at US 42 and the Watterson Expressway. The meeting was advertised in the Courier-Journal on July 10, 2014. On July 12, the VA announced a third satellite parking lot was now available at the Mellwood Arts Center for 99 cars. A meeting was then held on July 24, 2014 as scheduled at the Christ Church United Methodist Fellowship Hall, led by Project Manager, Travis Thompson, from the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. Public comments for the traffic proposal were due on August 8, 2014. It should be noted that the 5th District Highway Office used traffic data from a 2013 traffic volume study completed by URS Smith Group to plan for the improvements to the US 42 and Watterson Expressway interchange. More VA scandals came to light regarding long waits for appointments, plus cost overruns in the millions of dollars for new hospitals in Aurora, Colorado, Orlando, New Orleans, Omaha, and Las

---
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Vegas (where the ER was built too small and the contractor forgot to build the ambulance drop-off ramp).

In October 2015, after many comments from citizens, citizens' groups such as OSL, and after the Louisville Metro Council unanimously passed a resolution all calling for the VA to conduct an EIS to fully comply with its obligations under NEPA, the VA reversed course and determined that a full EIS was necessary. “Upon analysis of the study results and comments received from the public in response to the draft analysis of the Brownsboro Road site, VA concluded that we must prepare an EIS to fully comply with NEPA.”

According to the current projections regarding proposed schedules for the completion of the new Louisville VAMC, the phased construction is to begin in 2017 subject to budget and appropriations considerations. In 2023, the new VA campus is projected to open and 2025 is the latest extended completion date. The VA completed its Environmental Impact Statement in October 2016 and provided the public the opportunity to comment on the EIS until January 11, 2017. The St. Joseph site was sold in early 2016 and is currently being developed for residential homes. That property is no longer available as a potential replacement Louisville VAMC site, despite its consideration as an alternative in the DEIS.

Shortly after the DEIS was released in October 2016, the City of Crossgate formed a committee to communicate, understand, and analyze the full extent of the VA’s proposed VAMC replacement project and its impacts on veterans, the surrounding community, and the city as a whole. The Cities have also submitted FOIA and Open Records Requests to several government agencies in an attempt to gather as much information as possible to make informed choices. It is within that context the Cities are now submitting these comments to the draft EIS.

B. NEPA REGULATORY BACKGROUND

Since the VA is a federal agency and is responsible for the VAMC project, it is necessary for it to comply with NEPA and the National Historic Preservation Act (“NHPA”), and the regulations implementing these laws, in planning its medical facilities projects. Nat’l Trust for Historic Preservation v. United States Dep’t of Veterans Affairs, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 32015 (E.D. La. Mar. 31, 2010).


---
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Citizens Council, 490 U.S. 332 (1989). In addition, the VA has promulgated agency-specific NEPA regulations. See 38 C.F.R. § 26, et seq. However, as the VA itself has determined, the VA's agency specific NEPA regulations are woefully outdated.

While NEPA does not mandate a particular result, it prescribes that federal agencies consider the potential environmental consequences of proposed actions. Methow Valley, 490 U.S. at 350; O'Reilly v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng'rs, 477 F.3d 225, 228 (5th Cir. 2007). The environmental information required by NEPA must be "available to public officials and citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken." 40 C.F.R. § 1500.1(b). While NEPA does not command agencies to select an environmentally preferable course of action, it does require the agency's decision to be "environmentally conscious." Sierra Club v. Sigler, 695 F.2d 957, 976 (5th Cir. 1983). "NEPA's intent is not to delay or stop good projects, but to integrate environmental considerations into project planning to make good projects more effective and sustainable, without unnecessarily foreclosing future options."74

NEPA requires federal agencies to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") for any major federal action "significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." 42 U.S.C. § 4332(C). If an action does not on its face require an EIS, the agency may conduct an Environmental Assessment ("EA") to determine whether an EIS is necessary. 40 C.F.R. §§ 1501.3-1501.4. As a part of its impacts analysis, an agency must examine direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts. See 40 C.F.R. §§ 1508.7, 1508.8. If, after a "hard look" at the proposed action and its potential effects, the agency concludes that will not be any significant environmental impacts, the agency may issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), and is not required to issue an EIS. See Spiller v. White, 352 F.3d 235, 237-38 (5th Cir. 2003). Otherwise, if the record does not support a FONSI, the agency must issue an EIS. Sabine River Auth. v. U.S. Dept of Interior, 951 F.2d 669, 678 (1992).

Section 101 of NEPA is Congress's "Declaration of National Environmental Policy." It declares that it is the policy of the federal government:

To create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans.

Section 101(a) also refers to the "profound influences of population growth, high-density urbanization [and] industrial expansion." Federal courts interpreted this language to mean that Congress had the urban as well as the natural environment in mind when it enacted NEPA. Sec 8:39. NEPA requires, "the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and

unintended consequences." 101(b)(3). NEPA also mandates, "[E]ach person should enjoy a healthy environment." 101(c).

Section 102(2)(C) states both the "threshold" requirement and the "adequacy" requirement. It provides:

[A]ll agencies of the Federal government...include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment [the "threshold" requirement], a detailed statement by the responsible official on:

(i) the environmental impact of the proposed action,
(ii) any adverse environmental effect which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented,
(iii) alternatives to the proposed action,
(iv) the relationship between local and short term use of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and
(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

After initially issuing a FONSI, the VA reversed course and decided that an EIS was necessary for this project. Of course, this happened only after the Louisville-Metro Council issued a Resolution asking that the VA complete an EIS for the replacement Louisville VAMC project. However, the adequacy of the draft EIS along with the previous PEA and SEA are now at issue. Four of these requirements (i, ii, iv, v) define the responsibility of the agency to consider the environmental impacts of their action. The remaining requirement (iii) mandates that the VA must consider alternatives to their proposed action.

Although NEPA does not define an environmental "impact," CEQ regulations promulgated pursuant to NEPA does, and requires a discussion of direct and indirect impacts and beneficial as well as detrimental impacts. 40 C.F.R. §1508.8. Thus, in addition to direct impacts, the VA must examine indirect and cumulative impacts. See 40 C.F.R. §§ 1508.7, 1508.8.

NEPA also requires other decision-making responsibilities. Section 102(2)(E) requires federal agencies to "study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommend courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of public resources." A more elaborative statement of the requirement found at § 101(2)(C)(iii), this requires the consideration of alternatives even if and EIS is not prepared. Section 102(2)(A) requires federal agencies to "utilize a systematic,
interdisciplinary approach which will ensure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decisionmaking which may have an impact on man’s environment,” and Section 102(2)(B) requires federal agencies to “identify and develop methods and procedures...which will insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decisionmaking along with economic and technical considerations.” Section 102(2)(F) requires federal agencies to “recognize the worldwide and long-range character of environmental problems.”

With this background and for the reasons outlined below, the VA has failed to comply with NEPA in preparing its DEIS for the Robley Rex Replacement VAMC. The VA should withdraw its current DEIS, and appoint a new agency or decision-maker to conduct a full, adequate EIS that takes into account all reasonable alternatives and sufficiently evaluates the environmental impacts of those alternatives.

II. THE VA SHOULD WITHDRAW THIS DEIS AND RECONVENE THE NEPA PROCESS ONLY IF AND UNTIL THE VA UPDATES ITS NEPA IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS.

As an initial matter, the VA’s NEPA implementing regulations are codified in the Federal Register at 38 C.F.R. Part 26. These regulations were last updated in 1989. As stated in the VA’s own 2010 NEPA Interim Guidance for Projects [Exhibit 7], “the current regulations no longer meet the needs of the Agency.” Id., Part 1, at 10. At the time the Interim Guidance was published in 2010, it stated that the “VA is currently developing new agency NEPA regulations and Directive/Handbook to reflect the Agency’s current operations, organization, and mission.” The new regulations and guidelines would “enable VA to better address current environmental challenges of their actions and provide adaptability for the future,” “provide clarity on roles and responsibilities for environmental planning within VA and explain how environmental planning relates to VA programs, plans, and projects,” and “will also explain the relationship between VA and local, state, regional, and tribal agencies in the environmental planning process.” Id. at 10-11. Unfortunately, none of these improvements has been accomplished. The VA’s reliance on outdated policies and guidelines to advance this project demonstrates the project’s bias in completing the DEIS. It is actions of this nature that makes veterans and residents worry the VA will not be a good citizen of the community and comply with current regulations, especially during the construction an ongoing operations as the project moves forward. The updated regulations and guidance could have also prevented the tainted and insufficient NEPA decision-making process that resulted in this inadequate DEIS.

The Cities agree that the VA’s implementing regulations are wholly outdated and no longer meet (and perhaps never met) the needs of the VA, most egregiously with the failure of the VA to consult with the majority of veterans and the communities in which they live and work and large swaths of the urban community in Louisville. Outdated
regulations lead to inconsistent and arbitrary results, especially when the regulations provide insufficient and outdated guidance. The VA cannot rely on data and assumptions that are inaccurate and not based on substantial evidence. See *Northwest Ecosystem Alliance*, supra. The VA should withdraw this DEIS and reconvene the NEPA process only if and until the VA updates its NEPA implementing regulations.

III. **Without Prioritizing The Health Of Veterans And Without An Alternatives Analysis That Seeks To Hold The Care And Preferences Of Veterans As A Priority, Any Evaluation Of The Needs And Purposes Of This Project And Of The Reasonable Alternatives Pursuant To NEPA Must Be Withdrawn.**

While the Cities are uniquely situated to voice their opinions and concerns with regards to this project because of their proximity to the preferred alternative, their primary concern is with the preferred alternative are the quality of medical care, needs, desires, and preferences of the veterans. The DEIS provides no analysis of quality of care as it relates to the options evaluated by the VA. See DEIS, §2.1 at p. 2 (where the only criteria that addresses veteran health concerns is that the new VAMC is recommend to be within 15 miles of the U of L medical center). As noted by the GSL, “The absence of that analysis is perhaps the most fundamental flaw in the DEIS, as it threatens the quality of care for thousands of Veterans in the Louisville area.” GSL Comments at ___. The Cities agree and incorporate fully those comments of the GSL here. The preferred alternative will actually have substantial negative impacts to veterans, as the distance from Louisville’s downtown medical campus, the U of L School of Medicine, and the U of L Level 1 Trauma Center medical puts the health and lives of veterans in further risk when emergency care is needed.

This is not only the concern of the Cities and the GSL, it is also a concern of the Kentucky Medical Association (“KMA”). The KMA passed a resolution [Exhibit 20] condemning the VA’s preferred alternative for several reasons, which are as follows:

(1) “with the closing of the Community Based Outpatient Clinics (CBOC) the Midlands location is even further away from most of the veterans using the CBOC”;

(2) “the geographic isolation of the VA Hospital from the downtown medical center and medical school impairs the availability of physicians, including specialized physicians, to provide services to the veterans;”

(3) “all veterans suffering from stroke, or requiring invasive cardiac care, are transported to other hospitals for that care and transport times can be critical to the outcome for veterans”; 

(4) “inpatient transfers from the current VA Hospital to downtown hospitals
numbers in the hundreds every year (2011-470, 2012-423, 2013 to July 19-325);

(5) “the current VA Hospital relies on downtown hospitals for routine services during times of equipment failure, until replacement of faulty equipment, such as the failure of the autoclave that resulted in transfer of all elective surgery cases until it was replaced in 2012”;

(6) “most VA Hospitals are located in downtown urban settings close to university hospitals including Atlanta (Emory), Cincinnati (Univ. of Cincinnati), Indianapolis (Indiana Univ.), Nashville (Vanderbilt Univ.), Lexington (Univ. of Kentucky), Memphis (Univ. of Tenn., Memphis), St. Louis (St. Louis Univ., Washington Univ.), East Tennessee (East Tennessee State Univ.), Cleveland (Case Western Univ.), Baltimore (Univ. of Baltimore), Boston (Boston Univ., Harvard), Houston (Baylor Univ.), Chicago (Northwestern Univ.), Philadelphia (Univ. of Pennsylvania);” and

(7) “personnel and support services for Veterans are more accessible, and more likely to positively impact the health and quality of life of Veterans at a downtown location.”

For the above reasons, the KMA passed a resolution to oppose the preferred alternative for the construction of a new VAMC and to support a location in close proximity to the University of Louisville Medical Center for the proposed VA hospital. The VA’s failure to address these veterans’ health concerns in the DEIS is arbitrary and not in compliance with NEPA by failing to “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(a).

The DEIS also failed to include and address the July 2009 M. Davis and Company (“MDAC”) survey. MDAC conducted a survey of 537 veterans served by the current Louisville VAMC to determine the preference regarding the location of a new VA medical center in Louisville. [Exhibit 21]. The survey called for three options, to renovate the current Zorn Avenue site, to locate all patient care to a downtown site, or to locate inpatient care downtown and outpatient care at the Zorn Avenue site. The desirability of each option was rated by each veteran on a five-point scale ranging from “Very Undesirable” to “Very Desirable.” Eighty percent of the interviewed veterans had heard or read about plans for a new VAMC. Sixty percent preferred the “Renovate Zorn Avenue” option with 70.2% of surveyed veterans rating the “Renovate Zorn Avenue” option as desirable. Nineteen percent preferred the “All Care Downtown” option, and sixteen percent preferred the “Inpatient Downtown; Outpatient at Zorn Avenue” option. The study concluded that veterans prefer and desire the “Renovate Zorn Avenue” option by a considerable majority. Nowhere does the DEIS mention this survey, the veterans preference, or the veterans majority desire to stay at the Zorn Avenue VAMC location.
Looking more closely, the survey reveals the reasons why veterans made their survey choices. The most popular reason for veterans favoring the Zorn Avenue site was “Easier to get to the facility on Zorn Ave.; closer.” For those that favored a downtown location, the most popular reason was “Easier to get to the downtown facility; closer.” Thus, accessibility of the VAMC is the number one factor in determining where to locate a new VAMC or renovated VAMC. As noted by the VA itself, accessibility is a major flaw in the preferred site. DEIS at 12 (“The KY 22/I-264 interchange is congested, even after recent improvements.”).

The abysmal accessibility problems at the preferred alternative site combined with the preference of the veterans for ease of access were not adequately considered by the VA in the DEIS. Even the outdated and flawed traffic report (discussed in detail infra) scores most of the intersections and turns with a Level of Service (LOS) of D or below. Poor accessibility will lead to poor medical care, especially in emergency situations where delayed access will have detrimental impacts on the health and lives of veterans. In addition, there will be increased costs related to the continuing need to transport veterans to and from downtown facilities for care not provided at the VAMC. The accessibility issues will be compounded by the more than ten-mile distance between the preferred alternative site and the downtown medical campus in emergency situations. The long distance is also problematic for physicians and medical students who would otherwise volunteer and work at the VAMC in the absence of accessibility problems. The VA has also proposed to close all of the CBOCs in Jefferson County, increasing travel times and again compounding accessibility problems and wait times at the Midlands site. This was not subject to the rigorous exploration and objective evaluation required by NEPA. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(a).

Veterans’ preferences, access to the VAMC, and the quality of care with the preferred alternative were not adequately examined for another reason – the VA failed to analyze where veterans reside in relation to the preferred alternative site. A review was performed by GSL that examined the residency of veterans in Jefferson County by zip code. That review found that a substantial majority of veterans live in the western and southwestern areas of Jefferson County. As a result, the VA’s preferred alternative site is the site farthest from where the veterans live, especially compared to a west Louisville site, a downtown site, or the current site. Relying on public transportation will not fill the void left by the increased travel miles and times. This is another factor that will negatively impact veterans’ ability to access care. This is another unreasonable omission in the DEIS.

This was also verified by the Institute for Healthy Air, Water, and Soil, which found, based on U.S. census data,\(^{75}\) that veterans living in the zip codes farthest from the Midlands site have significantly lower household incomes (average of $49,507) than veterans living in the zip codes closest to the proposed site (average $145,033). The Institute’s other significant findings include:

• 40245 has the highest average income among veterans at $480,394, and is close to the proposed site. 40210 has the second lowest average income, $29,110, and is located in the West end of Louisville.

• 2,572 more veterans live in the seven counties farthest from the Midlands site than the 7 counties closest to the proposed site.

• Three of the zip codes farthest from the Midlands site have the highest rates of veterans living in poverty in Jefferson County: 40212 at 20%, 40211 at 16%, and 40210 at 20%. These same three zip codes, have the lowest median household incomes in Jefferson County (40212 at $26,713, 40211 at $25,943, and 40210 at $19,778). The 2012 national average for veterans living in poverty was 7.4%.

• The zip codes surrounding the Midlands site all have rates of poverty lower than the national average.

• People living in the seven zip codes farthest from the Midlands site have significantly lower household incomes (average of $49,507) than people living in the seven zip codes closest to the proposed site (average of $145,033).

• The seven zip codes farthest from the Midlands site have significantly higher percentage of people living in poverty (11%) than the seven zip codes closest to the proposed site (4%).

See Institute for Health, Air, Water, and Soil Comments to the DEIS for the proposed Replacement Robley Rex VAMC.
Figure 1: Population of Veterans in Louisville by Zip Code in relation to the Midlands' Site and CBOCs proposed to be consolidated. Source: Institute for Healthy Air, Water, and Soil (January 2017).

Because of the VA's failure to properly scope and listen to the veterans that will be impacted by the closure of the current Zorn Ave VAMC and the construction of the new VAMC, several veterans and veterans' groups have become outspoken in opposition to the Midlands site. In his November 8, 2016 Op-Ed in the Courier Journal, Colonel Fred Johnson, a 39-year Army veteran warns the VA's predetermined relocation of the Robley
Rex VAMC at Brownsboro Road would be a “rush to failure.”

Col. Johnson points out the VA “bought the proposed site in 2012 for $12.9 million before conducting a full impact assessment,” and that, “This should give us pause to consider the legitimacy of the decision in the first place.” Id. With regards to an unreasonable range of alternatives, Col. Johnson notes, “All three of the courses of action that were examined were in East Louisville. None were considered in West Louisville.” Id. He states, “Veteran accessibility and preference must be the most important factors measured in determining the best course of action. They were not included in the environmental study, and I have not found a source that addresses those two concerns.” Id. Connecting the care of veterans to the location of the VAMC, Col. Johnson states, “West Louisville is much more accessible to our veteran population, particularly those that need VA services most.” Id. From a socio-economic perspective, which must be considered under NEPA, Col. Johnson asserts that “significant positive economic impact the VA will bring” if it is located in an underserved community. Id. He concludes, “We cannot rush to failure on a decision that could adversely affect the next generation of veterans, many of whom are currently fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. We owe them, and all the men and women who have served our nation, so much more.” Id.

Another veteran, retired Air Force Brigadier General Rob Givens, has been outspoken in his opposition to the Midlands site in public meetings, town halls, and before the VA. He raises an important point, one that was never considered by the VA regarding the environmental, social, economic, and cultural impacts the constructing of the VAMC in a community that needs it:

> There is another part of caring for veterans beyond providing them medical service. We have an opportunity for them to make a difference again, as they did when they were in uniform. A project of this magnitude is of great value to the community, and where we place it matters.\(^7\)

Retired Marine Captain (JAG) Alan Roles, a citizen and resident of Northfield and U.S. Marine Corps veteran, states in his VAMC DEIS comments he has “grave concerns on the apparent decision of the Veterans Administration to locate a new hospital at the Midlands site. The traffic studies relied upon by the V.A. are obviously faulty and will create serious accessibility problems for the Veterans seeking emergency treatment or being transported downtown, if necessary, after being examined at the hospital at the Midlands site.” See Roles Comments to DEIS. He has concerns about surface water runoff into Crossgate, which already has stormwater flooding issues, especially when the Brownsboro site would require the adding of fill material to increase the ground height by ten feet. See


DEIS at 27. He has concerns that the highway and road improvements assumed in the DEIS will never be constructed and that funds have yet to be committed for that purpose. He is concerned about a decline in property values and negative economic impacts to surrounding businesses. He also notes, “The majority of the Veterans would prefer the hospital to remain at the present Zorn Avenue location. In the alternative, a downtown or south-end location or west-end location would better serve most of the Veterans and many of the employees of the hospital, who live in closer proximity to these locations.” He points out that the St. Joseph site “is not available.” Mr. Roles is also concerned that the CBOCs in various locations more convenient to Veterans will be closed and the Veterans will be required to come all the way from their homes throughout the service area to the Midlands site to be treated at that site.” He concludes, “This whole matter should be investigated from the beginning and the Midlands site should be reconsidered and rejected.” He ends with a suggestion to use the Midlands’ site “as a new Veteran’s cemetery or for the construction of a nursing home and rehabilitation facility for Veterans, with a design in keeping with the aesthetics of the neighborhood.”

The absence of these considerations impacting the veterans’ quality of care are fatal shortcomings of the DEIS. The DEIS fails to consider the impacts of the preferred alternative or any other alternative on the quality of care of veterans. The DEIS has failed to “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” when it comes to the health and wellbeing, and care of veterans. Without prioritizing the health of veterans and without an alternatives analysis that seeks to hold the care and preferences of veterans as a priority, any evaluation of the needs and purposes of this project and of the reasonable alternatives pursuant to NEPA must be withdrawn and re-evaluated to account for those deficiencies.

IV. THE DEIS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN, AND AN UNBIASED, RIGOROUSLY THOROUGH, AND OBJECTIVE EXAMINATION OF ALL REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES SHOULD BE PERFORMED, INCLUDING URBAN SITES, THAT ALLOWS FOR A PROPER COMPARISON OF EACH ALTERNATIVE IN COMPLIANCE WITH NEPA AND ITS IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS.

The analysis of environmental effects in an environmental impact statement must show a good faith objectivity on the part of the agency. *Isle of Hope Historical Ass. v. United States Army Corp. of Engineers*, 646 F.2d 215 (5th Cir. 1980). This requirement is not met if the VA’s environmental review is biased, or if the VA predetermines its decision or makes a prior commitment that prevents impartial analysis. 40 C.F.R §1502.2(g) (“Environmental impact statements shall serve as the means of assessing the environmental impact of proposed agency actions, rather than justifying decisions already made.”) Both pro forma compliance with NEPA procedures and post hoc rationalizations as to why and how the agency complied with NEPA are not acceptable. *Int'l Snowmobile Mfrs. Ass'n v. Norton*, 340 F. Supp. 2d 1249, 1258 (D. Wyo. 2004), citing *Davis v. Mineta*, 302 F.3d 1104, 1112-13 (10th Cir. 2002). See also *Thomas v. Peterson*, 753 F.2d 754 (9th Cir. 1985) and *Metcalf v. Daley*,
214 F.3d 1135, 1145 (9th Cir. Wash. 2000). In addition, the VA’s own NEPA implementing regulations state, “The major decision points for VA actions, by which time the necessary environmental documents must be completed, are as follows: (6) Land acquisition for development. Prior to the Secretary’s acceptance of custody and accountability (for Federal lands), or acceptance of offer to donate or contract for purchase (for private lands).” 38 C.F.R. 26.7 (Emphasis added.) See also 40 C.F.R. 1506.1.

The order in which the VA is required to follow to comply with NEPA is also critical to the timeline of the acquisition of the Midlands site. See Nat’l Audubon Soc’y v. Dept’ of the Navy, 422 F.3d 174, 185 (4th Cir. N.C. 2005):

In drafting the EIS, the agency has to follow certain procedures that the CEQ has set forth. Most relevant here, the CEQ stipulates that the agency will draft the EIS in stages. The initial draft is the DEIS. Id. § 1502.9(a). Once the DEIS is complete, the agency must circulate it in order to obtain feedback from other agencies and the public. Id. § 1503.1. The agency must then respond to these comments and publish a FEIS. Id. §§ 1502.9(b), 1503.4. After the FEIS is complete, the agency may be required to draft a SEIS if there are changed circumstances or new information becomes available. Id. § 1502.9(c). Finally, once the agency has made a decision, it must publish a ROD. Id. § 1505.2. Only then may an agency finalize its action. See id. § 1506.1(a).

As of the date of these comments, the NEPA process with regards to the replacement VAMC is far from complete. Yet, “In June 2011, after review of appraisals of several property sites, VA Secretary Eric Shinseki selected the 4906 Brownsboro Road property as the new location of the replacement VA medical facility.” Exhibit 22; VA Office of Inspector General (“IG”) Report at 1. This prior commitment of funds not only shows bias, but it has impacted the way the VA has conducted the NEPA process from the beginning and can be seen most egregiously with the failure to consider any reasonable alternative to the Brownsboro Road site. This bias continues to this day, as the VA and its representatives consistently state in public that the Midlands site is the only site the VA is considering. See Lisa Autry, Radcliff Town Hall to Address Veterans Hospital, WKYU-FM (January 3, 2017) (“A VA spokesperson said last week that plans are proceeding for the Louisville site and no other locations are being considered.”); Rhonda Miller, VA Not Interested in Hardin County Offer for Free Land for Medical Center, WKYU-FM (December 27,
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78 38 CFR 26.7(b)(6) also requires that “The major decision points for VA actions, by which time the necessary environmental documents must be completed, are as follows: (6) Land acquisition for development. Prior to the Secretary’s acceptance of custody and accountability (for Federal Lands), or acceptance of offer to donate or contract for purchase (for private lands).” (emphasis added).

2016) ("The News-Enterprise reports a VA spokesperson said plans are proceeding for the Brownsboro Road site and no other locations are being considered."); 80 Sheldon S. Shafer, Radcliff Jumps Into Bidding for VA Hospital (December 28, 2016), THE COURIER JOURNAL ("The only question is are we or are we not going to build at Brownsboro Center,‘’ Trexler said last week. ‘That is the only site being considered by the VA today.‘‘"); 81 Ben Sheronan, Local, Region, State Roundup: 50 Acres Offered Free for Veterans Hospital, THE MESSENGER (December 25, 2016) ("At a veterans’ town hall meeting earlier this week, officials said that is the only site under consideration."). 82

Because of these premature actions and express bias given to the Brownsboro Road site, the entire NEPA process has been tainted and the VA has illegally prejudiced the DEIS by rashly purchasing the Midlands property despite years away from completing its obligations under NEPA. The VA has unjustly limited the choice of reasonable alternatives in violation of the CEQ regulations, has acquired land locked property that will not support expansion prior to the completion of NEPA environmental documents in violation of the VA’s own NEPA implementing regulations, and has failed to show good faith objectivity in the preparation of the DEIS.

Despite comments and letters criticizing the deficient PEA and demanding a full EIS be prepared, the VA purchased the Midlands site in 2012 under unreasonably suspect circumstances. Those circumstances were well documented in the IG Report cited above. See Exhibit 22. The IG summarized its findings as follows:

We determined that the Office of Acquisition, Logistics, and Construction (OALC) conducted two appraisals of property in Louisville, KY, in December 2010 and in February 2012. The first appraisal valued the property at $9,850,000. The second appraisal valued the property at $12,905,000. However, OALC did not obtain a required review appraisal for determining the appropriateness of the two appraisals prior to purchasing the land for $12,905,000. VA did obtain a review appraisal in April 2014, nearly two years after the property was purchased and at a cost of $2,447. Spending $2,447 for the review appraisal was a waste of the taxpayers' money because the timing of the review appraisal was useless in determining whether VA paid just compensation for the property.

OALC did not obtain a review appraisal prior to purchasing

the property because VA policies were not clear as to when to obtain a review appraisal. As a result, VA lacks assurance the purchase price paid was reasonable, and VA may have overpaid more than $3 million for this property.

Furthermore, OALC misrepresented information provided to the HVAC regarding the 31 percent increase in the property's market value over a 14-month period, December 2010 to February 2012. OALC stated the analysis of highest and best use of the property was revised from residential to mixed-use development. This was contrary to our findings, as both appraisals state that the highest and best use of the property would be for mixed-use development. With effective oversight, OALC leadership could have avoided the possible overpayment and put this money to better use.

IG Report, at Report Highlights (Emphasis added). The failure to comply with the law and the overpayment of $3 million for the Midlands site further exhibits the VA's disregard for the law throughout this entire site-selection process.81

After the Midlands site was prematurely purchased, the VA began and completed its master planning process for the VAMC at the Midlands site in April 2013 and then completed its conceptual design process. DEIS at 13. The VA continued to take major action and spend federal dollars without completing the NEPA process. Not until October 2015, did the VA determine that its PEA was insufficient, requiring it to prepare an EIS. The result is a highly biased EIS that fails to seriously consider any reasonable alternative other than the preferred site — a site the VA grossly overpaid for and in which the acquisition process is riddled with inappropriate actions and compliance issues.

That bias is most evident in the DEIS itself. For example, the DEIS only considers three alternatives in Section 2.0 of the DEIS: the preferred Midlands site, no action alternative, and the St. Joseph property. However, shortly after the VA announced that it would be preparing an EIS, the St. Joseph property was bought by a developer and slated for development. This would severely limit the ability of the VA to acquire the property, let alone build a billion-dollar medical center on it, leaving only two alternatives: the preferred Brownsboro Road site and the no action alternative. And, even if the St. Joseph site were available, the environmental assessment of that property is grossly inadequate (as is the no action alternative) especially compared to the environmental assessment of the Brownsboro

81 See also David Wise, VA’s Actions to Address Cost Increases and Schedule Delays at Major Medical-Facility Projects., U.S. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE, GAO-15-332T (January 21, 2015) ("GAO Report"), at Exhibit 23. ("[T]he cost increases for these [VAMC] projects ranged from 86 percent to 144 percent and delays ranged from 14 to 86 months.") Until the VA solves its acquisition and construction problems, and fulfills the recommendations of the IG, GAO, and others, it should refrain from making decisions regarding billion dollar projects, especially when those decisions fail to comply with laws such as NEPA.
Road site. Again, NEPA requires a rigorous exploration and objective evaluation of each reasonable alternative. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(a). NEPA also requires the VA to "devote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail including the proposed action so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits." Id. at (b). However, no reasonable comparison could be done between the three alternatives because that data and assessments were not developed for the St. Joseph site, the no action alternative, or any other alternative.

In addition, the VA arbitrarily (and in violation of Executive Order No. 12,898 ("EO 12898")) eliminated all reasonable alternatives located on an urban site when it decided to evaluate only "greenfield" sites. The VA simply failed to comply with NEPA when it failed to evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives including urban sites. The inadequate "range of alternatives," and the deficient environmental assessment of the two alternatives it did assess, reflects the VA’s unwavering bias towards the Midlands site as indicated by their constant and consistent public comments that the VA was considering no other site besides the Midlands Site. The Cities agree with GSL that "through [the VA’s] prior commitment of resources and financial and emotional investment in its preferred alternative, the VA has demonstrated that it is incapable of performing the kind of good faith, objective review that NEPA demands." We also agree that our veterans are entitled "to the best possible health care in the most effective and environmentally friendly manner." Id. The DEIS must serve as the means of assessing the environmental impact of the VA’s proposed project for each reasonable alternative, rather than justifying decisions it has already made. The VA has failed to do so.

The VA’s acquisition of the Midlands site prior to completing the NEPA process, and the prejudgment and bias as a result of that premature acquisition, violates NEPA, the CEQ’s implementing regulations [see 40 C.F.R. 1506.1 ("While work on a required program environmental impact statement is in progress and the action is not covered by an existing program statement, agencies shall not undertake in the interim any major Federal action covered by the program which may significantly affect the quality of the human environment unless such action...[w]ill not prejudice the ultimate decision on the program. Interim action prejudices the ultimate decision on the program when it tends to determine subsequent development or limit alternatives.") and the VA’s own NEPA implementing regulations [see 38 C.F.R. 26.7 ("The major decision points for VA actions, by which time the necessary environmental documents must be completed, are as follows...6) Land acquisition for development.") The DEIS should be withdrawn, and an unbiased, rigorously thorough, and objective examination of all reasonable alternatives should be performed, including urban sites, that allows for a proper comparison of each alternative in compliance with NEPA and its implementing regulations.

---

[44 See also 40 C.F.R. 1502.14 ("Based on the information and analysis presented in the sections on the Affected Environment (§ 1502.15) and the Environmental Consequences (§ 1502.16), it 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 among options by the decisionmaker and the public.") (Emphasis added).]
V. **THE VA CRAFTED A STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED THAT WAS FOREORDAINED FOR THE APPROVAL OF ONE SPECIFIC ALTERNATIVE – THE MIDLANDS SITE – RENDERING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE VAMC AN EMPTY FORMALITY.**

The Purpose and Need of the VAMC project is stated in Section 1.2 of the DEIS as follows:

*The purpose* of the proposed project is to provide Louisville area Veterans with facilities of sufficient capacity to meet their current and projected future healthcare needs. These facilities would include a full service (inpatient and outpatient) hospital, associated CBOCs, and a VBA regional office. Within the Louisville service area, 60,943 Veterans were enrolled to receive care in Fiscal Year 2014. Enrollment is expected to increase to more than 68,000 (more than 11 percent) by FY 2024. During this same time period, outpatient clinic stops are expected to increase from 762,104 to over 963,000 (a 26 percent increase). Increased capacity is required to, at minimum, keep pace with increased enrollment and clinic stops while maintaining current levels of service and, optimally, improve service levels by accommodating expanded diagnostic services and where possible decreasing wait times for appointments. The increased capacity and services provided by the new VAMC would be expected to streamline and enhance the patient experience for users of the facility.

The proposed project *is needed* because the current hospital and CBOCs are operating at maximum capacity and are unable to accommodate the projected increase in the regional Veteran population. The configuration and condition of the existing 63-year-old Louisville VAMC facility offers limited options to expand to meet these needs. In addition, parking at the Zorn Avenue VAMC is insufficient. Because VBA functions exceed the physical capacities of its existing regional office location in leased space at 321 West Main Street, Suite 390, Louisville, the existing VBA regional office also requires relocation. These insufficient facilities challenge VA’s ability to safely, economically, and consistently provide high quality, integrated health care and services to the region’s Veterans.

Between 1998 and 2004, VA completed a nationwide Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) study to identify the demand for VA care and assess into the future appropriate function, size, and location for VA facilities. The CARES study confirmed that the Louisville VAMC has significant space issues. VA subsequently determined that new facilities constructed on a new site would be best suited to meet future needs. The specific factors that contributed to this determination of need
and that preclude renovating or making major additions to the existing VAMC include the following:

- Hospital infrastructure does not allow renovations to meet current design criteria:
  - The distance between structural columns limits open space utilization, and floor to floor heights are minimal for today's standards.
  - The primary electrical distribution system is at capacity and cannot accommodate additional high power requirements.
  - The heating, ventilation, and air conditioning infrastructure does not meet room air exchange criteria in many hospital areas, affecting patient comfort.
  - There are no dedicated patient transport elevators. The existing elevators cannot accommodate new beds.

- There is no appreciable vacant space on the campus for expansion:
  - The facility is 200,000 square feet short of the space needed for the current workload.
  - Providing services at maximum capacity results in very little available transitional space from the time of service until discharge.
  - There is no space available for expansion of diagnostic services, which affects workload and operational efficiency.

- Parking is limited to 1,200 spaces with no place to expand. The construction phase for an onsite parking garage would preclude use of a substantial portion of the existing parking spaces that would fall within a new parking facility footprint as well as for materials laydown, a situation that the already constricted campus could not feasibly accommodate even for a very short period of time.

(Emphasis added.)

The VA's purpose and need statement has failed to offer adequate and detailed evidence and data in support of the underlying purpose and need to which the VA is responding in proposing the alternatives including the preferred alternative. The purpose and need statement "necessarily dictates the range of 'reasonable' alternatives and an agency cannot define its objectives in unreasonably narrow [or broad] terms." City of Carmel-by-the-Sea v. United States DOT, 123 F.3d 1142, 1155 (9th Cir. Cal. 1997). This is critical particularly with regards to the Cities, because the purpose and need section also serves to inform the public about the VA's proposals. Soda Mountain Wilderness Council v. Norton, 424 F. Supp. 2d 1241 (E.D. Cal. 2006). This lack of support calls into question the need for the proposed project, the alternatives chosen to be discussed by the VA, the evaluation of those alternatives, and the means by which the VA has cooperated with veterans, the City of Louisville and other surrounding cities, community and veteran groups, and other stakeholders.
When an agency evaluates alternatives to a proposed action in an environmental impact statement, it “must answer three questions in order. First, what is the purpose of the proposed project? Second, given that purpose, what are the reasonable alternatives to the project? And third, to what extent should the agency explore each particular alternative?” Habitat Educ. Ctr., Inc. v. United States Forest Serv., 593 F. Supp. 2d 1019, 1022 (E.D. Wis. 2009), aff’d, 609 F.3d 897 (7th Cir., 2010). These requirements dictate the range of reasonable alternatives. League of Wilderness Defenders - Blue Mtn. Biodiversity Proj. v. Bosworth, 383 F. Supp. 2d 1285, 1295 (D. Or. 2005). Purpose and need statements are only upheld if they are reasonable. Simmons v. U. S. Army Corps of Eng’rs, 120 F.3d 664, 666 (7th Cir. 1997). If the stated purpose of the project is so narrowly or broadly defined as to exclude consideration of reasonable alternatives, the statement does not comply with NEPA. Id. The VA has crafted a statement of purpose and need that was foreordained for the approval of one specific alternative – the Midlands site preferred alternative – rendering the Environmental Impact Statement for the VAMC an empty formality. This undercuts the letter and the spirit of the NEPA process.

A. THE DEIS LACKS SUFFICIENT SUPPORTING INFORMATION TO JUSTIFY THE NEED AND PURPOSE STATEMENT.

The DEIS justifies its purpose and need statement by including unsupported and limited data with regards to veteran enrollment, potential increase in veteran enrollment, outpatient clinic stops, and wait times. DEIS at § 1.2 at 3-4. Yet, the VA offered no correlation between any alleged shortcomings of the current VAMC site, these statistics and the need to construct the proposed VAMC including the preferred site, size, configuration, and regionalization of the CBOCs. While the DEIS does state that the current VAMC is operating at “maximum capacity and are unable to accommodate the projected increase in the regional Veteran population,” [id.] it offers no data or information to support that statement, e.g. veteran wait times and backlogs, a need for capacity for specific services offered to veterans, staffing and administrative needs, or data on how the current VAMC is predicted to be utilized in the future including changes in services, demographics, and medical needs in a changing military landscape. In addition, the VA offers almost no similar background or data on the utilization of the CBOCs, and the need to replace the CBOCs with one site. Also, while, the VA claims that the current site facilities have “reached the end of their serviceable lives,”[id.] it offers no information to how much time before those “serviceable lives” expire. The DEIS offers no evidence that provides a sufficient basis for the purpose and need of this project, and therefore cannot provide a reasonable basis for the selection and analysis of the chosen alternatives. The VA cannot rely on incomplete and outdated data and assumptions. “The purpose of NEPA is to require disclosure of relevant environmental considerations that were given a hard look by the agency, and thereby to permit informed public comment on [the] proposed action and any choices or alternatives that might be pursued with less environmental harm.” Northwest Ecosystem Alliance v. Rey, 380 F. Supp. 2d 1175, 1196 (W.D. Wash. 2005)
If the need and propose statement is deficient, the entire NEPA process is compromised, as the requirements of the need and purpose statement dictate the range of reasonable alternatives the VA must evaluate. See League of Wilderness, supra. Without more detailed information that outlines the needs of the current VAMC site, the needs and purpose statement fails to provide a foundation to address how reasonable alternatives can satisfy those needs. As stated above, the statement of purpose and need must also be sufficient to adequately inform the public about the VA’s proposals including a reasonable range of alternatives. Pac. Coast Fedn. of Fishermen’s Ass’ns v. Blank, 693 F.3d 1084, 1099 (9th Cir. Cal. 2012). The DEIS’s purpose and need statement is wholly deficient, as it fails to offer specific, detailed, supportable, and citable data in support, and leaves the public wondering what the actual needs and purpose of the project entail. The DEIS should be withdrawn until more specific information and data that clearly defines and describes the short and long term goals of the project are provided.

In addition, the need and purpose statement fails to set forth adequate support and data that the current VAMC site on Zorn Avenue is inadequate, and that the construction of the VAMC at a greenfield site is preferred. While its astonishing that the VA claims the new VAMC will have “no impact” [DEIS, ¶ 2 at 45] on the environmental, social, cultural, and economic matters, the wholesale elimination of a large swath of reasonable alternatives under the auspices of a preferred “greenfield” site is not only unreasonable and denotes the VA’s fundamental misunderstanding of how to address environmental issues, but also violates EO 12898 by eliminating most, if not all, of the sites in the urban areas of Louisville, as stated below. The failure to consider the construction of a more than a billion dollar project in an urban area is not only an environmental justice issue, but also has other social, cultural, and economic ramifications that NEPA requires to be addressed -- the most striking being the failure to evaluate how veterans who live in low income, minority communities can access care at the VAMC, and how the VAMC has impacts -- both positive and negative on a location and community. The VA has failed to do so this DEIS.

The VA also does not adequately explain why it cannot expand at the Zorn Avenue site. Parking garages were slated for construction on the site multiple times, only later to be delayed or canceled. The Zorn Avenue site is much larger than the preferred alternative (65 acres versus 34.9), yet the VA has limited the developable land at Zorn to 22 acres without justification. The Zorn Avenue does have a challenging topography, but the VA offers no data or evidence that construction cannot occur on the property. Clearly, you can build on and around the steep topography on the site, as the many developments around the Zorn Avenue VAMC have demonstrated. The VA must also make public its plans for the Zorn Avenue VAMC site if they choose to move the VAMC.

The failure to adequately define the criteria needed for a new site is fundamental to determining the range of alternatives to be evaluated pursuant to NEPA. The statement of purpose and need does nothing to determine criteria or factors to help identify how alternatives will impact the human environment. The statement of purpose and need does
not adequately dictate the range of reasonable alternatives and failed to include reasonable alternatives that it should have considered. The DEIS should be withdrawn, and a more adequate purpose and need statement based on detailed data and evidence in support should be prepared that allows for a reasonable range of alternatives to meet the purpose and needs of the VA and veterans.

B. THE DEIS'S DATA SUPPORTING ITS STATEMENT OF NEED AND PURPOSE ARE INCONSISTENT, RENDERING THE DECISIONMAKING PROCESS FLAWED AND RESULTING IN A PUBLIC THAT IS NOT ADEQUATELY INFORMED AS REQUIRED BY NEPA.

As noted by Grow Smart Louisville, the information supporting the purpose and need statement provided by the VA is unreasonably inconsistent and therefore not based on substantial evidence. The VA cannot rely on data and assumptions that are inaccurate. See Northwest Ecosystem Alliance, supra. In the Executive Summary, p. xvii, of the DEIS, the VA states, “60,943 Veterans were enrolled to receive care in Fiscal Year 2014. Enrollment expected to increase to more than 68,000 by fiscal year 2024.” However, in Section 1.1.1, p. 1, of the DEIS, it states, “Currently, 59,000 Veterans in the Louisville service area are enrolled to receive care annually. Enrollment is expected to increase to more than 65,000 in the next 10 years...” These numbers are factually inconsistent. Also, the VA states the current VAMC has 123 in-patient beds, but the new VAMC will have 104 inpatient beds. See DEIS p. 3 and 17 respectively. The stated growth reasons for the need of new facility do not match up to the decrease in beds. Again, if the information is inconsistent, the decisionmaking process is flawed and the public is not adequately informed as required by NEPA. Northwest Ecosystem Alliance v. Rey, 380 F. Supp. 2d 1175, 1196 (W.D. Wash. 2005).

C. THE LACK OF EVIDENTIAL SUPPORT FOR THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE CBOCs AND THE VBA WITH THE VAMC LEAVES THE PUBLIC AND THE VA TO MAKE UNIFORMED DECISIONS.

The VA has proposed to eliminate three CBOCs and the separate VBA and to consolidate those locations with the VAMC at the preferred alternative site. However, the VA offers no data or support for the decision to do so in the need and purpose statement section of the DEIS. The DEIS only provides the conclusory statement that the CBOCs are generally “operating at maximum capacity” with no supporting evidence and that “it would be advantageous to co-locate functions of the Veterans Benefits Administration (VBA) regional office on the proposed new campus.” DEIS § 1.2 at 2. Conclusory statements without support are arbitrary and not in compliance with NEPA. Rankin v. Coleman, 394 F. Supp. 647 (E.D.N.C. 1975).

As stated above, the CBOCs provide needed services to a geographically diverse veteran population. The elimination of the CBOCs will make it more difficult for veterans to access those services, especially when centralizing the CBOCs in an area where most
veterans do not live and there is insufficient access to public transportation. However, there is no discussion of this in the DEIS, nor is there any other support that the centralization of the CBOCs is needed. The DEIS offers no guidance as to whether the CBOCs and the VBA should be consolidated, and offers no guidance as to how the CBOCs and the VBA should consolidated. As noted below, the DEIS did not include an origin-destination study to determine the origins of all trips to the existing VA hospital to determine the optimal geographic center of demand together with means of access to such a location, based on current patterns of access (especially transit) to the current location, especially in consideration of the consolidation of the CBOCs and the VBA with the VAMC. This failure invalidates the traffic and accessibility analysis by not accounting for the associated new trips.

These decisions will have a substantial impact as to the determination of the preferred site and other alternatives, as well as the design and composition of those alternatives. The lack of support for the consolidation of the CBOCs and the VBA with the VAMC leaves the public and the VA to make uninformed decisions on reasonable choices and alternatives for this project. This uninformed decision making does not comply with NEPA. See 40 C.F.R. 1502.14(a) (The VA must "[r]igorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives").

VI. THE VA FAILED TO RIGOROUSLY EXPLORE AND OBJECTIVELY EVALUATE ALL REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES.

NEPA requires the VA to consider alternatives to their proposed actions as well as the environmental impacts of those actions. The CEQ has described the alternatives requirement as the "heart" of the environmental impact statement. 40 C.F.R. 1502.14. See also Monroe County Conservation Council, Inc. v. Volpe, 472 F.2d 693, 697-698 (2d Cir. 1972) ("The requirement for a thorough study and a detailed description of alternatives, which was given further Congressional emphasis in § 4332(2)(D), is the linchpin of the entire impact statement.") and Grazing Fields Farm v. Goldschmidt, 626 F.2d 1068 (1st Cir. 1980) ("The primary procedural mechanism embodied in NEPA is the requirement that an agency prepare 'a detailed statement' discussing, inter alia, 'alternatives to the proposed action.'"). The VA must "[r]igorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives." [40 C.F.R. 1502.14(a)] and "devote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail including the proposed action so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits" [id. at (b)] even if "reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency" [id. at (c)]. The VA has failed to meet these standards in the DEIS.

The VA only considered three alternatives in its DEIS: the no action alternative, the St. Joseph site, and the preferred Midlands site. DEIS, § 2 at 9-46. However, the St. Joseph site is currently slated for private development. See Exhibit 24, Site plan and Letter. As a result, the VA only evaluated two reasonable alternatives – the no action alternative (which is required by law) and the Midlands site. Also, under the auspices of considering only "greenfield" sites, the VA unreasonably discarded all urban sites. Thus, in reality the VA only evaluated one alternative for a replacement VAMC – the Midlands site and the
VA’s preferred alternative. This is wholly inadequate and not in compliance with NEPA, especially for a project that will cost above one billion dollars and will treat hundreds of thousands of veterans for at least the next fifty years. In the very least, the VA should withdraw or supplement this DEIS to consider a full range of alternatives, especially in light of the circumstances that led to the elimination of the St. Joseph site from consideration. Where changed circumstances affect the factors relevant to the development and evaluation of alternatives, an agency must account for such change in the alternatives it considers. Sierra Forest Legacy v. Rey, 577 F.3d 1015, 1021-1022 (9th Cir. Cal. 2009), citing Natural Res. Def. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv., 421 F.3d 797, 813-14 (9th Cir. 2005). Our veterans deserve better.

The VA’s limited consideration of only “expressions of interest from potential offerors of previously undeveloped property that might satisfy its needs” was arbitrary. This restricted the VA’s list of alternative sites to “greenfield” sites which limited the choice of alternatives to suburban and exurban sites. The VA failed to make a good faith effort to reach out to other communities, especially those in Louisville’s urban core, west end, and south end that were closer to the majority veterans.

The factors used by the VA to determine potential locations also exemplifies the bias by which the VA has operated throughout this process. The “greenfield,” single-owner, 25-acre size, unreasonably limited the choice of alternatives, even if those alternatives met the VA’s need and purpose statement. That bias would not have been so apparent if the property that was prematurely purchased by the VA – the Midlands site, did not fall exactly within those parameters. The VA’s requirement for a single owner is also suspect and unreasonable. As stated by GSL:

"The reality is that many large public and private projects requiring multiple parcel assembly have been successfully constructed in the urban core of Louisville in recent years, including the KFC Yum! Center and the new Omni Hotel complex. Moreover, the effective exclusion of all urban sites (other than the Downtown Site, which was dismissed cursorily) eliminated the VA’s ability to evaluate the relative merits of such sites in terms of quality of care, socioeconomic impacts, access to transportation, economic development, and other important considerations. Whether such a site would have ultimately proved to be the preferred alternative is beside the point; the total exclusion of any such sites from detailed analysis in Section 2.0 of the DEIS makes that document fundamentally flawed."

The VA’s failure to severely limit the range of reasonable alternatives is arbitrary for another reason – the VA has failed to comply with Executive Order No. 12898 ("EO 12898"). Passed under the Clinton Administration, EO 12898 requires the VA “to the
greatest extent practicable” to make “achieving environmental justice part of its mission.” This requires agencies to analyze the human health, economic and social effects of their actions, including effects on minority and low income communities, when this analysis is required under [NEPA].” The failure to consider sites in the urban core and the west end – predominately lower income and minority communities and where the majority of veterans live – the VA has failed to comply with EO 12898 and its implementing guidance. Many community groups such as OneWest, Empower West, and the West Louisville Community Council, support the relocation of the VAMC to the West end of Louisville. Louisville’s West end local representatives such as Louisville Metro Council Member Jessica Green (D-1) and Council Member Barbara Sexton-Smith (D-4) also support locating the VAMC in the West end. The location of the VAMC so far away from where the majority of veterans live, and so far away from those lowest income areas in Louisville are located is also an undue burden on the veterans that live in those areas. See Section 3, above. The VA’s actions to eliminate any properties in the West end from contention is arbitrary and in violation of EO 12898.

In fact, there are several sites in the West and South end of Louisville that the VA failed to adequately consider with the range of reasonable alternatives. These include the former FoodPort (now Heritage West) site at 30th Street and Broadway, the former Philip Morris site at 18th Street and Broadway, the Iroquois Housing Project site on Taylor Boulevard, and the Beecher Terrace Housing Project site in West Louisville. In addition, a company led by business partner and veteran Reed Benet is making 50 acres of land directly west of I-65 and just south of I-265 in southern Louisville available as a donation to the VA for the new VAMC.

Several communities outside of Louisville have also offered to donate property to the VA for purposes of constructing a new VAMC. The Bullitt County Fiscal Court recently agreed to donate 42 acres of property it owns at Exit 112 off Interstate 65 and Preston Highway in Bullitt County. The City of Radcliff has offered to donate approximately 50 acres near U.S. 31W and Ky. 313 in the Mill Pond Business Park for a new VAMC, citing its proximity to Fort Knox and an existing VA nursing home.

The VA also arbitrarily discarded two sites as a result of their PEA: the Fegenbush site and the downtown site. See DEIS § 2.3 at 35. However, the VA determined that an EA was not enough and that it would prepare a full EIS. While a site selection in an earlier EA phase certainly does not mean it should be eliminated from consideration in an EIS, the claim that the VA can carry forward with the elimination of a site from a reasonable range of alternatives is even more arbitrary when the VA itself determine that an EIS was necessary under NEPA. The exclusion of these sites without a reasonable basis or a full analysis in the DEIS as part of the range of reasonable alternatives violates 40 C.F.R. 1502.14 and NEPA.

---

85 The previous owners of the FoodPort site have already conducted extensive Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III environmental studies of the property.
The VA dismissed the downtown site, the overwhelmingly preferred site of the veterans, siting several issues: the presence of historical properties, environmental concerns normally associated with urban properties, traffic, and utility requirements. DEIS § 2.3 at 35. The VA also arbitrarily discarded the Fegenbush site from the range of reasonable alternatives. The VA’s reasons for this are: the Fegenbush site has NHPA concerns, biological surveys would be required, additional utility work, and distance from amenities. DEIS § 2.3 at 35. None of these issues, together or individually, warrant the VA’s failure to include them in the range of reasonable alternatives requiring a more detailed analysis under the DEIS. Nor do these sites offer less desirable factors than their preferred Midlands site, which has many undesirable issues such as traffic and accessibility, non-compliance with zoning and land use ordinances, a land locked site that will require additional property acquisition for any expansion, stormwater issues, infrastructure and utility issues, incompatible uses, and the requirement to construct unfunded highway and road improvements, among others.

In addition, Mayor Fischer has indicated that his team has “other sites worthy of VA’s consideration. Exhibit 25; Mayor’s Letter at 6. The VA should have engaged the Mayor and the City of Louisville from the beginning to find properties that could meet the needs of the VA and the new VAMC. The VA chose not to do so. In light of the VA’s inadequate and limited range of alternatives, the failure to consider other reasonable alternatives, and the overall deficiency of the DEIS, the VA should take the Mayor up on his offer.

Each of the potential sites listed above has its advantages and disadvantages, and while the qualities of each of these location as a site for the new VAMC are disputable, that does not mean they should be excluded from the range of reasonable alternatives. The VA failed to “[r]igorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives.” [40 C.F.R. 1502.14(a)] and “devote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail including the proposed action so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits” [id. at (b)] even if “reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency” [id. at (c)] in violation of NEPA and the its implementing regulations. The VA should withdraw or supplement its DEIS and fully consider each of the above sites in their alternatives analysis.

See DEIS at 35, regarding its failure to review other sites, including the Fegenbush site: “the availability of other site options did not support investment in further site assessment [of the Fegenbush site] to determine suitability.” Here the VA completely ignores the only “considered” site in Metro-Louisville that actually provides good healthcare access to the large number of veterans in South Louisville, Southwest Louisville, Hardin County, and Meade County.
VII. THE ANALYSES OF THE ARBITRARILY LIMITED ALTERNATIVES ARE INADEQUATE UNDER NEPA.

The DEIS purports to extensively evaluate three alternatives - the Brownsboro Site (Midlands), the St. Joseph Site, and No Action. However, the detailed information in Section 2.0 of the DEIS deals almost entirely with the Brownsboro site. Not only is the lack of detail and analysis respecting the two non-preferred sites legally unsupported, but the DEIS’s analysis of the Brownsboro site is lacking in detail and does not adequately address the wide range of traffic, environmental, and socioeconomic problems associated with the Brownsboro site.

Respecting the St. Joseph site, the one true alternative because the VA has made it clear that they will be building a replacement VAMC somewhere in Louisville, the VA essentially copied all of the environmental and economic analysis relating to the Brownsboro site and pasted it to the St. Joseph site analysis. There was no robust review of the St. Joseph site. While the VA does not consider adequate alternatives to the Midlands site, as discussed supra, it utterly fails to properly assess the only other site under consideration in the DEIS, the St. Joseph site. Even though the St. Joseph site is sold and being developed, the VA could have at least properly analyzed the site pursuant to the requirements of NEPA, NHPA, and relevant VA regulations and guidance. Instead, the St. Joseph hospital building architecture and site planning is identical to that at the Midlands site. While that property is approximately 99 acres, the St. Joseph site plan uses a 34.9 acre site plan of the Midlands site. DEIS at 10.

Again, it deserves emphasizing that the site plan of the St. Joseph property is the identical site plan created for the specific land issues associated with Brownsboro site. While there are only two entrances to Brownsboro site, this is caused by the small parcel size (34.9 acres). Yet the St. Joseph site plan only has two point of ingress and egress. The retaining ponds in the Brownsboro site plan are located at the lowest elevation on the site, but when cut and pasted onto the St. Joseph site, their location serves no purpose. This failure to assess the St. Joseph site’s attributes is inconsistent with the requirements of NEPA and appears to be a lazy effort resulting from the VA’s knowledge that the St. Joseph site was no longer available for development. This goes against all basic tenets of good site planning. See Generally Lynch, Kevin, Site Planning, Third Edition.

In considering the land-use issues associated with the two sites (Brownsboro Road and St. Joseph), the DEIS states that the height issues are identical. Of course they are, because the VA uses identical heights for buildings at both sites. This is despite the fact that the VA in the DEIS goes to great lengths to describe that any changes to the Midlands planned building heights would cause problems with setbacks and circulation because the buildings would have to take up a larger footprint. This lack of particularized site treatment at the St. Joseph site reinforces that the VA improperly only considered one site, which it purchased prior to completing its environmental assessment, as required by VA
regulations. The VA even admits that “[a] general representation of the [Brownsboro Road] site plan on the St. Joseph Site is provided in Figure 2-7.” DEIS at 31. This problem is emblematic of the fact that the St. Joseph site and the No Action alternative in Section 2.0 are completely perfunctory and cursory, which is not legally sufficient under NEPA.

Another striking aspect of the failure of analysis in the DEIS is that the VA states that the construction of the VA hospital at the Midlands site will have no appreciable effect on the traffic in the area. The “proposed VAMC would not be a significant cumulative contributor to traffic volume [or] degradation of the level of service...”. DEIS at 236. Palmer Engineering, who completed the traffic study, conveniently comes to this conclusion by assuming: 1) that the Midlands site will be developed consistent with the rejected plan of 2006; and 2) that the KYTC will make all the planned road improvements that the VA requests. Both of these assumptions are entirely inconsistent with NEPA’s requirement of rationality when federal agencies consider actionable alternatives.

Furthermore, the VA clearly should have considered sites that, unlike the St. Joseph site, that are not in the process of development. Had the VA discussed potential sites with the City of Louisville, it could have considered still-available sites. See Mayor Fischer Letter.

The VA cannot escape its obligation to evaluate the impacts of building such a large project on a previously undeveloped site by simply asserting that the site would be developed by others in the absence of VA action. Doing so defeats NEPA’s purpose of requiring federal agencies to conduct a rigorous evaluation of the direct and indirect environmental impacts of their proposed actions and to disclose those impacts to the public. Of course, it is possible that any vacant land may later be developed by others, but if a federal agency such as the VA is the one to develop it, NEPA requires that that agency consider the full range of effects of that development on the previously undeveloped site. The land use and other impacts of the proposed VAMC are not equivalent to those of a mixed-use development. But more importantly, the VA must evaluate and consider the impacts of its proposal against the baseline of the current site conditions, regardless of whether a speculative future private development could have some of the same impacts.

---

87 Department of Veterans Affairs, NEPA Interim Guidance for Projects, September 30, 2010. (Exhibit 7). See 38 CFR 26.7(b)(6) (“The major decision points for VA actions, by which time the necessary environmental documents must be completed, are as follows: (6) Land acquisition for development. Prior to the Secretary’s acceptance of custody and accountability (for Federal Lands), or acceptance of offer to donate or contract for purchase (for private lands).”)

88 “The planned development zoning of the Brownsboro site was to accommodate a proposed development at ("The Midlands") that was reported to include 117 condominiums...and 119,500 square feet of retail space.” DEIS at 100.

89 This assumption is inconsistent with the plain language of the DEIS, wherein the VA states that it will “advocate for traffic improvements by the KYTC.” DEIS at 251. Why would the VA need to advocate for the improvements if they are already assumed to be happening as part of the VA's analysis?
The VA also failed to address the opposition to the Midlands site as an undeveloped site by several government agencies. The Kentucky Division of Water Quality preferred a site that "was already developed." DEIS, Appendix D at D-13. Also, the Louisville Metro Department of Public Works favored a downtown location that was already developed. Department of Public Works Comments, Exhibit 26.

A. IT IS UNCLEAR WHAT METHODOLOGY, IF ANY, THE VA USED TO ANALYZE THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES.

The analysis of environmental impacts in an EIS requires the use of a methodology to predict the effects of a proposed action on the environment. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.24. Other than an inadequate and underdeveloped matrix [DEIS at xix], the VA makes no attempt to use any other methodology such as the network method, an overlay method, or any type of modeling that was specific to a certain alternative. This is indicative of the DEIS's failure to evaluate an alternative (besides the preferred alternative) with any rigor. Because the data and analysis is not developed for any other alternative, there is no data or analysis to compare to the preferred Midlands site. This is demonstrated by the analysis given in the matrix found at page xix, where the VA repeatedly states that an impact is "similar" to another site without going into any detail whatsoever that would account for the locational and environmental differences among the alternatives. This lack of rigor does not "insure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussions and analyses in environmental impact statements." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.24. The VA did not identify any methodologies used to compare the alternatives because it did not gather enough data to make a thorough comparison as required by NEPA.

B. THE DEIS DOES NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA IN ITS ANALYSES OF GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.

An agency preparing an EIS is required to take an objective, good-faith "hard look" at the environmental and related consequences of its proposed action, and the alternatives to that action, in order to "inform the public that it has indeed considered environmental concerns in its decisionmaking process." Earth Island Institute v. U.S. Forest Serv., 351 F.3d 1291, 1300 (9th Cir. 2003). The "hard look" requirement requires identifying what the direct and indirect impacts would be, and also discussing their pertinence. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.16(a), (b). Chapters 3 and 4 of the DEIS, which discuss the relevant resources and the effects of the proposed action and its alternatives on those resources, do not meet the "hard look" requirement. The DEIS, in Chapters 3 and 4, focuses on the environmental impacts at the Brownsboro Road - Midlands Site, and typically states that the St. Joseph site would have similar if not identical impacts. See also matrix in DEIS at xix. It is clear from this effort that the VA never took a hard look at the environmental impacts of developing at the St. Joseph, Zorn Avenue, or other sites.
In addition, the DEIS relating to the Brownsboro site is fundamentally flawed for its failures to: 1) properly assess the traffic implications of the new VAMC using relevant, current date; 2) use a baseline for traffic at the Midlands site as it currently exists (undeveloped); 3) consider the implications of building on a constricted site where future growth can only be through the use of eminent domain; 4) properly assess the stormwater, sewer, and groundwater effects on neighboring cities and MSD’s infrastructure; 5) plan for potential hazard issues associated with karstic geology on the site; 6) address geological issues associated with extensive excavation and construction of deep geothermal wells where two geological strata meet; 7) address proper mitigation of noise pollution, especially affecting nearby schools; 8) deal with flawed assumptions regarding whether the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet will make local road enhancements to deal with obvious increases in traffic; 9) address the fact that, under the local land use plan, the replacement VAMC would be a clearly incompatible use for the area; 10) accept that many residential properties in the area will have a diminished market value; and 11) a wide range of other problems. For these reasons, the VA should withdraw its DEIS and restart the effort using genuine alternative sites, including ones in Downtown Louisville, South Louisville, and the West End.

C. THE DEIS DOES NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA IN ITS ANALYSES OF ACCESSIBILITY AND TRAFFIC.

The traffic analysis presented in the DEIS [DEIS at 3.13 and 4.13] for the Midlands site and the other alternatives is inadequate and contain fatal flaws that requires the VA to reassess traffic and accessibility in the EIS.

The traffic study does not provide a calibration of the existing conditions model, which is needed to ensure the traffic analysis accurately reflects the existing conditions. Review of the field conditions and queues reported in the study, indicate that the study significantly underestimates the current level of congestion at the impacted intersections. As a result, traffic impacts and congestion reflect optimistic operating conditions.

The study does not do an adequate corridor level analysis of the I-71, I-264, U.S. 42, Ky. 22, Westport Road and Herr Lane corridors. As noted by GSL, “An increase in traffic to the area at this magnitude would have significant and wide-ranging impacts on the functioning of the larger surface transportation network. Congestion in the immediate vicinity of either of the sites evaluated in the DEIS would create spillover effects to drivers on the nearby interstates and other local roadways.” In addition, corridor level analysis is needed for each to ensure that traffic signals not only operate well independently but also operate interdependently and provide adequate travel speeds and progression. Without a study that includes these larger and broader impacts to traffic and accessibility to the site, the limited outdated information presented in the DEIS related to traffic and accessibility are not reasonable to evaluate the impact to the Midlands site and other alternatives, the analysis shows that for those intersections that were analyzed, those intersections will operate at an unacceptable level.
In addition, the study’s analysis of design year (future year) conditions is flawed because the VA inappropriately relied on a ten-year old Traffic Impact Study for the Midlands site prepared in 2006. DEIS at 219. A proper design year conditions analysis is needed to ensure the proposed design meets both the current as well as expected future year traffic conditions and can be integrated with planned improvements. Even with the flawed design year analysis (which, if corrected, would show degraded levels of service and an even greater increase in delay and queues), the study show levels of service and increased delays and queues that are unacceptable for the area.

In the VA’s “no build” traffic assessment, the VA assumes that there would be a mixed-use development at the Midlands site instead of what is currently there – a vacant field. AS noted by GSL, “[t]his approach artificially inflates traffic projections for the ‘no build’ condition and conceals the true impacts to the transportation network that are attributable to the VAMC.” Shockingly, the VA did not include additional development in its “no build” assessment of the St. Joseph Site, despite the St. Joseph site being currently slated for a dense mixed-use development. This inconsistent methodology causes distorted results, which incorrectly reveal a much greater traffic impact at the St. Joseph site as compared to the Midlands site. Again, the VA cannot rely on incorrect data and assumptions when preparing an EIS. Northwest Ecosystem Alliance v. Rey, 380 F. Supp. 2d 1175, 1196 (W.D. Wash. 2005).

The traffic study is also flawed for relying on highway and road improvements including the construction of the proposed Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) at the intersection of U.S. 42 and I-264. While one of the highway projects has been included in the most recent Six Year Road Plan, as many as six (6) of these projects outlined in the DEIS are not funded and are not listed on the Six Year Road Plan. As noted in Mayor Fischer’s comments, the schedule for constructing the SPUI at U.S. 42 and I-264, has not yet been developed. See Exhibit ______ at 3. Without these improvements, many of the intersections around the Midlands site, including entrances to the Cities, have Levels of Service of “F” during morning and evening commutes. Id. The traffic and accessibility will only get worse, as the intersection at U.S. 42 and I-264 is currently the second most congested intersection in the city, and U.S. 42 between Lime Kiln Lane and Seminary Woods, just east of the Midlands site, is currently the ninth most congested area in Louisville. Id.

Mayor Fischer also noted the concerns of Louisville Metro Public Works with regards to the traffic analysis performed by the VA and its contracted engineers:

Public Works has expressed additional concern that the area considered in the traffic impact study was not large enough to fully capture area traffic conditions, and that data used to create traffic projects is from 2013. In particular, there is no information in the traffic impact study concerning the impact of the Replacement VAMC on traffic moving from
west to east through the U.S. 42/1-264 interchange, and on other area drivers who routinely travel through the area around the Preferred Site. Public Works strongly recommends using recent data to analyze traffic conditions to reflect current conditions, and is willing to help VA access more recent data that may be available from consultants who have studied these intersections as part of other area development projects. Public Works also recommends expanding the scope of the traffic study to understand impact to area drivers passing through key area intersections to create a more complete picture of traffic conditions after construction of the Replacement VAMC.

Id. at 4. The Cities agree. Even if most of the projects called for in the DEIS to improve traffic and accessibility were in the Six Year Road Plan, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet is constantly forced to delay or slow highway projects including in 2016. As stated by KTC Secretary Greg Thomas, “[T]he cabinet faces a low Road Fund cash balance, which compromises our ability to authorize new state road projects over the next biennium.” The VA cannot rely on incorrect data and assumptions when preparing an EIS. Northwest Ecosystem Alliance v. Rey, 380 F. Supp. 2d 1175, 1196 (W.D. Wash. 2005)

Under current conditions, the highways and roads leading to and around the Midlands site has some of the longest delays volumes in Jefferson County, especially during peak times. An increase in traffic, congestion, and delays would not only cause greater accessibility problems for veterans, employees of the VA, and the surrounding community, but would also have substantial negative impacts on driver and pedestrian safety including increased crash rates. While the VA’s flawed traffic analysis did review traffic impacts to the public generally, the VA failed to assess the accessibility and traffic implications to veterans and VA employees who will access the site. As noted above, the large majority of veterans in the VAMC’s service area live in the West, Southwest, and South of Louisville, not the Northeast. This was mentioned nowhere in the DIES. No analysis was done on accessibility for veterans. No analysis was done on transport times between the Midlands site and the downtown Louisville medical campus or the U of L medical campus. Those impacts were never evaluated.

These accessibility and traffic issues are also of particular concern to the Cities. Northfield and Crossgate are directly adjacent to the site. Graymoor-Devondale is directly connected to the site via the proposed secondary access road at Carlmar Lane. The citizens of these cities are concerned about each of the issues raised above, especially because this will impact their lives on a day to day and hour to hour basis. Their safety, and the safety of those who will be accessing the VAMC are of the utmost importance when evaluating reasonable alternatives under NEPA. Moreover, if the roads and highways are expanded as

---

the VA alleges they will be, the Cities and their citizens will be the first to be impacted by property acquisition—whether voluntarily or by eminent domain.91

There are also problems with basic depictions of the Brownsboro Site without traffic. The DEIS, at Page 157 Figure 4.1-2 Street view, reflects no traffic (vehicles or pedestrians) or parked vehicles on Carlimar Lane and Bedford. This is not an accurate view of these locations. The Cities also take exception, for other reasons, with street view images on page 157 of the DEIS depicting the Carlimar Lane intersection with Bedford Lane. The DEIS notes that an emergency access drive would be located at the south edge of the Brownsboro site and continue down Carlimar Lane for emergency vehicles who cannot access the main Brownsboro Road entrance. Residents of the area are concerned with increased traffic on the narrow streets if the proposed entrance to the VA property is opened onto the now dead-ended Carlimar Lane. Currently, parking on the streets in the neighborhood is unrestricted and when cars are parked on both sides of Carlimar Lane, only one lane of traffic can proceed. The streets are not constructed for heavy traffic, especially larger vehicle and truck traffic. The use of Carlimar Lane for emergency vehicles would be even more problematic for residents in the neighborhood who are already concerned about the safety of children who often play on and around the streets. The VA should restrict all truck traffic and delivery vehicles from using the Carlimar entrance, as well as a design for the Carlimar entrance that slows in-bound and out-bound automobile traffic. Further studies need to be conducted to accurately test the pedestrian safety and traffic concerns in the area. The Cities also request that the VA hold a public meeting with local residents and officials so that they may voice their concerns regarding the traffic and safety issues. Especially with regards to this secondary entrance.

The Cities are concerned with the location of the emergency access road located on Carlimar Lane that will be “accessible only to emergency responders (ambulance, fire, and police) should the main entrance on Old Brownsboro Road be inaccessible for some reason, such as an accident.” DEIS p. 218. Residents note that the interchanges near Westport Road, Herr Lane and the Watterson Expressway experience numerous accidents that impact traffic flow. Drivers are already rerouting through residential streets to avoid these accidents. Because on-street parking is currently allowed on these residential streets, the traffic burden for local residents is disproportionate and there is a concern that the emergency vehicles will need to navigate a route around the parked cars and increased traffic flow to neighborhood roads that occurs during accidents. Pedestrians would also be at an increased risk of harm created by emergency vehicles and increased traffic flow due to the many residential areas that do not have sidewalks. The Cities would like the VA to propose an alternative entrance to the Brownsboro site that does not pass through or negatively impact current neighborhoods.

91 At least three Northfield residential properties will need to be acquired for the highway expansion project: 2000, 2002, and 2004 Northfield Drive.
The basic data statements regarding employee traffic in the DEIS are negligently or purposely unclear. The DEIS states that the “VA is expected to increase the number of full-time equivalent employees (FTEEs) from 1,763 (FY 2015) to 2,106 (FY 2022). This increase of 343 FTEEs is based upon projected demand for health care services and not because of the proposed replacement VAMC.” DEIS p. 210. The Cities request more information on how the VA calculated these projections, as well as how these increases are factored into the traffic projections.

The Cities’ also seek clarification regarding the VA’s plan to “request service and supply deliveries be scheduled, if practicable and feasible, to avoid morning and evening peak hour traffic.” DEIS p. 251. Residents are concerned about the additional noise from heavy trucks during the early morning and late night hours if the current plan is to avoid peak hour traffic. The Cities request additional information regarding service and supply deliveries and request that restrictions be placed on deliveries to late morning and early afternoon hours only.

D. THE DEIS DOES NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA IN ITS FAILURE TO EVALUATE THE CONSIDERED, LANDLOCKED NATURE OF THE MIDLANDS SITE AND THE NECESSITY OF FURTHER ACQUISITION INCLUDING BY EMINENT DOMAIN IF THE VAMC NEEDS TO EXPAND IN THE FUTURE.

The Midlands site is far smaller than the Zorn Avenue site (which is 65 acres) and consists of only 34.9 acres of land. There is only one vehicular exit from the Zorn site. The site is surrounded by the cities of Crossgates, Greysmoor-Devondale and the Watterson Expressway. The reason the VA is considering building a new hospital in Louisville, according to the purpose statement in the DEIS, is that the veteran population is growing in the area and the Zorn Avenue site does not provide the possibility for expansion. While the Cities reject this analysis as cursory and conclusory, if true the Midlands site is a completely inappropriate site for development. The VA will be using the entire 34.9 acres of the site, foreclosing the opportunity to expand at the site when future demographic changes require expansion of the facility. When future expansion is necessary, Crossgate and Graymoor-Devondale will provide the only expansion opportunities, via expensive and contentious Eminent Domain. This is inconsistent with the Purpose of the Project, which is to create a sustainable VA Hospital for the Louisville Region for the foreseeable future.

Because the site is so constricted, this will lead to significant pressure on an already stressed road network. Also, because of the limited available acreage, the new hospital would have to be built at heights that are inconsistent with the suburban area that surrounds the site. In addition, the hospital and administration buildings will need to be built at a height that will be a nuisance to the neighborhood and be inconsistent with the Louisville Metro Zoning Code and Comprehensive Plan.
E. THE DEIS DOES NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA IN ITS FAILURE TO ADEQUATELY ANALYZE THE FLOODING THAT OCCURS ON THE SITE, IN CROSSGATE, AND IN GRAYMOOR-DEVONDALE AND THE IMPACT OF STORMWATER RUNOFF ON NEIGHBORS OF THE MIDLANDS SITE.

The NFIP flood zone maps for the area nearby the Brownsboro site show significant flooding potential:

![Flood Zone Map](http://apps.lojic.org/lojiconline/)

Figure 2: 100 Year Floodplain in Brownsboro Area. [http://apps.lojic.org/lojiconline/](http://apps.lojic.org/lojiconline/)

While the DEIS states that there are no flooding problems in the area because the property at issue is not in the 100 or 500-year flood zone, this analysis is incomplete and one-sided. There are significant areas of Crossgate and Greymoor-Devondale that regularly flood in relatively moderate rain events. There is a portion of land at the entrance to Crossgate that is effectively marshland on a regular basis. The Cities believe that these properties could be jurisdictional wetlands under the Clean Water Act. The addition of large amounts of impervious surfaces at the Brownsboro Road site and the potential disruption of the groundwater flow cause by the extensive excavation onsite would likely lead to exacerbated flooding in surrounding cities and roadways. The DEIS does not plan for these problems either during the construction phase or the after construction would be complete at the Brownsboro Road site. NEPA requires that the VA at least make a basic effort to analyze this fundamental environmental problem that will affect property values, health, and safety in areas contiguous to the site.

Furthermore, increases in stormwater and sewer discharges at the site will exacerbate the problems associated with Louisville-Metro's combined sewer system which is currently under a consent decree to achieve compliance under the Clean Water Act. While the VA states that the Metro Sewer District ("MSD") has assured it that there is
enough capacity to deal with the increase in sewage and stormwater at the Brownsboro site, the VA, under NEPA, is required to independently assess whether its construction and operation of the replacement VAMC at the Brownsboro Road site would be consistent with the consent decree in place. Placing a one million square-foot facility in a residential suburban location with basic sewer and stormwater systems will exacerbate problems and lead to more sewage discharges into the Ohio River and tributaries.

Presidential Executive Order No. 11988 (“EO 11988”) directs federal agencies to “reduce the risk of flood loss, to minimize the impact of floods on human safety, health and welfare, and to restore and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by floodplains” for federal projects. While the VA claims that the Midlands site does not fall within a 100 or 500-year floodplain as mentioned above [DEIS at 106], it does acknowledge that the site contains sinkholes. DEIS at 176. The flooding issues as described above are a concern for the Cities, and the Cities believe that the construction of the VAMC with the addition of acres of impervious surfaces will only increase the problem. The VA’s DEIS is insufficient because it does not recognize the potential to flood on site and adjacent sites, and fails to fully analyze the impacts the construction of the VAMC will have to exacerbate these flooding events. The VA should re-evaluate the flooding potential of the site and the floodplain determination especially in light of the requirements of EO 11988 and the 2015 amendments to it.

Sinkholes flood because of inadequate drainage of stormwater runoff from surrounding surface lands. This type of flood event occurs when the sinkhole’s outlet to the subsurface (the swallow or swallowhole) is clogged with natural debris (like sediment) or trash, or the opening has collapsed. Sinkholes also flood when hydrologically connected surface waters themselves flood and backup into subterranean channels. Further, the flood zones of densely spaced sinkholes may overlap, and one sinkhole may spillover into a “downstream” sinkhole, enlarging the area of the floodplain beyond that which would exist otherwise with respect to isolated sinkholes. The possibility of a cumulatively enlarged sinkhole floodplain in the instant case poses significant unanalyzed costs and environmental impacts from the VAMC construction because the Midlands site and surrounding area features karst terrain and several sinkholes as noted by the DEIS.

Floodplains are a natural part of hydrologic systems and serve important natural and beneficial values and purposes, such as recharging groundwater, moderating floods, and providing habitat for wildlife. The hazards to human life and property associated with development in floodplains are also well recognized. Presidential Executive Order No. 11988 acknowledges these natural benefits and hazards by directing federal agencies to restore and preserve beneficial values of floodplains, while also initiating actions “to reduce the risk of flood loss [and] minimize the impact of floods on human safety, health, and welfare.” An EIS must identify the floodplain potentially affected by federal agency action; consider alternatives to avoiding adverse effects to and incompatible development in the floodplain; determine that there is “no practicable alternative” to project siting in a floodplain, address measures that will minimize potential harm to or within the floodplain,
and provide the public an opportunity to comment on the federal agency's evaluation of these factors. Id.

The VA must independently comply with 100-year floodplain management law, including, without limitation, Executive Order 11988, “Floodplain Management Guidelines for Implementing Executive Order 11988” (Water Resources Council 1978), and must comply with § 404 of the CWA. EO 11988 requires federal agencies to avoid to the extent possible the long and short-term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of flood plains and to avoid direct and indirect support of floodplain development wherever there is a practicable alternative.

Specifically, the VA must comply with these floodplain management authorities, including the Executive Order, by undertaking, or causing to have undertaken, hydraulic studies to establish the base flood elevations associated with each directly impacted sinkhole, evaluate project alternatives that avoid or minimize impacting the sinkhole floodplains, refrain allowing construction on the Midland’s site unless it can be demonstrated that there is no other “practicable alternative” to impacting sinkhole floodplains, and involve the public, including the Cities in this decision-making.

The VA must also comply with the requirements to delineate the floodplains of sinkholes and only allow construction that avoids impacting sinkhole floodplains. If a floodplain will be affected by a project, the agency must consider alternatives “to avoid adverse effects and incompatible development in the floodplain.” EO 11988, Section 2(a)(2). Prior to assisting the siting of a project in such a floodplain, the agency must find that the location is the “only practicable alternative” and must mitigate possible harm to humans and the environment through design or other modification measures. Id. Early public review of and involvement in proposals for actions in floodplains is also required. Id., Section 2(a)(4).

EO 11988 was amended in 2015 to improve the U.S.’s preparedness for and resilience against flooding related to shifts in world climate. Those changes included the method by which a floodplain is established. EO 11988 § 6(c) now states,

The floodplain shall be established using one of the following approaches:

(1) Unless an exception is made under paragraph (2), the floodplain shall be:

(i) the elevation and flood hazard area that result from using a climate-informed science approach that uses the best-available, actionable hydrologic and hydraulic data and methods that integrate current and future changes in flooding based on climate
science. This approach will also include an emphasis on whether the action is a critical action as one of the factors to be considered when conducting the analysis;

(ii) the elevation and flood hazard area that result from using the freeboard value, reached by adding an additional 2 feet to the base flood elevation for non-critical actions and by adding an additional 3 feet to the base flood elevation for critical actions;

(iii) the area subject to flooding by the 0.2 percent annual chance flood; or

(iv) the elevation and flood hazard area that result from using any other method identified in an update to the PFRMS.

In addition, the amended EO also requires, “Where possible, an agency shall use natural systems, ecosystem processes, and nature-based approaches when developing alternatives for consideration.” Id. at 2(a)(2). The VA must re-evaluate the Midlands site in light of these additional requirements, especially with the propensity for flooding on the Midlands site and on the residential properties bordering the south side of the site. In addition, the DEIS fails to consider green infrastructure alternatives in the design of stormwater systems as required by the amended §2(a)(2) in any alternative. The VA must withdraw the DEIS to rigorously explore alternatives that include green infrastructure and other “natural systems, ecosystem processes, and nature-based approaches when developing alternatives for consideration.” Id.

Another concern for the Cities involves the impact of construction on the topography of the site and the exposed subsurface soils that would drain into the stormwater as a result of the grading. According to the DEIS, “Temporary increases in sedimentation in stormwater drainage could occur as a result of surface runoff erosion.” DEIS p. 175. Disturbing subsurface soils and potential stormwater contamination are both grave concerns of the area residents. “Wind erosion could temporarily increase airborne particulate matter in the area, resulting in short-term health, visibility, and aesthetic impacts.” DEIS p. 175. The VA must include a mitigation plan regarding air quality and stormwater contamination during the construction phase of the project, and rigorously explore alternatives including other sites, that would have less impacts on air and water quality.

The DEIS states that during the construction phase for the Brownsboro site, that measures must be taken to minimize runoff from the site and an Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control Plan must be enacted to trap 80 percent of the suspended solids that
could runoff from the site. DEIS p. 179. The Cities are concerned with the impact the other 20 percent of erosion and sediment that could contaminate stormwater during the construction phase. According to the DEIS, no control plans are currently in place to minimize these risks. If 35 acres are expected to be disturbed during construction, the Cities maintain that water quality from stormwater runoff will be impacted beyond what the DEIS deems “localized and negligible.” DEIS at p. 179.

F. THE DEIS DOES NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA IN ITS ANALYSES OF CONSTRUCTION NOISE AND BLASTING.

Although the VA Traffic Impact Study estimates that an approximately 10,000 average daily traffic (ADT) increase to the roadways near either of the new VAMC locations considered, the DEIS does not include any quantitative evaluation of the local noise impacts of this increased traffic. The DEIS asserts, without support, that traffic-related noise impacts “may increase...but would not be expected to increase disproportionately from current levels.” DEIS at 250. Without quantifying the expected traffic noise levels at either proposed location, there can be no useful comparison to current conditions, as required under NEPA.

Regarding construction blasting, Section 3.7 of the DEIS identifies and maps noisesensitive land uses surrounding the Brownsboro and St. Joseph sites. But Section 4.7 does not contain any discussion of the impacts of increased noise from construction, operation, and traffic on these sensitive entities. The VA does address some mitigation measures it will make regarding noise pollution, but it does not address the fact that some local land uses, including Ballard High School, Kammerer Middle School, and Wilder Elementary, are incompatible by noise decibel associating with blasting.

There are other deficiencies in the EIS’s noise analysis, including, for example, use of outdated methodology and data, reliance on computer-based simulation programs rather than actual measurement on the ground, and failure to take into account the suburban and rural nature of the area, and failure to consider impacts on sensitive areas.

G. THE DEIS DOES NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA IN ITS ANALYSES OF KARST, SINKHOLES, AND OTHER GEOLOGY ISSUES.

"Karst refers to a type of topography formed in limestone, dolomite, or gypsum by dissolution of these rocks by rain and underground water. It is characterized by closed depressions or sinkholes and underground drainage. During the formation of Karst terrain, water percolating underground enlarges subsurface flow paths by dissolving the rock. As some subsurface flow paths are enlarged over time, water movement in the aquifer changes
character from one where ground water flow was initially through small, scattered openings in the rock, to one where most flow is concentrated in a few, well-developed conduits. As the flow paths continue to enlarge, caves may be formed and the ground water table may drop below the level of surface streams. Surface streams may then begin to lose water to the subsurface. As more of the surface water is diverted underground, surface streams and stream valleys become a less conspicuous feature of the land surface and are replaced by closed basins. Funnels or circular depressions called sinkholes often develop at some places in the low points of these closed basins.” *Louisville Hazard Mitigation Plan*, 3.10.

![Figure 3: Louisville Karst Vulnerability, Louisville Hazard Mitigation Plan, 3.10.](image)

Figure 2 highlights this significantly higher karst and sinkhole risk in the Eastern Part of Jefferson County. Instead of avoiding karst vulnerability areas, in the Eastern portion of Jefferson County, the VA only considers sites with high karstic vulnerability and does not consider sites in the West End where this is less of a problem.

Figure 3 depicts LIDAR assessed sinkhole at the Brownsboro Site as set out in the DEIS at Section 3.4. However, section 4.4.2.1 does not discuss the impact of this sinkhole on construction or determine how the obvious karst issues at the Brownsboro site would be address during construction and after. The DEIS asserts that “the risk from
development of this site does not appear to be any greater than development in other similar areas of Jefferson County." This is a clearly inaccurate assessment given the clearly greater risk as set out in Figure 2. The VA’s failure to actually evaluate the potential adverse effects of geology and soil problems is obvious and inconsistent with the requirements of NEPA. Furthermore, stating that effects would be the same as “other similar areas” does not provide the public with any information as to what those effects actually are, or allow a meaningful comparison of alternatives.

While the VA did identify 100-year floodplains as required by the NEPA, it did not do so for the sinkholes on the Brownsboro site, which is also required under NEPA. See Karst Envtl. Educ. & Prot., Inc. v. Fed. Highway Admin., 559 F. App’x 421, 423–24 (6th Cir. 2014). NEPA, its implementing regulations, 40 C.F.R. 1500–1508, and Executive Order 11988 require the VA to analyze and consider alternatives to 100-year floodplain impacts around karst conditions at the Brownsboro site. The VA is obligated to conduct an independent evaluation of 100-year floodplains related to sinkholes in the karst topography of the project area. There are concerns that sinkhole hazards and flooding associated with stormwater run-off could create problems for neighboring cities. As such, the VA is required to conduct a study and evaluate 100-year sinkhole floodplains.

Constructing a colossal building on a karst vulnerable site is very risky. The VA, at minimum, should implement and require more construction mitigation measures to prevent more sinkhole development at the Brownsboro site. Part of what makes karst terrain so unstable is the reliance on water to stabilize the ground above it. In areas where large pockets of groundwater have developed, the stability of the area relies mostly upon precipitation and restoration after drought events. Groundwater pockets maintain the supply for springs. If construction of the geothermal wells resulted in the loss of groundwater in certain areas, foreseeable results of such events include the drying of springs that relied upon the output from groundwater, inevitably impacting the environment surrounding the area.

The DEIS notes that the Brownsboro site is located on primarily limestone aquifers and that the depth of these aquifers generally ranges from 50 to 200 feet deep. DEIS § 3.5.2 at 80. The DEIS recognizes that blasting may need to be utilized to remove bedrock for construction. Id. at 180. The Cities contend that no studies have been conducted regarding the environmental impact of disturbing these aquifers during construction activities such as blasting, digging, and increasing grade levels. The only studies that have been conducted relate to surface water run-off and do not factor in the presence of known perennial springs near the site. Some homes in the area currently require one or more sump pumps to run almost continuously due to the aquifers and active springs directly south of the proposed construction area. The Cities are concerned that the construction activity will increase the likelihood of flooding, which is already prevalent in the neighborhood. More studies on the locations of aquifers and springs, the depth of such aquifers, and the impact that blasting and construction would have on the subsurface conditions need to be performed.

Figure 4.4-1 of the DEIS shows the existence of Jefferson Limestone in the subsurface soil on the Brownsboro site. In order to build the new facility, piers will need to be drilled through the bedrock. The DEIS notes there is a risk of exacerbate karst vulnerability, as a result of the drilling, and its impact on existing small sinkholes and voids due to groundwater dissolving the limestone. DEIS p. 176. Studies have not been conducted regarding the existence and locations of those voids and the impact karstic activity could have on underground springs that flow through sections of Graymoor-Devondale. Further studies need to be performed regarding the risk of future sinkhole activity in the area. The DEIS notes that, “During construction, a geotechnical engineer would be present to observe the excavation and rock removal to determine treatment methods to minimize the potential for karstic activity.” DEIS p. 176. The Cities request that these measures be conducted before construction, instead of during construction, so that the risk of karstic activity may be minimized.

The Cities are also concerned with the impact of possible blasting on nearby buildings and houses during construction. The Cities request additional details from the VA regarding ways to mitigate and prevent damage to the nearby homes, as well as the risk of future sinkhole activity during blasting. The Cities also request that the VA perform pre-
blasting inspections and surveys on all structures within a five-mile radius of the Midlands site, if the VA maintains the Midlands as the preferred site.

H. THE DEIS DOES NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA IN ITS ANALYSES OF UTILITIES.

The issues associated with MSD and sewers is dealt with supra. The VA Brownsville will necessarily impact Louisville’s compliance with the consent decree. See Consent Decree: Louisville and Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District: Civil Action No. 3:08-cv-00608-CRS. Even though significant amounts of sewer waste would stored onsite, there will still be impacts on the wastewater and sewer loads during peak stormwater events.

In an email from Jim Holderman, a representative of LG&E/KU, Mr. Holderman stated that the Midlands site “provides the greatest challenge [among alternative] to serve a load of 8 MVA” and that LG&E/KU “currently [does] not have the capacity available at the site.” “LG&E/KU would have to acquire “additional [right of ways], which would be difficult to obtain, and it would be the most expensive option. Additionally, we do not have means to provide a backup feed.” Exhibit ___. Email from Jim Holderman, LG&E/KU Representative, December 22, 2010. The DEIS failed to take these utility and end electricity service difficulties into consideration, and failed to rigorously evaluate other alternatives in light of this information.

I. THE DEIS DOES NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA IN ITS ANALYSES OF SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTE.

Solid waste generation and disposal are a significant concern to the Cities’ residents. It is not clear from the DEIS what routes will be used to transport solid waste and hazardous materials away from the facility. Residents are concerned that the Graymoor-DeVondale streets including Carllmar, Bedford, and Herr could be designated as routes for ingress and egress of hazardous waste. Due to the traffic and safety concerns previously mentioned regarding the use of trucks on the narrow streets of Graymoor-DeVondale, residents are apprehensive about not only the traffic impact of these streets by construction vehicles, employees, contractors, and disposal services, but are also concerned about the health impacts on the public from exposure to hazardous materials. The Cities request that the VA not use the secondary exit through Graymoor-DeVondale for the transport of any hazardous or solid wastes.

J. THE DEIS DOES NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA IN ITS ANALYSIS WHEN IT FAILS TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE COSTS AND RESOURCES REQUIRED FOR FIRE PROTECTION.

Other than a general description of the Lyndon Fire Protection District [DEIS at 121], the DEIS fails to evaluate the added costs and resources of the construction and operation of the VAMC at the Midlands site on the Lyndon Fire District. On May 17, 2013, the Mayor of Crossgate submitted comments to the VA with regards to fire protection.
protection, among others. This was in direct response to a letter from Russ Rakestraw, Chief of the Lyndon Fire Protection District to Senator Mitch McConnell dated December 14, 2011, wherein Chief Rakestraw states, “building a government complex that pays no property tax on a prime piece of commercial property would deprive our district of critically needed revenue. Additionally, such a facility would increase our workload due to fire alarm incidents, and, possibly, emergency medical responses.” [Exhibit 27]. Thereafter, the Mayor of Crossgate received a letter from the Chief Rakestraw and the Lyndon Fire Protection District, informing the Mayor and others that due to budget constraints, the fire department needed to reduce its staff, resulting in an 11% decrease in suppression staff, which would “directly result in an increased loss of life and more significant fire damage resulting in higher amounts of property loss.” April 23, 2013 Letter from Chief Rakestraw; Id. at 1. “The reduced staff will also cause a longer wait time for emergency medical service.” Id. The DEIS failed to consider these fire protection restraints and comments from the Mayor of Crossgate, including the ability of fire protection districts to offer services to a VAMC at the Midlands site, while the VA would require to pay no property taxes that would benefit the fire district. The failure to rigorously explore this issue among a reasonable range of alternatives is arbitrary and a violation of NEPA and its implementing regulations.

K. THE DEIS FAILS TO ADDRESS THE OPPOSITION TO THE MIDLANDS SITE BY OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.

The VA also failed to address the opposition to the Midlands site as an undeveloped site by several government agencies. The Kentucky Division of Water Quality preferred a site that “was already developed.” DEIS, Appendix D at D-13. Also, the Louisville Metro Department of Public Works favored the downtown location or the redevelopment of the Zorn Avenue site because “most of the issues possibly associated with the development of the greenfield sites do not exist.” Louisville Metro Public Works Comments at 2, Exhibit 26. As stated by Mr. Pullen:

With [the Midlands site] being a Greenfield site, we have several concerns. First is the conversion of currently pervious area in to non-pervious surface area. As well as drainage concerns, there are several endangered species of plants, such as Running Buffalo Clover, that have been documented in this county. Additionally, Indiana Bats also have been found in many wooded areas in Jefferson County. The site has potential to be Prime and Unique Farmland. The site is in close proximity to numerous residential areas.

The largest issue is traffic and air quality. This site is served by KY 22 just off the I-264/US 42 Interchange. This interchange is extremely congested as it exists today. Any entity further developing this area would be required to
make major improvement to the highway infrastructure as part of getting encroach permits and other approvals. These improvements would likely involve major improvements to the I-264 interchange. With the already heavy congestion at this location, further degradation to air quality is problematic.

The DEIS failed to rigorously explore these issues and failed to take into consideration the preferences of other government agencies that have a role in regulating the construction and operation of this project and site.

L. THE DEIS FAILS TO EVALUATE SIGNIFICANT CLIMATE CHANGE AND GHG EMISSIONS CONCERNS AND CONSIDERATIONS.

The CEQ recommends that agencies review their NEPA procedures and propose any updates they deem necessary or appropriate to facilitate their consideration of GHG emissions and climate change. Final Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in National Environmental Policy Act Reviews, Council on Environmental Quality (August 1, 2016).\footnote{Available at https://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/xwp-content/uploads/2016/08/ceq-guidance-climate-change.pdf} The VA has failed to do so. Until the VA has updated its NEPA implementing regulations to include the CEQ’s climate change guidance, it should refrain from major federal action.

Other than a cursory evaluation of greenhouse gas emissions that the VA generically applied to the VAMC facility without regard to location (DEIS § 3.2.2.3 at 53-56), the VA completely failed to evaluate impacts on climate and climate change despite the August 2016 CEQ Guidance, which states, “Federal agencies should consider the extent to which a proposed action and its reasonable alternatives would contribute to climate change, through GHG emissions, and take into account the ways in which a changing climate may impact the proposed action and any alternative actions, change the action’s environmental effects over the lifetime of those effects, and alter the overall environmental implications of such actions.” Id. at 9. The Guidance also recommends “agencies select the appropriate level of NEPA review to assess the broad-scale effects of GHG emissions and climate change, either to inform programmatic (e.g., landscape-scale) decisions, or at both the programmatic and tiered project- or site-specific level, and to set forth a reasoned explanation for the agency’s approach” and also counsels “agencies that the “rule of reason” inherent in NEPA and the CEQ Regulations allows agencies to determine, based on their expertise and experience, how to consider an environmental effect and prepare an analysis based on the available information.” Id. at 5. “Agencies should be guided by the principle that the extent of the analysis should be commensurate with the quantity of projected GHG emissions and take into account available data and GHG quantification tools that are suitable for and commensurate with the proposed
agency action. The rule of reason and the concept of proportionality caution against providing an in-depth analysis of emissions regardless of the insignificance of the quantity of GHG emissions that would be caused by the proposed agency action."

At no time does the VA evaluate GHG emissions on a specific alternative, nor does the VA evaluate the GHG emissions from transportation other than generic indirect assumptions. The CEQ has provided a number of tools to help calculate the impacts of GHG emissions on transportation. The VA should withdraw its DEIS and fully evaluate the impacts to climate and climate change including utilizing one or more of the CEQ's recommended transportation GHG accounting tools such as the Commute Mode Switching Impact Tool, GREET, Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator (MOVES), Smart Location Calculator, and Travel Efficiency Assessment Method (TEAM), among others.

M. THE DEIS FAILS TO COMPLY WITH NEPA IN ITS ANALYSIS OF AIR QUALITY.

The DEIS does not adequately analyze the effect on the region's Clean Air Act attainment status and overall air quality resulting from changes in the transportation network associated with the Replacement Louisville VAMC.

The DEIS asserts that vehicle trips to and from a replacement VAMC campus would replace those occurring to existing VA facilities. However, this basic conclusion fails to take into account the differences in miles traveled by patients and employees for the different alternatives. Nor does the EIS consider how changes in traffic patterns due to a relocation would affect the performance of the city-wide and regional transportation network in a way that could interfere with the state implementation plan to achieve air quality attainment status.

N. THE DEIS DOES NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA IN ITS ANALYSIS OF WATER QUALITY.

The DEIS correctly asserts that, "a relatively high percentage of this watershed is impervious (allowing for more runoff) because of intense development." DEIS at 80. It also notes that the proposed Brownsboro site is located in the upper Muddy Fork of the Beargrass Creek watershed, and Metro Sewer District has already classified the overall pollution impact on the watershed as "moderate to severe" due to poorly performing septic tanks and the usage of lawn chemicals. DEIS at 80. The DEIS notes that the north half to the center of the Brownsboro site as problematic due to the collection of stormwater ponds. The south half of the site also drains into the Watterson Expressway right of way. The Cities contend that more studies need to be conducted on the stormwater drainage and
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the impact that the proposed VAMC would have on the water quality of nearby surface waters because of the likelihood of increased water pollution from stormwater runoff and discharges from the VAMC site.

DEIS states that "Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 requires federal agencies to reduce stormwater runoff from federal development projects to protect water resources. Facilities with footprints exceeding 5,000 square feet must be designed in a manner that maintains or restores the redevelopment site hydrology to the maximum extent technically feasible." DEIS, p. 179. There is no way for the site's hydrology to be restored when the VA is digging ten feet, adding fill, and drilling 400 foot geothermal wells in property that is undisputed to have significant karstic properties, including extant sinkholes.

"Potential impacts to water quality due to stormwater runoff from the construction site are predicted to be localized and negligible..." DEIS, p. 179. This is not good enough, what if there are significant problems associated with blasting and drilling? The VA is not prepared for this scenario under the EIS.

O. THE DEIS DOES NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA WHEN IT FAILS TO RIGOROUSLY EXPLORE THE VA’S COMPLIANCE WITH THE FEDERAL PROPERTY & ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT, AND FAILS TO CONFORM TO LOCAL PLANNING AND ZONING ORDINANCES AND REGULATIONS.

Under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the VA must contact the local land use officer and consider public comments. There is no indication that the VA did this. Furthermore, the project is totally inconsistent with the Louisville Comprehensive Plan. The height of the buildings is greater than that allowed by the comprehensive plan.

Section 3.8.1.1 of the DEIS identifies a set of four principles developed by the VA to achieve "a balanced consideration and evaluation of land use, the built environment, cost, security, mission need, and competition on facility location decision-making." (DEIS, p. 99) But the remainder of the DEIS completely ignores these criteria, and provides no evaluation or comparison of how the alternatives perform against these metrics. The evaluation criteria listed in Section 4.8.1 bear no similarity to those identified in the prior chapter. (DEIS, p. 197) Had the VA actually considered its own land use principles outlined in Section 3.8.1.1, it would become apparent that the preferred alternative does
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not meet the criteria. The Brownsboro Site is not “pedestrian-friendly, near existing employment centers, accessible to public transit, ... [or] existing central cities.” The location does not “promote transportation choice,” nor is it “accessible to a diverse range of employees and visitors.” It does not “promote infill development” or represent a “previously used or underused site[, including historic districts.” Finally, this location does not “[foster protection of the natural environment by avoiding development of green space.” Most of the VA’s land use criteria point to a Downtown alternative, which the VA dismisses as a true alternative.

The DEIS identifies “compatibility with existing and future land use designations and zoning design standards” as the basis to evaluate potential adverse land use impacts. The Brownsboro Site is currently zoned as a planned development district to accommodate a proposed mixed-use development, The Midlands, which was to include condominiums, apartments, a hotel, restaurants, offices, and retail space. Use of the site for the VAMC is not consistent with the objective of the planned development district to diversify and integrate new development into existing development. The VAMC would represent a single-use, non-diversified development that does not align with the local land use authority’s plans for the site. The DEIS states that a use is “inconsistent with current or planned future land uses and community goals for land use” is an adverse land use impact, yet it does not identify the incompatibility of the VAMC with the planned development zoning district as an adverse impact.

Section 4.8 of the DEIS acknowledges that building the VAMC at either the Brownsboro or the St. Joseph site would violate the height limitations of the applicable zoning form districts. For the Brownsboro Site, the west bar would exceed the maximum building height by 42 feet, a 33 percent exceedance. The south parking deck, which would extend well into the “transition zone” between the town center form district and the adjacent neighborhood form district, would exceed the height limit by almost half. These significant exceedances will cause considerable harm for neighboring residents. The proposed development would violate the required transition from town center development to neighborhood development, which was intended to protect residences from this type of harm. The DEIS does not provide any meaningful evaluation or consideration of this adverse impact. The St. Joseph alternative would also cause significant harm to neighboring residents, where the proposed VAMC would exceed the maximum allowable building height by more than a factor of four.

Mayor Fischer states: “It does not appear that the EIS considered the application of the Planned Development District standards approved for the Midlands in evaluating the impact of the proposed Replacement VAMC. For example, the Midlands plan included one- and two-story residential units along the residential east and south property boundaries, and taller buildings, including a hotel, in a very small area closer to I-264. Maximum building height was limited to 75 feet in a small area along I-264, with the majority of the site limited to 45-foot building heights and 35-foot building heights located closest to adjacent residences. The Replacement VAMC plan includes an 83-foot tall parking garage next to the most densely developed residential area to the south of the
property, a 162-foot main building, a 102-foot tall secondary building, and a 115-foot parking garage on the north side of the property.” Fischer Letter at 2. The site plan of the VA fails to consider these measures which mitigate the land use impacts on neighboring residents and communities. The Mayor further states: “It is difficult to conclude that the construction of a development of the scale of the Replacement VAMC was anticipated by the community following the approval granted in the Midlands case. The two projects are substantially different in size, scope and scale.” Exhibit 25 at 3. The Cities join in all the Mayor’s comments, but especially these related to the incompatible nature of the VAMC were it located at Brownsboro Road.

The DEIS states, “Although the impact of altering the character and use of a vacant site to full development use would be major, the impact would be expected with or without the proposed VAMC, and whether or not VA was the entity developing the site.” DEIS p. 197. The Cities disagree with the assertion that the development would be major regardless of the type of mixed land uses utilized on the Brownsboro site. The development of the proposed site as an office building or multi-family residential usage would have a severely less intrusive impact on local residents than the construction of a medical center and campus designed for thousands of veterans.

P. THE DEIS DOES NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA WHEN IT FAILS TO RIGOROUSLY EXPLORE THE DIMINUTION OF FAIR MARKET VALUES OF NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES.

Already, the home values in Crossgate, Northfield and Brownsboro Farm have decreased since the announcement of the VA Hospital’s location at the Midlands site. The DEIS states that there will be a positive economic impact resulting from construction of the Replacement Louisville VAMC at Brownsboro Road. But it does not address diminution in property values in the surrounding area. Under NEPA, the VA should at least address the diminution in Fair Market Value of residential homes in the area pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22.

Q. THE DEIS DOES NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA IN ITS HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL ANALYSES.

VA states that there are “no NRHP historic districts or eligible structures onsite or immediately adjacent” and that no known archaeological resources at the Brownsboro site. DEIS at 11. However, there are significant historic properties in the area that will be affected by the traffic, noise, and change in the character of the area from adding a million square foot facility. These include nearby Locust Grove, Zachary Taylor Cemetery, the Zachary Taylor House, the Taylor-Oldham-Herr House, and the Herr-Rudy Family Houses. DEIS at 58. The VA confirmed that prehistoric artifacts were present at the Brownsboro site, assigned to the Early Archaic Kirk Corner-Notched Cluster. DEIS at 57. The NHPA requires a review in a situation like this, notwithstanding the letter from the Kentucky SHPO, where there is a possibility that eligible NRHP artifacts will be destroyed. The VA
should complete a formal, comprehensive Section 106 review.

Furthermore, the letter from the Kentucky SHPO makes clear that there are archaeological materials that should be reviewed though the VA counters that "[n]o adverse effects to archaeological features or historic properties." DEIS at 71. Section 106 requires that an agency must comply "prior to the approval of the expenditure of any Federal funds on the undertaking or prior to the issuance of any license as the case may be ...." The Council's regulations require compliance "early in the planning stages of the undertaking, when the widest feasible range of alternatives is open for consideration ...." 36 C.F.R. § 800.3(e). See Kent County Council for Historic Preservation v. Romney, 304 F. Supp. 885 (W.D. Mich. 1969).

Most courts find that a property need not be formally determined eligible to be considered an "eligible property" for purposes of the application of Section 106. Boyd v. Roland, 789 F.2d 347 (5th Cir. 1986); Morris County Trust for Historic Preservation v. Pierce, 714 F.2d 271 (3d Cir. 1983); Hough v. Marsh, 557 F. Supp. 74 (D. Mass. 1982). See also Pueblo of Sandia v. United States 50 F.3d 856 (10th Cir. 1995); Colorado River Indian Tribes v. Marsh, 605 F. Supp. 1425 (C.D. Cal. 1985) (agency may not apply different standards of historic review to properties listed in or officially determined eligible for the National Register and properties that might be eligible but have not been listed or officially determined to be eligible).

R. THE DEIS DOES NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA IN ITS SOCIO-ECONOMIC ANALYSIS.

The DEIS contains almost no information regarding socioeconomic conditions in various parts of Jefferson County, particularly regarding distribution of the veteran population. There are major differences among the alternatives in the level of access for Veterans. The DEIS contains no information regarding the geographic distribution of Veterans in the 35-county service area of the VAMC and the CBOCs. Without this information, the public cannot assess what effect distance from a Level I Trauma Center and decreased access to public transportation would have on veterans. Public transportation options are very limited at the Brownsboro Site, and will certainly be worse when traffic conditions deteriorate.

In addition, and as noted above, the VA's conclusion that this project will have no environmental justice impacts is alarming, demonstrating a lack of awareness of the impacts of this project on lower income and minority communities, which includes veterans, and on the overall community and environment.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Again, the Cities are requesting the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs ("VA") withdraw the DEIS, re-evaluate their site selection process, prepare a new Environmental Impact Statement with full participation of the veterans and community, comply with
relevant Executive Orders with regards to environmental justice, update its own NEPA implementing regulations, correct the inadequacies in the DEIS’s analysis on the impacts to veterans and the site alternatives with a discernible methodology that compares a full range of reasonable alternatives, and otherwise meet the requirements of the NEPA. The Cities request that once a new DEIS is issued, the VA also allow for public comment.

Respectfully submitted,

Randy Strobo
Clay Barkley
STROBO BARKLEY PLLC
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December 1, 2016

Robley Rex VAMC,
Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office
(Attn: Judy Williams)
800 Zorn Avenue
Louisville, KY 40206

Dear Replacement Activation Team,

Please accept the attached printout of an article I wrote for the Institute's Policy Blog as a comment following the public meeting on November 15 at which the Draft Environmental Impact Statement was presented.

I have been following this matter since the late 1990's and have written some 25 summaries of public hearings and other related matters. The attached article summarizes not just the Nov 15 meeting, but most of the issues raised since the beginning. The same arguments are being made over and over. The attached comments and all the other articles are available on the Institute's website: www.khpi.org/blog. The current article was published Nov 19.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute.

Respectfully,

Peter Hasselbacher, MD
What Is Happening at Louisville’s Veterans Hospital?

A public hearing to present the results and hear comments about the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Replacement VA Medical Center in Louisville was held on November 15 at Christ Church United Methodist on Brownsboro Road. This is just down the road from the favored site on a vacant former farm on the southeast corner of the intersections of the I-264/Waterson Expressway and Route 42/22/Brownsboro Road. Two separate sessions were held: at noon and 6 pm. I attended the earlier session which lasted just shy of three hours. I did not count heads, but I estimate that something fewer than 100 people were in attendance including VA staff, consultants, and reporters. I learned about the hearing earlier from the newspaper. When I got home that afternoon, I found my personal notice in the mail delivered after the fact by the VA to all those who signed up as interested persons. I do not know if more people would have attended had more timely notice been given in this manner. The people who did show up were clearly already engaged, seemed to be largely neighbors of the project, and almost uniformly against locating the project at Brownsboro for multiple reasons. I do not know how the evening session went and will limit my comments to the midday session.

A bit of background.
The Robley Rex VA Medical Center replacement process has been a long, contentious, and multiply drawn out process. It is not becoming less so. I first
became engaged in the late 1990s when I began service as a government affairs officer for the University of Louisville. The VA was, and still is an important part of UofL’s clinical, teaching, and research missions. An alternative was broached at that time that instead of building a separate hospital, that a VA hospital-within-a-hospital could be fashioned as part of University of Louisville Hospital. This concept represented too big a deviation from the tradition and mindset of both the Veterans Administration and its patients to get off the ground. The issue of whether an entirely separate medical system to meet the general medical needs of veterans remains open for discussion—indeed it was brought up at Wednesday’s session! I have written often and at length about the planning process and hearings held to date.

The final selection of possible locations.
Following a typical by-the-book methodical government process, three new potential sites were identified on which to build a new VA Medical Center: downtown near the existing academic medical center, a location referred to as the St. Joseph’s site near the intersection of Old Henry Road and the Jefferson Expressway in far-east Jefferson County, and the ultimately favored Brownsboro Rd. site. Surveys of and meetings with veterans overwhelmingly favored remaining at the present Zorn Avenue site but were equally overwhelmingly against building a new hospital downtown. For a variety of other reasons including difficulty and cost of land acquisition and construction, time to occupancy, flood plains, and travel distances for patients and University physicians and trainees alike, the Brownsboro Rd site was chosen and the land purchased.

Not everyone was happy. Was that even ever possible? From the beginning, there was opposition to the government’s choice. Downtown officials and boosters, and the University pressed strongly for a downtown location for both economic development and convenience reasons.
Although the downtown site was eliminated for a variety of reasons, note that convenience for UofL was one of many factors that tilted the site decision to Brownsboro. Additionally, a major factor was that the veterans themselves were very much against a downtown location. Residents in neighborhoods surrounding the site were and are adamant that the Brownsboro site is improper for the same reasons that residents of any previously predominantly residential neighborhood would likely raise. I have detailed these before but they include traffic, noise, air and water pollution, construction inconvenience, and any other reason that might be conceived of—some relevant and some not. In the unavoidable tension that arises in these situations the opponents of change are often unkindly characterized as mounting the ‘not-in-my-backyard’ defense. The root of this difficult situation requires solving the equation of balancing the interests of the project’s neighbors with a broader community interest in meeting its obligations to the interests of our veterans. I suppose if it didn’t hurt a little in the process, we wouldn’t be doing it right.

Was the meeting held simply to check off the boxes?
There is a legal procedural purpose that the meeting had to fulfill. To build on land, especially federal land, certain requirements must be met including compliance with environmental laws. Previous surveys of the potential sites did not unearth any deal-breaking findings. However, even people or businesses that claim to dislike government regulations know that one of the very best ways to kill or delay a federal project is to use the government’s own regulatory processes against it. This is how our Ohio River Bridge project was delayed for so long, and why to build the eastern-most bridge, a tunnel had to be built under a “historic” house that no one seems to want to buy or take care of. So it came to be that in addition to the previous reasonable surveys, the VA was pressed into conducting a more extensive and expensive full-bore Environmental Impact Study (EIS) to look for any potential physical, environmental, cultural, or socioeconomic impacts of building on either the
Brownsboro or St. Joseph sites, or of continuing to operate using the existing Zorn Ave site. The purpose of Wednesday’s meetings was to present the draft form of the EIS to the public and to collect feedback from the public. The VA’s internal conclusion following its full EIS continues to favor building on the Brownsboro site. An executive summary of the Draft EIS is available here, and the complete document is available on the VA’s website. An audio recording and copies of the presenter’s slides are available.

Less than executive summary of the EIS.

A consultant from the company that did the EIS walked through the various findings under headings required by law including: Need for a Hospital, Aesthetics, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soil, Hydrology and Water Quality, Wildlife and Habitat, Noise, Land Use, Floodplains and Wetlands, Socioeconomics, Community Services, Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials, Transportation and Traffic, Utilities, and Environmental Justice. In this sense, he was checking off the boxes. I will not repeat the findings here. Suffice it to say that no threatened wildlife or plants were found, nor ancient graveyards. Such impacts as were identified were minor or the same as those that would be relevant no matter what form of multi-use development ultimately occurs on the property. [A multi-story office building is already immediately adjacent to the site. It is likely that the land at the site’s entrance where the Goodwill Industries building once stood will see some sort of commercial development. Aerial photos document the extent of existing commercial development typical of what springs up around major intersections.] The potential impacts identified were termed minimal or could be reasonably mitigated. Significantly, there were no meaningful differences in impact between the Brownsboro and the St. Joseph sites except for traffic which would be impacted to a greater extent at the latter. The difference between the two sites seems moot now because the St. Joseph land is reported to be no longer available. There will of course be unavoidable local disruptions during construction from any
development. The effect on aesthetics will depend on the individual observer and range from negligible to major.

**Will anything change the minds of opponents?**

Suffice it to say that the audience, composed nearly entirely by site neighbors or their allies, was having none of it. Most of their old arguments against locating a hospital at Brownsboro were raised again with a few new ones I had not heard before. Small-particle air pollution from car exhaust was a new one that seems to have caught on. Threats that doctors would not come out to a Brownsboro hospital was another. Most the concerns that have been raised in this process have been legitimate. I would likely raise them too if I lived there. Some objections seemed irrelevant.

**Care must be taken.**

A handful of comments were ill-advised to raise. I would not have pointed out, as more than one person did, that the VA will not pay taxes on this valuable piece of land, and that the neighbors would be better served by managing the real-estate differently to generate better income so as not to have to pay correspondingly higher taxes themselves. Some developments are presumably thought better than others. I would not have trivialized the report because it surveyed many Native-American tribes to enquire about possible ancient uses of the land but did no surveying of their undesignated “clientele.” I would not have made the blanket statement that “no one thinks [Brownsboro] is the appropriate place for this hospital” which allowed one potential client in the audience to interject: “This veteran does.” I would not have assumed that the single African-American in the room would represent a potential client of the Hospital to be consulted, or who would benefit economically if the replacement hospital was built west of 9th Street.

I am willing to grant that the juxtaposition of references to race and property
values by the same speaker were accidental, but I found them inappropriate if not insensitive. It remains true however, that controlling who can live where, or how land can be developed has been a factor that perpetuates structural racism to this day. Even as I write this, there is opposition to an affordable housing development at Norton Commons. Additionally in Prospect up the road, the city is fighting a proposed affordable living complex for seniors reportedly raising concerns about crime, traffic, and decline in property values. It may be true that some clients of a Brownsboro VA hospital will not look or dress like the individuals in the neighborhoods surrounding it. Many will have medical conditions and share the non-medical determinants of health associated with disadvantaged populations. We can never know what is in a given individual’s heart, and I would like to assume the best, but opponents of locating a VA hospital in their neighborhood must be sensitive to how others might interpret their concerns. An element of social justice unavoidably overlies this matter.

“It’s the traffic, stupid!”

... was a phrase used a few times on Wednesday. I agree that a worsening in traffic is a valid concern– perhaps even the most justifiable one. Will traffic be so bad that the hospital cannot be approached by emergency vehicles, patients, or visitors? Will people be able to get to work in an acceptable manner? Will busses be able to get to the schools in the area? Paradoxically, the issue of traffic is the both the major one offered and yet the one most amenable to empiric examination and forecasting.

There is no question that traffic on Brownsboro Rd/Rt. 42 is heavy in the early morning and late afternoon. That is why these times are called rush hours. Thirty years ago, I commuted downtown from Prospect, often more than once a day. It wasn’t that bad! River Road was wide open as a quick alternative and there were few traffic lights. Predictably, with the extensive commercial and residential development of eastern Jefferson and adjacent counties, traffic got
worse—not just at Brownsboro, but at Breckenridge, Shelbyville, Taylorsville, Bardstown, and all the other choke points defined by our two circumferential interstate rings. As I followed the VA site-location discussions, I began to pay attention to traffic. I would drive both early and late through the intersection. I stood on corners at rush hours and noted that the off ramps mostly cleared with each cycle of the light. I pulled up Google maps showing traffic at different times of the day. I still use that intersection often. I must confess that there is a disconnect between what I hear from opponents of a hospital there, and what I perceive. Of course traffic can be a pain there at rush hours, but I do not know if it is worse than what the rest of us endure every day all over the city. I am confident that during most of the day, traffic around the proposed hospital site is pretty reasonable if not clear.

We should not judge current traffic to be the baseline. The bridge and other construction projects have thrown a monkey wrench into traffic all over the county. The widening of the I-75 exit from the Waterson played havoc with traffic for many months as is the ongoing widening of I-71 approaching the Jefferson Expressway. A bridge on Rt. 22 was washed out for many months, and that road is blocked for construction even now. The construction on Rt. 42 further up the road at the site of the tunnel at I-265 has forced people to modify their commuting routes. I disagree very much with statements that recent modifications to the Brownsboro intersections and their traffic lights, and the addition of the intersection at Westport Road have not improved traffic. Finally, Kentucky’s Department of Transportation has plans on the book to make additional substantial modifications at the Waterson/Brownsboro bridge which were on display at the meeting.

Traffic is an issue, certainly, but even so, does that mean we should put a hold on all future growth in the county? An important take-away from the models exhibited Wednesday is that there is little difference in predicted transit times
whether the site is filled with a hospital, or with the other non-hospital, mixed-use development that is certain to happen. (Tables with projected transit times were made available.)

It is not in the interest of the opponents to overstate the severity of traffic in the area. On the other hand, our entire community deserves to be convinced by empiric data, properly collected, that the hospital neighbors are not being asked to assume more than their share of an undue or unfair burden.

There are important concerns to agree with.
I share some of the concerns of the neighbors. Closing and consolidating three community primary care outpatient clinics seems a step away from the concept of primary care provided close to home. The Brownsboro site is convenient to out-of-towners, but not so much for urban Louisvillians. I tend to agree with one speaker that we should be moving away from a separate healthcare system for veterans and including them in a single payer system with the rest of us. A smaller number of VA facilities for specific issues related to service and combat can still be made available on a regional basis. Just as with schools, when there is more than one healthcare system and one group is funneled into one of them, it becomes difficult to say they are both equal.

I also agree with some of the speakers that control of veteran healthcare is not a provider entitlement for economic development purposes—not for a downtown medical center or a medical school. Veterans are not a reward to prop up otherwise failing healthcare providers. Perhaps it would have been nice, as some suggested, to have put the hospital in West Louisville. Recent planning for other development projects there have not come to fruition. I do not remember if in the early stages of the site selection process that any acceptable locations were identified. Neither can I recall that any town meetings were held in that half of the city. I hope my memory is wrong. Regardless of where our VA
Hospital ended up, frequent access by public transportation is essential. Not all will arrive from surrounding suburbs or counties.

**No one is listening to us!**
I cannot agree with all the comments that “no one is listening.” Participants complained bitterly that they were not being listened to, or that their questions were not being responded to usefully. Since I was not in those loops, I cannot comment on responses to individual queries. Not being listened to is different animal than not liking the answers being returned. There have been quite a few public forums where plans for the replacement hospital were presented at which there was a lot of action. It certainly appeared to me, at the very least, that the design and placement of the new hospital was modified to respond to issues raised by the local community. Modifications were not what was wanted however. The commenters on Wednesday afternoon aimed the same criticism of not listening on senior federal and local elected officials who represent a larger constituency and who did not adopt the neighbors’ favored positions. The single exception mentioned was Councilwoman Angela Leet, the District 7 official who represents the neighborhoods around the Brownsboro site and who has championed their concerns.

**What should we make of these objections?**
I do not know how to respond to criticism that the site is too small to house a hospital, or that the site allows little room for future expansion such as “should we have three Vietnam Wars at the same time.” I have to defer to people who build hospitals and healthcare systems about whether the site is big enough, but the planners should be able to convince an unbiased and unemotional 3d party that their conclusions are reasonable. I am puzzled at the persistence of about statements assuming a conspiracy to improperly inflate the purchase price of the Brownsboro land by “$3 million,” or in plans to hand over the Zorn Ave. land to a favored developer on which to build McMansions and make big-bucks.
I tried to estimate a time-value of money on the the land transaction some time ago. If the property was first purchased in July 2004 for $7.9 M and sold 8 years later on July 2012 for $12.9 M, the annual rate of return would be a little less than 7%. This is what I used to hope for in my University retirement accounts. In any event, the transaction was investigated by experts and no illegality was found. Vague accusations of financial misdoings should not be continued in the “birther” mode. Advance the claims in court if they are real or stop making them. I do admit I would be pissed off too if there was a backroom deal that turned the old Zorn site over to the private benefit of some insider. If someone has something, out with it!

Another continuing objection is still being pushed of which I do not understand the relevance to our local matter. It is pointed out that in recent years, some new VA Hospitals have not been completed on time or on budget– some failing badly. What else is new about government projects? The Veterans Administration is rightly under intense scrutiny in Washington and elsewhere. It deserves to have its feet held to the fire for a host of reasons including access and quality. If the VA and its contractors cannot manage and finance major construction projects in a satisfactory manner, I suggest they fold–up shop altogether and provide vets healthcare in the same manner and places as the rest of us. Until that happens, I do not see how this objection is relevant to us in Louisville where a new VA hospital is currently needed. I would also turn up the heat on our federal officials to get on the job. It’s not just at VA hospitals where our tax dollars are being wasted.

The arguments about better quality downtown are specious.
I cannot agree with the oft-mentioned justification for putting a new hospital downtown because the quality of care is better there, or that doctors and facilities there will work well together to provide care to the our Veterans. As a lifelong academic physician, I would like to make those assumptions too, but at
present they are unwarranted if not demonstrably incorrect. The three hospital systems downtown do not play well together. Objective determinations of safety and quality made by both government and private organizations—flawed as they may be—put two of the downtown hospitals at the bottom of the list for both Louisville and Kentucky. I would like to believe this status will change—perhaps even in the time it will take to build a new hospital. I should point out that quality ratings of our VA have been very good to excellent.

The way VA hospitals staff their hospitals nowadays is different from the times when I was a VA trainee, employee, and physician. The staffing practices of VA hospitals and medical schools has changed. For example, our medical school could not provide enough primary care physicians or hospitalists to serve its needs so the VA hired these healthcare professionals on its own. I understand that it has begun to hire some of its own specialists as well. The Louisville VA contracts for specialty services such as cardiology with other Louisville hospitals. There are excellent hospitals and medical centers which could potentially serve VA patients that are closer to the Brownsboro site than are the downtown hospitals. A little competition may not be bad in our to provide the best possible care to VA patients.

This objection got under my skin.
I reject categorically the several comments which warned that “physicians,” presumably University Physicians, will not come out to a Brownsboro hospital. As an albeit retired member of the executive faculty, I felt obliged to make a comment of my own on this matter. Of course they will come—no matter where the hospital is. The Veterans Hospital is important to the University of Louisville’s clinical, teaching, and research missions. Its patients comprise an increasingly important piece of its student and housestaff training programs. Faculty physicians who currently serve at the VA will come because it is their duty, their calling. On a more practical basis, they will also come because they or
their departments are being paid for clinical services under contracts that require salaried physicians to be on VA hospital grounds. Google Maps tells me that driving time to the Brownsboro site is barely longer than to the Zorn site, and if time finding parking and walking to the hospital are taken into account, door-to-door time from University to Brownsboro is probably shorter!

Is a downtown site really the most convenient? Perhaps not for everyone, but an adjacent VA does not necessarily equate to more physicians spending time in the hospital. In fact, it makes it easier to stay away in a private office or lab. From a training point of view, being located away from the mothership allows senior housestaff to assume a justifiable and necessary greater degree of independence. There are tradeoffs in these time and distance issues.

**Project already delayed?**

It occurs to me that one reason not mentioned that Louisville’s project might not be completed on time and within-budget is because of the well-organized opposition to it. I do not see this opposition retreating. Indeed, the Crossgate subdivision hired a lawyer who has already asked for a further delay and is rattling the oppositional tool of failure to follow federal regulation. The creation a few years ago of the single purpose advocacy organization “Grow Smart Louisville” has been effective in extracting a pro-downtown policy position from the medical society. Its activities were intended to allow former University President Ramsey an opportunity to reopen negotiations to return the favored site to downtown. The success of this advocacy and lobbying group has been impressive. Maybe it’s a done-deal, maybe it is not. It seems to me that all interests have had an opportunity to make their cases.

**The Vets themselves want to stay at their Zorn home.**

Much was made of the well-documented preference of veterans to remain at the Zorn Avenue site. Equally valid is the well documented overwhelming preference
of veterans not to have to go downtown. If it is true that hospital experts and
engineers believe that the old hospital has exceeded its useful life; and that it is
not possible to build a second structure on the site; then the most relevant
question has not been put before the Veterans themselves. The choice to be
considered is: if staying at Zorn is off the table, would you rather have your new
Veterans Administration Medical Center downtown, or at the Brownsboro Road
location?

It is probably too late at this point to start over, but in my opinion, based on my
attendance at virtually every public forum held in the past 5 or more years, non-
urban Louisville veterans would strongly prefer the Brownsboro location. Since
I am unaware that a public forum was ever held west of 9th street, and unaware
of how many veterans live in urban Louisville, I have no reason to be confident
of where they would prefer to go for their VA care. I suspect it would be to
primary care clinics near their homes or perhaps even to a VA hospital in urban
Louisville itself. If adequate public transportation is available, urban vets might
not be unhappy at Brownsboro. It is not that much further out than Zorn. I
doubt that urban veterans would choose to have to make the trip to the outer-
most reaches of the county as at the St. Joseph site, nor should they have to.

What would I do if I were they?
This article was hard to write and is too long because this is not a simple matter.
I am personally unaware of any solution that will make all the players happy. I
believe the Veterans Administration and its consultants and contractors made
their best good-faith effort in arriving at a decision to place a new hospital at
the Brownsboro Road intersection. I wish I could say that I would not feel
differently if I lived in the Brownsboro neighborhoods, but to be honest with
myself, I cannot. Who would believe me no matter what I claimed? It is
impossible for everyone to be objective in this matter. It appeared to me that
the audience at the morning session last Wednesday was made entirely of
residents and their backers who opposed locating a hospital at the site. Virtually all speakers prefaced their comments by claiming to be a veteran or to be a family member of a veteran— but none claimed to use a Veterans Hospital. There were vanishingly few actual hospital–using veterans in the room.

Nonetheless, one of the last speakers from the audience at the noon session provided a different perspective. After identifying himself as a Veteran, he offered what he termed a “simple statement: that ...” not since I returned from Vietnam, [emotional pause] ... not since then have I seen such disastrous non-support of veterans.” He could not continue and no response from the audience was attempted or possible. The decision of where to place a new Veterans Hospital is a decision that the community as a whole had to, or yet has to make. Balancing fairness and justice for both those who live or work near the Brownsboro site, and veterans who have been promised and are due healthcare services requires a judgement worthy of Solomon.

Peter Hasselbacher, MD
Emeritus Professor of Medicine, UofL
President, KHPI
19 November 2016
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I thought on “What Is Happening at Louisville’s Veterans Hospital?”

P Hasselbacher

November 23, 2016 at 11:59 am

I wrote the above over-lengthy article without looking at any of the 24 other articles I wrote since 2011 covering the Veterans Hospital replacement project. I find that I have been saying the same things over and over, just as the proponents of “anywhere but Brownsboro” and “only downtown” been making the same arguments over and over. We seem as a community to be going round and round on the matter. How can we get off the dime?
November 15, 2016

Robley Rex VAMC  
Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office (Attn: Judy Williams)  
800 Zorn Ave.  
Louisville, KY 40207

RE: Alternate Site for New Robley Rex VAMC

Dear Ms Williams,

As you and your team continue to plan and discuss the best options for providing the most advanced healthcare for our Veterans, please consider building a new, state-of-the-art facility at 18th & Broadway. The site currently consist of approximately 19± acres, with the possibility of acquiring nearby acreage for added amenities and/or a parking structure.

A new Robley Rex VAMC campus at this location could be the most cost effective and convenient location proposed to date. This site is bounded, on the East and West sides, by State road Highway 31W, which is a direct route to and from Fort Knox. It is a major public transportation transfer hub, for both North/South and East/West connections, and minutes from the downtown medical and medical research campuses. We learned that many Veterans, who depend on VA medical care, live in West and South Louisville and many of these Veterans have asked us to present this location to the VA again for consideration.

In the year 2009, we met with Congressman John Yarmuth to discuss the potential of this site for the new facility. At that time, it appeared that all site requirements could be easily met; according to the list of requirements Congressman Yarmuth shared with us.

This location could provide a convenient, comfortable, safe, and healing environment for our Veterans. As Councilwoman Angela Leet says, "be a first step in conquering the east/west divide, which could truly begin to unite our community in ways we've only imagined".

General information for the 18th and Broadway site is enclosed. The 2D rendering shows where a 155,000 s.f. Walmart Superstore would have been located on the site, which will give quick reference of a building footprint area on the site. However, the entire site could accommodate a multi-story facility with a much larger building footprint. The site is subdivided, as shown on the 2D rendering, and the approved subdivision plat can be accessed using the following link.


After review of the enclosed documents, please let me know if you have questions, need additional information or would like to meet to discuss in further detail.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Sincerely,

Teresa L. Bridgewater
President

"Building Pride in Our Communities"
WWW.TMGKY.COM
NewBridge Crossing
Towne Center
Louisville, KY

PROPOSED PROJECT DATA

Demographics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Under 18</th>
<th>18-64</th>
<th>65 and Over</th>
<th>5-minute drive</th>
<th>10-minute drive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>11,411</td>
<td>18,590</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>111,919</td>
<td>222,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>5,824</td>
<td>35,048</td>
<td>43,983</td>
<td>155,886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area Overview:
- Adjacent to Brown-Forman Corporate Headquarters, with over 1000 employees
- A new full service YMCA proposed across the street. Pre-construction work is in progress
- Just minutes from Louisville's downtown central business district, arts venues, five star hotels, major medical campuses, the YUM Center Arena and Louisville's hottest entertainment spots.

NewBridge Development LLC | 230 New Millennium Dr | Louisville, KY 40245 | 502.586.386 | E: FRANK@TRINITY.COM
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Tom FitzGerald, Director, Kentucky Resources Council

Address
Post Office Box 1070

City/Town
Frankfort

State/Province
KY

ZIP/Postal Code
40602

Email Address
fitzkrc@aol.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

To whom it may concern:

The Kentucky Resources Council, Inc. (Council), herewith incorporates by reference as if fully set forth below, the written comments of Grow Smart Louisville dated December 28, 2016, and those of the City of Crossgate and other cities submitted January 11, 2017, regarding the deficiencies in the DEIS.

It is apparent from both the words and actions of the VA that the VA has prejudged the matter of the location of the replacement hospital, and has framed the environmental documentation under NEPA so as to rationalize the choice of the Brownsboro Road site rather than to provide full and fair consideration of a range of reasonable alternatives.

40 CFR 1506.1 imposes limitations on actions by federal agencies in order to protect the integrity of the NEPA review process, including the obligation to take "no action concerning the proposal" "which would ... (2) Limit the choice of reasonable alternatives."

The VA has through acquisition of the Brownsboro Road site prior to completion of the site-specific Environmental Assessment and the subsequent Environmental Impact Statement, prejudiced a full and fair evaluation of alternatives; instead framing the scope, purpose and need, and analysis of impacts so as to provide post hoc justification for a decision rather than a fair consideration without bias, of alternatives.

The Council concurs that the process has become so tainted that the only remedy consistent with the policy and purposes of NEPA and the case law, is withdrawal of the proposed DEIS, revision of the agency NEPA regulations, and assignment of the development of an EIS to one of the cooperating agencies or to an independent consultant.

The recent statement attributed to VA Medical Director Martin Trexler further underscores that, notwithstanding NEPA, the agency is not seriously evaluating siting in an even-handed manner. According to a recent Courier-Journal article "VA to consider site for hospital," Mr. Trexler stated at a recent veterans' town hall meeting that "Today in the process the only question is are we or are we not going to build at Brownsboro Center[,]" "That is the only site being considered by the VA today."

It could not be more clear that the VA is simply "going through the motions," and is rationalizing rather than analyzing alternatives for the hospital siting. That Mr. Trexler's comment is not simply an outlier is confirmed by the comment from VA spokeswoman Judy Williams in an article appearing in today's Courier-Journal confirming that the VA remains focused on building the hospital at the Brownsboro Road site "until something changes. And we have had no indication of that."

For the reasons stated above and in the attached comments, the Council requests that the DEIS be withdrawn.

Cordially,

Tom FitzGerald
Director
Kentucky Resources Council, Inc.
P.O. Box 1070
Frankfort, Kentucky 40602
From: Jeff Underhill  Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 7:24 PM  To: Jeff Underhill  Subject:  

Dear Senator McConnell,

As I watched the State of the Union Address last week, I was reminded of how fortunate Louisville is to be home to the most powerful person in the U.S. Senate. The longer I watched, it seemed odd that you were absent from mention and view (perhaps that is politics).

Unfortunately, in an issue of huge importance for Louisville—{location of the new VA Hospital}----you and our other representatives to Washington are missing. Your support for a new hospital is commendable, however, the proper location is this major investment is also a very important decision.

It is understood that the Veterans Administration is a independent federal agency that ultimately makes the site selection, not our locally elected officials.

On the other hand, I must assume that the VA has an ear open to Senator #1.

I do not live near the chosen site on Brownsboro Road, so I don’t have a “not in my backyard” complaint. I am a local real estate developer, but I have no property involved with any potential VA site. Simply, as a life-long Louisvillian, I see this project as one of the most significant federal investments in our community in a generation.

The new bridges may have a larger budget, but not all is federal money, and there are not permanent jobs involved—as is the case with the VA Hospital.

The location of our beautiful downtown arena was debated for years. At $238 Million, that project is about a quarter of the $900 million (and rising) projected for the VA.

So why is this project not being viewed as a major economic development issue for our city?

I have attended several public meetings, read numerous articles and spoken with a broad spectrum of people about the VA project. To date, I have heard very few people in favor of the Brownsboro Road location. I understand the former property owner wanting to maximize the sale price. I understand VA officials may find their work easier to continue with preparations in developing this site than to begin on an alternate site combining a number of parcels.

I know that some veterans prefer this site, but I believe some of that sentiment includes outdated stereotypes and prejudices regarding a downtown location. I have not heard that anyone who is opposed to the Brownsboro Road location, is opposed to veterans getting the finest facility possible.

I personally feel greatly indebted to our veterans that have defended our many freedoms—including my freedom of speech with this letter.

They are entitled to services which can be greatly enhanced in a Downtown location.

To summarize a number of the factors:

*Land was purchased in the East End. The $12 million spent does not necessitate that we must spend over $900 million on the wrong site.
Perhaps the ground could be used to handle future needs for nearby Zachary Taylor National Cemetery.
*Traffic is a major concern. Costly highway improvements are needed for the Brownsboro site, and yet traffic is already excessive in that location. The thousands of daily car visits necessary for the VA will only exacerbate the problem (creating worse congestion, pollution and safety problems).

Downtown, there is a street grid with numerous options for ingress and egress, plus much of the utilities infrastructure.

Most importantly, there is already a huge investment in other hospitals staffed with medical personnel, so traffic could be reduced by that connectivity (also saving much time and expense). This would benefit veterans and their families also.

* Parking is a much larger need at the Brownsboro site, as all visits will require cars. A 3000 car garage is proposed.

With a downtown, buses, existing parking for nearby medical facilities, and walking connectivity will lessen the traffic.

* Transportation to the Brownsboro site is only possible by car.

How is accessible for many of the elderly, handicapped, and low income patients?

There is no public transportation to the site, no walking connectivity to nearby restaurants, and there are no hotels in the area.

What is the foresight of such a plan?

Downtown, the VA Hospital would be serviced by regular bus service and be in close walking proximity to a wealth of amenities.

*Amenities are limited near the Brownsboro site.

Downtown, Veterans would be close to many medical specialists and social services (Healing Place, Volunteers of America, etc.), their visitors would be close to hotels and restaurants of all price ranges, plus easy access to churches, sporting events, theaters, museums, and the Riverfront Park.

*Economic development benefits for the Brownsboro site have not been communicated in any forum I have seen—in fact, many neighboring property owners contend that the VA traffic will lessen their property values.

Downtown, the economic development benefit would be great. The long blighted East Broadway Corridor could be revitalized with new restaurants and services. In surrounding neighborhoods like Phoenix Hill, Butchertown, and Shelby Park, there would be reinvestment including convenient housing for hospital employees. Tax valuations would increase creating more tax dollars for the city.

I hear that certain downtown social services could benefit from grants to assist veterans if they were in close proximity to provide care.

I also hear that UofL Medical could be eligible for millions of dollars in annual research grants if it was affiliated with a downtown VA hospital.

*Timing is important in every equation. Much time has been spent on the Brownsboro Road site, and it would add time to assemble the necessary downtown property, but even if it added 2 to 3 years, there is currently a functioning VA facility on Zorn Avenue—so wouldn’t it be preferred to build the new hospital in the best possible location? Then future generations could benefit from all of the advantages stated above, and alleviate unnecessary drive time for the next 60 years.

Senator McConnell, it is not too late for you (plus Senator Paul and Congressman Yarmuth), to do the right thing.

The VA is supposed to issue their final site recommendation very soon.

No local citizen or elected official has the power or authority to redirect the VA on this issue except you. You have done many things for our community over years of public service. I am sure that you want to pick your battles and would rather not contradict a bureaucracy that has devoted many resources on this decision.
At the same time, you are the Leader of the Senate, you love your city, you do not back away from tough issues when it is the right thing to do. Please use the power you have ascended to with the backing of local voters, and make the right thing happen for veterans, for taxpayers, for your hometown, and for your legacy.

Respectfully,
Jeff Underhill
EmpowerWest is a network of black and white churches in Louisville dedicated to economic empowerment in Louisville’s largely-black West End. We believe in rebuilding the five pillars of black empowerment: the black family, the black church, black education, black businesses and black media.

So we’re called to speak out for locating the next Veterans Administration hospital here.

Thought of a VA hospital locating in the East End has created a backlash, “not-in-my-backyard” (NIMBY) reaction from those near Brownsboro Road. That community has a justifiable concern for a huge influx of traffic and congestion. We don’t blame them.

You won’t hear that from us. Given the opportunity, we’d welcome the hospital as a neighborhood place to serve our veterans. It is our children in the military. Our sons and daughters- black, brown and white- have served our country in disproportionate numbers compared to other parts of the city. They should receive their health care in their community.

"Your people will rebuild the ancient ruins and will raise up the age-old foundations; you will be called Repairer of Broken Walls, Restorer of Streets with Dwellings." -Isaiah 58:12.

As pastors, we envision with the Prophet Isaiah the rebuilding of a devastated part of our city, repairing the walls and restoring the streets. We’ve seen the power a large federal veterans hospital has to revitalize a community. A sister organization, the national Cooperative Baptist Fellowship, is headquartered in Decatur, Ga. Decatur leaders credit the Veterans Administration hospital as key to Decatur’s current vitality.

Louisville’s West End needs an infusion of vitality. Good hospital jobs will make for improved West End quality of life and housing. A great hospital supports ancillary businesses in health care, such as doctors’ offices, therapy, research and rehabilitation. Hotels, restaurants and other services would spring up close by. We’d have better security, roads and schools.

We have room here. The East End is congested. Downtown is already full of hospitals and medical services. We have vacant land with wide roads and easy access to downtown. We’re closer to the downtown medical center than the current hospital on Zorn Avenue is now. East End medical complexes operate in cooperation with the downtown complex right now. Why not the West End?

Seeing with the eyes of God, we envision a new day in a new place for our veterans and our community. With all fervent prayer, we ask that you see with us and find it in your hearts to bring the hospital home to where it belongs.
Chris Sanders is a Louisville attorney and coordinator of EmpowerWest, a coalition of Louisville area pastors and churches seeking to unleash the educational, economic, and spiritual power of West Louisville residents so that they might maximize their God-given potential and capacity.

Judy Williams
Public Affairs Officer
Robley Rex VA Medical Center
Louisville, KY 40206
(502) 287-5502

Bullitt County judge executive wants county to donate land for new VA Hospital

Posted: Dec 16, 2016 2:27 PM EST
Updated: Dec 16, 2016 4:02 PM EST
By Gil Corsey

LOUISVILLE, Ky. (WDRB) -- Bullitt County's judge executive wants the county to donate land to host the construction of a new VA Hospital.

Bullitt County Judge Executive Melanie Roberts plans to make a motion at the Dec. 20 Fiscal Court meeting to donate 42 acres of property owned by Bullitt County for that purpose.

"My administration is, and always has been, a staunch advocate of veterans' affairs," Roberts said in a written statement. "Bullitt County would welcome this facility as a way to show our utmost support for the ones who have sacrificed so much to keep our home free."

In recent weeks, a group of activists has lobbied for the new hospital to be built in west Louisville. And Louisville Mayor Greg Fischer said he isn't set on recent plans to build the new hospital in east Louisville.

The U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs paid $13 million for the land off Brownsboro Road near the Watterson Expressway. But some neighbors are fighting to block construction.

"It's all about the traffic," Irene Yearger said. "They can't handle it now."

In a letter to the VA responding to an environmental impact study, Mayor Fischer gave feedback on what he feels would be best for veteran care. He cited problems with the current location, including traffic congestion, high utility costs and transportation issues for veterans.

"It's our thought that we will continue to move forward with this location until something tells us otherwise," said Martin Traxler, director of the VA Medical Center.

Mayor Fischer says the city has other sites worthy of the VA's consideration.

Copyright 2016 by WDRB Media. All rights reserved.
MR. TRAXLER: Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you very much for coming to this comment session for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the property of Brownsboro Road. I'm the Marty Traxler; I'm the medical center director at the Robley Rex VA Healthcare System.

We have folks here from our construction facility management office. And the ladies that are up on stage here are from Labat Environmental, and they're going to lead us through the presentation and take us to the end of that presentation where everyone here will have the opportunity to make comments.

So, again, thank you all very much for being here.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you, Marty. My name is Lucy Schwartz. I'm a contractor with Labat Environmental. We supported the veterans administration in the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement. The VA has asked us to facilitate this meeting this afternoon so that they can pay careful attention to your comments.

You -- or, we have a list of people who have signed up to comment. At the end of those -- we were going to try and limit those to about 5 minutes. At the end of those, if there are any other members of the audience who want to speak, please raise your hand and we'll -- we can accommodate -- hopefully, accommodate that at the time.

Let me start out by saying the restrooms are out that door to the left and then turn left at the receptionist's desk. Please do note the emergency exit. Of course, we don't expect an emergency, but it's always good to be prepared. And there's some water and some lemonade, I -- in the -- over on the side if you are interested.

[WHEREUPON, off-the-record remarks are made.]

MS. SCHWARTZ: So this -- the purpose of this meeting, we are going to over -- provide a little overview of the NEPA, for National Environmental Policy Act process as well as the Environmental Impact Statement and then turn it over to you because that's the most important part of this meeting is to hear from you, the public.

This isn't a time for questions and answers; this is a time to hear from you. The VA will take those comments into account and will address those comments in the final Environmental Impact Statement, which is expected to be published early next year.

Just to go over what our little presentation for the next about 30 minutes is going to go over, I'm going -- we're going to give you a little overview of the National Environmental Policy Act process. Susan and our colleague, David Lindeman from Palmer Engineering, is going to talk specifically about transportation impacts, and then we'll turn it over to you.

[WHEREUPON, slide show presentation given.]

[WHEREUPON, meeting resumes.]

MS. SCHWARTZ: So, I -- I apologize, but we -- we wanted to get through our presentation of the -- the -- the overview so that we can, then, turn it over to you for your public comments.

So the VA will consider the comments that are
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1 received here today as well as any comments in
1
2 writing, in comments that are given by email, by
2
3 regular mail. The draft EIS will be revised, as
3
4 necessary. Comments will be considered and
4
5 addressed. Then the final EIS is expected to be
5
6 issued in January of next year with a record of
6
7 decision no sooner than 30 days following the
7
8 issuance of the final EIS.
8
9 The VA is requesting your comments on all
9
10 aspects of the draft Environmental Impact
10
11 Statement. Then there are several ways of
11
12 commenting. We do have comment forms on the
12
13 table. You're welcome to fill that form out today
13
14 and leave it with us, and it will be fully considered
14
15 in the public record. You can take the comment
15
16 form, fill it out later, and mail it in. You can do -16
17 you can send an email and -- or you can just send
17
18 your own letter to the -- to that address. And
18
19 some of you have already given me copies of your
19
20 comments for the record, and then those will
20
21 certainly be entered into the record.
21
22 Once we do start the public comment period,
22
23 your comments are going to be transcribed by
23
24 Barbie, our court reporter. She may ask you to
24
25 speak up if she can't hear you. She may also ask
25
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1 you to spell your name if -- if I can't read it from
1
2 the sign-in sheet or if after the people who have
2
3 signed in to talk, if we're able to open it up to
3
4 other people from the -- the group who want to
4
5 talk.
5
6 So when you -- we have a microphone set up
6
7 here. If you could come up to the microphone. I'm
7
8 going to call the first three names, and if could
8
9 come up and be ready to give you comments. I'm
9
10 afraid we have to limit at least initially to 3
10
11 minutes a person. So then anybody afterwards
11
12 who does want to speak who -- who has been here
12
13 and wants to speak is able to do so.
13
14 And then as in -- in any public meeting, if you
14
15 could be considerate of others and -- and listen to
15
16 what people have to say, just as you want to be
16
17 listened to as well.
17
18 Thank you so much for participating. Oh. I
18
19 should add, too, if you don't want to come up to
19
20 the microphone, Susan Smiley, has a microphone
20
21 that we can bring to you.
21
22 So, with that, I am going to -22
23
23
MS. SPEAKER: Excuse me?
24
24
MS. SCHWARTZ: [no response]
25
25
MS. SPEAKER: Excuse me? Can you
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address the VA people there in the front row?
MS. SCHWARTZ: I'm sorry? Oh. To
introduce
MS. SPEAKER: Address the peop -people on the front row that are the VA people. Do
you know who they are?
MS. SCHWARTZ: Absolutely. We have
George Ordereese [phonetic], who is from the
Chicago Regional Office, and also Glenn Whitman,
who is the NEPA Project Manager for this project.
George is the -- the overall project manager for
the replacement VA project.
I am going to call the first three people who
signed up. We're going to do it in the order of
people who signed up. And then as I mentioned,
at the end, if there's anybody else who wants to
make a comment, we will try to accommodate you.
But again, I do need to try to limit you to 3
minutes a person. And so when I tell you it's time,
if you can respect that so that other people who
want to speak will have an opportunity to do so,
we would certainly appreciate it.
So the first three people Charles Eales [sic],
if I have that right, Ann Stanley Hoffman, and
Randy Strobo, if you could come up. And, Charles,
Page 8
you're first.
Charles?
MR. SPEAKER: Hell, I'll be Charles.
MS. SCHWARTZ: No. If -- well, no. If
Charles isn't here, let's start with Ann.
MR. KOPACC: I'm here.
MS. SCHWARTZ: Oh. I'm sorry,
Charles. Go ahead. I may have gotten your name
wrong. Could you -- could you spell it for the
court reporter, please, since I obviously did get
your name wrong.
MR. KOPACC: K-o-p-a-c-c. The
Table E-2
question is, as project manager, can you
guarantee us that the Zorn site will become a
retirement home for soldiers if this hospital is
built here? What's going to happen to the VA
center?
MR. WHITMAN: The final disposition
hasn't been determined at this point -MR. KOPACC: It's part of the project.
MR. WHITMAN: -- it's -- it's premature
because what we're looking for is -- let -- let me
use the mike.
Yeah. The final disposition hasn't been
determined yet because it's a little premature to
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get valid, interested parties to come forward for re-utilization of that site retention. So, at this point, their utilization study has not been completed and it won't be until we get closer to --

Mr. Kopacc: Sure it has.

Mr. Whitman: -- the start of this project.

Mr. Kopacc: The Louisville Board of Realtors have decided; they want it.

[Whereupon, audience chatters inaudibly.]


Ms. Hoffman: I asked when I got here today what would happen with these comments. As many of you have been to all of the meetings that we've had in the past about the VA, and I think most of us have repeatedly asked for input back from the VA about what we've had to say. We have not gotten those comments back. It has been a very frustrating, long road for many of us. And there are certain people here who have been working for several years trying to get answers about this particular project. We heard years ago somebody say, "It's the economy, stupid."

Well, it's the traffic, stupid. Which is going to bring about an inordinate amount of vehicular traffic increases with this project. I wrote down that it's five thousand -- 5,022 vehicles will enter and exit the facility daily. Just, be my guest, and go to this port. And that is my main concern. It is the traffic. It is the pollution. It is the noise that is going to increase.

Ms. Speaker: Here. Here.

Ms. Hoffman: Just -- you know, just -- just go on -- on I-71 or -- or I-264 and try to get on Brownsboro Road.

I don't know anything about when this traffic study was done. I did ask. I'm not sure, but someone did it at some point. I believe that, but I certainly question the numbers. Because you can go almost any day at certain times and there is a backup.

And my concern is -- is that ev -- it -- when -- with the increase, are the veterans really going to be able to get to the facility on time? I don't think so.

So I -- I'm -- I don't know. I'm very frustrated because I -- I think that we need to think in terms of the effects that it's going have on that immediate area. And it's not that the -- we don't believe that the veterans don't need a new facility. But I don't think this is the right location; I never have. And I continue to -- to say, please, consider putting this someplace else. [Applause]

Ms. Schwartz: Thank you.

[Applause]

Ms. Schwartz: Next is Randy Strobo, followed by Joseph Brenhan, followed by James and Elizabeth Downing.

Mr. Strobo: Thank you. My name is Randy Strobo. I represent -- myself and my firm represents the City of Crossgate. And first, I'd like the Labat and -- and the VA team for putting this together and allowing us to comment here today.

We've been retained to consult, advise and comment on the EIS. And that's pretty extraordinary for the City of Crossgate to take that step.

There was obvious concerns that we're trying to address here today, and some of them include the lack of the evaluated alternatives in the EIS, which is pretty much the cornerstone of any EIS study that's performed.

We are concerned about the impacts to the veterans. We are concerned with the impacts to accessibility and transportation. We're concerned about the impacts to the surrounding city's residents, businesses, schools, churches, and stakeholders.

We are also concerned with the time line of acquisition and other events and the compliance generally with its implementing regulations, its guidance, and policies that the VA is required to comply with.

We are also concerned about the intensity and density of this project. We are concerned that the current plan and design of the building leaves no room for growth and expansion.

And in a more general matter, we are very concerned about the failure for the VA to update its NEPA implementing regulations since 1986, I believe. I think the VA is currently in the process of finalizing new regulations, but is -- that is something that needs to be addressed immediately.

We are also concerned that the EIS
Section E.4.6
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1 determined that there was no impact on
2 environmental justice matters. We think that is
3 not in compliance with Executive Order 12898, and
4 that there are obvious environmental justice
5 issues and it's -- that it is absurd that its -- that
6 the EIS found no impact.
7 So we will be submitting full written
8 comments. We have also requested an extension
9 of time to respond to the EIS for us to make
10 thorough comments to the EIS. We made that
11 formal request yesterday. We asked for 60-day
12 extension.
13 We ask that -- again, that you all grant that
14 request -- the VA grants that request for a 60-day
15 extension to give us enough time to thoroughly
16 address the EIS, to provide the transparency that
17 the stakeholders deserve.
18 We also, you know, want to note that our goal
19 here is to do the best that we can to assure that
20 the VA fully complies with the spirit and letter of
21 the law, including NEPA and all of its implementing
22 regulations. And after that, that's all I have.
23 MS. SCHWARTZ: All right.
24 MR. STROBO: Thank you very much.
25 MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
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[applause]

2 MS. SCHWARTZ: All right. Joseph
3 Brennan, followed by James and Elizabeth
4 Downing, followed by John Taylor.
5 MR. BRENNAN: I think I signed the --
6 the wrong paper, but since I'm here, I'll speak.
7 [laughter]
8 MR. BRENNAN: I'm an old preacher, so I
9 don't turn down the opportunity get in front of a
10 mike.
11 My concern is the question of the -- of the
12 traffic. I mean, I've been here -- I -- the -- it's
13 almost impossible at certain hours to get on to
14 I-71. And it's impossible because of the backup
15 along Westport Road is -- is among -- is one of the
16 problems. But you -- you could find, on a given
17 day, a -- a backup that goes from I-71 all the way
18 back to -- to St. Matthews.
19 Now, the question is here of we're talking
20 about environmental impacts. Has there ever been
21 any study, recently done, on the impact of the
22 pollution caused by the congestion of -- of -- of
23 the cars?
24 Modern --
25 [applause]

Page 15

1 MR. BRENNAN: -- modern science has --
2 has -- has demonstrated that there are now
3 nanoparticles from pollution which pass through
4 the -- which pass through the nasal cavity and are
5 lodged in -- in -- into the brain, into the question
6 of billions of -- of these particles. Now this -- now
7 this would be the last place we'd want to put a
8 hospital, right in near an area where you'll have
9 created a high -- a high part of -- a questioned
10 area of -- of pollution.
11 I'll throw something out which has never
12 been -- which has never been suggested, and this
13 is a way out thing but you can consider it. I -- I --
14 I will consider a -- a third alternative -- a fourth
15 alternative, and that would be a -- a property
16 exchange between the VA Hospital property -- that
17 the projected grounds and the Am -- the American
18 Red Cross Legion, which is -- which is located
19 right in the -- in the hospital district.
20 This is a way out type of things, but you've
21 got antiquated properties over -- over in the --
22 over at the -- the -- at the Red Cross, and, you
23 know, you have -- certainly have a lot less of a
24 suggestion of less traffic com -- problems. But I
25 just throw that out just for an idea since it has
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veterans fought for the right for everybody to have their own opinion and, you know, be considerate of that.

Thank you.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you very much.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Next up is John Taylor, followed by James Wilkinson, and I'm terribly sorry, I can't read the next name, Jane or John, and I just can't do it. But --

CHAPLAIN WILKINSON: I'm James Wilkinson.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Actually maybe you signed it. Maybe that was it.

CHAPLAIN WILKINSON: I'm Chaplain


The -- the reason that I'm here today is after I retired from the Army, I was a maritime chaplain. I traveled through 17 states in -- in the United States. And when I was sick or -- or -- or needed some medical attention or something like that, when I was away from home in my own country here, where did I go but to a veterans hospital. So I'm familiar with veterans' hospitals in -- in quite a few of those 17 states. And have been vocal, and my friends have said I should add these comments to the this discussion about the fact that I've seen some good veterans hospitals in other states and I've seen some that weren't quite as good. And in my perspective the -- the best one that I've seen is right here in Louisville, Kentucky.

I voice the opinion that if we're going to open a new veterans hospital, we probably should build it in Kansas City, Missouri, where they really need one desperately more than we do. And so people ask me to come and -- and share that opinion and that insight with you.

I've also seen things that aren't being proposed in these proposals, and I know this is about environmental impact. And I'm more concerned about the impact on veterans than I am about the impact on squirrels or rabbits or those -- those kinds of things. I have a big backyard, and I take good care of some of the wildlife in that very area. I live about half a mile from where one of these proposed sites is.

But the -- the thing that I would share with you is that if we're going move to another site and build a new hospital, then we should do new things that -- that other veterans hospitals have learned to do, like at Nashville where they have a parking lot that -- that's adequate for the hospital and they're located right next to Vanderbilt University Hospital, where the residents support the veterans medical program come from and all that kind of thing. That works very well. We're -- we're not going to do that here. We're not going to do that kind of thing. Why not?

If we're going build something new, let's do something new, not just relocate to -- because you can't renovate and relocate or take care of the renovation that's alive and kicking [phonetic]. We're doing something here that's already appreciated by many veterans.

We have the remote clinics that many of us go to and -- and find very helpful and very useful and working quite well. And that does take some of the stress off of the parking problem with the hospital and -- and that kind of thing. We can explore those options and improve upon them rather than eliminate them in -- in this proposal as we're proposing here.

So I think the impact that we should look for is: What's the impact on the veterans? I'm a veteran that doesn't think I was really, adequately
Section E.4.7

MR. TAYLOR: They don't pay property taxes. You see, here we go again. You want to stick this thing out here on basic land and so forth and not pay any taxes. I'm tired of this. This community needs money. And the way to do it is to manage your real estate and find a better use, which this property will find, and it'll bring in income.

Thank you.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Next up is Charles Wachowski, followed by Pat Roles, and James Elder. Charles? Thank you. Thanks.

MR. WACHOWSKI: Good afternoon. I am Charles Wachowski. I'm a veteran, and I belong to a veteran support group that visits the hospital every month. I get a lot of feedback from the veterans there. The hospital in place right now is doing an excellent job; I get all those comments all the time.

But we're here now to talk about a new location. I'm not opposed to a new location, it's just the one that's been proposed. I live about three miles from here, so it's not really impacting me traffic-wise. But I witnessed the development there. It's not improved; the traffic is just as bad as it was before they opened the Westport Road Interchange and they the added ramp.

I want to follow-up quickly, the last gentleman that was up here. Property, why did they let them increase the property value before they purchased it? There's a big waste of money right there.

[applause]

MR. WACHOWSKI: There had to be some special interest there, I would say. So anyway, that -- that's why we're upset with the government. Anyway, the most important thing, in my -- my viewpoint, is to serve the veterans in the best possible way. And a new hospital would serve that. Why aren't we putting the hospital in a location that's more accessible to the veterans?

We have a lot of them are coming from down in -- around Fort Knox. There's going to be a new veterans home down there that's going to need accessibility to this hospital. There's a lot of -- lot of -- lot of questions here. What -- this -- this seems to be -- they're doing an environmental impact study, and it seems like it's a done deal right now; it's going to go on Brownsboro Road.

Table E-3
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MR. TAYLOR: Conservative people, I know you are here, neighbors, whatever. And the thing that -- that I think is wrong is things really -- no one is listening to the people that live out here so far. Now, what kind of government is that? I thought we were -- certainly now, I hope we turnaround this attitude, that the government listens to us for a change.

Now I'm not getting into that issue, but I'm serious, I think it's time to listen to the negatives here. Why -- why does the government -- I went through an urban renewal situation once with the government buying my property, and it was a disaster, as most government programs are. Sorry.

But one last thing, do you know that this piece of land here with a price tag on it, is one of the highest, most expensive pieces of ground around here. Now --

MR. TAYLOR: -- that's negative thinking right there. First of all, the VA hospital doesn't pay any taxes; right?

MS. SPEAKER: Right.
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That's very troubling. There's a lot -- lot of issues here.
I've followed this for several years now. I talked to -- I -- I was invited to be at a teleconference at the VA Hospital with -- with the folks -- the VA folks up in Washington. And this was before they ever did the Westport Road Interchange. I told them that the traffic is horrendous there already, and that -- and Westport Road Interchange did not -- it did not change a thing.
And also, when Secretary Cynshecky [phonetic], one of his deputies was at the one of the functions for my veterans org -- organization. I wrote him. He -- he attended that and spoke to us. And I attended that. And I wrote him a little handwritten note and tol -- expressed my concerns then. Got nothing back. Very alarming.
That's all I've got to say. Thank you.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

[applause]
MS. SCHWARTZ: Next up is Pat Roles, followed by James Elder, followed by Irene Yeager.

MS. ROLES: Hi. I'm Pat Roles; I'm the wife of a proud marine. I have a couple of comments.
I read most of the EIS. It's troubling. And on Page 1, Section 1.1 --
MS. SPEAKER: Ma'am. A little louder.
MS. ROLES: Okay. Is that better?
MS. SPEAKER: Yes.
MS. ROLES: Okay. The service figures for 2015, as best I could tell, were that 59,000 veterans are enrolled for care at the Louisville hospital. 610,000 visits by the veterans are made to that hospital that -- during that year.
Projections for 2015 are 65,000 veterans to seek services at the hospital; 753,000 visits annually.
Now Page 3, Section 1.2, is just two pages later, in 2014 there were 60,943 veterans enrolled for care. Why the change? There were seven -- 762,104 annual visits. Why the change again?
Projections for twenty-four -- 2024 are of 68,000 veterans, 963,000 annual visits. Why do these numbers keep fluctuating?

On Page 14 in the Appendix B, the traffic study, which I recommend everyone read because it is really frightening, as far as the claims the VA makes, the size of the proposed hospital in 2015 was 1,286,731 square feet. That does not count the BBA building, it does not count the two parking garages, or all the other outbuildings they need. They have now reduced that. The size of the hospital building will be one thousand thirty five hundred [sic] square feet. It doesn't include the BBA benefits building, the two parking garages, or the other buildings. Plus, they're closing three community-based clinics. At least that many. That's what they're saying now.
My friends and I have studied all 124 veteran Association Medical Centers in the country. They're not well run. We have especially studied the five hospitals being built in the last seven years. They are a mess. Denver will cost twice as much as it was supposed to, over $1.9 billion dollars. My favorite is Las Vegas. They forgot to put the ambulance bays outside the emergency room.
Now, who wasted our money? Who cannot read the blueprints? And we're supposed to trust the VA to build a hospital here on time and on budget?

I have two more questions because our questions really don't ever get answered. Now I did cause a stink and John Yarmuth answered some of my questions, but not really; they were more platitude.
I think as people that are concerned about veterans, and many of us live in this community, that we need to know in January, when the final EIS is published, where will you park that we need to know in January, when the final EIS is published, where will you park thirty -- 3,300 construction cars and/or trucks. I mean, where? There's not much parking in this area.
The other thing we need to know is when will the Cab -- the Transportation Cabinet actually build the SPUI, that interchange? They're notorious for putting things off. How long did they talk about building the bridges? 50 years? I'm just saying.
I'm -- I'm with John Taylor. How do we trust the government to do this right and do it right for our veterans?

Thank you.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

[applause]
MS. SCHWARTZ: Next is James Elder, followed by Irene Yeager, followed by Kyle Ellison.
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MR. ELDER: Good afternoon. My name is James William Elder; I answer much faster to "Bill."
This -- I've plowed through this Draft EIS, and it's amazing how many Indian tribes they contacted to see if there was any problem with that, people in Nebraska. I don't see any indication that they talked to any of their clientele, who don't live around here.
I'm a veteran. But I've developed other resources, so I don't need to go there. I had an uncle, a World War II bomber guy, that was there.
I'm a Cold War guy that flew there. But what about the clientele.
There are better alternatives. When they said what they'd looked at for all these criteria, let's -- this one and this one, didn't hear a word about the clientele. Did you?
It was all about how easy it would be to use this site as a development there. Well, I know of a site where there's nothing there now. The old Iroquois Homes Housing Project, 47 acres. Not 34, 47; right by the Watterson down there off Taylor Boulevard; owned by the Metropolitan Housing Authority of Louisville. No buildings onsite, but they had plenty of utilities there in the old days.
Architect last night talked about the utilities they're going to need. It's a hospital; they need dual feeds for electric, dual feeds for water, all the outflow, you know, sewer, all that's got to be taken care of. And hospital floors aren't business floors like what was there when Blue was going to build a hotel. They're not 10, 11 feet; they're 15 feet. Okay. It's much bigger structure.
We're all horrified by the traffic. We live it every day. And this business of the single point urban interchange, great. When are you going to start? Okay. They don't know.
And if you look back there on the EIS pages, I -- I think it's five fifty -- 521, 555, somewhere, not on the PDF reader page, but on the bottom of the lower right part of the page, you'll find a whole much of wiggle room, like, well, they might be able to, if possible and practical. You ever read government deeds, if practicable; you know what that means? No. That's what that means.
So, please consider that downtown site near the hospitals, consider the Iroquois home site, and consider the needs of your clientele. Thank you,

Gents.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you very much.
Next is Irene Yeager, followed by Kyle Ellison, followed by Greg Wright.
MS. YEAGER: First of all, I live in Crossgate; I am directly impacted with my view of my -- out of my kitchen window and my bedroom window. I will be smelling those fumes that the gentleman talked about when the cars are parking and un-parking. I will have a direct view of the parking garage.
I want to thank the veterans for coming. We really appreciate your input because this is, after all, your hospital. You should have the primary choice of picking where you want to be, not where some committee, site selection committee who doesn't give a rip about where you-all go and doesn't care about how it impacts the rest of us in the city.
It's a community project. It's not an empty [phonetic] project. It affects all of us in one way or another. If you ever have to travel in that area, it's the traffic stupid. It's the wrong site, the wrong location, the wrong idea.

In the beginning, that my husband and I started on this was March the 12th of 2012. That happened to be our anniversary. I will never forget that day. We didn't know anything was going on; we were told nothing; and we were left in the dark. From that time on, the VA has been obstructionists in our life and has not been compliant.
We have offered alternatives. We have talked with every representative; they've all turned their backs on us, all the way down to our Mayor of Louisville. We have never been included, we the people; we're paying for your-all's building. On 3/29 -- oh, no.
On November 15th, 2012, the official that said this is here today, and the VA flat-out stated that they're not going to do an EIS, an environmental impact study; the -- the study is not necessary. Well, yes, George, it is necessary and it was done. Thank you very much.

MS. YEAGER: But there was also another study done in 2009, and it -- I happen to ha -- get -- receive a pack -- a mystery package, no name on it, two CD -- or, one CD, and it had
Deposition of VA Public Meeting on November 15, 2016

1. three -- three packets to it -- or, three pamphlets to it. And it told us of a choice that was given to the veterans. And there was five hundred and --
2. I've got five hundred and seventy -- sixty veterans were interviewed, and this is what they based all of their strategy on, on that one study.
3. The choi -- choices that the veterans were given was, build a new hospital on the existing Zorn site, build a hospital located with University Hospital, and build a hospital at a different site near University of Louisville.
4. MS. SCHWARTZ: I'm sorry, but I --
5. you're over your three minutes. If you could just, you know, take a few seconds to wrap it up, that'd be great.
6. MR. SPEAKER: Give her extra time.
7. MS. YEAGER: This is a letter from Robert McDonald, Secretary of the VA. He said:
8. [reads] Second, in the EIS the -- will the VA distinguish the major challenges of Brownsboro Road site with relatively insignificant matters?
9. Road site with relatively insignificant matters?
10. The VA will be treating all potential impacts as equally significant.
11. I don't think they're doing that.
12. MS. SPEAKER: That's right.
13. MS. YEAGER: This is the facility.
14. MS. SPEAKER: That's right.
15. [applause]
16. MS. YEAGER: Yeah.
17. MS. YEAGER: That's what the veterans want. So don't trivialize what they want because aren't we serving them or are we serving ourselves?
18. MS. SPEAKER: That's right.
19. MS. YEAGER: 70.2 --
20. MS. SCHWARTZ: There --
21. MS. YEAGER: -- percent --
22. MS. SCHWARTZ: -- there are several people who also signed up to speak behind you.
23. MS. YEAGER: -- 70.2% said to renovate Zorn. My husband will show you plans that we've shown John Yarmuth, Martin Traxler, and anybody else that's willing to look at it. These are the choices and the graph. And I'll be glad to show you this chart. And this is the company that sent me the study.
24. MR. SPEAKER: Who is it?
25. MS. YEAGER: It's MDAC, M. Davis and Company, out of Bo -- Philadelphia, I think it is.
26. Thank you very much.
27. [applause]
28. MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
29. MS. YEAGER: This is the EIS that's a worthless piece of paper.
30. MS. SCHWARTZ: Kyle Ellison is next, followed by Greg Wright, followed by Gill Holland.
31. MR. ELLISON: Thank you. I am an Army veteran. I worked in an Army hospital during the Vietnam War with wounded coming out of Vietnam. I would like to say several things.
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1 First, it's not -- I don't live in this neighborhood. I've learned to avoid this intersection by being stuck there. I -- I do -- I go out of my way. It's not just the bottleneck. It's that we have medical personnel, we have hospital personnel, clerks, orderlies that are going to have to figure out how to get out there if there isn't very good public transportation.
2 And I -- it's -- it's going to be inconvenient for a large number of people for; like, how long, 80 years? How long --
3 MS. SPEAKER: That's right.
4 MR. ELLISON: -- is this going to be there? So you're going have people -- if a doctor has to see somebody, a specialist, they're going have to drive 20 miles --
5 MR. SPEAKER: Right.
6 MR. ELLISON: -- from downtown out here and then back. It's going to be hard to find people that are willing to put up with that.
7 Another thing, in the military at least there's great strength in numbers. Like industries clustered together, there's a reason that we have hospitals that cluster together; they work with each other.

MS. SPEAKER: Amen.
MR. ELLISON: We see that out there at Norton and Baptist around Dupont Circle; we see it downtown. So I think that the quality of medical care would be better if it was closer to downtown.
Third, I -- I think -- you know, I've seen -- an -- anyway, I guess I would like to see medical impact study about the quality of care. I haven't heard anybody mention that.
I would also like to see a -- a beneficial socioeconomic impact, I think this their quote off one of the slides earlier.
I notice as I looked around here today there is only one person that might be African-American in this room. Maybe there's somebody else, but I only see one.
And so, I guess I question why are we going to spend public money to develop an area that doesn't need any help, and then we're going to spend more public money to develop the area that does need help downtown and west of downtown, particularly the -- west of Ninth Street. So I guess I would like to see some jobs and spending take place down there.
I am one veteran who is not afraid to go downtown. There are lots of things I learned to be afraid of in the military, going downtown is not on my list.

Greg Wright, pastor of Plymouth Congregational United Church of Christ in Russell. And my congregation is entirely African-American, except for my wife and I right now. We're in Russell. You've heard of Russell because you read in the news HUD is about to spend $40 there. Wow! What makes it so that one federal agency and another don't talk to each other?
The hospital proposal, whether we go right downtown, out with where Walmart bailed and there's two other available major significant pieces of property right there, where the food court pulled out. That's 26 or 28 acres alone. And there's two very large, vacant industrial lots available for further development there.
One of the things we talk about in Russell is the need for anchor institutions that draw local businesses to open up around it. Think of the kinds of businesses that are open around hospitals. They are among most stable, successful businesses around.
And the fascinating thing is that those kinds of businesses take the money that is spent there and put them right back in their community. It doesn't end up in Arkansas or somewhere else,
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We are not going back to Square 1 entirely; to move forward in the zoning process.

Had significant EIS statements drawn up in order about the two other sites I suggested, the old building. It's as simple as that.

As I talked with them, I discovered the numbers veterans who just blew off this whole thing because nobody, nobody, nobody had ever asked them their opinion. Now I know why. There were 570-some surveyed out of the entire veteran population of the community. And I've heard it said twice, at least, up here already, and I will verify the issue. Government asked us for our input but gives us no feedback. Okay.

Feedback is found foundational to communication. As far as far as we know in Russell right now the plan is going forward was developed by -- and and I -- believe me, I have respect for your professional skills and -- and knowledge -- but it was developed by professionals in some variation of isolation, and what they deemed was appropriate without responding to the input of the people who it was going to affect. I see it time and again. I've seen it with HUD. I'm hearing about it here. And until we do differently, we shouldn't be spending money building. It's as simple as that.

The people have a right to be heard. And in this case, especially the veterans. Let's go back to the drawing board long enough to hear them and give them feedback. When we know little things about the two other sites I suggested, the old Foodport [phonetic] site and the Walmart site, both had significant EIS statements drawn up in order to move forward in the zoning process.

We are not going back to Square 1 entirely; we have starting places. It will not be another ten years, if we do it right.

Thank you.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Gill Holland is next, followed by Kate Talamini and Nancy Halbleib.

MR. HOLLAND: First, I'd like to say we're very excited about having a new VA in Louisville. We think it's going to have a huge, positive impact for the well-deserved care of well-deserving veterans.

My only questions are, you know, it seems like one of the major decision reasons was just the ease of access to this one particular site because there was one other. I get that. But there's a lot of things that are hard to do that are the -- still the right thing to do, and I think there's other sites in our community.

You know, we talk about an environmental impact statement. I don't know why the city hasn't shown the leadership and provided an economic impact statement because when we talked about other sites, whether it be west of Ninth, Broadway and 18th, closer to the county line, we could have huge, positive economic impact for our community with this massive infusion of federal infrastructure dollars. So this is a great project that can have a huge, positive ripple effect as opposed to know, driving down property values over which then reduces our -- our tax space.

So I would think, you know, the -- the -- the spending that we're going incur from taxpayers, let's have a great return on investment, and let's have a great return on community at the same time. I can't see nor [phonetic] -- you know, I -- and that goes also to one of your other deal-making procedural points is the socioeconomic benefits, obviously, are much bigger in another part of town that needs this.

If you think about 1952, when the other VA was built, there was no flood wall, there was no interstate highways. And we're basing a lot of this on a 2006 traffic studies. My iPhone was not invented in 2006.

Norton Commons was -- didn't start in 2006. Oldham County, there's huge development.

There's 2,000 people in Norton Commons that did not exist in 2006. Oldham County has been blossoming. They all drive down 42 and 22. So I
think we're basing a lot of this study on a super outdated -- you know, if you look at the development in Louisville over the last 10 years, and again, think about 60 years ago, 1952, think about 60 years ahead of now what's going to happen. Norton Commons is only half -- halfway there, and there's lots of other developments on the -- on the plan.

One of my other concerns is just the general precedent. You know, we do have plans in the city for zoning, for variances, the -- these are very important issues in our community, especially in certain parts of this area over here where people might not want 30 stories in Holiday Manor or in Prospect down the center. So if we do a variance here, what does that precedent lead to?

But that's my comments. Thank you very much.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: So I -- I apologize; I skipped over Helen Davis. After Helen, Kate Talamini, followed by Nancy Halbleib.

MS. DAVIS: I have a little different perspective. I am a resident of Windy Hills. I do drive 42 and 22, this area on daily basis. I'm also the mother of a --

MS. SPEAKER: Louder.

MS. DAVIS: -- deceased -- I'm also the mother of a deceased Air Force captain. My son was contracting officer in the Air Force, and he grew up in this area, went to school within a one mile radius of the site. And after the site was proposed, and I was not supportive, I had to question myself why I was not supportive. Was I not supportive because it impacted me or was I thinking about the veterans?

And I asked my son about the site. He said, "You've got to be kidding. I can't believe they're even thinking of putting it there." He said, "As a contracting officer, I am aware daily that what I do is not for the Air Force, it's not for the Pentagon, it is for myself; it is for the taxpayers.

We are building this site for the veterans, but we are the taxpayers and we need to do the proper due diligence for the veterans. We want to be mindful of the end result.

As a contracting officer, he had a goal for every project. The -- every project needed to be successful for the constituents. The constituents for this project are the veterans.

When we talk about this and we're looking at the transportation study, and the gentleman mentioned study that he did and it looked like the transportation and the in and out for the Zorn site would be no different than the site on Brownsboro Road.

What was not taken into account for that site is all of the remote clinics that will be closed. So the current VA site does not include the traffic from all those remote sites where the veterans will be coming in and out. We add that to the Brownsboro site, and that has a major impact for the veterans.

Plus, and several people have already mentioned this, transportation to and from for those veterans from those clinics that are now disbursed throughout the city, it's going to change then their whole lives in terms of getting necessary needed services.

So it impacts the veterans but it also impacts the surrounding community because we all know that the traffic is horrendous. And sufficient studies have not been done. They haven't taken into account the current conditions and future conditions. And so my concern is not just because it impacts me, but I really, truly want to do, and I -- my son would've wanted to do what was best for his fellow servicemen.

Thank you.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Kate Talamini, followed by Nancy Halbleib and Angela Leet.

MS. TALAMINI: Thank you. I'm pleased to be here. My comments to you today are on behalf of myself, a frequent traveler of the 42 corridor, and also a friend, Susan Depratt [phonetic]. I would say, also, that I have been a resident of Louisville ever since the first big hospital was built as a -- as a neighbor there. And it -- it has always been a good neighbor in our community, right, in Zorn Avenue.

This has been a hot button topic for us for years, and finally we thought about speaking out after a letter to the editor in Courier on Sunday. I imagine most all of you are familiar with it. It was written by Christina Lee Brown, Dr. Kathleen Lyons, and John Stough, and several others. So my comments this afternoon, put our -- Susan and
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1 I put our heads together and wrote a few things down, really, in response to that letter to the editor from Sunday's paper.
2 So, we said: Not only do these writers explain very succinctly why the proposed location for the hospital off Brownsboro Road is such a mistake, but they also present many excellent points why other locations preferable.
3 A downtown location for a 21st century VA Hospital reaps many advantages from a proximity to other medical facilities, but there is much to be said for rebuilding on the present site, the current VA Hospital. The property already owned by the VA has more than adequate acreage. 47 acres more than, of course, Brownsboro site, which allows for future expansion, even more than the 104 beds that they have now and the 104 beds that are proposed for the Brownsboro site.
4 Ease of access with in place highway and mass transition systems. Yes, the buses goes up and down the road up to the VA Hospital off Zorn right now. It's all in place. And its close proximity to the cluster downtown hospitals. These advantages are quite apparent and easily grasped. But one other great aspect of maintaining the VA hospital at its current site is its lovely treed pastoral setting.

MS. SPEAKER: Not anymore.
MS. TALAMINI: They're gone?
MS. SPEAKER: They're gone.
MS. TALAMINI: Oh.
MS. SPEAKER: There's a huge struct -- there will be a huge parking garage there supposably [sic] when they haven't even decided to stay.

MS. TALAMINI: Well, you -- you sort of blow my -- my point there.
MS. SPEAKER: I promise the first time I saw it I cried. I absolutely cried. And I also live in that neighborhood. I live in the 2900 block of Cleveland Boulevard, and that site made me cry.

MS. TALAMINI: I would hope that there's enough property that it could be replanted. So I would -- would continue in that regard with my thoughts that if mind and soul are important to healing, so are the setting. The clean air that is in that location as compared to what downtown congestion has to offer and even the Brownsboro Road congestion.
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much -- if you're trying to go see a sick person in a hospital or you have to fight the traffic, that's no fun. These are aspects are far superior of the Zorn Avenue site to any other possible locations.
In promoting our thoughts about the logistics and practicality for endorsing the VA Hospital on Zorn Avenue, we additionally would point to the following items:

The VA system seems almost in capable of building its new campus facilities on time and reasonably within budget. After their 15 years and cost overruns of $1.7 billion, the Denver VA is not only over budget but woefully behind schedule. And when it opens next year, on the very day that it opens, it will be too small for the population it is projected to serve. The Oland -- Orlando, Florida, VA is now $213 million over budget. And the New Orleans facility is $100 million over budget.

There are architectural and construction firms specialin -- specializing in onsite hospital additions, renovations, and expansions. Houston's MD Anderson Cancer Center, the Baptist Medical Center South in Jacksonville, Florida, and the University of Virginia Medical Center, which is a 500-bed hospital with that adjacent land for expansion, are just a few of the successful onsite hospital projects.

I -- I would challenge the organizers to think about relocating the 100 beds that are in the operation now on Zorn Avenue to some kind of a -- a -- a downtown substitute, whatever, for the four years that it would take for construction while you'd tear down what's there now on Zorn Avenue and possibly rebuild.

MS. SCHWARTZ: If -- if you could summarize the rest of your comments --

MS. TALAMINI: Yeah.
MS. SCHWARTZ: -- so that other --
MS. TALAMINI: Uh-huh.
MS. SCHWARTZ: -- people can continue.

Thank you.
MS. TALAMINI: Less problems with me to negotiate with the Department of Transportation to re-configure -- reconfigure roadways, if, according to the VA, that parking is the bes -- biggest issue at the Zorn site, a larger facility is not going to solve that problem. Solving parking issues on a larger parcel of land are significantly less costly than building a new campus facility.

And if a state-of-the-art treatment facility is
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| 1. needed, a specific targeted purpose, perhaps a
2. smaller satellite bed facility near the existing
3. medical complex downtown might be beneficial.
4. Just a couple of other little bullets. Building
5. a larger facility on a smaller site, like with the
6. Brownsboro proposal, seems to preclude any
7. future expansion. And if physical space is an
8. issue, a larger site will have more room for
9. expansion. Furthermore, towers could be built at
10. Zorn more easily than at Brownsboro.
11. That's all. Thanks.
12. MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
13. [applause]
14. MS. SCHWARTZ: Nancy Halbleib,
15. followed by Angela Leet, followed by Philip
17. MS. HALBLEIB: My name is Nancy
18. Halbleib. My husband is a veteran. We were
19. thrilled to hear, I think, like most people, that --
20. MS. SPEAKER: Excuse me. We can't
21. hear you.
22. MS. HALBLEIB: Can't hear me.
23. MR. SPEAKER: Stand closer.
24. MS. HALBLEIB: My name is Nancy
25. Halbleib. My husband is a veteran. |
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| 1. And we were thrilled to hear about a VA
2. Hospital, I think, as most of us are, a new VA
3. Hospital. We do live in this area; we've been out
4. here for 50 years.
5. The traffic on US 42, Brownsboro Road,
6. US 122, Herr Lane, and the Watterson Expressway
7. are extremely heavy. I think everybody knows
8. that. It starts early. What I'm going speak about
9. is just one -- one area that I think is very
10. concerning, too. Just one of many.
11. But anyways, couple years ago when the first
12. VA meetings were here, we went to the meetings,
13. and they mentioned that they would probably have
14. to put an access road from the hospital over to
15. Herr Lane so they would have trucks to go in.
16. buses, whatever that they needed to go in there.
17. Herr Lane, I don't know -- I -- I presume
18. everyone here is familiar with Herr Lane; Herr
19. Lane is 1.2 miles. That's it. That is Herr Lane.
20. On Herr Lane are three schools on -- right on Herr
21. Lane, Ballard, Wilder Elementary, St. Albert the
22. Great.
23. MS. SPEAKER: Kammerer.
24. MS. HALBLEIB: And Kammerer.
25. I've spoke to these schools. I was just | 1. curious about their populations. These schools,
2. all together -- and there's also another school
3. about two blocks back, St. Albert the Great is that
4. way -- collectively that's 4,051 students. Two of
5. them, the Ballard and middle school, get out. But
6. they start in the morning at about the same time
7. and they get out in the afternoon about the same
8. time. Then the grade schools start around 3 -- 3
9. to 4:00.
10. Even with an access road from there I think it
11. would just be a tremendous traffic jam to handle
12. that, even if they're going to widen that, you know,
13. with that -- just a mess.
14. But anyway, this clearly needs to be
15. re-thought and before a horrible financial disaster
16. happens to the VA -- can't tell what that is -- can't
17. read my own writing -- a financial happens to the
18. VA over putting it in an already heavily populated
19. area of Louisville. No doubt, it -- it's a disaster in
20. the making and a huge, ongoing financial mess for
22. MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
23. [applause]
24. MS. SCHWARTZ: Angela Leet, followed
25. by Philip Cochran, followed by Harold Trainer.
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| 1. MS. LEET: Good afternoon, I -- I know
2. many of you-all in the room because I serve as
3. your Councilwoman representing District 7.
4. First of all, let me start saying we're here for
5. a very important cause today. We're here for our
6. veterans. And let me start by saying thank you to
7. the veterans that are here in our -- in the room
8. today.
9. [applause]
10. MS. LEET: And -- and while I'm not
11. personally responsible, let me express my
12. apologies for the delay and the length of time that
13. it has taken to even get to this point of discussion.
14. I don't understand the process of why it takes so
15. long. I understand why we have processes and
16. that's what I'm somewhat confused about today.
17. The process hasn't really been followed.
18. Today we're here looking at these three
19. alternates. We know that these aren't even real
20. alternates because one of them is already sold to
21. someone else. We established back in 2005 with
22. the care study that a new medical center was
23. necessary to take care of our veterans. So that
24. eliminates the no option alternate. So they're
25. giving us one option? Why study that if that's |
1. what they're telling us we have to have?
2. The VA, I think, is simply checking their
3. boxes. They will tell us that we're limited to the
4. three choices in the -- in the book and that there
5. are no other options. I simply am not going accept
6. that response.
7. [applause]
8. MS. LEET: While I will admit that I'm
9. new -- new on the scene in terms of catching up
10. with stuff that has taken place in back in 2005
11. and 2006, I personally believe the process has
12. been flawed since 2009 when we stopped listening
13. to the veterans whose voice was surveyed utilizing
14. scientific methods with 95% confidence levels
15. [phonetic] -- with 95% confidence levels. And they
16. said, as we already saw, that they wanted to stay
17. at Zorn.
18. The second choice was to move downtown,
19. which was systematically eliminated, although
20. we're not sure why because the documentation in
21. thousands of pages don't really tell us why.
22. And their third choice was to find a green
23. field [phonetic]. Overwhelmingly, the vets here in
24. Louisville believe their care is good. And I will
25. say thank you to Martin Traxler for that and to the

---

1. nurses and to the doctors because they do believe
2. that they're getting good care. I have relatives
3. that are vets that are taken care of at the VA. And
4. not once have I heard somebody say that I've had
5. bad care there. So I do want to say thank you for
6. the service you're providing in your community
7. because we need you. Our veterans do.
8. [applause]
9. MS. LEET: But we can also look and say
10. what the vets, and some not even -- may disagree
11. with it -- the care, but I do believe in Louisville
12. our care is good. But what I don't believe that the
13. VA is good at is construction. They have a
14. history --
15. [applause]
16. MS. LEET: -- to suggest in the past that
17. they are not competent to do projects on time and
18. on budget. The examples, we've already heard
19. some today, that Denver Hospital did $1.1 billion
20. over budget. That's a billion with a "B". Imagine
21. that. I mean, cumulatively in this room I can't
22. imagine that we even make that much in our
23. lifetimes together. I mean, that is a lot of money.
24. The Louisville project is starting to follow this
25. pattern with an overpayment of $3,000,000 for the

---

1. I will be submitting my formal comments in
2. writing, and I thank you for your time and your
3. service.
4. [applause]
5. MS. SCHWARTZ: Harold Trainer is next,
6. followed by Carol Rawert Trainer, followed by
8. MR. TRAINER: Thank you. Hi. I'm
9. Harold Trainer. I live in Prospect. I'm a Vietnam
10. veteran, and I'm a member of Veteran for Peace.
11. And I -- I really, for the life of me, cannot
12. understand and have never read why they can't
13. rebuild down at Zorn Avenue, except the property
14. value is so high that maybe some in our political
15. world believe that veterans shouldn't be using that
16. highly priced property.
17. And the second thing is that I'm just
18. absolutely amazed after driving down Brownsboro
19. Road so many times that they would chose that
20. site and be so stubborn to stay on that rationale.
21. That really is not -- is going to be difficult for
22. veterans, especially those maybe that are not --
23. have some disability or a little bit older or
24. something.
25. Thank you very much.
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1. MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
2. [applause]
3. MS. SCHWARTZ: Carol Rawert Trainer
4. and the last person who has signed up is Robert Marshall.
5. MS. TRAINER: Hi. I'm a Vietnam veteran and also president of the Veterans for Peace chapter in here in Louisville. And my group, most of us in my group, are all against the new site, Brownsboro Road, for several reasons.
6. For one, the traffic and the pollution that everybody has already talked about.
7. And that area, when I first saw it, I thought, this looks like it's too small, really, for such a big hospital and right next to a really busy and ever growing freeway. It's loud and it's noisy and it's going to be polluted. I can't think of a worse place to put veterans. You say, "Thank you for your service." Well, that's not a thanks, you know.
8. The place we have at Zorn Avenue is a beautiful site. And I'm not -- and I don't believe they can't do something to that site. I just don't believe it. I'm getting cynical about my government. And I don't believe that there isn't something we can do there. And if we can't do it there, at least downtown, close to the veterans who really need it.
9. You know, most of us that live out in the east end we've got cars; we've got money. But the people downtown, the people closer into the city don't. How are they -- let's think about them instead of ourselves and what's good for us.
10. And I had a couple of other things. And one thing that kind of bothered me is the money thing. You know, like I've heard today, we don't know what is going to happen to the site after the -- the hospital moves. Well, you know, I don't believe that either. Somebody has plans for that site.
11. And I know it's going to bring a lot of money. And nobody can tell me that, all of a sudden, they're not going to do a new study and say, "We can't do all this on this site now," you know, for the new big corporations or the big money coming in. I -- I just don't buy it.
12. So -- and -- [applause]

1. favor of the hospital, just not in favor of that location. I have -- my father and one of my grandfathers were veterans, so I think they deserve whatever -- whatever they're entitled to get.
2. It's -- to me, this whole -- system of decision, its mind-boggling. We've got just a few irrefutable, undisputable facts. Number 1, you've got this location betwe -- it's right in the middle of two major interstates that are four miles apart.
3. And then you've got already Brownsboro Road traffic. I think everybody in this room, thinks the traffic is bad. And so -- so we have two interstates close together; we have existing horrible traffic.
4. And the solution, and I use that term both loosely and advisedly, is to put a $1 billion project on a tract of property where that's landlocked, where there's one source of ingress and egress. I mean, to whom is that really a solution?
5. My older brother is -- is a physician, went to UK med school. They've got the VA hospital right close to the med school. He did his residency down at the University of Alabama at Birmingham, one of the top teaching hospitals in the United States.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 65</th>
<th>Page 66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 States. They got the VA -- VA hospital right where the bid medical complex is. They do a lot of work with the med students, especially 3rd and 4th year. They also do a lot of work with the residents. So they're already there. They can share equipment. They can do a lot of things. There's synergy having everybody located close together. Of course, I guess, some of you believe that synergy and convenience and lowering costs are either overrated or irrelevant. So, my -- I guess it's the thing that I think we need to concentrate and focus on is this is a permanent solution. Just like the VA Hospital over on Zorn, it's been there, what, 50 years. This is not like a mobile home where if it doesn't work, we're going to be able to pick up and move it. Once we put this thing there, we're all stuck with it. And my overriding concern is that we've got to that this should be a no-brainer decision, and we've got out-of-town bureaucrats that can come in and wreak this havoc and then they're going to leave. And guess what, this is our mess to clean up and deal with until we die. [applause]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you. Cathy Franck.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MS. FRANCK: Hi. My husband was a veteran, and I'd just like to add that in addition to the environmental impact, one additional study perspective that the VA might want to consider is a public relations impact study. [laughter &amp; applause]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 MS. FRANCK: Traffic is something that really, truly impacts thousands of households in this area, and does the VA now want to become a name to be begrudged every day by every household car driver in this area with their children sitting in the car. Let's ask the VA to continue to keep anything associated with our beloved veterans just that. And let's allow them, our veterans, easy access to their care as well. The Zorn Avenue site, we knew, is easy accessible and it's accessible to people throughout the state. We lived in Northern Kentucky. And it's also close to the great doctors downtown who don't have -- who -- who do drive out to provide our veterans with care. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 E'town and Hardin -- and Hardin County. What those folks need when they're having a problem is not necessarily to drive 70 miles or 100 miles, a half a day, they need an insurance card that they can go to their local facility, commercial facility and get care. It's that simple. That was my first point. My second area was the hospital should be downtown. The reason, if we're going to build a hospital, it should be downtown, quite frankly, is the synergy between all the other hospitals, all the rehab centers, the medical school that's down there. It just makes sense. Spalding is there, you know, for the nursing facility. The third option for me was Zorn, mainly because that's where the vets really, really want it, and that's where my prop come -- well, well, the -- the final was the -- putting it out at the Midlands. It's insane. It's asinine. The reason -- or, going to Zorn, I kept hearing, &quot;You know, Zorn, we just can't build there.&quot; Well, yes, you can. Anybody who's ever been to the Zorn facility realizes that there is a very large gully in the front right here. We could build a four- or five-story parking garage and...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hospital on top of it, and it would serve the same condition.

Now I did have a friend that said, "You know, those folks are going to go -- go crazy who live out at Zorn because they're building such a big facility there."

"Well, yeah, you're probably right."

But we could also, if we just built a parking garage out here and put a nice plaza on it, a landscaped plaza and everything, then we could -- could reclaim a lot of the existing parking that's back there and build a new hospital facility, brand-new from the ground up; keep the existing facility and turn it into the assisted living facility that the veterans here want.

MR. YEAGER: Now, since we own the property already that's been overpaid for, as everyone has mentioned, we could also use that as a -- a memorial garden and cemetery for the veterans to have as proper burial [phonetic].

MR. YEAGER: That I con -- conclude.

Thank you.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

MS. HARTY: Sorry. I didn't hear your reply. That doesn't mean that that's the only time that it's --

MS. SCHWARTZ: David, do you want to --

MS. HARTY: I didn't hear your reply about the times.

MR. LINDEMAN: I'm just saying that's what the -- the highest volume is in those time frames. It doesn't mean that there's not high volumes outside of that.

MR. LINDEMAN: I --

MS. HARTY: What was --

MR. LINDEMAN: -- well, I'm --

MS. HARTY: -- your peak hour?

MR. LINDEMAN: -- I'm not --

MS. HARTY: What's your --

MR. LINDEMAN: -- I'm not --

MS. HARTY: -- peak hour?

MR. LINDEMAN: -- positive but I'm pretty sure it's 7:30 to 8:30 in the a.m. and --

Mr. Lindeman: Now, since we own the property already that's been overpaid for, as everyone has mentioned, we could also use that as a memorial garden and cemetery for the veterans to have as proper burial [phonetic].

It doesn't mean that there's not high volumes outside of that.
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the VA -- give the veterans their cards to get -- to get their medical care at suburban and local hospitals. And we can just go on living without the pollution and all of the -- the things that we find unacceptable about this project. Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: If you could -- if you could introduce yourself and spell your name for the court reporter, please.

MS. COOKE: For the what?

MS. SCHWARTZ: For the court reporter, for our --

MS. COOKE: Okay.

MS. SCHWARTZ: -- stenographer.

MS. COOKE: My name is Jackie Cooke, J-a-c-k-i-e C-o-o-k-e.

I used to work at the VA, and I happen to know that my patients to a single one wanted to keep it at the old facility. I know they need some update, but they wanted to keep it at that physical facility.

Everything that everybody has said has been good, but the one bottom line that nobody has mentioned, and I have good authority for some commercial real estate people, we shouldn't even be talking about the Brownsboro site. And the reason that that's an issue, and I think there needs to be a study about that, is why that -- and who made it possible for that -- for that site to be bought out.

The one person that benefits, we're talking about who gets -- benefits and all, is the person that owned that property. And at the time that it was bought, it was considered a white elephant.

And the lady said, "Oh, it'd be easy to get rid of." No; it was very hard for him to get rid of.

And so somebody, for some reason, made it possible for him to sell that. And of course, we know the great benefit, it was well overpriced. But that's the bottom line. There ought to be a study about why he was able to get some people to bail him out of his financial problem. And so that's the whole issue.

We shouldn't even be talking about that piece of property, at all. And that's the biggest issue, I think, there is of this whole thing.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: That's the extent of the
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1. on -- plunked down on it. I'm sure there are other
2. opportunists would love to get a hold of that
3. property. It's on the river. It's beautiful. It's
4. pastoral like that. Thank you.
5. MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
6. [applause]
8. MS. SCHWARTZ: Can -- a little closer.
9. MS. WINNETTE: Hi. My name is Yvette
10. Winnette, Y-v-e-t-t-e W-i-n-n-e-t-t-e.
11. THE REPORTER: Wait. I'm --
12. MS. WINNETTE: I -- I will get with you
13. later. Trust me.
15. MS. WINNETTE: A couple things have
16. been said today about that the -- this current
17. facility cannot provide the services needed. What
18. are those services? Has anybody asked? And
19. where are the veterans getting the services today?
20. Are they doing without? I think that's a very
21. important question that the VA needs to be
22. address.
23. I've attended a lot of these meetings and I've
24. asked lots of questions, but the two that I've yet to
25. see any feedback on, one of them, deals with
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1. directly with the question of were the veterans and
2. the physicians given current or projected traffic
3. data based on the improvements of downtown
4. traffic flows following the completion of the
5. bridge? I think everyone deserves an answer to
6. that question, especially the vets and the
7. physicians.
8. The next question that I've asked and I have
9. seen nothing in the way of response to this and
10. this follows a long with Ms. Leet's statement about
11. the process. If this project does go forward, the
12. residence of Louisville, the veterans, the
13. physicians, the employees of the VA, they have a
14. right to know that compliance will be the forefront
15. of every action that's taken from the minute the
16. RFP is released for construction and the
17. compliance all the way through to once the facility
18. is opened.
19. I have a great concern that the houses in the
20. area, when they start blasting, what happens.
21. Granted it does impact property values, that
22. impacts all of Louisville, if our traffic -- if our
23. taxes become less. And the whole thing is the VA
24. is not providing feedback. We come here and we
25. get information, but it's not useful information.
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1. MS. SPEAKER: Amen.
2. MS. WINNETTE: I have had a history of
3. working where I was required as part of the work
4. that I was doing that the person I served I had to
5. give them the information they needed to make an
6. informed decision.
7. I don't think the VA is getting the appropriate
8. information to make a -- an informed decision. I
9. think they're getting information that helps them
10. guide them to where they want to be. I don't think
11. it's true information that is informative. I know I'm
12. not getting information to make an informed
13. decision. And based on some of the comments and
14. documents I've seen today, I don't think veterans
15. and the physicians are getting that either.
16. And physicians need to square up with the
17. patients now that they will not come to this facility
18. once it's built. Now maybe there's an assumption
19. the veterans today won't be around then. I don't
20. think that's going to be the case. I think they're
21. tough guys and women, and they're going to be
22. here, and we need to serve them within informed
23. decisions.
24. [applause]
25. MS. SCHWARTZ: Bef -- before I --
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1. before I get to you, I'm sorry, I may have
2. neglected to call on James Aland [phonetic, is -- is
3. he still here? And if I did, I sincerely apologize.
4. AUDIENCE: [no audible response]
5. MS. SCHWARTZ: And then another name
6. Joe Gantz, Cantz [phonetic]?
7. AUDIENCE: [no audible response]
8. MS. SCHWARTZ: Okay. I'm sorry. Go
9. ahead.
10. MR. WEINBERG: I'm David Weinberg,
11. it's W-e-i-n-b-e-r-g. I notice I'm probably the last
12. one to speak, so I'll make it real quick because
13. most everything has been said.
14. You know some people would say this is a VA
15. hearing, some would say it's a VA presentation,
16. because to have a hearing you have to have
17. somebody listen. And our past experience has
18. been is that they're not listening. And our past experience has
19. been that tough guys and women, and they're going to be
20. here, and we need to serve them within informed
21. decisions.
22. [applause]
23. MR. WEINBERG: The on -- the only
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MR. WEINBERG: -- and I appreciate all that you've done.

MR. WEINBERG: It becomes obvious if you're listening.

Nobody thinks this is the appropriate place for this hospital. The residents certainly don't, but that's not the most important thing. The doctors don't. And most importantly, the veterans don't.

MR. SPEAKER: This veteran does.

MR. WEINBERG: Well, most veterans don't. And I think the research to that is that they don't believe it is.

I hope you're listening today. I hope you reconsider the -- the options and that -- because there are better options than you have today.

Thanks.

MR. MAGRE: My name is Steve Magre, and it's spelled M-a-g-r-e; I actually will be representing German-Paristown Neighborhood Association.

In terms of our association looked at this issue two different times. Actually it came back with the same recommendation that we don't think this is the correct site for the new hospital. We certainly support the new hospital.

We are in a neighborhood that has a whole lot of veterans that live within our boundaries, probably some other -- so many neighborhoods throughout Louisville, Kentucky, and certain surrounding.

The big issue I want to bring up is access. And I -- I really am concerned in terms of the employees, 2100 employees. How many of those employees depend on public transit to do their jobs and to get to their jobs.

And I know for a fact, and I've confirmed it with a person who was my colleague last year on the Council, and Angela is a -- a star as far as I'm concerned, particularly with this issue, when she said she studies it and works it every day, she does. I know that for a fact.

And one of the concerns, I know she has, I have, is there's not good transit service out here in this area that you're talking about. I don't even know how a bus could fit into the traffic patterns in terms of getting the -- the kinds of services TARC provides into the downtown area. And frankly, the other side is going out to Zorn, which has been brought up. That really concerns me.

And secondary is I just heard somebody say the physicians aren't going come out to this site. Well, they're -- they're not probably because it -- it takes too long in terms of their time allotment in terms of how they would schedule their ability to do their jobs.

I -- I've heard this from sources on my time with Volunteers of America and being on that board, there's some really knowledgeable people that talked about the time frame that the University has in its partnership to help with the VA out on Zorn Avenue is tight the way it is.

There's no possibility they could get them from downtown or from the campus on Belknap and make their way through all this traffic and all that we've been hearing and talking -- or talking about today and -- and say they can commit to that.

I don't know that that was considered. If -- in the -- where the owl lands or doesn't land or where the squirrels move about, where there's wetlands, all of those are boxes checked off. I get it. But there are better options than you have today. And I'm here to actually tell you folks that I've not heard from maybe one or two veterans today about the -- what the VA has been doing. But I will tell you that on May the 11th, 2011, I attended the first public hearing about what the VA was going to try to do in terms of the impacts are going to be in terms of lack of access so great that it's going to, I think, impact the care to our veterans, and, frankly, create a situation that the veterans might not even come. It's just too much. It's just too -- too long a drive or maybe many of the veterans have to use TARC, you know, or city -- or transit.

There's got to be a better site. And there's been six sites brought up today by other people that are better sites. There has to be reconsideration in that. I sure hope you heard this loud and clear with this hour-and-a-half presentation. Thank you.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Sir?

MR. WARE: Good afternoon my name is Allen Ware, W-a-r-e. I am a Korean Navy veteran who uses the facility on Zorn Avenue.

I'm here to actually tell you folks that I've not heard from maybe one or two veterans today about the -- what the VA has been doing. But I will tell you that on May the 11th, 2011, I attended the first public hearing about what the VA was going to try
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1 to do and build a new hospital and find a site.
2 They had four or five sites available. And when it
3 came time for comments, the auditorium -- the --
4 the line up to the microphone went all the way
5 back to the backside of the auditorium.
6 No veteran spoke that day wanted the hospital
7 to be downtown. So I congratulate the VA for
8 removing that site in this final analysis.
9 Thanks you very much.
10 [applause]
11 MS. SCHWARTZ: And I -- I think he's
12 going to -- do you -- do you want to speak from
13 there.
14 MS. SPEAKER: Yeah. Can you hear?
15 MR. CRAWFORD: I just had a -- a -- a
16 simple statement.
17 MS. SCHWARTZ: If -- could you give
18 your name.
19 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes. My name is Ken
20 Crawford.
21 And not since I returned home from Vietnam
22 [cries], not since then, have I seen such
23 disgraceful non-support of veterans.
24 MS. SCHWARTZ: Sir?
25 MR. BASS: My name is Larry Bass.

1 And --
2 MS. SCHWARTZ: Could -- could you
3 spell please.
4 MR. BASS: B-a-s-s.
5 Not discounting the last two fellows that
6 spoke, I'm not a veteran, but I wonder if anybody
7 has looked at buying Jewish Hospital downtown
8 that is financially not the best shape remodeling it
9 and using it for the VA hospital using it for the VA
10 hospital where they're close to other services,
11 other hospitals, doctors don't have far to go. And
12 it makes more sense than building a brand-new
13 hospital out here.
14 Thank you. That's all I've got too say.
15 MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
16 [applause]
17 MS. SCHWARTZ: I see no one else lined
18 up. I am going to offer that no one else wants to
19 speak. And if that's the case, we'll close the --
20 oh, sorry.
21 DR. HASSELBACHER: Hello. My name
22 is -- is Peter Hasselbacher, and I'm a --
23 MS. SCHWARTZ: If you could speak a
24 little closer; it's hard to hear you.
25 DR. HASSELBACHER: Well, okay. Yeah;

1 these are directional, and I should know that.
2 They don't -- they work this way. Keep them right
3 at your mouth, okay, for the next time.
4 There are lots of reasons why the location of
5 new Zorn Avenue hospital out here needs to be
6 legitimately considered; traffic is certainly first
7 among them.
8 A new argument against locating the hospital
9 here that I've heard, though, is that the doctors
10 won't come. And I -- I need speak to against that.
11 I need to say that that's not the case.
12 I've been a VA doctor for -- for all my life.
13 I'm still a -- a -- an executive member of the
14 faculty at the University of Louisville. They will
15 come. We will come. Not only the ones that are
16 being paid to come, and we do get paid salaries
17 from -- from the VA, but we will come because it's
18 part of our mission.
19 Our residents are here. Our students are
20 here. We will come and we will teach them. In
21 fact, it will be easier. I can say that because
22 the -- the trip to the VA that only takes a couple
23 minutes from downtown, but you know that parking
24 lot, if you can find a place, it's another five
25 minutes on your walk. And if you'll look on Google

1 Map, this is only two minutes longer to get -- to
2 get to the VA, and -- and parking will be easier.
3 So do not worry about your University
4 physicians or the physicians that the VA hires
5 themself now. The VA hires its own primary-care
6 doctors, its own hospitalists. They will come here.
7 The -- the patients -- our veteran patients will be
8 served well no matter where they come, whether
9 it's at Zorn, whether it's here, or whether it's
10 downtown.
11 MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you. Could you
12 please spell your name for the court reporter.
13 DR. HASSELBACHER: [no audible
14 response]
15 MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you. Is there
16 anyone else who would like to speak?
17 MR. LOUD: Good afternoon. My name is
18 Carl Loud, L-o-u-d.
19 God bless America.
20 [applause]
21 MR. LOUD: God bless America. We're
22 living in a country where we have the opportunity
23 to express our opinions about just about anything
24 that comes up. I spent 30 years, that's 3-0 years,
25 serving our country in the Navy. I also spent 23
1 years providing healthcare to my fellow veterans
2 at that VA hospital on Zorn Avenue. So do the
3 math; I've been around for a while.
4 And, of course, my comments are emotional,
5 and if I get emotional, I -- please excuse me. But
6 I know every day when I left home that VA Hospital
7 I knew I did the best job I possibly could for
8 anybody and any person that happened to be
9 crossing my path that day.
10 I gave good medical care. And I would put
11 that VA's medical care up against any other
12 hospital in this community, Baptist, Norton, you
13 name it, they're all on about the same par.
14 I don't care where they build the new hospital,
15 just build one. Because I don't care where they
16 come from, Madison, Indiana, Shelbyville,
17 Simpsonville, you name it, they will come. As the
18 old saying goes, build it and they will come. And
19 they will come and they will work there; the
20 doctors will be there; the technicians will be there;
21 everybody's there; the support staff will be there.
22 Everybody will come.
23 The environmental studies, the traffic studies,
24 all these other studies, well, you can study
25 something to death. When I first got here, they
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1 didn't have that new bridge that they just hope
2 opened up because they were too busy studying
3 and studying and studying. Well, finally they
4 finally got it built. Thank God. God bless
5 America.
6 And they will build a new VA. I won't be there
7 working. I probably will die there. But I know
8 they will build a new VA somewhere. Thank you.
9 MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
10 [applause]
11 MS. NORTHRUP: Hi. My name is
12 Eleanor Northrup, E-l-e-a-n-o-r N-o-r-t-h-r-u-p.
13 THE REPORTER: What was the fir -- I
14 didn't even hear the first part.
15 MS. NORTHRUP: Eleanor, E-l-e-a-n-o-r,
16 Northrup, N-o-r-t-h-r-u-p.
17 THE REPORTER: Thank you.
18 MS. NORTHRUP: And I'm up here not to
19 take much time, just to apologize for the outburst
20 back there about cutting down the trees. So sorry.
21 I'm up here to say that the only time we see
22 an impact is a shift change. I'm three blocks from
23 the current hospital. You know, I knew it was
24 there when I moved in. I have several family
25 members [cries], unfortunately, that have been
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1 there recently. Excuse me. I'm up here to say I
2 want to extend an invitation for you to stay. It's a
3 beautiful park-like setting. Despite the fact that
4 you guys have decimated all of those trees, I have
5 a -- I have a very strong belief that ha -- that has
6 a lot to do with the healing process.
7 So I'm not here to say don't put it there, don't
8 put it there. I'm here to say stay where it is. I
9 think that's what the veterans want. The
10 neighborhood would be fine with that. We have a
11 new bridge downtown. We have the bridge in the
12 east end. We're used to that.
13 The only thing that I can say is that it
14 bothered me today when I was reading over the
15 summary that it said no environmental --
16 environmental impact if it was Option C, and no
17 impact to the wildlife if it was Option C.
18 The impact has been done with the removal
19 those trees and it -- it pains me to think that that's
20 a flat parking lot when it could be a parking
21 garage for a possible new facility.
22 So please consider the fact that you could
23 stay there, retain the beautiful park-like setting,
24 and make everybody happy.
25 [applause]
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1 MS. HILBRECHT: My name is Sharron
2 Hilbrecht, it's S-h-a-r-r-o-n H-i-l-b-r-e-c-h-t.
3 My husband is a service member with 23 years
4 in the military. I just want to refute a little bit the
5 thing about the -- the ma -- the physicians.
6 I've worked on this project for four years.
7 The Kentucky Medical Association has passed
8 resolutions saying that they believe as the
9 Kentucky Medical Association that the best care
10 would be downtown for our veterans. There's many
11 reasons why. I -- I have -- I have that online. I
12 can put it out for you guys.
13 I also have a quote from John Roberts, the
14 Vice Dean for Graduate Medical Education and
15 Continuing Medical Education at U of L. This is
16 what he says: [reads] Each day U of L sends a
17 total of 106 residents and fellows to the Re --
18 Robley Rex VA Hospital
19 Approximately two-thirds of the residents and
20 fellows are solely assigned to the VA, but are
21 required to return to the Medical Center Campus
22 for half-day continuing continuity practice clinics
23 each week. Many, additionally, have to return to
24 the medical school campus for their required daily
25 or weekly didactic and clinical case conferences.
Some of the major conferences in medicine and surgery can be teleconferenced, but due to limitations of the teleconference space, availability, many residents need travel back and forth between the VA and the campus. Approximately one-third of the residents and fellows, after making morning rounds at the VA, are on-call for future consults and may have to return to the hospital, if requested, throughout the day and night. I truly believe that the veterans would get better and more timely care at a downtown site and that the resident and fellow educational environment would be greatly enhanced with the VA on the downtown medical campus. I would also like to concur with the fact that my husband and I would get TRICARE Insurance because he is in the National Guard, which means that we can chose our doctor. We prefer that. We don't prefer when he retires to go to a VA hospital. And I'm not sure why we continue to build brick and mortar structures to service our veterans. Let us have the choice where we want to go and be served.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you very much. Anyone else?

AUDIENCE: [no response]

MS. SCHWARTZ: All right. With that, we will close this session of the public hearing on the draft EIS. We will have another session that starts at 6:00 tonight. And again, there will be opportunity to ask questions at the posters, and then we will start, again, with the presentation at 6:30 and then start public comments at 7. Thank you all for very, very much for coming and for your very thoughtful comments.

[WHEREUPON, the Public Comment Meeting, 12:00 to 2:00 p.m. Session concludes at 2:50 p.m.]
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| 32:6 33:16 34:18 |
| 39:8, 11 41:9 |
| 42:13 44:11 50:13 |
| 51:10 55:6, 8 |
| 56:12 58:17 59:2, 4 60:2 72:1, 9 |
| 75:10 83:8, 11, 14 |
| 85:3 87:3 90:19, 21 95:3 96:7 |
| timely | 70:5 93:12 |
| times | 10:18 39:12 |
| 60:19 72:7 82:2 |
| tired | 23:4 63:11 |
| title | 95:3 |
| today | 5:1, 13 9:15 |
| 11:18, 24 18:17 |
| 32:16 38:13 48:11 |
| 56:5, 8, 16, 18 |
| 58:19 61:13 62:14 |
| 70:19 77:16, 19 |
| 79:14, 19 81:17, 19 |
| 83:20 84:10, 22 |
| 91:14 |
| tol | 25:17 |
| told | 25:8 32:5 33:2 |
| tonight | 94:8 |
| top | 64:25 69:1 |
| topic | 48:19 |
| total | 59:19 92:17 |
| tough | 79:21 |
| towers | 53:9 |
| town | 41:6 44:15 |
| tract | 64:18 |
| traffic | 10:2, 4, 8, 14 |
| 14:12 15:24 24:2 |
| 25:8 26:23 30:11 |
| 31:24 34:24 44:19 |
| 47:10, 23 51:2 |
| 54:5 55:11 61:11, 16 64:12, 13, 15 |
| 66:9 71:5, 13, 16 |
| 16 73:17, 24 78:2, 4, 22 82:25 83:19 |
| 87:6 89:23 |
| traffic-wise | 24:1 |
| train | 17:8 |
| Trainer | 55:25 60:5, 6, 8, 9 61:3, 6 63:1, 6 |
| transcribed | 5:23 |
| transcript | 96:10 |
| transit | 82:14, 23 |
| 84:8 |
| transition | 49:20 |
| transparency | 13:16 |
| transportation | 4:17 |
| 12:5 28:13 37:8 |
| 47:3, 5, 16 52:18 |
| trauma | 70:14 |
| travel | 31:23 93:4 |
| traveled | 18:19 |
| traveler | 48:12 |
| TRAXLER | 2:7, 11 |
| 36:6 57:25 |
| treating | 33:22 |
| treatment | 52:25 |
| treed | 50:2 |
| trees | 90:20 91:4, 19 |
| tremendous | 55:11 |
| tribes | 29:5 |
| TRICARE | 93:17 |
| trip | 87:22 |
| trivialize | 35:19 |
| troubling | 25:1 26:3 |
| trucks | 28:9 54:15 |
| True | 35:5 79:11 |
| 96:9 |
| truly | 48:2 66:10 |
| 93:11 |
| trust | 27:22 28:18 |
| 41:16 77:13 |
| try | 3:8 7:17, 18 |
| 10:12 84:25 |
| trying | 9:23 11:23 |
| 51:1 |
| turn | 3:15 4:2, 17, 24 14:9 69:14 |
| turnaround | 22:8 |
| turned | 32:10 76:24 |
| twenty-four | 26:20 |
| twice | 27:16 42:1 |
| two | 17:24 26:15 |
| 27:3, 8, 25 32:25 |
| 40:11, 14 42:21 |
| 55:3, 4 64:10, 13 |
| 67:3 77:24 82:2 |
| 84:22 86:5 88:1 |
| two-thirds | 92:19 |
| type | 15:20 |
| typewritten | 95:7 |
| &lt; V &gt; |
| VA | 1:10 2:2, 12 |
| 3:3 4:6, 25 5:9 |
| 7:1, 5, 12 8:16 |
| 9:17, 19 11:16 |
| 12:12, 19, 21 13:14, 20 15:16 16:24 |
| 32:6, 16 33:18, 19, 22 43:9 44:16 |
| 47:10 49:9, 13, 14, 21 50:1 51:6, 9, 12, 17 52:20 54:1, 2, 12 55:16, 18 57:2 |
| 58:3, 13 59:14, 16 63:24 64:22 65:1, 1, 13 66:6, 11, 15 |
| 70:12, 15, 21, 22 73:19 74:1, 19 77:21 78:13, 23 |
| 79:7 80:14, 15 83:16 84:23, 25 85:7 86:9, 9 87:12, 17, 22 88:2, 4, 5 |
| 89:2, 6 90:6, 8 92:18, 20 93:5, 7, 15, 20 |
| vacant | 40:14 |
| valid | 9:1 |
| value | 24:7 60:14 |
| values | 44:5 78:21 |
| Vanderbilt | 20:3 |
| variance | 45:15 |
| variances | 45:11 |
| variation | 42:10 |
| VA's | 89:11 |
| Vegas | 27:18 |
| vehicle | 61:15 |
| vehicles | 10:5 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Time (HH:MM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>29:12 60:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worry</td>
<td>88:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worse</td>
<td>61:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worthless</td>
<td>36:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would've</td>
<td>48:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wounded</td>
<td>36:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wow</td>
<td>40:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrap</td>
<td>33:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wreak</td>
<td>65:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>31:5 36:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writers</td>
<td>49:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing</td>
<td>5:2 55:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td>13:7 48:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrong</td>
<td>8:9, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrote</td>
<td>10:4 25:15,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 49:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Y &gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarmuth</td>
<td>28:2 36:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeager</td>
<td>25:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28:25 31:4, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32:22 33:17 34:1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4, 7, 12, 16, 19, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35:7, 18, 24 36:1, 4,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12, 17 67:4, 6, 7, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69:17, 23 70:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah</td>
<td>8:24 21:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35:16 52:12 69:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73:3 85:14 86:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year</td>
<td>4:10 5:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26:12 51:14 65:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years</td>
<td>9:23, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21:18 25:3 27:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28:16 37:11 43:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45:3, 4, 5 48:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51:11 52:7 54:4,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 65:14 88:24, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89:1 92:3, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yesterday</td>
<td>13:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you-all</td>
<td>2:21 13:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31:18 34:25 56:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your-all's</td>
<td>32:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette</td>
<td>77:7, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y-v-e-t-t-e</td>
<td>77:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Z &gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td>76:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zoning</td>
<td>42:24 45:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zorn</td>
<td>8:14 33:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35:15 36:5 47:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48:18 49:21 51:4,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 52:5, 8, 21 53:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57:17 60:13 61:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65:14 66:18 68:15,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20, 21, 23 69:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70:11 76:23 83:3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 84:20 87:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88:9 89:2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MR. TRAXLER: Welcome, everybody. I'm Marty Traxler; I'm the medical center director of the Robley Rex VA Healthcare System here in Louisville.

We're here tonight to take public comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the property of Brownsboro Road.

I want to thank Methodist Church for opening their doors to us and letting us have this meeting here tonight. We appreciate it. And thank all of you for coming to take time out.

We have with us tonight our partners from Labat Environmental, Lucy and Susan, and they're going to go through some of the presentation here and then invite David: David is a traffic consultant, and he'll talk mainly, of course, about the traffic. And then we'll open it up to comments.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you, Marty.

As he mentioned, my name is Lucy Schwartz. Thank you, Marty.
And also, if you -- if you decide you want to speak, please feel free to put your name on a list and -- and we'll call you in order.

MS. LEET: Good evening, everyone. I'm Councilwoman Angela Leet, representative for District 7.

MS. LEET: I do want to say I did speak earlier, and I'll -- I'll -- the comments may be a little bit repetitive, but I know there -- so -- I did wait until the end to speak last time, and some people had to leave before my comments were heard.

I also have another comment from a fellow colleague to read into the record that I did not read earlier this afternoon. So I will try to keep it close to three minutes --

MS. SCHWARTZ: And -- and if you can just make -- maybe leave it for Dave -- for for Barbie, too, so she has it. That'd be great.

MS. LEET: I -- I will. This is an extra copy for --

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

MS. LEET: -- that. But --

MS. SCHWARTZ: Perfect.

That the no action alternative does not meet the need for purpose and action. So we need to do something for our veterans.

This process has been flawed since 2009, when we stopped listening to the veterans whose voice was surveyed using scientific methods with 95% confidence, and they said they wanted to stay at Zorn Avenue.

Secondly, their second choice was to move downtown. And their third and last choice was to find a green field, to start from scratch.

Overwhelmingly, the vets here in -- the veteran care here in Louisville is good. And I did want to say thank you. I said thank you earlier to Martin Traxler. I said thank you to the nurses and doctors that work at the VA day in and day out and commit their work -- their life work to providing care to our veterans.

What the VA is not good at is construction. They've demonstrated this to us through their projects in Orlando, their projects in Denver, which we've heard of $1.1 billion overbudget, 1.1.

As I said earlier, I -- I would -- I would bet my salary, my Metro council salary on the fact that everybody added together in this room, we don't make $1.1 billion. Maybe even in a lifetime we don't make that.

The Louisville project is starting to follow the pattern with an overpayment of $3 million on this property. And I don't expect each of you to have read the nearly -- or, over thousand pages of materials that have been accumulated over the last five, six, ten years. But I've -- what I'm convinced is through these documents is that they have not picked the best location for our veterans.

If they had followed the rules from the beginning and if they had not begun to emulate the pattern of past projects, I would be standing next to the Veteran Administration advocating with them. I am not representing just my constent -- constituents, I am representing our community.

And if this continues into the political realm, and they delay the project again, if they have to re-open site selection and they have to blame someone, I'll take the blame and they can take me down from my position, and I'd be okay with that because I fought for the right cause.

MS. LEET: I'm hopeful that they will truly consider all of our comments tonight, and
they won't just hear them and stick them in appendix somewhere, but they will reply individually and honestly and transparently to each one that will speak here tonight. I will be submitting my comments in writing. And then I have one other statement that is very short, and I will read it. This is from my fellow Metro councilwoman, Marianne Butler in District 15. She says: [reads] To Whom It May Concern, I write in favor of a new VA Hospital to serve our veterans at the location -- at a location that is easily accessible for all via mass transit. At question is the current location selection which just underwent an Environmental Impact Statement. The 572-page Draft Environmental Impact Statement favors the Brownsboro Road site despite potential adverse effects related to air quality, aesthetics, noise, land use, solid waste, hazardous -- hazardous materials, transportation, and traffic. Surely, you can see that this location is a bad fit for all and offers no room for growth. A downtown location, a south Louisville location at the old Iroquois Homes, or a location at 18th and Broadway will better serve our veterans and are readily accessible via mass transit. At the south or west Louisville locations the development is greatly needed. Jobs are needed and the domino impact of development would transform the neighborhood. I urge you to consider the decision to build off -- to build off Brownsboro Road. Government spending of this magnitude should help redevelop the neighborhood and spur additional development, not tear apart a neighborhood and make it more difficult for veterans to get to the facility. Sincerely, Marianne Butler.

MR. HICKS: I -- I don't know if all the additional cost, obviously close to a billion dollars, were included for the hospital, but there at 18th and Broadway will better serve our veterans and are readily accessible via mass transit. At the south or west Louisville locations the development is greatly needed. Jobs are needed and the domino impact of development would transform the neighborhood. I urge you to consider the decision to build off -- to build off Brownsboro Road. Government spending of this magnitude should help redevelop the neighborhood and spur additional development, not tear apart a neighborhood and make it more difficult for veterans to get to the facility. Sincerely, Marianne Butler.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Next -- next up is John Hicks, followed by Fred Johnson, followed by Rob Givens. MR. HICKS: Hello. My name is John Hicks. I want to say that we need for our veterans a new or updated hospital. It is very important. We owe them that. But I also think that this project is the wrong project, the wrong location.

Veteran preference has been shown in surveys that I think Councilman -- Councilwoman Leet mentioned, that the -- the majority of veterans do not want this in this location. Demographics and show that they prefer the existing location. Regarding the EIS. I believe that this EIS is not valid. There was no comparison of using the existing location and improving that. I know it was said that it's difficult to improve that location, but it's not impossible. Also, I think it was a waste of time and a waste of money to include the Factory Lane site. It's fairly common knowledge that that site has been under contract by a local developer since early this year. So admittedly they had started the process before then, but they also were originally going to have their -- their EIS ready by February. And it was around March, I believe, that it went under contract. So they should've dropped that and looked at other alternatives. I don't think the EIS is valid.

MR. HICKS: I -- I don't know if all the additional cost, obviously close to a billion dollars, were included for the hospital, but there are infrastructures in -- of costs; electrical, sewage, all of those things. And I'm not sure many of those costs are included in this or whether they're expected to be borne by taxpayers in Kentucky and Jefferson County and Louisville. When you talk about accessibility, and this is negative, not a positive, because we have veterans scattered all over the county and all over the state. But regarding accessibility, they are saying that the intersection that they're talking about is going to mitigate the additional traffic. (1)

although it's been said that it is funded, if we all know the State of Kentucky's finances currently and probably in the future, I think there's a good chance that funding going away. And they build a hospital and that doesn't happen that's even worse for the veterans. Let's see. I don't know that that studies actually really included the impact based on I-60 -- I-264 and 71. Right now, on any given evening on 264 east bound going onto I-71
at 4 or 5:00 it will be backed up all the way to Shelbyville Road. And that's if there's not a problem on I-71. My understanding is that they're going to expand the ramp from 264 east to 71 to two lanes, but 71 is still only two lanes wide, and there are no plans anywhere to expand that. So it -- it's just a nightmare getting in and out of there. And it's not fair to the veterans sitting through that all the time. That's just the nighttime traffic; morning traffic is -- is just as bad. They say that it would not significantly contribute to the degradation levels of service at the intersection of US42 and Kentucky 22. The reason that it want significantly increase that degradation is because it's already at a Level F, and there's nothing lower than Level F.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Hicks identified the two major reasons, accessibility and veterans' preference. I think those both speak to themselves, so I'm going to talk about two other things that are associated with that. And that -- one is that insufficient number of forces of action were considered when we developed this proposed move. We didn't consider any locations seriously in the south end or the west end. I think we should bring economic impact to our city, and we could do that by bringing the VA to one of those locations where the underserved of our community can best benefit them. I will tell you I spent over 30 years, and there were 30 years of my life rebuilding other countries. I want to try to rebuild my own. If I bring the VA to where it can have the biggest economic impact that's best for our city and best for our citizens.

MR. HICKS: I'm -- I've got --

MR. JOHNSON: And finally, and most importantly, I believe -- I believe that the biggest threat to our national security is wasted government dollars.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Next is -- next is Rob Givens, followed by Mr. Burden, followed by Larry Hilton.

MR. GIVENS: I'm not sure I can follow with the passion that Colonel Johnson has brought to the equation. But I'm Rob Givens. I'm 27-year Air Force veteran, former Brigadier General in the Air Force. And I am also a disabled veteran.

MR. JOHNSON: Please, no applause for that. I chose my profession. And I chose what I intend to do for our country. We veterans are not a special interest group. We have relevance and we have needs [phonetic]. And I'm asking of the members of the Veterans Administration who will make the decision on where this hospital go take into account the statements of all the previous speakers, which I
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1 agree with completely.
2 But there's another aspect that I want to bring
3 up that ties into that. In the healthcare of
4 veterans I have no doubt in everyone in the room's
5 intentions to provide the best possible care of the
6 veterans. But care is so much more than just the
7 physical act of caring for our bodies.
8 We've been at war for 15 years, gentlemen.
9 And the spirit of my generation of veterans is at
10 stake. And nothing, nothing will be more relevant
11 to these men and women who have tried to build
12 communities across the globe to allow them to
13 build a community here in Louisville.
14 And we can do that by the strategic placement
15 of this hospital where it provides the best
16 economic impact, the best second and third order
17 impact, and is truly accessible for all.
18 The current location as planned does not do
19 that. This area does not need the economic
development. It doesn't need the extra jobs. It
20 doesn't need any of the things that will come with
21 this hospital. But if we place it in an area, if we
22 take a look at other courses of action to place it in
23 a more depressed area, we can change a
24 community. And you can give relevance to the men
25 and women who tried to do that across the globe
because they can do it at home.
26 And if we can move this hospital, we could
27 end up placing a statue of a soldier, sailor,
28 airman, Marine and Coast Guardsman that says
29 this community is saved by the American veteran.
30 Give us that opportunity to look at other courses
31 of action to do that.
32 Thank you.
33 [applause]
34 MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
35 [applause]
36 MS. SCHWARTZ: We have Mr. Burden,
37 followed by Larry Hilton, followed by Pat Roles.
38 And, I'm -- I'm sorry, your first name.
39 MR. BURDEN: Huh?
40 MS. SCHWARTZ: Your first name?
41 MR. BURDEN: Pardon?
42 MS. SCHWARTZ: Your first name? I
43 couldn't read it.
44 MR. BURDEN: Joe.
45 Good afternoon -- or, good evening. I'm Joe
46 Burden, a retired Sergeant from the United States
47 Army. I had 27 years of military service. I have
48 lots of medals. I am disabled.
MS. ROLES: Thank you very much.

AudiencE: Thank you.

MS. ROLES: Good evening. Thank you for coming. Can you hear me?

AudiencE: Yes.

MS. ROLES: I'm Pat Roles. I'm married to a proud marine, Alan. We've lived in this area 40 years, and we've seen huge changes.

The VA Hospital would be a total disaster. I spoke this afternoon, so I'm not going to go into the detail I did. But like every other meeting I've been to in the last four-and-a-half years, I came away with more questions than answers. I want real answers when you finalize the EIS. I think you owe that to the veterans and to the people of the community of Louisville, not just in this area, but the whole community.

First of all, there are a number of different sets of veteran figures in the EIS. Why? They range from 66,000 to 68,000. Why is that? Do these figures include the fact that they will be closing three community-based clinics? How do we know they won't close the other five community-based clinics?

They say they'll have an employment for some 3300 construction workers over five years. Only I noticed tonight on the screen they expect 500 construction workers each year. Where are those people going to park in this area? I only know about one vacant lot and that's across from Ballard High School; it's a two-lane road, Herr Lane. They don't need more traffic over there. They have enough.

When will the Transportation Cabinet actually build -- well, I should first say: When will they get funding? When will they let the build bids [phonetic]? And when will they build the intersection that we need so desperately already? They're saying 2019. They talked about the bridge for how many years? I think that intersection needs to be built before they even dig the first shovel of dirt in this area if they really do.

As far as setbacks go on the property, they're talking about 100 feet from the end where the office building is, I think. They're talking about 200 feet of a setback from the City of Crossgate. 200 feet doesn't help when you're building a hospital of 10 stories and 12 stories looming over 2-story and 1-story houses. Keep that in mind. They're drawings, I think, are very, very misleading.

And finally: Why was the St. Joe property called. Marsha Hicks. Marsha Hicks. I think I was called. Marsha Hicks.
Some of the ways to mitigate haven't been approved or have other impacts that -- like people losing their homes along 22 and businesses along 22.

The traffic, bottom line, is that the veterans and their families and their caregivers are going to be sitting in gridlock trying to get in and out of the facility. This is not in the best interest of the veterans.

Another thing that's about to change, and I don't know how it's been considered, is that it seems like there will be an increase in traffic on I-71, 42, and 22 with all the people going to and from the East End Bridge that is set to open this fall -- or, this winter; sorry.

There's no access to it from 42, so anybody who lives out there has to get to it either from the Snyder at 22 going north to the river or via 71. Accessibility is a huge issue. It creates additional risks of accidents and harm to those who live here, especially if ambulances and fire trucks and other emergency services can't get to us when we need it.

Another aspect is future expansion. Hopefully, there will be a decrease in the number of future veterans. But if it comes to a need to expand, there's no place to go. This seems very short-sided and a bad use of resources that should go to help our veterans.

Due to the many issues associated with this property, I request that another location be chosen as soon as possible to provide veterans with the care and accessibility they deserve without spending another dollar trying to cram it into this unsuitable site.

Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Now Larry Kirschenbaum, followed by Kirk Hilbrecht, followed by Richard Estes.

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Good evening.

My name is Larry Kirschenbaum. I live in the City of Crossgate.

I'm not going to go into any long remarks about the various aspects; other people are doing that much better than I. I just want to go through -- remind you of a little bit of the history of these meetings.

The very first meeting was back in about 2011, 2012 that was called for the area residents at the Thomas Jefferson Unitarian Church. At that time we invited the people from the VA to come and speak to us. And we thought, you know, that was very nice; they're coming; they're going to talk to us; everything was going to be fine. That was the high point.

[laughter]

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Since then, at every meeting, there have been requests for comments. I don't know how many hundreds or thousands or millions of comments have been provided to the VA, comments that have been given at one meeting or repeated again at the next meeting and then the next meeting. And there has been zero feedback from any -- to any of those comments.

I just want to know: Is there anyone here who can speak to this and -- or guarantee us that these comments are that are being provided here tonight will actually be addressed and answered and not just some justifications that will end up in the final EIS?

Thank you.
Section E.4.1

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Kirk Hilbrecht, followed by Richard Estes, and Shelby Taylor.

MR. HILBRECHT: Well, good evening.

Sorry about that. Good evening. I'm Kirk Hilbrecht. I'm the Mayor of Crossgate. I'm a 23-year-old -- or, 23-year veteran.

MR. HILBRECHT: That would be great, wouldn't it. I'm also a -- currently a member of the Kentucky National Guard.

I do have some comments about the EIS. As a citizen and a local resident, I am extremely concerned that the VA property transaction occurred prior to a true environmental study, as per regulation. And so, for the record, please note that Crossgate is requesting a time line and detail of the property transaction.

Number 2 is accessibility. And I don't think anybody had an easy breezy time coming into this meeting here. As you know, this area is currently -- this whole beautiful area here is -- is quite candidly is over built. Just try getting into the new Kroger's [sic] and you'll know what I'm talking about.

MR. HILBRECHT: So basically, having this hospital being built in this location we're going have the same issue.

Veterans like myself will have an accessibility issue just getting to the hospital. I promise you, even being adjacent to where this hospital is being proposed, I'm going to have a hard time just taking that left-hand turn to make it to the adjacent property. That's going to be a big, big deal.

Water runoff. Now I'm speaking on behalf of the residents of Crossgate. We're going to have some issues with water runoff.

Graymoor-Devondale and the -- and -- and the mayor of Graymoor-Devondale and those people on their council, as well as ours, are very concerned about water. The water, it's not going have any place to go since there's not going have any green there. And it will run right into our neighborhoods and their neighborhood. It happens.

Also we have sinkholes and flooding because, I mean, this is kind of an -- a cavernous area. You ever heard of Cave Hill? I mean, we have lots of caves around here. So that's what's going to happen as well for our neighborhood.

Now, sustainability. Our -- I'm very proud that our -- our oldest daughter is into sustainability. And when you really kind of peel back the onions, you kind of see what that's all about; it's not just a bunch of tree-hugging things.

It's really talking about what's going to happen tomorrow. Where is this 50-year-old development going to be tomorrow? Where -- what's it going to look like in this area?

And as Marsha Hicks had mentioned, the only place that this -- that this hospital can go to grow is push us out, and we don't live in Crossgate no mo'. I mean, I'm serious. We're going to -- there's nowhere else to go but out, not up anymore on this property.

So what does that mean, that the VA hospital can invoke, and has it in their guidelines, to invoke eminent domain. Which means, again, if you're going to grow this area, the neighborhood is going have to say, for all of us -- all of us veterans, it's time for you to go. And candidly, as the Mayor of Crossgate, I'm not cool with that.

And again, when -- specifically when you take a look at Robley Rex that we just talked about, where it's an old dated facility. It's 60 years plus, and they're still building on it to make room for the veterans. Again, I only see that happening here as well in smaller space.

And last but not least, talking about sustainability, is guys and gals and VA people, let's get out of the property business. I currently am a member of TRICARE; I can go anywhere I need to to get the care that I need to anytime and it doesn't cost as much as actually owning a brick and mortar facility. And it's something that we can make happen today versus waiting for those time lines to give us the best care that we need.

Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Richard Estes is next, followed by Shelby Taylor, followed by Michael Yeager.

MR. ESTES: Good evening. I'm afraid I might be a little bit of a black sheep on you tonight, but back when this started, I was the...
MR. TAYLOR: I don't think so, but I could be wrong.

MS. SPEAKER: But that's what it says.

MR. SPEAKER: Yep. It is.

MR. TAYLOR: 104.

MR. SPEAKER: 104. It was in the paper today.

MR. TAYLOR: That's interesting.

Because I was told that by the time -- you're the man that knows. How many beds are there there, 104?

MR. SPEAKER: [no audible response]

MR. TAYLOR: That's amazing. I had somebody tell me there were over 200 beds.

Well, my point is, that's not enough beds.

Speaking to this lady here, I was in the Orlando Veterans Hospital four days after it opened. They have about 130 beds, I believe; 40 of them devoted to psychiatric arrest. And the building is magnificent. It's the most beautiful building a -- for a VA hospital I've ever seen.

But at least half of it is for administrative offices, which is just a joke when you really think about it. So, I -- I -- I don't think that's the answer.
MR. TAYLOR: That's all I've got - that's really all I've got to say. Thank you. [applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you. [applause]

Michael Yeager: I talked -- spoke a little bit earlier at the other meeting.

To answer a couple of questions that have come up, one, they are moving the veteran's benefits group out to this facility. Now that's 3- or 400 people, I think it says in the EIA. So, yes, there will be more offices than what you currently have at the VA.

I spoke about some something different -- well, actually I -- I will repeat myself a little bit. You can put a parking garage, a large parking garage in what I call the "gully" in front of the existing VA building. You'd have to get rid of a parking and build your new facility. That type in it --

MR. SPEAKER: Could you stop for a minute, sir?

MR. YEAGER: Yes, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I can't hear you for somebody over there talking.

MR. YEAGER: Okay.

MS. SPEAKER: Sir, can you stop talking please [phonetic]?

MR. YEAGER: I'll get a little closer to the microphone.

You can use the existing facility to do two things, actually move the veteran's benefits area into that into that, in the lower levels. It's still good for office space. And you could put assisted living up on top of it. Those are things that I'd said earlier.

And with a little grace, I'd like to address some other issues.

One, I think the veterans are basically trading accessibility issues from Zorn to here. At Zorn you have no parking; here you're not going to be able to get to it.

MS. SPEAKER: That's right.

MR. YEAGER: I mean, traffic is -- is bad. I -- I just don't know any way to say it. And to give you an idea of the way that they hope to change the traffic, Highway 22, which is currently three-lane highway, they're proposing four to five lanes; Highway 42, which is currently four to six lanes at the intersection, they're talking 7 to 8 lanes; Lime Kiln Lane, which is currently three lanes, they're turning into five lanes; Herr Lane, from Ballard High School over to Westport, they're - which is currently two lanes, they're turning into three to four lanes.

The funding that's supposed to be committed for this, funding from the - the state only occurs on two-year intervals. That's the way the fiscal budget is set up in the State of Kentucky.

So, 2019 they may have funding dedicated to it, but they do not have funding committed to it. And they may not for another four or five or ten years.
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1 Lane that they say they're going to have to improve. LG&E has purchased a site between the Temple and I-71 that they're going to put in the second electrical substation and route that stuff through there.
2 They say that the buildings are -- one is 160 stories, as I recall, and they say it's an -- an 8- to 10-story building. That's hospital numbers. That's not real numbers as far as a - a normal building. A normal building is around 12, 12-1/2 foot floor to floor. So we're looking at probably a 12- to 15-story building sitting there.
3 The other building is supposed to be a 105 stories high. That's, approximately, 9 to 10 stories on a regular condition.
4 We're looking at two parking garages, one that's six stories and one that's eight stories.
5 There's not a parking garage outside of downtown Louisville that is over three stories, at all. You can go around, you can look at hospitals, you can look at -- Baptist East is the exception; I think theirs is six stories.
6 They're going to put in a laundry facility. I was talking with a friend here just while ago, and
7 he was telling me that the laundry facility for the VA may still, he's not sure, I'll ask Mr. Traxler about this: Do you currently still bring in laundry from other facilities in -- such as Cincinnati and everything do that here?
8 MR. TRAXLER: We do Lexington, sir.
9 MR. YEAGER: You do Lexington now.
10 So, you know. . .
11 MS. SCHWARTZ: If you could -- if you could summarize the rest of your points, please.
12 MR. YEAGER: -- all their stuff. I'm --
13 I'm close.
14 MS. SCHWARTZ: Okay.
15 MR. YEAGER: This facility that we're building is for a 50- to 70-year time frame. That's the way you build hospitals. You don't plan for 10 years or 15 years like you would a Walmart.
16 Well, what's going to happen in the next 50 to 70 years? Ten years off. And I'm -- I'm going to give an opinion a little bit on the downtown facility.
17 In five years it's projected that we will have cars that will drive themselves, ten years on the outside. You go in, you punch a few buttons, you say what you need -- where you need to go, and

Table E-2

1 it'll take you there, downtown, Zorn, Fegenbush Lane, wherever.
2 Some of us are not thinking long-term. And I'd like to say, I think the VA is one of the worst on this. It's been addressed for a little bit before, but this site is maxed out so bad that there is no expansion. The reason they're building a six- and eight-story parking garage is -- is because they don't have room for a regular parking or expansion.
3 Thank you.
4 [applause]
5 MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
6 [applause]
7 MS. SCHWARTZ: Next is Kara Estes, followed by Mike whose last name, I believe, starts with "V," and after that will be Mr. Keane.
8 MS. ESTES: Hello. I'm Kara Estes. I'm a commissioner and resident in the City of Crossgate. And I don't really have a whole lot to add, but I just want to piggyback on what Angela Leet says, Marsha Hicks, and a couple of other people talked about looking at alternative sites.
9 But I wanted to talk about, again, from the very beginning, the VA has been in violation of their requirements, you know, from the very beginning in choosing the site. They're in violation right now, and I wanted to cite that violation. According to the Council of Environmental Quality, their Regulation Section 15012 [sic], which talks about the alternatives that are supposed to be included a proposed action. I'm going to read it. It says: [reads] This section is the heart, the heart, of the environmental impact statement. Based on the information and analysis presented in the sections on the Affected Environment. . . and the Environmental Consequences. . . it 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 among options by the decisionmaker and the public. It's supposed to evaluate the reasonable alternatives. Folks, there is no alternative in this EIS.
10 MR. SPEAKER: That's right.
11 MS. ESTES: The alternative is a site that the VA can't even buy. So it is an invalid EIS.

Section E.4.1

Course Reporting Services, Inc.
502.899.1663
We have put that on record, it's invalid. And if the VA thinks they can get away with it, I -- I'm just flabbergasted that they have the gall to come out here and do this EIS without having a comparative analysis of a valid and reasonable site.

That's all I have to say.

Ms. Schwartz: Thank you.

Ms. Schwartz: Are you Mike?

Mr. Vairin: Yes, ma'am, Mike Vairin.

Ms. Schwartz: Can -- can you spell your last name, please.

Mr. Vairin: V-a-i-r-i-n.

Ms. Schwartz: V-a-i-r-i-n.

Mr. Vairin: Yeah.

Ms. Schwartz: Thank you.

Mr. Vairin: That's Mike Vairin. I don't write very well.

Ms. Speaker: Michael Vairin --

Mr. Speaker: Face the mike, please.

Ms. Speaker: -- face the mike.

Mr. Vairin: A couple of comments. I'm a veteran --

Ms. Speaker: Closer.

Mr. Vairin: I'm a veteran. I've never had to be forced to use the hospital here, but I've had friends that have and they rave about the service and what they get from your staff, et cetera. And so I applaud you for providing that good service to our veterans here in Louisville and in Kentucky.

I live in this area. My biggest concern is accessibility. I know we've heard this ad nauseum. When we talk about accessibility, we're not just talking about people that's living in the neighborhood, we're talking about people that need to use the hospital and get to it in a timely manner.

And we all know, when you don't feel good or we have relatives that don't feel good, if you get stuck in traffic 20 or 30 minutes, that increases the anxiety and the discomfort that people that are older or that are under a lot of health pressures have to endure. It's total lack of respect to expect these people to -- to have to sit in that type of environment, which is going to happen.

Of course, we live in -- in this neighborhood you know you've got four schools, at least four schools, maybe five, that empty into this one location here that has to get on the freeway.

Someone earlier said something about I-264 today, you -- you say the traffic that is beginning at Shelbyville Road at 4 in the afternoon, I've seen it go beyond 264 backed up, and it lasts for two hours. It's the same way in the morning.

Now, if you have emergencies, you have people wanting to get to the hospital in a normal course of business that are patients, you expect them to sit on for I-264 for two hours to get to a hospital, and let alone people that live in these areas.

The presentation that was given a couple years ago from the highway department about this interchange, I understand, based on what comments were today, that you-all included this type of traffic either from a development, commercial development or a hospital into those numbers.

Well, I applaud you. I hope you did, because if you're -- if you're going to not build that interchange before you build this hospital, that's a disaster. You're talking about gridlock. Nobody in this whole area will be able to move. Forget about the Krogers [sic] and all these places. But the bus -- the businesses in these areas will die because of gridlock. Forget about the future.

At the end of the day, we -- we -- our country is experiencing a lot of challenges. The biggest challenge is credibility of government. Re -- regardless of what -- what your pol -- your policy or your party affiliation may be, to me, it's credibility.

The VA administrative staff on 60 Minutes and other reports for these other hospitals is a total disaster when it comes to administration. They may be great when it comes to delivering healthcare; when it comes to administration and credibility, it's a zero.

And, I'm sorry, you-all are professionals. I was a professional. If somebody told me that, as a professional, I'd want to dump -- jump in a hole somewhere.

And I thank you for your service to this country for -- for working with the VA, but you're not thinking about the veterans first that need healthcare when you do something like this. There are other locations. But downtown is not a good place, that's fine. Go down to Ninth Street; you've got all that property down Ninth Street. You've got an interchange down there. Go to 23rd or
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<tr>
<td>1. wherever it is, you've got another interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. down there with plenty of vacant land that all flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. and ready for develop -- well, it will enhance the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. environment down there from a commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. standpoint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. So, this may be a done deal. If it is, chalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. another one up for government credibility, or a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. lack of, in my mind anyway. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[applause]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS. SCHWARTZ:</strong> Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[applause]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS. SCHWARTZ:</strong> Mr. -- Mr. Keane is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next, followed by Alan and I -- I'm sorry, I can't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read this last name, either Bond maybe and then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>followed by Sharron Hilbrecht.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. KEANE:</strong> I -- I'm sorry that she could</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not read my name because I have the onslaught of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson's disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But I think we're missing the whole point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tonight. Abraham Lincoln, and I'm not a quoting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person, said he was going to take care of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veterans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. SPEAKER:</strong> Yes, he did.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. KEANE:</strong> I understand the people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that are here in their neighbors that don't want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm going to tell you a little story. I worked in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction for 30 years. We did the Old St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Hospital; we did Baptist East; we built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audubon -- is that what they call it now, I don't --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not sure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS. SPEAKER:</strong> Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. KEANE:</strong> There is no way that you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cannot re-do this beautiful hospital and not disrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the patients or what is going on. I did it for 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years. I know how it works. It will not work on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownsboro Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If anybody in their right mind were would drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out there at 3:00 in the afternoon, when the nurses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes shift, when Ballard gets off, the traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be a nightmare. It should stay where it is,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where it was intended, and they can upgrade it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It doesn't take a scientist to do that this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm -- I -- I just don't understand how putting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>something on the Watterson Expressway is going to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>express my views as a veteran. I like it when I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go out there. I was out there yesterday. My</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointment was two hours late. Fine with me. I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walk around the grounds --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS. SCHWARTZ:</strong> In -- in front of the microphone,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. KEANE:</strong> I walk around the grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They're beautiful. What are they going to do with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that land if they disband it. I -- I just don't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understand. I don't think -- and I understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every person here that wants their house to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protected and not have a lot of traffic I understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But, like I said from the very beginning,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Lincoln said he was going to take care of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me. And that's all I want to say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[applause]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS. SCHWARTZ:</strong> Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[applause]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS. SCHWARTZ:</strong> Next is Alan, ag --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>again, I apologize, I can't read the last name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. BIRCH:</strong> That's okay. Once my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative assistant accused me or writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with my toes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS. SCHWARTZ:</strong> So, I'm sorry, what is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your name?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. BIRCH:</strong> Alan, A-l-a-n, Birch,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-i-r-c-h. And there are only about five ways to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spell each of them. I am not a veteran. And --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and I was not able to serve. But I do appreciate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of you that have and who serve now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the questions is: Are we all being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>injured [phonetic] not in my backyard? Well, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean, I looked at the computer simulations on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownsboro Road of 2025 properties and it's just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not credible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table E-3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section E.4.4.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table E-3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section E.4.4.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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higher is it lower? I don't know. They didn't tell me.

Transparency and -- and what they seem to be -- basically, I am wondering what they're trying to hide. Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Sharron Hilbrecht, followed by Joe Malloy, and then Jim, and there is no last name for Jim.

MS. HILBRECHT: Hi. I'm Sharron Hilbrecht. I spoke a little bit this afternoon. I am a resident of Crossgate, a taxpayer, and the wife of Kirk Hilbrecht, who is a veteran with 23 years of service and currently in the Kentucky National Guard.

This afternoon I spoke about the Kentucky Medical Association and resolution that they passed saying that they support the downtown site because they feel like, as physicians, they can better serve our veterans if the veterans are where they are, where the doctors are.

One doctor said to us that if he has a veteran that is in the VA hospital and it's -- and he needs to check on him, it's fairly easy for him to get to Zorn a couple times from downtown. But if he is -- the veteran is at the new location, the veteran might get checked on in the morning and then not get again maybe until the next day or maybe not until that night. So that's something that when we think about veteran care we need to consider.

My other concern is with the environmental justice impact. On the back page of this it says there's no impact on the environmental justice. Well, let me just point out that when many of you men and women who've served our country during Vietnam and Korea were drafted into the Army, or the Navy, or the Marine Corps, you came from a variety of locations in the Jefferson County area.

It didn't pick from one location or a ma -- have a bunch of ma -- of folks in one location.

Now that we're a volunteer military, the majority of the veterans that are in Jefferson County, if you look at the 2010 census, live in the ZIP codes 40272, 40216, 40258, 40214, 40299.

They are not in 40222 or 40207. They're not in Prospect. They're not -- they're not where we're putting the hospital. The other --

[applause]
MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Joe -- Joe Malloy is next up, and then I believe maybe it's Jim Wallace after that, and Irene Yeager is the last person who has signed up.

If anyone else would like to sign up, we have our signup sheet at the table or when we -- when we finish with Irene Yeager and people want to speak from the audience, we will -- should have time for that as well.

MR. MALLOY: First, I'd like to say that there are -- I have met a lot of great people that work at the VA and provide services to the veterans.

My name is Joe Malloy. I've been an administrator and employee at Robley Rex for the past eight years. I'm also a veteran and caregiver for a severely mentally ill brother suffering from military service disability. As a result, I have then dealt with VA policies and health treatment issues for over 40 years.

Additionally, after my military service, I was in the insurance industry. Later, I moved into healthcare management.

Before continuing, I want to iden --

acknowledge Angela Leet, Metro Council Member. Her recent article in the Courier-Journal gives all concerned parties time not to ignore vital facts.

The main thing I want to bring up here is that when it comes to choosing a new site, I strongly favor the present location on Zorn Avenue. For one thing, it well exceeds 50 acres, much larger than all the sites being considered. Also, if you're an engineer and can't do something with that site, please get out of the profession.

[laughter & applause]

MR. MALLOY: Apparently the favorite site is the one near Watterson Expressway, Brownsboro Road. In my opinion, this would be a major mistake, if for no reason other reason that this location, others, would be a traffic nightmare, especially for veterans having to drive long distances and who aren't familiar with the Louisville area, including the future aging veterans, as well as aging staff members. Here, this country, worldwide, we're about to hit a tsunami in healthcare. Brace yourself.

If properly done, the Robley Rex site could be a case study format for future VA hospitals.

It also offers the opportunity for college students majoring in architectural design and engineering to provide input. This would allow students to obtain credit in their chosen field while gaining real word -- world experience and helping to design future VA hospitals.

If the facts have value, then how much do we know that is true? I don't think we can come to a proper conclusion for a new VA hospital if we're not asking the tough question. If the VA is going to build trust with veterans in the public, then best practice is truth telling, where trust is built and which illuminates transparency.

If your approach is critical thinking, then you can't apply absolutes to right and wrong thinking, but you're usually right because your facts and reasoning is right. We must not fear for tactics of a bloated organization or a federal agencies that utilizes plausible deniability where a non-negotiable view and fairness have no meaning.

That is, if the outcome is to desensitize the truth.

The VA objectives should be to maintain, enhance, improve the quality of life for every veteran. When it comes to mental health, the VA, along with the private sector, has been unwilling to commit the resources to provide necessary resources for the next -- for the most severely inflected patients.

We have an aging veteran population and workforce. In this regard, we need recognize the following: aging compromising; cognitive and physical coordination, reaction time is limited; failing eyesight affects ability to process imaging; hearing loss affects mental health acuity, increasing loneliness, isolation, and anxiety; memory problems appear; more depression and neurological disorders; abuse of prescription and illegal drugs; drug interaction and monitoring is crucial.

We have a national shortage of providers to provide healthcare services. Nationally, 25% of doctors are 65 plus and likely to retire soon. Even with licensed -- increased licensed of nurse practitioner, physician affi -- assistants will not fill the void fast enough. This includes many health and support specialties positions.

In -- in summary, we have ri -- arrived at an inconvenient truth and a point of no return as follows: healthcare, in general, evoke strong...
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1 motions, more so when uncertainties lie ahead.
2 Many editorials and concerns have settled on
3 accessibility, site preference, and a strong
4 emphasize emphasis on political and economic
5 impact. We will never reach a consensus. The
6 last shred of hope will be caregivers, family, and
7 close friends who, in looking ahead, face
8 unrelenting demands and hardships in providing
9 the support for veterans in meeting medical
10 appointments and compliance issues of the future.
11 I will add, because maybe I haven't gone over
12 my three minutes. I --
13 MS. SCHWARTZ: Actually you have, but
14 I was cutting you some slack.
16 I've been through all this. I'm an
17 ex-healthcare administrator. I've been to over 400
18 different types of facilities in the United States. I
19 won't laugh; I'll leave.
20 [applause]
21 MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
22 [applause]
23 MS. SCHWARTZ: Jim Wallace, I believe,
24 and then Irene Yeager.
25 Did I get your name right?
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1 MR. WALLACE: Close enough.
2 MS. SCHWARTZ: Okay.
3 MR. WALLACE: Good evening. I'm
4 jimwalshstudio.com.
5 I am a photographer, been a photographer in
6 Louisville for about 30 years. I own a 70-year-old
7 studio. I write a -- a journalistic piece for the
8 Portland Anchor.
9 A few weeks ago I did a piece I think you'll
10 find -- might find interesting that pretty much says
11 the same thing that I've heard you folks say this
12 evening. The thing that has come to my mind in
13 this is obviously VA is not building this hospital
14 for living veterans.
15 The veterans that are sitting in this room
16 tonight are not the people it's going to serve. We
17 are looking at 50 years out. So my question to VA
18 quite simply is: Who are you building the hospital
19 for, is it for veterans that's going to be living in
20 the next decade, the next two or three decades, or
21 are you building something for wars for veterans
22 that are yet to be veterans.
23 Thank you.
24 MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
25 [applause]
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1 MS. SCHWARTZ: Irene Yeager is the
2 last person who is signed up to speak.
3 MS. YEAGER: I'll try not to go over.
4 MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
5 MS. YEAGER: First of all, there was a
gentle --
6 MS. SCHWARTZ: A little closer to the
7 mike.
8 MS. YEAGER: First of all, there's a
gentleman that came this afternoon. He was one
9 of the last to speak. He was a veteran. And he
10 was very upset. And I wish to apologize to him.
11 We're not here to offend the veterans; we're here
to Honor them. We're here to see that they get the
best facility possible. And the Midlands is not the
place. It's the wrong location and it's the wrong
choice.
12 I would also like to say that I met with most of
you-all at meetings that represent the VA. I'm
ashamed to know that I'm looking at people who
are unprofessional, who are indignant, who
ridicule us when we question them, and I -- I'm
going to go over the site selection committee and
evaluate.
13 First of all, I'd like to read you a page from
14 the EIS. And I want to know -- I want an answer
tonight. I don't want to wait. [reads] The
15 Brownsboro site has not been approved or
16 developed by the VA absolutely. And it can be
used by the VA for any other purpose or sold
17 should the VA choose another site for the
18 proposed VAMC.
19 Well, if you're going to sell it, you really made
a big mistake. You wasted a lot of money, and you
should've reconsidered that before you even
purchased it. You broke the law anyway because
you should've done an EIS before you purchased
the property. So, you know, we're having to pay
for your mistake.
20 This afternoon there was mention of a 2006
study and it covered traffic and it covered square
feet for a planned development. This is what the
com -- planning commission said, and they did not
recommend building there until they covered
parameters.
21 [reads] Staff recommendations. Staff
22 recommends approval of the zoning change
request, the forms district change request, and
23 plan development, along with the associated
binding elements -- which the VA apparently

Table E-2

Section E.4.1

Table E-3

Court Reporting Services, Inc.
502.899.1663
Deposition of VA Public Meeting on November 15, 2016-one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 65</th>
<th>Page 66</th>
<th>Page 67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>doesn't have, contain within this report -- if the traffic concerns can adequately address and sufficient detail be provided to the mass issues of mass and scale -- you-all haven't done that yet. And what it was approved for -- nothing about hospitals -- offices, single-family residential, retail, restaurants, hotel, apartments, and condominiums. A hospital, a $1.3 billion -- or, billion square foot hospital -- or $1 million -- let me start over. 1.3 million square feet of hospital does not -- is not covered in residences or restaurants or even a hotel is not that big. The other thing I wanted to discuss was the recommendation for the development more dense than a single-family is contingent upon substantial improvement in the transportation system. Have we mentioned traffic before? Do you get the program? This may require a delay of office development until the completion of improvements such as Herr Lane extension, Westport Road exchange, et cetera. So if you-all had done due diligence, we wouldn't be standing here talking to you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. SCHWARTZ: All right. You have the floor. MS. YEAGER: Okay. The acquisition team was developed on -- the site selection committee was created and -- and met and con -- conducted their survey on May 11th through the 13th, 2010. These are the people that were on the acquisition team. Jacqueline Post, Wayne Pfiffer, Bob Moray, Tommy Wright, Katie Smith, Jeffrey Lincoln, George O -- Ordereese [phonetic]. George Ordereese is present tonight. Wayne Pfiffer moved from -- trans -- was transferred from here, Louisville, to Hawaii, and was fired last January. I -- I have a problem with this site selection committee for the simple reason nobody, nobody was represented as a veteran and nobody was represented from Louisville. There was no architect; there was no planner, no city planner, nobody that would be qualified to survey the properties and say this is -- this is the one that makes sense. So I question this entire board. On March 12th, 2012, Wayne Pfiffer came to our neighborhood of Crossgate. He said he was, quote, &quot;[He] was sorry that he had not consulted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Page 68 | |
|---------| |
| the residents sooner. The hospital will be 800 square feet with -- with 109 beds. One or two parking garages, two water towers, et cetera, et cetera. The environmental study and the traffic study for the development would be completed in the near future," and that he would provide copies to our mayor whi -- at the present -- at that time. We never saw copies. We never saw anybody from the VA be friendly or come forth with information or answer our questions. We were the adversaries, and we were tra -- treated like red-headed stepchildren. Then I met George Ordereese on November 15th, 2012. And he stood up and said, "Oh. It's not necessary to have an Environmental Impact Statement. It's -- there's no need for it." Well, I -- I disagree. I disagree with you wholeheartedly. I think you just, you know, I'm going to get my paycheck anyway, so . . . If I did that in my job, I wouldn't have a job. And lastly, on July 11th, I was minding my own business, and I threw this envelope up on the counter where I put my mail, and I didn't look at it; it didn't -- you know, it didn't occur to me to look |

---

Table E-3

| [applause] | |
| MS. YEAGER: [examines document] An applicant is incorporated under design measures that exceed the minimum of the district which compensate for non-compliance with the requirements to be weighed or the restriction application of the provisions of a regulation would deprive applicant of the reasonable use of the land or create unnecessary hardship on the applicant. So deal with that. |

| [applause] | |
| MS. YEAGER: Okay. MS. SCHWARTZ: You're -- you're at about five minutes. MS. YEAGER: Oh. MS. SCHWARTZ: Just -- MS. YEAGER: Okay. MS. SCHWARTZ: -- to say. MS. YEAGER: I'm going to cover these gentleman in the front here. MS. SCHWARTZ: I'd -- actually bef -- before you even -- you can continue, but if -- is there anyway else who wants to speak after Ms. Yeager is through? AUDIENCE: [no audible response] |
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| 1 at it. There is no return address. It's all computer-based, there's -- you know, it's a mystery package. It's a mystery package to everyone. If there's anybody in here that sent this to me, I thank you from the bottom of my heart because this is the information we wanted to know. These are the foyers that we've ha -- we've entered and never been answered. I have the answers tonight. This is what was in it. It came from Philadelphia and the MDAC, who did a study for the veterans, and these are our findings. They study was done on July 2009, and veterans were called together. There was a random sample of four thousand -- of 3900 veterans who use the medical center. They randomly selected them by phone call and had certain questions to ask. They tried to interview 510 veterans; they interviewed 537. These were the choices that were given to them; renovate Zorn, all care downtown, inpatient and outpatient at Zorn. Here it is in black and white. Overwhelmingly, overwhelmingly, overwhelmingly, 60% wanted Zorn. That's in blue. And these people on the site selection committee ignored this, ignored it, refused to admit that this is what it is. I don't know why. But somebody's going to have to answer for it. The des -- desirability that Angela talked about, there's a 70% -- 70.2% to renovate Zorn, top line. Then they compared Zorn to downtown or outpa -- inpatient at downtown. Okay. The desirability for Zorn was 70.2, neutral was 9.6%, and undesirable twenty -- 20.3%. Downtown, combination neutral and desirable was 41.1%, undesirable is 58.9%. Not staggering numbers, but I -- you know, I appreciate all that you veterans do. I -- believe me, I -- from the bottom of my heart. I experienced Vietnam right along with you-all. I was on the other side of the pond. It was a painful, painful year for -- years for all of us. Then there was a town meeting. And none of the residents, none of the neighbors, none of the citizens of Louisville were invited to this. We were excluded. There were very few people that went to this except for veterans, and this was what was found. Hang on. Okay. I'm just going to read it verbatim. [reads] Total of a hundred and ninety -- ninety-four comments were received, 20 were phone calls, 15 were verbal comments, and fif -- 115 written comments. Veterans' preferences is com -- concerning the location of the hospital: a hundred a twenty-through -- 122 preferred staying at Zorn, 26 preferred being built at a green field, 22 reported any location was acceptable, 12 preferred a new down -- a downtown area, 6% preferred a hospital built anywhere but downtown.

Section E.4.4.4

Six proposed sites were a -- were also presented. 26 of the veterans prefer a green field, 15 at the Brownsboro site, 8 at the Fegenbush site, 3 at Factory Lane, and 1 preferred at any other field. So overwhelmingly, 89%, once again, want to stay at Zorn. But when we talked to vet -- when we talked to the VA, they would tell us, "Oh, well, you know, they always want to stay where it's -- where it's home." Well, why not let them be at home? Why not? I don't understand why not. The veterans that are still alive, there are 9% that are World War II or before. There -- the overwhelming majority is 70.6 veterans from Vietnam War and Persian War -- War. Part of the mystery letter. Outpatient is -- outpatient/inpatient visits, 87% of them use outpatient at least once a year, 19% use inpatient once a year. There you are. Okay. We're getting to the Midlands. MS. SCHWARTZ: I'm -- I'm going to let you finish, but just let me ask: If there is anybody else who wants to give a comment when Ms. Yeager --

Section E.4.2

MS. YEAGER: -- these three things.

MS. SCHWARTZ: No. No. No. That's fine. I just wanted to make sure that people knew that they still could comment.

MR. SPEAKER: I am [phonetic].

MS. SCHWARTZ: I'm sor -- okay.

MR. SPEAKER: When she's finished.

MS. SCHWARTZ: That's fine. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Let her take as long as she wants.
MR. YEAGER: This is the colossal mess at the Midlands. This is the traffic circulation at the Midlands. This is the entrance, exit, emergency, deliveries, visitors, doctors, nurses, everybody comes in here, everybody leaves in here. This is the emergency room portion of the hospital, and they -- they have to go all the way around -- all the way around to exit. And my house is right about here. And I get to look at parking garages and gas fumes. I don't think so. I'm a cancer survivor. I don't want to have any more toxic air in my a -- my lungs. Thank you.

These are our homes; these are the hospital buildings. It's going to be worse than this. We're not being told the -- the honest truth. I want to hear from architects that say it's going work. I don't want to say hear from somebody that's come from the VA, that's paid by the VA, to tell me my in -- the information I need to know because I don't believe what you-all say.

And last, I have met Fred -- Colonel Fred Johnson. Bless his heart. Thank you so much for speaking up. I appreciate it terribly. And rushing to failure is exactly what you are doing.

Thank you.

MR. STEWART: I wish we had a court reporter here, because I real -- I truly believe this is being shoved down our throat. I don't really think we have a -- a -- a say -- [applause]

MR. STEWART: -- in this whatsoever. [applause]

MR. STEWART: Because I'm one of the people that has a property that backs right to where one of those parking garages is.

Supposedly the parking garage is going to be 60 feet off the back property of my house, where my daughter's bedroom and my son's bedroom is. We're going to hear tires from people when it's raining, squealing around the corners in the parking garage. That's a very small part for me.

The traffic patterns. Everything that we've been discussing tonight is not being really, truly considered. I don't think they're really taking us seriously. I don't think they're going to give us the -- the truth of really why this is being put there.

I don't think the whole thing that came about -- [applause]

Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

[applause]

MS. SCHWARTZ: If -- if you could please --

MR. STEWART: Sure.

MS. SCHWARTZ: -- say what your name is and --

MR. STEWART: Sure.

MS. SCHWARTZ: -- spell it for the court reporter --

MR. STEWART: Sure.

MS. SCHWARTZ: -- that'd be great.

Thank you.

If there is anyone else who wants to speak, if you could like up over there that would be great, and we'll call you in turn.

MR. STEWART: Hello. My name is Jeff Stewart. I live in Devondale [phonetic].

I wasn't even going to speak tonight but I -- I'm just kind of curious watching everybody here how many believe that's still in the audience that this is a done deal? Raise your hand?

AUDIENCE: [complies]
zero green space for the veterans to get outside; there's no place for the veterans to get fresh air, walk around.

I also know -- I've got videos on my phone from what my backyard looks like after a -- slightly heavy rains. Once you build a concrete jungle, I can assure you, without a doubt, no matter what the engineers try to tell me, my house will flood.

I've got a neighbor right here, who's right next to me, he will tell you we can paddle a canoes, I can get my jet ski out right now, there's a property that is landlocked that my -- my mother- and father-in- law own, it gets two to three feet with the heavy rain.

You wait until they build parking garages and everything else and all that runoff comes our way in our neighborhoods. This is a disaster. They're not discussing it. They're not telling us the truth. That's all I have to say about that.


THE REPORTER: I'm sorry -- Jeff Stewart?

MR. STEWART: Stewart. S-t-e-w-a-r-t.

THE REPORTER: Okay.

MS. SCHWARTZ: And -- and just, again, if you could state your name, please.

MS. ROLES: Yeah. I'm Pat Roles. I just want to really thank Irene and Mike Yeager for leading our efforts in researching the VA hospital because, frankly, they, and with some assistance from me and some other people, did a better job than the VA did in writing this ridiculous EIS. It is a work of fiction.

Thank you.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Again, if you could state your name.

MR. MALLOY: My name is Joe Malloy.

I'd like to -- to add that I think what I hear from everybody in the few meetings I attended briefly is there's great concerns about this study, and rightfully so. As I said earlier, you would never get away with this in the private sector. I've been there.
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The Meeting in the matter, on the date,
and at the time and place set out on the title page
hereof.

It was requested that the Hearing be
taken by the reporter and that same be reduced to
typewritten form.
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<tr>
<td>wanting    47:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wants      4:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66:23</td>
<td>72:11, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>war        17:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71:25</td>
<td>72:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wars       20:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waste      9:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:11, 12 15:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wasted     15:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watching   74:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water      3:14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:13, 15, 19, 19 40:12, 22 68:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watterson  50:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wave       79:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way        13:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:8, 9, 21 42:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47:5 50:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73:7, 8    77:17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne      67:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ways       26:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51:23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we, 6:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weeks      62:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weighed    66:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome    2:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well       23:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:18</td>
<td>31:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:15</td>
<td>37:20, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42:18</td>
<td>45:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:3</td>
<td>52:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55:15, 22 57:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58:9, 22 64:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68:18</td>
<td>71:20, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>went       11:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70:24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We're      2:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:25</td>
<td>30:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:15</td>
<td>33:21, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:14</td>
<td>41:11, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42:14</td>
<td>46:10, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:19</td>
<td>54:18, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55:8, 22, 23, 23 56:21 58:23 59:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worldwide  58:23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worse      12:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73:15</td>
<td>76:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worst      43:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worth      40:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would've   56:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wounds     20:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Page: 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrap</td>
<td>14:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>67:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write</td>
<td>9:11 45:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing</td>
<td>9:5 51:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td>4:10 25:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrong</td>
<td>10:25, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:12 35:2 59:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63:16, 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Y &gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarmuth</td>
<td>76:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeager</td>
<td>32:22 34:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:6, 10, 11 38:11, 14, 17 39:7 42:7, 11, 14 57:5, 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61:24 63:1, 3, 5, 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66:2, 12, 15, 17, 19, 24 67:3 72:12, 13, 15 73:1 78:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah</td>
<td>45:16 78:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year</td>
<td>11:15 23:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52:8 70:19 72:6, 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years</td>
<td>8:8 14:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:11, 12 17:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:24 22:17, 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:10, 24 25:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:2 34:11 39:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42:17, 17, 19, 19, 22, 23 47:13 50:3, 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52:11 53:15 57:18, 22 62:6, 17 70:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79:11, 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yep</td>
<td>35:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yesterday</td>
<td>19:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:19 50:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you-all</td>
<td>47:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:14 63:19 65:4, 23 70:17 73:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Z &gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>21:1 28:17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COMMENT FORM

**Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus

### PLEASE PRINT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Organization:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>City:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>Zip:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add to Mailing List:  

| No | Yes |

Comments:

--

Comments must be postmarked by **December 12, 2016** or send via email to  

LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
WRONG SITE !!!
WRONG USE !!!
I003_Anon3  Note: This comment is identical to I002_Anon2 but was submitted separately.

WRONG SITE !!!
WRONG USE !!!
IT’S
THE
TRAFFIC!
The Location of the New V. A. Hospital

The proposed relocation of the V.A. Hospital on Brownsboro Road is not the best site for the project. The current traffic situation on the outlining I 264 is already one of severe congestion. During even normal hours there are complications in cars and trucks gaining access to North bound I 71. During more heavily traveled hours there are backloads from I 71 as far back of St. Mathews. Exits to both Westport Road, Brownsboro Road and I 71 are congested at times for miles of car to car traffic. At such times access to the proposed hospital would be seriously impaired. Furthermore, the area offers only limited public transit access for employees who will working at the facility, not to mention accessibility to V.A. patients and their family members.

Associated with the traffic congestion will be a increase in the level of air pollution in the area. There is now scientific evidence that air pollution creates small nano particles that have been discover enlarged in the brain in the millions. The net result of these accumulations of oxidized particles has yet to be medically determined.

Alternatives that have been suggested have been to convert the projected area as an cemetery extension for graves of those who have served their country in our military. While preferring this alternative I would propose another alternative namely that of a property switch with properties currently housing the downtown offices of the American Red Cross. This would allow hospital and medical assistance in a centralized local where there is access to other prominent medical hospital facilities and physician offices. This location would also provide greater access to both V. A. patients and the employees of the hospital facility. Red Cross offices would have less transportation issues than a proposed suburban hospital and would provide services to the outlining community.

Dr. Joseph Brennan
2911 Creekside Dr. Lousiville, KY 40241
jbren10266@aol.com
(502) 742-0620
Veterans Administration Hospital on US 22: Will It Work Against Our ‘Culture of Health’?

By Christina Lee Brown, Dr. Kathleen Lyons, John Stough, Keith L. Runyon, Eric Gunderson, Sharron Hilbrecht and Gill Holland.

The stories in Sunday’s Courier-Journal Forum section that proposed ways to attain a “Culture of Health” in Louisville were most exciting in their promise of a locally emerging system of values that would place a priority on the health of the residents of this community. This enlightened culture would urge us to consider health in all policies that impact public well-being, and in all decisions made by government acting on behalf of the people they are elected to protect and serve.

Here in Louisville, there’s a decision that is being made that in many ways promises to work against a culture of health. The siting of a new Veterans Administration Hospital on a 34.5-acre lot on the Brownsboro Road exit of the Watterson Expressway is inconsistent with the values of a “Culture of Health” in a number of ways.

- The location, the result of an inside deal with no public discussion prior to its announcement, is in the midst of an already highly developed commercial and residential district in Eastern Jefferson County. Issues of air pollution, traffic, public safety and growth have not been adequately answered.
- A draft environmental impact study of the site calls this the “preferred” site over other choices “despite potential adverse effects,” according to a Courier-Journal story last week. In fact, one of the other sites examined – the current medical center on Zorn Avenue – would be the least damaging option with respect to traffic, public safety and growth issues, and possibly with respect to air pollution as well.

The report lists a number of problems with the Brownsboro Road site, including air quality, aesthetics, noise, land use, solid waste, hazardous materials, utilities, transportation and traffic. However, The C-J story reported, the environmental study “reported that any problems fall within acceptable limits except for aesthetics.”

From 2012, when plans for building the hospital on the Brownsboro site were announced, other fundamental questions that are as significant as the health issues have been raised. The most basic of these is the decision to build the six-story, 1 million square foot hospital, in a location that is isolated in the midst of suburbia, with no room to expand. Furthermore the site is nearly ten miles from the downtown medical center, where veterans would have ready access to the very best equipment, specialists and expertise. Perhaps most disturbing, the physical distance...
reduces the opportunity to be part of important research that can make the physical, psychological and spiritual health of our veterans.

These concerns embrace our community’s financial health, not to mention our veterans’. Would this hospital site be in the long-term financial interest of the community? Will inevitable expansion mean unnecessary community stress over issues like eminent domain in the neighborhoods adjacent to the site? Will it mean costs for paving and traffic control. And will more parking lots and cement buildings that are neither sustainable nor “green” improve the heat island crisis in our region? And what of the six-story height? Combined with the density this hospital poses zoning challenges for the entire area. Will Holiday Manor’s next incarnation be a six-story shopping complex? Who is to say no, if the VA hospital is built at that scale?

Synergy is critical to healthy life in all areas, but in no area more than health care. Medical issues are not isolated, especially with our wounded veterans who have been exposed to harsh conditions and dangers that are unimaginable to most civilians. Why should they have anything other the best and most comprehensive care that addresses all of the complex issues that attend their illness?

It was no coincidence that until the Brownsboro site was named four years ago, best minds had decided that the new hospital should go on a downtown site. Unfounded fears of crime have been reduced substantially since that time. What is more, expanding development downtown has made it a more promising site than ever.

It is up to our local representatives – including Sen. Mitch McConnell, Rep. John Yarmuth and Mayor Greg Fischer to advocate for the health and well-being of all Louisvillians, and our veterans, in particular. Clearly the proposed site for the hospital on Brownsboro Road is not reflective of the Culture of Health that places a priority on our entire community.

Christina Lee Brown, founder, Institute for Healthy Air Water and Soil; Dr. Kathleen Lyons, retired executive director, Center for Interfaith Relations; John Stough, principal broker, Kentucky Select Properties; Keith L. Runyon, retired editorial page editor, the Courier-Journal; Eric Gunderson and Sharron Hilbrecht, president and board member of Grow Smart Louisville; and Gill Holland, co-developer The Green Building.
**COMMENT FORM**

**Draft Environmental Impact Statement**
**for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Organization:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>City:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 Pkwy 0.1</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State:</th>
<th>Zip:</th>
<th>Add to Mailing List:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

I am a 90yr old WW II vet
I am not in favor of taking the VA away from here
There is too much Traffic
No need for a 3rd level area
Please do not
Put the VA here

Comments must be postmarked by **December 12, 2016** or send via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
**COMMENT FORM**

**Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

**for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Jacqueline A. Cooke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>719 Greenridge Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip:</td>
<td>40207-1307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add to Mailing List:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

The traffic going east toward Prospect (from at least Hubbard's Lane) from 2:30 pm on is an abomination, and get, steadily worse — without any construction or additional traffic load that the new VA would add. This traffic would last well into evening if no impeding enough alone to building at this site.

It is now longer a secret (if it ever was) that the choice of this site was based on the sale of this previously "white elephant" you're of land ... for the sole benefit of the obviously very well-connected individual!!! (who not only underbid this property that made off like a bandit — considering the over-inflated price)!!

I (have you ever worked as a Physician Assistant) at a VA Clinic, and it's a one-ender patient I know did not want to move from the Zion facility. They felt it is their own — it is quiet & peaceful — yes, it needs to be renovated or completely rebuilt, but it is in an much better location, according to those concerned. This new hospital grounds have no aesthetics, what so ever which is also important.

Comments must be postmarked by **December 12, 2016** or send via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
This is a sweeping miscalculation as regards traffic fiascos. Thy experience now on Rudy Lane alone, at traffic hour on the evening is 50 minutes from the curve to get to 42.
**COMMENT FORM**

**Draft Environmental Impact Statement**
for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Gary Householder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>1304 Houseworth Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>Zip:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>City:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add to Mailing List:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

I am for the proposed location -

The Hospital is a Regional Hospital -

Most vets don't like the idea of going down town, one way streets, & the public traffic -

Few vets are in west central Louisville who use VA (other than some homeless) TARC lines are available for those few who would need it -

Traffic coming to VA in A.M are coming in & not outgoing - Afternoon - Reverse of traffic flow - leading while residents are returning -

Why not follow trend of Jewish Norton & Baptist & move treatment center where people live & want to be served -

Comments must be postmarked by **December 12, 2016** or send via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
Draft Environmental Impact Statement
for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus

PLEASE PRINT

Name: Shirley H. King
Address: 6832 Brownsboro Rd
State: Ky.
City: Louisville
Zip: 40222

Comments:

You need to do a new study on traffic. I have lived in the area for forty years, and the traffic is
50% worse now in 2016 than it was in 2006. That was 10 years ago. And doesn't apply to 2016.
Your study is no dated. Stay
up with the times. It's 2016!!!
I012_Montgomery_M

Mrs. Schuhmann A. Montgomery
2109 Newmarket Drive
Louisville, Kentucky 40222

Dec. 15, 2016

Dear Judy Williams,

I am so sorry that I am unable to be there tonight to beg you not to place the Veterans Hospital — the Robley Rex VA Medical Center at 800 Zorn Ave. in Louisville 40202.

My husband, Schuhmann A. Montgomery, and I built our home at 2109 Newmarket Dr. in Northfield, at Northfield Estates. It is of major concern for us. The traffic is already so dense. We need your help. I am in my mid-eighty now.

Why are we so sad? Because it is so terribly unfair. My husband died of a heart attack in December 2001. We are good neighbors. Please understand that we are trying our best to cope with this major problem.

This is a waste of taxpayer dollars. Please help us. Please.

Sincerely,

Margie Montgomery
I am truly sad to have to labor under the weight of unnecessary reality that "everybody" in government, medical and elected development are and have been thrust into disastrous VA project beyond ability and long-term neighbors of the community. As such, it is my belief that the traffic congestion will only get worse with this Midland's location, existing expresssion, all along US 42 are irreconcilable and will undoubtedly get worse under the proposed development, overloaded thoroughfare, daily vehicle volume and congestion accelerated by already existing poorly constructed traffic signals misplaced vegetation and the unquantifiable human frustration exerted by local residents and visitors.

When there are truly viable alternative locations, stubborn and recalcitrant insistence on the Midland's location is despicable and draconian for the well-being of veterans and local residents alike.

This a travesty with no specified details justifying why the new site is OBSOLETE, seems to work regardless. Honestly, no one making the decision LIVES in or around the proposed site!!!
COMMENT FORM

Draft Environmental Impact Statement
for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus

Name: David Morrow
Organization:

Address: 615 Sycamore Ln.
City: Louisville

State: Ky Zip: 40207

Add to Mailing List: ☐ No ☐ Yes

Comments:

Better surgery for surgical patients
Better public transportation

Comments must be postmarked by December 12, 2016 or send via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
I015_Shostle_J

COMMENT FORM

Draft Environmental Impact Statement
for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus

PLEASE PRINT

Name: Jon Shostle
Address: 5917 Ashwood Blvd. Dr
State: Louisville
City: Zip: 40207

Organization: 
Add to Mailing List: □ No □ Yes

Comments:

As Matthews needs something that will bring in revenue for the city, the traffic is terrible as is now.

The most logical location would be downtown. The traffic is terrible. It would be a great place robot.

What is Mayor's & McConnell thinking? Making a name for themselves, thinking of citizens in the area. Would it all the housing money that was paid for that property ever be sold and show what it was worth.

Comments must be postmarked by December 12, 2016 or send via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
**Please Print**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Organization:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom SPRINGER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>City:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2110 APPLE ORCHARD LN</td>
<td>CRESTWOOD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State:</th>
<th>Zip:</th>
<th>Add to Mailing List:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>40014</td>
<td>□ No □ Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

I am opposed to build the VA at the Midlands site. It is bad for Vets, the neighborhoods, traffic and sound planning. Louisville is the city. There is sound reason for the public controversy. This decision is arbitrary and capricious. It was pre-determined, and since from the VA has been trying to defend it. That is not how the NEPA laws is supposed to work—it is supposed to be open and transparent. The decision was made years ago, behind closed doors to benefit the then-landowners. The fact that the VA purchased the site before the process is clear evidence of a pre-determined decision. I hope this goes to court. The Federal judge will see your process was arbitrary, capricious, and against the overwhelming public opposition.

Traffic alone is a nightmare. It is not just the US 42/1-264 intersection, it is 1-71. Every day it breaks up US 60. The redesign will not help the 1-71 bottleneck. The hospital will only make it worse, especially for the veterans.

Please be responsive, objective and select either the 1-265 site or the No Build.

Comments must be postmarked by **December 12, 2016** or send via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
I017_Suter_M

COMMENT FORM

Draft Environmental Impact Statement
for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus

PLEASE PRINT

Name: Marcy Suter
Organization:

Address: 203 Winding Bluff
City: Louisville

State: KY Zip: 40207
Add to Mailing List: ☐ No ☐ Yes

Comments:

With the existing horrific traffic congestion at highway 42 and the Watterson Expressway, my major concern is the impact of the proposed interchange at 42 and the Watterson on the rebuilding and this proposed location. It is not large enough. Our government has failed us again by examining something down our throats that is not the best location for our veterans residents of the projected site, or taxpayers at large.

I retired from VAMC Louisville Dept of Surgery in 2010. At that time many of the doctors knew there were not in favor of the Brownsboro Rd location for a new VA hospital.

Comments must be postmarked by December 12, 2016 or send via email to LouisvillereplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
November 15, 2016

Letter to Representatives of the VA Hospital Commission:

Regarding the future location of the VA Hospital, we heartily endorse the position expressed by Christina Lee Brown, Dr. Kathleen Lyons, John Stough and others in a letter sent to the Courier-Journal as seen in the Sunday, November 13, 2016 edition.

Not only do these writers explain very succinctly why the proposed location for the hospital off Brownsboro Road is such a mistake, but they also present many excellent points why other locations are preferable.

A downtown location for a 21st century VA Hospital reaps many advantages from a proximity to other medical facilities, but there is much to be said for rebuilding on the present site of the hospital. The property, already owned by the VA, has more than adequate acreage which allows for future expansion, ease of access with in-place highway and mass transit systems, and virtually only a few miles distance to the cluster of downtown hospitals. These advantages are quite apparent and easily grasped. But one other great aspect of maintaining the VA Hospital at its current site is its lovely treed, pastoral setting. If mind and soul are important to healing, so are the setting, clean air, and comfort of access. These aspects are far superior at the Zorn Avenue site to any other possible location.

In promoting our thoughts about the logistics and practicality for endorsing the VA Hospital on Zorn avenue, we additionally would point to the following points:

The VA seems incapable of building its new "campus" facilities on time and...
reasonably within budget. After 15 years and cost overruns of 1.7 billion, the Denver VA is not only over budget, but woefully behind schedule and when it opens next year, on the very day that it opens, it will be too small for the population it is projected to serve. The Orlando VA is 213 million over budget and the New Orleans facility is 100 million over budget.

There are architectural and construction firms specializing in on-site hospital additions, renovations and expansions. Houston's MD Anderson Cancer Center, Baptist Medical Center South in Jacksonville, FL and The University of Virginia Medical Center (which is a 500 bed hospital without adjacent land for expansion) are just a few of the successful on-site hospital projects.

Since the current Louisville VA hospital facility situated on approximately 47 acres has been successfully operating at the Zorn site for 60 years, it seems more efficient to expand, renovate and upgrade on site.

# there would be no need to involve or negotiate with the dept. of transportation to reconfigure roadways, access and traffic flow. (This area around Brownsboro is way over capacity now for all the commuters that must go this way.)

# if according to the VA that "parking is the biggest issue" at the Zorn site, a larger facility (3 outpatient clinics, the hospital and administration office) on a smaller acreage (Brownsboro) is not going to solve that problem. Solving parking issues on a larger parcel of land are significantly less costly than building a new campus facility.

# if a state of the art treatment facility is needed (a specific, targeted purpose), perhaps a smaller "satellite" VA facility near the existing medical complex downtown might be beneficial.
# Building a larger facility on a smaller site (Brownsboro) seems to preclude any future expansion.

# the number of beds stays essentially the same on a site (Brownsboro) that is significantly smaller. Is future hospital bed expansion possible at the Brownsboro site? If the number of beds has not been a factor in relocating to Brownsboro, what are the factors? And, if physical space (patient beds) is really not an issue, construction, renovation and upgrading at Zorn seem most cost effective.

# If physical space is an issue, a larger site will have more room for expansion. Further, "towers" can be built at Zorn as well as at Brownsboro.

# The infrastructure is already in place at the Zorn facility.

Thank you for giving consideration to our point of view on the location of the VA Hospital site.

Susan DePree
Prospect, KY 40059

Kate Talamini
Louisville, KY 40207
## COMMENT FORM

Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus

### PLEASE PRINT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>HAROLD TRAINER, VETERAN USAAF RET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>30539 CHAMPIONSHIP CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip:</td>
<td>40659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>PROSPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add to Mailing List:</td>
<td>[ ] Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments:

The Brownsboro location is not appropriate due to congestion, crowding, community conflict. The VA should remain at Zorn unless justified as inadequate. It is not now, if Zorn Ave VA site is not justified, an alternate site other than Brownsboro Rd. Downtown is probably most appropriate.

Brownsboro location is an environmental mess, and expensive.

Comments must be postmarked by December 12, 2016 or send via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
**COMMENT FORM**

Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>James F. Wilson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>6711 Wolf Rd Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>Ky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip:</td>
<td>40231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Environmental issue/preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Routing and other problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add to Mailing List: [ ] No [ ] Yes

Comments must be postmarked by **December 12, 2016** or send via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLEASE PRINT</th>
<th>Organization:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Roth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Northfield Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add to Mailing List:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No</td>
<td>□ Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

I attended the 1/15/16 meetings. Many speakers had excellent input. Please listen to these speakers!

Veterans and local residents do not feel 40222 location is appropriate or desired by anyone.

Put downtown, rebuild on current space or zero and start that needed development that has good public transportation.

Please listen to the public!

Comments must be postmarked by December 12, 2016 or send via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
**Comment Form**

**Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>DAVID L. CHANDLER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>6403 HARPVALLE RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip:</td>
<td>40222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>U.S. CITIZENRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>LOUISVILLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

Common sense and good judgment dictate that any new V.A. medical center not be located at 4906 Stranburg Rd Louisville, Kentucky in such close proximity to such undesirable residential neighborhoods, which already find themselves overrun with significant traffic problems.

Additionally, the 4 to 5 year construction time will cause huge disruptions for thousands of citizens on a daily basis. Doesn't the V.A. have centers for the well being of all U.S. citizens, not just its own.

The need to "build-up" the vacant 10 acres above current needs 500 acres to allow for infrastructure to be built is ridiculous. Can't we rethink the amount of land the neighborhoods will be gaining. The one outcome can be horrible.

Financially speaking, the country's National Deficit dictates that we should be spending another billion dollars on any hospital especially one that involves a majority of veterans and local physicians that should be constructed on the Bemis/Burg site. Thank you for your consideration.

D. L. Chandler

Comments must be postmarked by December 12, 2016 or sent via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
COMMENT FORM

Draft Environmental Impact Statement
for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus

Please print

Name: Gay Harmon
Address: 3106 Northfield Drive
City: Louisville
State: Ky
Zip: 40222
Add to Mailing List: [ ] No [ ] Yes

Comments:

As with most government projects, I am concerned that this EIS is presented to the public after the property is already purchased and the alternative B site is no longer a viable option. The public once again loses faith in government when we are given a "choice" after the fact.

Concerning the stance of the EIS that little to no impact on the public for the Beroards site is like saying an extra cup of sugar a day for a diabetic will have little impact. Traffic in this area is grim at best, especially from 3-6 pm and adding a million plus visitors a year defies common sense. Additionally, the comparison of the hospital versus commercial use of the property is based on information from 2006. How can a 10 year old study be used to justify your premise while I'm very skeptical that they budget would influence anything since the deal needs to be done.

For the record, I oppose this project.

Comments must be postmarked by December 12, 2016 or send via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
The VA hospital needs to be kept on 20% acre where the veterans where it is. Do not put it on 22 where the traffic congestion and pollution will be terrible. All the citizens who live there are dead set against it. Please listen to our vets and our citizens and do what is best for them. There is no green space on the site. It is being institutionalized. This is not going to help property values.
## Comment Form

**Draft Environmental Impact Statement**
for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus

### Please Print

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Organization:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUSAN A. DEPREE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>City:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6949 Harrods View Circle</td>
<td><strong>PROSPECT</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State:</th>
<th>Zip:</th>
<th>Add to Mailing List:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KY</strong></td>
<td><strong>40059</strong></td>
<td>□ No ☑ Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments:

1. Has the Brownsboro site been tested for environmental radon exposure? If so, what were the results?
2. At the Brownsboro site has a cost/benefit analysis and/or feasibility study been performed for the proposed use of geothermal energy? If so, who performed the studies and what were the results?
3. What is the long-term environmental impact of using geothermal energy at the Brownsboro site?
4. Has the VA (or others) done any formal and/or rigorous analysis of the potential of on-site (Zorn Ave) upgrading, renovating, modifying, mitigating or rebuilding in whole or in part? In other words, has there been any written, in-depth analysis of the deficiencies at Zorn facility and why the deficiencies cannot be remediated? If so, who prepared the analysis and what were the results?
5. What long-term contingencies or plans are in place for any future need for expansion at the Brownsboro site? How does the VA propose to expand this site for future needs?

Comments must be postmarked by **December 12, 2016** or send via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
November 21, 2016

The Veterans Medical Center
800 Zorn Avenue
Louisville, KY 40206

RE: Proposed New Veteran’s Hospital

Attention: Judy Williams

I am writing in opposition to the proposed location of a new Veterans Hospital at Brownsboro Road and the Watterson Expressway and offer several alternative sites that I believe should be considered. The negative environmental impacts of building a new hospital at the Brownsboro Road location would be significant, and in the case of many of the negative impacts they cannot be overcome, especially with regard to traffic volumes and air pollution.

Alternate sites which I believe should be considered, include the Broadway site in downtown Louisville recently rejected by the Walmart Company, the Clarksdale housing area and the now abandoned Food Port property. Factors favoring these sites include:

• Easily accessible by public transportation and the interstate highway system.

• Within reasonable proximity of the existing Medical Center in downtown Louisville, where many doctors who serve the Veterans Hospital patients have their offices and medical equipment.

• Existing infrastructure in place to serve a new VA Hospital (e.g. roadways, water, sewer, gas and electricity).

If a downtown location was selected, the Brownsboro Road site could be developed as a Veterans Cemetery as an adjunct to the Zachary Taylor National
Cemetery, which will surely need to be expanded to serve future veterans. A Veterans Cemetery on the Brownsboro Road site could include extensive landscaping and screening to mitigate existing air pollution at this extremely busy traffic intersection.

While the current EIS did not consider these alternative sites as these locations were not available at the time the EIS was prepared, this fact should not obviate reopening the EIS to evaluate these alternatives, or other downtown locations. The cost of an expanded EIS would be minimal in comparison to the nearly billion dollar bricks and mortar cost of a new VA Hospital in the wrong location.

I also wonder if creative architects and construction managers could not come up with designs and construction methods that would make the current Zorn Avenue VA Hospital location work for many years to come.

Sincerely,

Hunter G. Louis

Hunter G. Louis
ATTN: Judy Williams

In reading Inside Louisville, notations concerning a new location for the VA hospital, I am concerned that the east location would not be great for anyone that travels that area regularly. When Gene Snyder backs up from heavy traffic, accidents, what will this mean for our veterans coming for care? More time, more anxieties and only God knows what else.

Please consider the West End corridor as suggested by Councilwoman Angela Lee et al. This location could be all you need it to be, with all the help needed for veterans, this could simplify the situation in many ways.

A Concerned Citizen

L. P. Skipton
PO Box 16842
Louisville, KY 40256-0842
Dear Decision Makers,

Please, please, please don't build the new VA hospital at the intersection of 264 and Brownlows Road. That intersection is nearly intolerable right now. It would be cruel and unusual punishment to force elderly or mentally ill veterans to attempt to get through that traffic at any time of the day.

Why can't you recover the money you have already spent on the site? The approved site was clearly wrong and the money spent to buy the property was grossly inflated. It was not a market price.

The entire community is opposed to this site.

The choice of that site will be detrimental to veterans, to the citizens and to the already tarnished reputation of the VA.

Yours truly,

(mo) Raleigh Ridge
5403 Poindexter Creek Ct.
Prospect, Ky. 40059
M-009

November 21, 2016

Robley Rex VAMC
Att: Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office
800 Zorn Avenue
Louisville KY 40206

Comment Form
Draft Environmental Impact Statement
For Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus

The **proposed** site for the new Louisville Veterans Hospital at Watterson Expressway and Brownsboro Rd. is wrong, wrong, wrong.

**Wrong for the veterans.** Many will have to travel great distances from Dixie Hgwy, Taylor Blvd, West Louisville and Southern IN and encounter long traffic delays at this location. And, there is NO plan or space for future expansion. The veterans deserve better, much better especially considering this new facility will cost about ONE BILLION dollars or more by the time it is furnished.

**Wrong for the taxpayers.** That’s all of us. Our federal government paid about $13,000,000 for the site which has a documented value of no more than $8,000,000 to $10,000,000. Makes you wonder who is benefitting from playing fast and loose with our money or is the VA incompetence in managing development and construction really that bad. And based on the debacle currently going on with the VA Hospital in Denver we can certainly expect nothing but huge cost overruns and multiple time delays.

**Wrong for the neighborhood/community.** The traffic at this location is abysmal already without the additionally necessary traffic for the construction and the thousands of cars coming and going for the hospital staff and veteran outpatients. The proposed garage is supposed to hold 3000 cars, times a turnover rate of at least 3 equals about 15,000 in and out vehicles per day. Traffic on the Watterson already backs up to Westport Rd. at rush hour. And, there are currently over 4000 students in four schools off of Herr Ln. less than a mile from the proposed site. Parents are coming and going at these schools now and will be doing so often at hospital shift changes which will add to more chaos.

**Alternate Site.** Many other sensible sites have been suggested at the public meetings; sites more centrally located, sites less expensive to develop, sites more in line with veteran’s needs and desires, and sites more economically beneficial. Obviously, the Walmart site at 18th and Broadway would go a long way toward erasing the 9th Street divide and providing solid economic impact in an area that certainly needs it. It is more centrally located and closer to the downtown medical center. More convenient for everyone. However, none of these were considered in the VA impact studies.

**Help!** We need the Veterans Administration to rethink this site now. Thanks for your consideration.
Walter Thomas Halbleib Sr.  
Kentucky Air National Guard Veteran  
6914 Sprig Leaf Circle  
Louisville KY 40241
COMMENTS FORM

Draft Environmental Impact Statement
for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus

Please Print

Name: Jackie Chandler
Address: 6463 Haverhill Rd
State: KY
Zip: 40222
City: Louisville

Comments:

Why don't you retrofit Zorn Ave location?
Why wasn't retrofitting a part of Alternative C?
Your traffic studies are 10 yrs + 3 yrs old.
The terrible clog of traffic occurs now, not 3 yrs ago.

I invite you to sit on my deck (which faces US-22) and watch the backups from 3:00-6:30 everyday! My property is 50 feet from VA property line.

There is NO ROOM FOR EXPANSION. Would you exercise eminent domain if and when expansion becomes necessary?

Another alternative is to consider the West end site. Would be wonderful economic boost to that area.

Comments must be postmarked by December 12, 2016 or send via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
My comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Robley Rex VA Hospital is as follows:

1. The voluminous impact statement appears well written and reflects a serious concern for the VA hospital relocation and requires a significant time and effort to comprehend the important issues.

2. My reading suggests that relocation will seriously affect the quality and lifestyle in all of the areas under consideration. I live within 2 miles from the Brownsboro site under consideration of Blankenbaker Lane and am aware of the difficult traffic delays that are already being encountered during 4:30-6:00 peak. I am unconvinced that the proposed changes will overcome the added traffic caused by the hospital AND the additional growth to the East will dramatically negatively the quality of life for residents around the area.

3. I recommend that the Brownsboro site be eliminated for the relocation of the Robley Rex VA Hospital.

James B. "Scotty" McArthur
4903 Clovernook Road
Louisville, KY 40207
U.S.A.
Home Phone (502) 897-5788
Email mca2ky@twc.com
December 1, 2016

Robley Rex VAMC
Attn: Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office
800 Zorn Avenue
Louisville, Kentucky 40206

To Whom it may Concern:

We as property owners of property located in the City of Windy Hills Jefferson County Kentucky wish to express our total disagreement with Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) dated October 2016 recently submitted to our fellow citizens and us.

The following are EIS listed Resource /Issues that are not detrimental to our property but may effect others in our city or other areas surrounding site located at 4906 Brownsboro Road. (See #1)

Aesthetics - Cultural Resources - Geology and Soils - Wildlife and Habitat
Socioeconomic - Community Services - Solid waste and Hazardous Materials - Utilities - Environmental Justice

The following are EIS Resource /Issues that are already starting to cause detrimental issues to our property and will effect others in our city or other areas surrounding site located at 4906 Brownsboro Road.

Hydrology and Water Quality - Floodplains and Wetlands -

We have enclosed multiple overviews of our property (See #2, #3) and how storm/surface water has been directed toward our property. Since the improvements have been made to L-264 more surface water has been directed toward the tributary of the Muddy Fork of Beargrass Creek behind our house. Floodwater has entered the first floor elevation on at least five (5) houses on the southwest side of 5814 to 5622 Bonfire Drive. This has occurred three or four times in the last 10 years. The drainage swale behind our house handles more surface water than we have ever experience in the forty years we have lived here. (See #4, #5)

Presently most surface water from the VA site is directed toward the north and toward Westport Road. The drainage of Westport Road goes to the Muddy Fork of Beargrass Creek. This can and has caused a lot of down stream flooding.

Based on a C-J article dated April 12, 2012 the 36 acre Midlands property was to be purchased from Jonathan Blue within a short time. If built per data presented means that approx 50% of 36 acres (See #1) will be covered over and not able to absorb rainwater.
This water has to go somewhere. This surface water increases dramatically during heavy short duration rains (1.5 to 2 inches rain in one hour) and can cause flash flooding. This is already happening without the VA hospital. Our weather patterns are changing and the MSD data is based on past climatological data. I do not agree with the findings concerning storm water and surface water calculations.

Noise
Same article in CJ in 2012 indicated that there would be 753,000 trips to the new VA hospital each year. (See #6) If that is correct that means one trip to and another from this location. Assuming a veteran visit once a year would mean 2063 visits. However the article says only 1080 would visit in a busy day. See Transportation and Traffic and Land Use

Land Use
Based on provided rendering it appears that an entrance to this VA property is to be provided from rear to Carlinar Lane. This will dramatically increase noise in a very quiet serene neighborhood. There is no doubt that if a rear entrance is provided Carlinar Lane will be very heavy traveled route out of this property to Westport Road. It will not take long for veterans to discover the easiest route to travel due to congestion at Hwy 22 and US 42.

Transportation and Traffic
The study of BTM Engineering showed that the US 42 at Northfield Drive and Old Brownsboro Road was already operating at an unacceptable service level and would see a significant adverse impact from the construction and operation of the hospital. This report suggested fixes for that intersection should be addressed. This is a reported fact. We have lived here for 40 years and have seen this interchange get worse every year. In my opinion there was not enough time spent in understanding the effect traffic problems on I-71 have had on the US42 to I-264 interchange. I-71 is a parking lot on incoming lanes to Louisville in the morn and out going lanes in the evening. It is just awful if there is a wreck on I-71 in ether direction. If a wreck occurs, I-264 is backed up beyond Westport Road interchange. They all try to get off I-71 and I-264 to US 42 ASAP. Yes an exit ramp from I-71 to US 42 may help but does not solve the problems. To add another point not discussed in the EIS is the amount of traffic that will be added in this area due to the opening of the east end bridge in early 2017 and its detrimental effect on I-71.

The recommendation to reconstruct the US 42 at I-264 with a single point urban interchange (SPUI) (See #7) does not solve the problem. If this is such a great solution why hasn’t this design change been installed at this point in time? The problem is here today and we have to live with it. Very simply the traffic lights at Rudy Lane and 42 and Northfield at 42 causes tremendous back up of traffic. Once you get through these lights you can enter I-264. There is not enough storage for autos between the center of the interchange and these lights to obtain a good flow of traffic. Just study the aerial view with the SPUI superimposed over interchange. This is what we have now and it does not work.
Believe me the traffic each night backs up to Lime Kiln Lane to the east and back to Zachary Taylor Cemetery to west both lanes. By removing two traffic lights and installing one over the overpass will not do the trick. Suggest you look real hard at Diverging Diamond interchange (DDI) (See #8) or others similar in design. I personally have seen these used in Chicago and Atlanta handling a lot more traffic than this interchange.

The most important point we wish to make is that if the VA hospital is to be built we and all our neighbors in this area do not wish to wait for road and drainage improvements to be completed. Those who do not have to suffer the consequences from those promises only break promises. There are real and serious problems with this VA hospital location. If solutions can be designed and agreed to buy those citizens being affected by this construction I would agree to the construction of the hospital. However the road improvements must be completed before construction is completed or even started. I believe other sites can be found to meet the needs and desire of our loyal and courageous veterans.

Respectfully submitted

Ralph & Deborah Wirth
509 Indian Ridge Road
Louisville Kentucky 40207
hci@iglou.com

Enclosures: #1-#8

cc: Senator Mitch McConnell; Senator Rand Paul; Councilwoman Angela Leet
STUDY: VA TRAFFIC CAN BE MANAGED

Some worry new site for hospital is too congested

By Chris Otts
cotts@courier-journal.com
The Courier-Journal

A new hospital serving military veterans could have a "significant adverse effect" on traffic near Brownsboro Road and the Watterson Expressway, according to a study completed for the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs.

But the 753,000 trips a year the new hospital would generate can be managed with road improvements and isn't a big enough hurdle for the VA to reconsider its chosen location, the study concludes.

"We do know there is an issue with traffic that needs to be worked out, but there are really no other show stoppers," said Bob Morey, facility planner at the current VA Medical Center on Zorn Avenue.

A draft of the "programmatic environmental assessment" was published March 29 by TTL Associates of Toledo, Ohio, as part of a mandatory federal review of the hospital's impact. It comes as a public meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday to get comments.

See VA, Page A6

CJ 4/12/2012

VA HOSPITAL PROJECTIONS

» 753,000 ADDITIONAL TRIPS ON NEARBY ROADS
» MORE THAN 65,000 VETERAN VISITS ANNUALLY
 » 1,080 VETERAN VISITS ON A BUSY DAY
 » 300,000 SQUARE FEET OF BUILDING SPACE
 » 2,400 SURFACE PARKING SPACES
Single-point urban interchange

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

A single-point urban interchange (SPUI, /ˈspjuːɪ/ or /ˈspjuːriː/), also called a single-point interchange (SPI) or single-point diamond interchange (SPDI), is a type of highway interchange. The design was created in order to help move large volumes of traffic through limited amounts of space safely and efficiently.
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Description

A single point urban interchange is similar in form to a diamond interchange, but has the advantage of allowing opposing left turns to proceed simultaneously by compressing the two intersections of a diamond into one single intersection over or under the free-flowing road.[2]

The term "single point" refers to the fact that all through traffic on the arterial street, as well as the traffic turning left onto or off the interchange, can be controlled from a single set of traffic signals. Due to the space efficiency of SPUIs relative to the volume of traffic they can handle, the interchange design is being used extensively in the reconstruction of existing freeways as well as constructing new freeways, particularly in dense urban environments.[3]
A diverging diamond interchange (DDI), also called a double crossover diamond interchange (DCD),[1] is a type of diamond interchange in which the two directions of traffic on the non-freeway road cross to the opposite side on both sides of the bridge at the freeway. It is unusual in that it requires traffic on the freeway overpass (or underpass) to briefly drive on the opposite side of the road from what is customary for the jurisdiction. The diverging diamond interchange was listed by Popular Science magazine as one of the best innovations in 2009 (engineering category) in "Best of What’s New 2009".[2]

Like the continuous flow intersection, the diverging diamond interchange allows for two-phase operation at all signalized intersections within the interchange. This is a significant improvement in safety, since no long turns (e.g. left turns where traffic drives on the right side of the road) must clear opposing traffic and all movements are discrete, with most controlled by traffic signals.[9]

Additionally, the design can improve the efficiency of an interchange, as the lost time for various phases in the cycle can be redistributed as green time—there are only two clearance intervals (the time for traffic signals to change from green to yellow to red) instead of the six or more found in other interchange designs.
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Double Crossover Merging Interchange
December 1, 2016

Robley Rex VAMC
ATTN: Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office
800 Zorn Avenue
Louisville, KY 40206

RE: Comment Form For Draft Environmental Impact Statement For Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus

Dear Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office:

I am sending herewith my Comment Form regarding the Draft Impact Statement For Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus. I trust that my comments and comments of others being sent will be considered and I urge the Veterans Administration to reconsider its decision to proceed with the construction of the hospital at the Midlands site. Thank you in advance for your consideration of my Comments.

Very truly yours,

Alan W. Roles

AWR/ak
Enclosure

cc: Hon. Randy Strobo
Strobo Barkley, PLLC
239 S. Fifth Street, Suite 917
Louisville, KY 40202

Hon. Mitch McConnell
601 W. Broadway, Room 630
Louisville, KY 40202

Hon. John Yarmuth
600 Martin Luther King Jr. Place, Suite 216
Louisville, KY 40202-5129
# COMMENT FORM

**Draft Environmental Impact Statement**
**for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Alan W. Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>2208 Wynnewood Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip:</td>
<td>40222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add to Mailing List:</td>
<td>☐ No ☐ Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

"SEE ATTACHED"

Comments must be postmarked by **December 12, 2016** or send via email to Louisville Replacement Hospital Comments@va.gov.
COMMENTS

I served in the U.S. Marine Corps. I live in Northfield. I have grave concerns on the apparent decision of the Veterans Administration to locate a new hospital at the Midlands site. The traffic studies relied upon by the V.A. are obviously faulty and will create serious accessibility problems for the Veterans seeking emergency treatment or being transported downtown, if necessary, after being examined at the hospital at the Midlands site. Furthermore, no construction should be commenced, until after the highway improvements are completed by the Kentucky Department of Transportation, or least until after highway construction has in fact begun. I understand that the funding of the proposed highway construction has not yet even been committed. The additional traffic will also result in increased air pollution, particularly when vehicles have to wait in slow moving traffic. Speaking of pollution, the surface runoff of rain into the Crossgate neighborhood will cause flooding and accompanying pollution hazards. I understand that elevation of the Midlands site will be built up ten additional feet. Undoubtedly, property values in Crossgate will decline. The hospital will also have a negative economic impact on neighboring businesses. The design of this multi-story facility is not aesthetically compatible with the adjacent neighborhoods.

The majority of the Veterans would prefer the hospital to remain at the present Zorn Avenue location. In the alternative, a downtown or southend location or westend location would better serve most of the Veterans and many of the employees of the hospital, who live in closer proximity to these locations.

I view this process of seeking public input as a charade. The V.A. violated the law, when it purchased the property without first performing an EIS study. It then paid way too much for the property and has wasted additional taxpayer funds for its various studies and planning to date. The current EIS study has contradictions. None of the public’s previously submitted comments have been addressed in a meaningful way. The V.A.’s recent presentation indicating an ongoing consideration of the St. Joseph’s site is fraudulent. That site is not available, which should have been known to the V.A. For the sums expended to date and what is proposed to be spent at the Midlands site, a new hospital on Zorn Avenue could have been constructed at the Zorn Avenue site or in all probability the present hospital could have been improved and updated. I note that since this matter was first presented to the public, a new building has been built on the Zorn Avenue site, a new entrance has been constructed for the present hospital, and trees have been removed to build another parking lot or a parking garage on the property. The proposed number of beds at the new facility is totally inadequate, apparently based on unrealistic projections. The money already expended on this project and over budget construction at other sites around the country, which have gone way over budget, would have been better spent by the issuance of medical cards that could be used by Veterans at any licensed healthcare facility or provider. Why waste more money on an inadequate site, particularly when other hospitals in the Louisville area have empty beds, which could be utilized?

Another concern is that various clinics in various locations more convenient to Veterans will be closed and the Veterans will be required to come all the way from their homes throughout the service area to the Midlands site to be treated at that site at what will basically be a clinic, not a hospital. I further understand that the V.A. is now planning to move the Veterans Benefits Administration Office to the site, which will only cause additional traffic and air pollution for the surrounding area.

This whole matter should be investigated from the beginning and the Midlands site should be reconsidered and rejected. Since that property has already been purchased, the land could be used as a new Veteran’s cemetery or for the construction of a nursing home and rehabilitation facility for Veterans, with a design in keeping with the aesthetics of the neighborhood.
## Comment Form

**Draft Site-Specific Environmental Assessment for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus**

### Name: James Ducoing
### Address: 2324 St. Andrews Dr.
### State: Kentucky
### Zip: 40222
### City: Louisville

**Comments:**

> Please extend comment period for location of new VA Hospital. I do volunteer work in the West End of Louisville weekly & see the need for jobs & commercial activity. The West End would be a better place for new hospital.

- Signed: James Ducoing
- Date: 12/11/16

---

Comments must be postmarked by **February 1, 2015** or send via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov
**COMMENT FORM**

**Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

**for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Organization:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KATHLEEN NORTCROSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>City:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>800 INDIAN EDGE Rd</td>
<td>LOUISVILLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State:</th>
<th>Zip:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>40207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

We have heard the VA environmental impact conclusions and examined their charts—all of which would be completely disproved with one trip in the area, especially in the morning or evening.

But as to the actual environmental impact—here is the rest of the story—

To accommodate the necessary holding tanks needed by a hospital—the area would need to be raised 10 feet. This is an area that is already prone to flooding (ask anyone around there, with a basement). Raising the land that much would be an environmental disaster to all the nearby neighborhoods... Certainly their engineers should have known that?

As I look at all the negatives that the veterans would face with this site, I wonder why would the VA, who I thought was there to help veterans, treat them like this when the majority of them do not want the hospital there—

Could the ridiculous exorbitant amount paid for that land have something to do with it?

Comments must be postmarked by December 12, 2016 or send via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Loretta Woolley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>218 Indian Ridge Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip:</td>
<td>40207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add to Mailing List:</td>
<td>□ No □ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>After paying too much for the proposed VA, then inducing the Vet's? Next a traffic issue. I feel this is an insult to homeowners who live adjacent to this proposed Vet. Traffic is already a problem in this area. This project will just enhance the problem. Bad mistake. Some one's pockets are full.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments must be postmarked by December 12, 2016 or send via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
Of course neighbors want the best for veterans who put their lives on the line for our freedom. In fact, concern for their lives is in large part what this battle represents.

The irony of leaving those same veterans and their families trapped in the traffic congestion that neighbors of the site suffer on a daily basis escapes the Department of Veterans Affairs. That is, like the complaints of people who have spent years in the area and know its problems well, it is willfully ignored.

I have to wonder whether the person or persons who did this impact analysis were lax, negligent, or some combination of the two. It was noted in the Aesthetics category that the extent of adverse effects for the Bowman Road site— which in reality was the only real option from the start—would be on a spectrum with consideration to the points of view of various observers. By the time the Socioeconomic category was reached, a curt “no long-term adverse effects to property values” sentence essentially condemned neighbors to the sweeping power of eminent domain. By whom and on what economic theory was this concluded?

There are other options for this facility that would be far better suited to the needs of veterans, their families and VA employees.

I ask that you consider them. Failing that, I ask that you experience the traffic jams of your making once this project is completed.

Comments must be postmarked by December 12, 2016 or send via email to LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov.
December 8, 2016

Robley Rex VAMC Activation Team office
Attention: Judy Williams
800 Zorn Ave.
Louisville, KY 40206

Replacement-Robley Rex VA Medical Center

Dear Ms. Williams:

I am a WW2 veteran, I like the hospital where it is or the Brownsboro Rd. location.

I am totally against the New Cut Road suggestion and VERY totally against the West end location.

Both of these locations are difficult to get to on city streets, early morning appointments mean driving sometimes in the dark on west end streets.

I see nothing wrong with the Brownsboro site, there is I-264, I-71 and I-64 to the Watterson. With streets improvements by the federal and state depts. of highways can easily revamp the easy access in and out to the hospital.

Please disregard all the hullabalo reminds me of people always opposing zoning changes.

Elmer W. Jacobs
PH: 502-548-0186
M-019

TO: Replacement Rex Robley VAMC
    Attn: Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office
    800 Zorn Avenue, Louisville KY 40206

FROM: Stephanie Stidham
    1800 Bardsey Circle
    Louisville, KY 40222

DATE: December 8, 2016

RE: Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office

These comments are in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement: Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center in Louisville, KY.

As a resident of Crossgate, the small city next to the proposed Brownsboro Road site, I want our Veterans to have the best facility available. The potential Brownsboro Road location is not the best location for this facility for the reasons enumerated below and many others that have already been brought to the attention of the VA.

- The process in which this site was selected was tainted by non-transparency and unfortunately suspect decision-making. Due to this, the decision to keep this location as the preferred site is considered rigged and not in the best interest of our Veterans or the community. The value of the land was much less than what was paid. A full environmental impact study was not done until after the land was acquired and after local leaders brought it to the attention of the VA.
  - The draft environmental impact statement recently released addresses issues which should have been addressed prior to the purchase of the property and during a full and thorough (following all federal policies and procedures) review. This information is outdated and gives the impression that the DEIS is just a perfunctory requirement that needs to be done and not a real review. An example of this is the inclusion of property located on Factory Lane (Old St. Joseph Site) as a potential Alternative B. This was an alternative earlier but not now. The property is being developed and is not available. How can the decision to make the Brownsboro Road site a preferred location based on merit when it is being compared to a site that is no longer available. The only way to rectify this appearance of being rigged or a done deal is to begin the process again and select real current alternatives, including a South End and West End location.
  - According to data, the vast majority of Vets in our community live in the Western and Southern parts of Jefferson County. Why would a location so far away from the Vets to be served be considered the preferred location? Why would a location so far away from other local hospitals and medical facilities be the best location to share resources and provide enhanced access of care for our Vets?
  - Only a new selection process will remove the stigma of being rigged and the appearance that the site was chosen for reasons other than it is the best for our Vets. As it appears now, the site is the preferred location simply out of expediency and the desire to move forward quickly. Not only are the citizens around this proposed site against this location so are most of our local elected leaders. The citizens of Louisville and across the nation who will be providing their tax dollars (latest cost I heard is over a billion dollars) to this facility deserve more transparency. Additionally, there may be other options available now that were not even thought of before, such as the discussion on whether bricks and mortar facilities truly are the best way to serve our valued Veterans.
The Brownsboro Road site is landlocked on one side by the Watterson Expressway making it essentially one way in and one way out. Building emergency exits will not fix this problem because of the inherent nature of the property. Any exit will still dump the traffic into the same general area using the same few roadways. The review states that potential changes to the configuration of existing roadways in the area would help but this is not true. Again, these assumptions are based from individuals who do not live in the area or travel through this area on a regular basis. Additionally, who pays for the costs for these changes? Is this included in the building/construction costs or are these costs to be absorbed by state road funds (which are not sufficient to cover current needs across the state)? Wouldn’t choosing a location which did not have these significant traffic concerns/issues make more sense?

- The Watterson Expressway is often shut down or slowed significantly due to accidents on it or on I-71 (which the entrance is the next exit after Brownsboro Road). The data should be reviewed immediately. It gets shut down or slowed several times a month. This is relevant because people wanting to go to Oldham County or far Eastern Jefferson County will get off on the Brownsboro Road exits trying to avoid I-71. This exacerbates an already full traffic volume on both 22 and 42. Many times I have sat on the expressway for over an hour inching my way to the exit trying to get home. I have also had difficulty even trying to make a right hand turn out of my subdivision.

- Due to this frequent traffic problem, Veterans would never know if they will be late for appointments or planned tests. Again, given its landlocked location, there is no other way to access the site when these accidents and shut downs occur. As mentioned above, since the vast majority of Vets being served by this potential facility would be coming from the South or West end of Jefferson County, the Expressway would be the primary path to the facility. With our aging population, it seems that having a facility closer to the Vets, in the West End or the South End, with a variety of roads to access the location would be in the best interest of the Vets. Choosing a location that did not need significant traffic reconfiguration, making the cost of the facility much higher, would also seem to be in the best interest of the taxpayers.

The DEIS states that there would be adverse impact to the local area. It also states that the land use being proposed is not in compliance with local land use policies and plans. While the federal government can choose to not comply with local land usage plans, the question is should it? Should the federal government force a locality to have a facility (one with acknowledged adverse impacts) that does not want it (due to many real traffic and other issues, when other more appropriate options are available. Is this the role of the federal government to bully locals into accepting an inappropriate location when other, better locations are available?

- I do have concerns over the potential noise, parking, water and the quality of life issues which this facility will bring to this area. I am concerned that the location is way too small for the amount of services the VA wishes to have onsite now and in the future, making it obsolete before it is built. What is being suggested in the plans for the new VA Medical facility keeps expanding but the space isn’t available. They are trying to make this location work for its needs but it clearly isn’t what is needed. Adding additional elements only exacerbates the concerns with traffic, noise, pollution, etc. and making the design less and less desirable for a residential suburban neighborhood. It would make sense that any site chosen be larger than what is currently needed for future capacity. I also am concerned that the location is not in proximity to other medical facilities so that resources can be shared. I am confident, however, that others are expressing these concerns on my behalf as well.

As a taxpayer and resident I urge you to open the process again and look at all options available for this facility, particularly a South End and West End location. Please do not choose this location out of expediency and desire to move forward quickly. I understand much money has already been invested in this site but much more money will be spent in the construction phase. The Zachary Taylor National Cemetery located a few blocks away from
the proposed Brownsboro site is closed to new interments, turning veterans away. The Brownsboro Road site purchased by the federal government would be perfect site for a new cemetery. Its proximity would allow it to share resources (grounds staff, security, etc.) with the Zachary Taylor location thus making it more efficient and maximizing federal tax dollars.

Measure twice and cut once. A phrase often heard to caution individuals who try to hurry and cut corners. The Brownsboro Road location is not the best option for this facility. The site has inherent problems that can only be solved by finding a new location. Our Veterans and the citizens of our community deserve a new site selection process.

I hesitated about providing comments to this process, believing as many have expressed that "the VA is going to do what they want and the decision is already made and this entire comments request is simply a check in a box that has to be done." I would like to believe better in my government and in my governmental leaders. Given the national discussion since the presidential election I believe the federal government must listen more to its people. It is government for the people by the people. I hope that a new site selection process will be performed, including South End and West End locations which are closer to the Vets the facility is to serve. Only this step will remove the stigma of the old process and help to restore citizen confidence in the decision-making and administration of the VA.
Re: Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center

To whom it may concern:

The area around 18th and Broadway is highly unsafe. Any night time visitor could be very dangerous.

The area around University Hospital is no better. I'm serious.

VA hospital should be in the general area of Zachary Taylor Cemetery or stay where it currently resides.

Thank you!

EMS Roger Thompson
55 Navy Rd. 290608

Phone (502) 935-0223
Address 3108 Parkside Court
Louisville, KY 40214
December 13, 2016

Robley Rex VAMC,
Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office
800 Zorn Avenue
Louisville, KY 40206

Attn: Judy Williams

Subject: Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center

ONE VETERAN'S OPINION ON THE SITE SELECTION OF THE NEW VA HOSPITAL

Ms. Williams:

As we veterans, citizens of Louisville and interested parties have fixated on watching this whole VA Hospital scenario play out, I feel a sense of futility and despair regarding the entire issue. In spite of considerable public input into the selection site for a “new” hospital for veterans, most of which were pointedly in favor of either upgrading the current hospital or tearing it down and building another one at the same site, I and many others following this issue were stunned, but not surprised, by the government’s site selection committee’s selection of the Highway 42-1254 junction after learning that a local entrepreneur had recently purchased the site, had it reassessed after it had just been assessed a short time before, and reaped a significant profit for his timely investment. Coincidences happen, but the smell was certainly fishy.

In my judgment, the Zorn Avenue location was accessible, popular and paid for. What in the world would prompt a change from a proven, familiar and appreciated site to one that is contentious, overpriced and a precursor to a monumental traffic nightmare.

I have my doubts as to the true intent of the Administration seeking input as to which of several sites is to be selected, given the choice that was previously made, but I decided that I had to at least express my sense of outrage at the selection of the Highway 42 site rather than working with the Zorn Avenue site.

I can be reached at the following address, phone number of email for further discussion.

John B. Mattingly
3900 Glen Bluff Road
Louisville, KY 40222
502-425-4067
jandmatt36@gmail.com

Sincerely,

John B. Mattingly
Ms. Williams,

Attached are the signatures and comments of nearly 330 Louisville residents of various zip codes who are requesting an extension to the 12 December deadline for public comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement the VA released at the end of October.

http://www.tinyurl.com/va-extension

Attached is also the Comment period extension request for the VAMC Draft EIS, dated 14 November 2016, as submitted by the law firm of Strobo-Barkley PLLC, representing the cities of Crossgate, Northfield and now Old Brownsboro Place.

We need more time to adequately respond to this 600+ page document and all the documentation that preceded the DEIS.

The extension doesn’t cost the tax payers or veterans ANYTHING. Providing the BEST medical care at the BEST facility at THE BEST location for our veterans is PRICELESS!

Could you please give us an update to this extension request?

Regards,

Kirk Hilbrecht, Mayor of Crossgate and Army//Air Force Veteran

--

Kirk Hilbrecht
Mayor of Crossgate
khilbrecht@crossgateky.org
Voice-to-text number: 502-265-6864

Check out our website at: http://www.crossgateky.org
On Tue, Dec 6, 2016 at 6:12 AM, Kirk Hilbrecht <khilbrecht@crossgateky.org> wrote:
Ms. Williams,

Attached are the signatures and comments of nearly 300 Louisville residents of various zip codes, asking for an extension to the public comments deadline for the Draft EIS.

The extension doesn't cost the tax payers or veterans ANYTHING. Providing the BEST medical care at the BEST facility at THE BEST location for our veterans is PRICELESS!

Could you please give us an update to this request?

Regards,

Kirk Hilbrecht, Mayor of Crossgate and Army//Air Force Veteran

On Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 7:19 AM, Kirk Hilbrecht <khilbrecht@crossgateky.org> wrote:
Ms. Williams,

Attached are 250 signatures from citizens who are requesting an extension to the 12 December deadline for public comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement released at the end of October.

http://www.tinyurl.com/va-extension

Attached is also the Comment period extension request for the VAMC Draft EIS, dated 14 November 2016, as submitted by the law firm of Strobo-Barkley PLLC, representing the cities of Crossgate, Northfield and now Old Brownsboro Place.

Please advise us as to the status of this extension.

We need more time to adequately respond to this 600+ page document and all the documentation that preceded the DEIS.

Granting an extension doesn't cost the tax payers or veterans anything. However, ensuring veterans as myself are giving THE best medical care at THE best facility at THE best location is PRICELESS.

With one week until the current public response date, we need to know immediately if this extension has been granted.

I look forward to your response.
Sincerely,

Kirk Hilbrecht, Mayor of Crossgate and US Army and US Air Force Veteran

--

Kirk Hilbrecht
Mayor of Crossgate
khilbrecht@crossgateky.org
Voice-to-text number: 502-265-6864

Check out our website at: http://www.crossgateky.org

EMAIL DISCLOSURE: Email is intended solely for the correct addressee(s). If an email was sent to you in error, please notify us by replying to the email or by telephoning 502-265-6864.

The City of Crossgate reserves the right to monitor both sent and received emails.

--

Kirk Hilbrecht
Mayor of Crossgate
khilbrecht@crossgateky.org
Voice-to-text number: 502-265-6864

Check out our website at: http://www.crossgateky.org

EMAIL DISCLOSURE: Email is intended solely for the correct addressee(s). If an email was sent to you in error, please notify us by replying to the email or by telephoning 502-265-6864.

The City of Crossgate reserves the right to monitor both sent and received emails.

--

Kirk Hilbrecht
Mayor of Crossgate
khilbrecht@crossgateky.org
Voice-to-text number: 502-265-6864

Check out our website at: http://www.crossgateky.org

EMAIL DISCLOSURE: Email is intended solely for the correct addressee(s). If an
email was sent to you in error, please notify us by replying to the email or by telephoning 502-265-6864. The City of Crossgate reserves the right to monitor both sent and received emails.
November 14, 2016

Attn: Judy Williams
Robley Rex VAMC
Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office
800 Zorn Avenue
Louisville, Kentucky 40206

Re: Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center

Comment period extension request for the VAMC Draft EIS

Dear Ms. Williams,

This firm represents the City of Crossgate, which is located on Kentucky Route 22 (Brownsboro Road) directly adjacent to the proposed Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center (VAMC) site. This letter is to request that the Department of Veteran Affairs (VA) extend the public comment period by sixty (60) days beyond the existing December 12, 2016 deadline for the VAMC's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The DEIS is far too long and complex to be adequately reviewed by December 12, 2016, especially in light of the impacts to the City of Crossgate and other adjacent stakeholders including the veterans the VMAC will serve, cities, individuals, local governments and agencies, businesses, churches, and schools because of the proposed project. Given the consequences of this proposed project to those stakeholders and to ensure that the rights of those subject to the impacts are fully protected, it is necessary to review the draft EIS in great detail to develop comments.

Pursuant to Executive Order 13563 and 40 CFR §1503.1(a)(4), which are the NEPA regulations requiring active solicitation of public comments, agencies must afford interested persons and the public a meaningful opportunity to comment on agency actions such as environmental impact statements and analyses that affect them. The VA should know from past experience with DEIS/EIS comment periods of other proposed VA Medical Centers across the United States that a good deal of time is necessary to adequately review and analyze a DEIS. Our ongoing review at this time indicates that it will take at least sixty (60) more days than the VA is currently providing to adequately evaluate this information, most especially the impact on transportation and traffic in the proposed area. Anything less that that amount of time will significantly hinder our ability to comment meaningfully.
It is critical that the process for commenting on the documents be handled in a way that facilitates maximum transparency and public participation. Therefore, in the interest of providing parties impacted by the proposed project a meaningful opportunity to comment, we request that the comment period for the DEIS be extended by 60 days beyond the existing December 12, 2016 deadline.

Respectfully,

Randy Strobo
Clay Barkley
STROBO BARKLEY PLLC
Please extend the replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center DEIS public comments deadline.

City of Crossgate

GIVE US MORE TIME
TO REVIEW ALL THE INFO
STROBO BARKLEY PLLC represents the City of Crossgate, which is located on Kentucky Route 22 (Brownsboro Road) directly adjacent to the proposed Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center (VAMC) site.

This petition is to request that the Department of Veteran Affairs (VA) extend the public comment period by sixty (60) days beyond the existing December 12, 2016 deadline for the VAMC's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The DEIS is far too long and complex to be adequately reviewed by December 12, 2016, especially in light of the impacts to the City of Crossgate and other adjacent stakeholders including the veterans the VMAC will serve, cities, individuals, local governments and agencies, businesses, churches, and schools because of the proposed project. Given the consequences of this proposed project to those stakeholders and to ensure that the rights of those subject to the impacts are fully protected, it is necessary to review the draft EIS in great detail to develop comments.

Pursuant to Executive Order 13563 and 40 CFR
§ 1503.1 (a)(4), which are the NEPA regulations requiring active solicitation of public comments, agencies must afford interested persons and the public a meaningful opportunity to comment on agency actions such as environmental impact statements and analyses that affect them. The VA should know from past experience with DEIS/EIS comment periods of other proposed VA Medical Centers across the United States that a good deal of time is necessary to adequately review and analyze a DEIS. Our ongoing review at this time indicates that it will take at least sixty (60) more days than the VA is currently providing to adequately evaluate this information, most especially the impact on transportation and traffic in the proposed area. Anything less than that amount of time will significantly hinder our ability to comment meaningfully.

It is critical that the process for commenting on the documents be handled in a way that facilitates maximum transparency and public participation. Therefore, in the interest of providing parties impacted by the proposed project a meaningful opportunity to comment, we
request that the comment period for the DEIS be extended by 60 days beyond the existing December 12, 2016 deadline.

This petition will be delivered to:

Public Affairs, VAMC
Judy Williams
VAMC
VAMC Comments
Public Affairs, VAMC
Laura Schafsnitz
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Signed On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mallory Krish</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristina Christensen</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk Hilbrecht</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanie Gillis</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Lauer</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Stidham</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chas Krish</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40242</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharron Hilbrecht</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Shaw</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Shaffer</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40216</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bev Weinberg</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40242</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Olsofka</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Albers</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Bork</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Meyer</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Falcone</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40205</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Harlan</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40205</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Wajda</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Ann Fenwick</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Blevins</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Wise</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krystal Juneau</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keleigh Lebre</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Roles</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Irby</td>
<td>Gulfport</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>39507</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID ANDERSON</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Ades</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gerrish</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Salazar</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40241</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Ratliff</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40291</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Baber</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40241</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Elder</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Burke</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Impellizzeri</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Swain</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Allgeier II</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Kirschenbaum</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elwood Sturtevant</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40241</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Speigel</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>julie cunningham</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/29/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Conley</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/29/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Elmes</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/29/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Senior</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40243</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11/29/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sondra McMurray Lancaster California 93536 United States 11/29/2016
Linda Fay Sampson Eugene Oregon 97405 United States 11/29/2016
Denise Ragland Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Clara Small Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Sue Rogers Louisville Kentucky 40220 United States 11/29/2016
Clark Rhea Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Mark Welch Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Brent Shuman Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Homer Holt Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Sally Rhea Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Scynthia Luckett Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Melissa Lawson Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Richard Ham Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Adrian Oliver Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Matt Willinger Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Jenny Fishback Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Luther Bakken Louisville Kentucky 40222-6342 United States 11/29/2016
April Smith Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
John Jennings Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Lindsay Harden Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Amy McWaters Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Robyn Ernst Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Robert Williams Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
James Bailen MD Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Laura Hood Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Scott Stuckert Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Frank Strickler Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
LaVaughan Will Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Brian Feeney Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Dave Davis Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Karen Murray Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Susan Mays Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Mary Stuckert Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Joan W Champion Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Kari Cornish Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Mary Hamilton Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
Marcia Kearns Louisville Kentucky 40222 United States 11/29/2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy Morgan</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Lepping</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Breit</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Weeter</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert DeSensi</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Bakken</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allidin Kraft</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40223</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Fishback</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwенeth A. Dunleavy</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Fowler</td>
<td>Milltown</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>47145</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Trainer</td>
<td>Prospect</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40205</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jennings</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Kissling</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Martin</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40242</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Dohn</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Harper</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40242</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Andriot</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Thomas</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Finley</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Westin</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>77006</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Heuser</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Weinberg</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40242</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Burke</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Milliken</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLOTTE WALFORD</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40205</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Neal</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40241</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Jenkins</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessie Thatcher</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona Lindsey</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40216</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara Estes</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Chappell</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Roles</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Aalen</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Warren</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Vezeau</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Windy Hills</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Martin</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Lebre</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Taylor</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Deegan</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes Jenkins</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Kottak</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Peterson</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40223</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Sweeney</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Rawls</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>douglas owen</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Elliott</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shari Owen</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Kraft</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Durso</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Anderson</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Dodge</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Murray</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Harralson</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES KEANE</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer McAdams</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Kraft</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Robinson</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kraft</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizzie Robinson</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane EMKE</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40206</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Ramsey Kraft</td>
<td>Masonic Widows a</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40041</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Scales</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby Kraft</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>david kraft</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip Hancock</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyleen Parker</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Madison</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Gahm</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Anderson</td>
<td>Prospect</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40059</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schu Montgomery</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen Ryan</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40208</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxanne Sturtevant</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40241</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Armstrong</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Welch</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Armstrong</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Neyman</td>
<td>Goshen</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40026</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Weick</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40241</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Stewart</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Halbleib</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40241</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Palmer</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Gardiner</td>
<td>Prospect</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40059</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Harcourt</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Anderson</td>
<td>Prospect</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40059</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara Talbott</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Dohn</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Wajda</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Jaber</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Wine</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40220</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Rentschler</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40217</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis McMurry Tate</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40245</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Beal</td>
<td>Novato</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>94949</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Small</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40242</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Cravens</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40241</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Yeager</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Yeager</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Baird</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40242</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ashley</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40242</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Wade</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Murray</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodi Hugues</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Weber</td>
<td>Hood River</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>97031</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Sisco</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40206</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hicks</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Hicks</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fay Dorval</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Hostle</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Recktenwald</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40205</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddy Smith</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Stiebling</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Stiebling</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thomas rademaker</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christena Burell</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40241</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Cooney</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>60614</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollis Starks</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Robinson</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Kaplin</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vicki lurie</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Gunderson</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Michels</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40241</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Jolly</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40242</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Painter</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40272</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Scholtz</td>
<td>Prospect</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40059</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison O'Grady</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara Magers</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Mercer</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Bache</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40241</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Meira</td>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>45419</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harold trainer</td>
<td>Prospect</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40059</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM HIRZEL</td>
<td>Pewee Valley</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40056</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Shapiro</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40241</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lisa whitlock</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Henson</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40218</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry Humphrey</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40241-6233</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Birch</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Fawbush</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Perkns</td>
<td>Lou</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>12/7/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marci Shuman</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/7/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katie austin</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40241</td>
<td>12/7/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth Read</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/7/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Kmetz</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/7/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Weintraub</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
<td>12/7/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phyllis derfner</td>
<td>sunny isles beach</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>33160</td>
<td>12/7/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crosstown and other cities will drastically be impacted by the new VAMC. We need more time to respond to the

I live nearby and believe locating the hospital there will make an already extremely congested traffic area

I believe the chosen site is hopelessly useless to vets for access and ease of transport especially during peak hours

I do not think the area can handle the traffic. I can barely get out of Northfields to get to work in the morning.

The site is too small.

This is a very important matter and every one should have enough time to read the ENTIRE DEIS so they can

Even considering this location is a very bad joke. I don’t believe that the vets were considered in this decision. Traffic is a mess even without a hospital. I feel someone has gotten a big pay off on this decision. Mitch, where are you when we need you?

I am signing because I believe more time is needed to adequately review and assess the impact of this proposal

I do not think the Brownboro Road area is already very congested. I can’t imagine that it is even being considered as a hospital location.

The impact of this project will last for generations, so the DEIS deserves close examination and the public deserves the opportunity to have the time to fully review the details of the plans.

I’m sending this petition because I don’t like the idea of having inadequate time to read and understand it before moving forward

I believe the chosen site is hopelessly useless to vets for access and ease of transport especially during peak hours

Traffic at the Hwy 42 exit from the Watterson is often a gridlock during hours that will mostly be impacted with even more traffic generated by the new VA Center. The method of getting people out of the VA Center is confusing and will dump more traffic on an already overly burdened section between the Watterson and Lime Kiln Lane. It is already very difficult getting in and out of these busy businesses along this section of road.

I’m signing this petition because the selection of the VA hospital site was completed without the proper environmental study prior to the selection. The site is the poorest choice that could have been made due to many issues. Some of these issues include traffic problems, environmental issues, and a site least preferred by veterans.

I’m signing because I believe the rushled timeline for reviewing and commenting on the Environmental Impact Statement is not in the public interest and gives the appearance that public comment is not really desired.

The site is the poorest choice that could have been made due to many issues. Some of these issues include traffic problems, environmental issues, and a site least preferred by veterans.

I am signing because I don’t like the idea of having inadequate time to read and understand it before moving forward

I believe the chosen site is hopelessly useless to vets for access and ease of transport especially during peak hours

I am a veteran and this hospital will not serve the great majority of my fellow vets before moving forward

I’m signing this petition because the selection of the VA hospital site was completed without the proper environmental study prior to the selection. The site is the poorest choice that could have been made due to many issues. Some of these issues include traffic problems, environmental issues, and a site least preferred by veterans.

I am signing because I don’t like the idea of having inadequate time to read and understand it before moving forward

I am signing because I believe the rushled timeline for reviewing and commenting on the Environmental Impact Statement is not in the public interest and gives the appearance that public comment is not really desired.

I am signing because I don’t like the idea of having inadequate time to read and understand it before moving forward

I am signing because I believe the rushled timeline for reviewing and commenting on the Environmental Impact Statement is not in the public interest and gives the appearance that public comment is not really desired.

I am signing because I believe the rushled timeline for reviewing and commenting on the Environmental Impact Statement is not in the public interest and gives the appearance that public comment is not really desired.
Mary K. Wintergerst  Louisville KY  40241 United States  11/30/2016
Dear Mr. Robley,

My husband is a veteran. He and I have very serious concerns regarding the proposed location and its negative impact on veterans access to care;

I'm signing this petition because more time is needed in order to adequately review the environmental impact statement and assess the impact to my neighborhood.

I also want to protect Northfield and the surrounding areas from an adverse environmental impact on our community.

I oppose the the new construction of the VA Hospital off hwy 22.

I am against the VA best BF built in this space.

I've been concerned about creating a facility that meets future needs as well as the needs required at this time!

I live in the Brownsboro Rd area and the traffic is already horrendous! I have no problem with a Veterans Hospital being "in my backyard". It makes sense. Last night I had to go Blankenbaker Ln to River Road to Lime Kiln Lane, back to Brownsboro Rd at 5:45 to get from Brownsboro/ Rudy ln to Brownsboro/Lime Kiln Lp! It has gotten ridiculous! It is a common practice to have a document delayed and delayed and then issue it around major holidays, so the VA took months to complete a Draft EIS, they should provide courtesy of extending the review to the public and veterans that will be profoundly impacted. I cannot in good conscience allow the VA to treat our Vets with such blatant disregard by choosing such a horrible site to construct a VA center. The Vets deserve much better. An extension to allow a little more time seems such a small request. Please consider this request and the comments that arise from the responses submitted, to do the right thing, and make a change of giving the VA the what they deserve.

Randall Chappell  Louisville KY  40242 United States  12/1/2016

The VA needs to listen to the VETS. This hospital needs to be built in the West End.

The property is too small for this hospital. The building of a new VA Hospital on Brownsboro Rd would be a tragedy for veterans and residents. More listening by the VA is needed!!!

Sandra Kissing  Louisville KY  40222 United States  11/30/2016

I am signing because the proposed site is ill-considered and backward-looking. Deep suburban placement of such facilities is inappropriate given the horrible public transit in Louisville and the demographic concentration of veterans in West and South Louisville. Note I write this as someone living in the East End only minutes from the proposed location.

I travel through the holiday manor area several times daily and it is already so congested at many times during the day, I cannot even imagine the negative impact a hospital being built in this area would have on everyone. An extension to allow a little more time seems such a small request. Please consider this request and the comments that arise from the responses submitted, to do the right thing, and make a change of giving the VA the what they deserve.

I have not had an adequate amount of time to review and interpret the entire document.

I'm concerned about the increased traffic and stress on the infrastructure. We are not serving the best interest of the school children in our neighborhood and others who would have to fight with daily traffic gridlock. The VA is about to make a serious blunder by choosing the property for the new hospital and many other services. Closing the area VA centers and consecrating them on this property is a disservice to our Vets. Further study needs to consider a new Hospital. Either down town with our major hospitals or else in the West End that so desperately needs good paying jobs which you will make available.

I don't want the VA being built there. It is a very poor choice. The Brownsboro traffic makes the currently considered location a poor choice. More time is needed to consider the environmental impact statement and assess the impact to my neighborhood.

I also want to protect Northfield and the surrounding areas from an adverse environmental impact on our community.

I oppose the the new construction of the VA Hospital off hwy 22.

I am against the VA best BF built in this space.

Sandra Kissing  Louisville KY  40222 United States  11/30/2016

I am a VET. I am signing for the property that would accommodate an outdoor facility to enhance veteran rehabilitation and perhaps a lodging facility/hotel for families of veterans that could generate money for upkeep of the property and provide family support for veterans. I think we need to be forward thinking about creating a facility that meets future needs as well as the needs required at this time!

I'm a VET and I want what is best for my fellow VETS.

I'm signing this petition because more time is needed in order to adequately review the environmental impact statement and assess the impact to my neighborhood.

I also want to protect Northfield and the surrounding areas from an adverse environmental impact on our community.

I oppose the the new construction of the VA Hospital off hwy 22.

I am against the VA best BF built in this space.

I'm concerned about the increased traffic and stress on the infrastructure. We are not serving the best interest of the school children in our neighborhood and others who would have to fight with daily traffic gridlock. The VA is about to make a serious blunder by choosing the property for the new hospital and many other services. Closing the area VA centers and consecrating them on this property is a disservice to our Vets. Further study needs to consider a new Hospital. Either down town with our major hospitals or else in the West End that so desperately needs good paying jobs which you will make available.

I don't want the VA being built there. It is a very poor choice. The Brownsboro traffic makes the currently considered location a poor choice. More time is needed to consider the environmental impact statement and assess the impact to my neighborhood.

I also want to protect Northfield and the surrounding areas from an adverse environmental impact on our community.

I oppose the the new construction of the VA Hospital off hwy 22.

I am against the VA best BF built in this space.

I have not had an adequate amount of time to review and interpret the entire document.

I'm concerned about the increased traffic and stress on the infrastructure. We are not serving the best interest of the school children in our neighborhood and others who would have to fight with daily traffic gridlock. The VA is about to make a serious blunder by choosing the property for the new hospital and many other services. Closing the area VA centers and consecrating them on this property is a disservice to our Vets. Further study needs to consider a new Hospital. Either down town with our major hospitals or else in the West End that so desperately needs good paying jobs which you will make available.

I don't want the VA being built there. It is a very poor choice. The Brownsboro traffic makes the currently considered location a poor choice. More time is needed to consider the environmental impact statement and assess the impact to my neighborhood.

I also want to protect Northfield and the surrounding areas from an adverse environmental impact on our community.

I oppose the the new construction of the VA Hospital off hwy 22.

I am against the VA best BF built in this space.

Sandra Kissing  Louisville KY  40222 United States  11/30/2016

I'm concerned about the increased traffic and stress on the infrastructure. We are not serving the best interest of the school children in our neighborhood and others who would have to fight with daily traffic gridlock. The VA is about to make a serious blunder by choosing the property for the new hospital and many other services. Closing the area VA centers and consecrating them on this property is a disservice to our Vets. Further study needs to consider a new Hospital. Either down town with our major hospitals or else in the West End that so desperately needs good paying jobs which you will make available.

I don't want the VA being built there. It is a very poor choice. The Brownsboro traffic makes the currently considered location a poor choice. More time is needed to consider the environmental impact statement and assess the impact to my neighborhood.

I also want to protect Northfield and the surrounding areas from an adverse environmental impact on our community.

I oppose the the new construction of the VA Hospital off hwy 22.

I am against the VA best BF built in this space.

I have not had an adequate amount of time to review and interpret the entire document.

I'm concerned about the increased traffic and stress on the infrastructure. We are not serving the best interest of the school children in our neighborhood and others who would have to fight with daily traffic gridlock. The VA is about to make a serious blunder by choosing the property for the new hospital and many other services. Closing the area VA centers and consecrating them on this property is a disservice to our Vets. Further study needs to consider a new Hospital. Either down town with our major hospitals or else in the West End that so desperately needs good paying jobs which you will make available.

I don't want the VA being built there. It is a very poor choice. The Brownsboro traffic makes the currently considered location a poor choice. More time is needed to consider the environmental impact statement and assess the impact to my neighborhood.

I also want to protect Northfield and the surrounding areas from an adverse environmental impact on our community.

I oppose the the new construction of the VA Hospital off hwy 22.

I am against the VA best BF built in this space.

I have not had an adequate amount of time to review and interpret the entire document.
This is my childhood neighborhood and my parents still live there. That area is not conducive to a major hospital. The traffic patterns don't support it; there are not enough emergency routes that ambulances could safely drive, no hotels close by, too many schools leading to children being late to and from due to increased traffic....

There is not enough time given to read the entire DEIS. We need more time in order to properly evaluate and comment. The VA is rushing us!

The decision to put the VA hospital at Interstate 264 and Rte 42 was ill-conceived and not well thought out. Besides traffic and pollution issues, easy accessibility via public transportation is non-existent and easy accessibility to other physicians and specialists is also non-existent. The current site is NOT centrally located and easily accessible to the veterans most of whom live in the western and southern parts of Louisville. This is a horrible location. Very congested with existing residential and commercial development and far away from patients. The traffic is horrible already and will only get (much) worse!

I do not believe the area will be able to adequately support additional activity created by the hospital traffic.

I'm against the proposed location because of high congestion, traffic, in area. It doesn't appear that anyone is happy with the proposed location - including the Vets. It seems the location is inconvenient for many. We need more time to consider other options.

I don't believe this is a good site for the veterans to travel to, plus the area is ridiculously crowded, the exit backs up to Westport Rd. and out on the expressway so it's dangerous.

I feel the traffic problem which already exists will increase to where it will be unbearable. It is the wrong location!!!!!!!

I am signing because I want what's best for the veterans. Louisville KY 40222

I'm signing because I want what's best for the veterans.

Don't want VA hospital built on Brownsboro Rd due to traffic/congestion concerns. The hospital will have a HUGE amount of very negative impacts on our area and our roads. As if a solution to traffic would be to widen Herr Lane... and do what... make it another ugly "Westport Road type horrible location!!!!!

I feel the traffic problem which already exists will increase to where it will be unbearable. It is the wrong location!!!!!!

I don't think this location is correct for the hospital.

I'm against the proposed location because of high congestion, traffic, in area. Now you can't move in traffic and sit at stoplights a long time. There is no where to go the way it is now even without the proposed V.A. Hospital.

I'm against the proposed location because of high congestion, traffic, in area. Now you can't move in traffic and sit at stoplights a long time.

The VA needs to be "co-located" in downtown Louisville, near the city's well established medical community. It doesn't appear that anyone is happy with the proposed location - including the Vets. It seems the location is inconvenient for many. We need more time to consider other options.

I'm signing because I want what's best for the veterans. Louisville KY 40222

The VA is rushing us!

I'm against the proposed location because of high congestion, traffic, in area. Now you can't move in traffic and sit at stoplights a long time...
### EM031- Supporter comments

- WE NEED MORE TIME! Please extend the replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Draft EIS comment period! City of Crossgate via Change.org

This series of comments are in the form of Web-based submissions collected in one HTML file from Change.Org on December 13, 2016. The comments are included here, below, as EM031-COMMENTS. Note that many, but not all, of these comments are exact duplicates of those submitted elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Name, City, State</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS</td>
<td>Robert Hoye, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>The proposed site is inadequate for &quot;long-range strategic planning&quot; for health care of deserving veterans. Consideration for new VA Hospital for location within the regional health care &amp; trauma center in the downtown medical center with existing facilities and health services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS</td>
<td>Laurie Heuglin, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>Need more time to review the DEIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS</td>
<td>Laurie Heuglin, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I believe the Brownsboro Rd site has too many traffic hindrances to be adequate for a hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS</td>
<td>Denise Kaufman, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I believe building a hospital at this location is a mistake. It's not convenient for the veterans or the doctors and the neighborhood is not equipped to handle the additional influx of people or traffic. This location would not be wasted if it could be used as an extension of the now-full Zachary Taylor Cemetary less than 1 mile from this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS</td>
<td>Jean Duncan, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>Traffic at the Hwy 42 exit from the Watterson is often a gridlock during hours that will mostly be impacted with even more traffic generated by the new VA center. The method of getting g people out of the VA Center is confusing and will dump more traffic on an already overly burdened section between the Watterson and Lime Kiln Lane. It is already very difficult getting in and out of these busy businesses along this section of road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS</td>
<td>Larry Schaefer, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I am signing because I believe the rushed timeline for reviewing and commenting on the Environmental Impact Statement is not in the public interest and gives the appearance that public comment is not really desired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS</td>
<td>Marcia Kearns, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I'm sending this petition because I don't like the idea of having inadequate time to read and understand it before the government imposed deadline is past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS</td>
<td>Steve Shapiro, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>The process of developing the EIS is flawed and I do not believe the site under consideration is the best site for a new VA Medical Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS</td>
<td>Nanette Vale, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>Our veteran's deserve a facility that will be convenient and useful to their needs and I do not believe that this site will serve that purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS</td>
<td>Susan Mays, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I do not think that the Brownsboro location is the best option for the new hospital. There is already a major traffic problem in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS</td>
<td>Vikki Webb, Louisville, KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I don't think this is the best site for the hospital. Space and traffic would be negatively impacted.

**EM031-COMMENTS - Fred Johnson, Louisville, KY**
I’m a Louisville veteran who uses the Robley Rex VA Hospital. We need to invalidate the current plan to move the new hospital to the Brownsboro Road site. We need more time to determine a location that provides the best accessibility and care for veterans.

**EM031-COMMENTS - Donna Sketo, Louisville, KY**
We are in support of our veterans and a new hospital if needed; however, even with the recent updated 2016 studies, concerns are not addressed such as:
1) Due diligence needs to be conducted on the updated 2016 traffic studies/environmental impact as the updated findings seem to be largely an effort to rationalize the Brownsboro Rd location with little substantiation re: impact of potential future builds of road infrastructure. At a minimum, even with a possible build, the traffic situation is not predicted by their own assessment to significantly improve - and that is based on predicted hypothetical traffic volume and patterns that they anticipate would result from locating the hospital here. So, they are trying to locate the hospital in an area that already has a very poor score with significant traffic congestion and they are showing little improvement gained from infrastructure builds predicted by their own assessment......how does this make sense? Even if their updated assessment was truly objective and accurate (and a build happens), in school a "D" with a slight potential improvement up to a "C", is still not considered good performance......does the government have so much lower of a standard?
2) The Brownsboro Road site only has 36 acres, which is currently less than the 47 acres the VA hospital now has and significantly less than the alternate St. Joseph site of 99 acres. Given the projected veteran population growth over the next 10 years as well as the potential construction cost, logic would dictate utilizing a site that has additional acreage to continue to allow for expansion past the next 10 years. It would be extremely short-sighted not to consider further expansion past a 10 year mark. The Brownsboro Road site is extremely limited due to being more tightly constrained on all sides as well as significantly more congested with a heavier population concentration.
3) The existing green space would be eliminated by the proposed hospital at the Brownsboro Site whereas other sites such as the current location or the alternate St. Joseph site would still have green spaces due to the additional acreage.
4) Additionally, it has been indicated that the majority of the local vets live in the West End and South End as well as the majority of the hourly workers, who heavily rely upon public transportation. The veteran population in the East End tends not to be as reliant on public transport. It makes more sense to locate the facility closer to the community of veterans it serves who needs to rely on public transportation or to have a site that can provide better access for the vets and workers.
There are better options for our vets and our citizens.

**EM031-COMMENTS - Jeff Sketo, Louisville, KY**
There are significantly better options for the location of the VA hospital and the issues this location would cause on traffic, light and noise pollution.

**EM031-COMMENTS - George McNair, Louisville, KY**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Name, Location</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS</td>
<td>Bob Jones, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I am signing this petition because the Midland property is too small to build a new VA hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am a Vietnam vet and it makes absolutely no sense to put this VA Hospital in this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancye Tuell, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I believe putting the VA hospital on old Brownsboro Road is not the best thing for the community. We already have way too much traffic and congestion in this area and would only be adding more traffic. I don't feel that all of the sites were looked at carefully and that the Brownsboro Road site was the only one considered. Not sure what went on that the Va had to pay $3 million more dollars for the property but this leads me to believe that this was the only site considered. Please look at other sites first and see if there's as much congestion and traffic as there is at this site. My vote would be to update the existing site or go with one of the other options. Thank you, N. Tuell Indian Ridge Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanley Wilcox, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>Need more time to review the study. Unrealistic deadline. Environmental impact will be disastrous. Study findings in favor of this site are unfounded and remain unverified with no credible evidence. The findings appear severely rationalized and serve solely to give a rubber stamp of approval to this project. I am an Air Force veteran/retiree vehemently opposed to this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April Morgan, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>This East end location seems illogical when most Veterans &amp; especially disabled Veterans in our community do not live in the east end. The South end or West end of our community would be a better location- not only for the veterans who would be visiting the hospital for services, but also for desperately needed economic development in those under-utilized areas. The current proposed site seems like some sort of grossly inflated land sale that was a result of some type of politically- motivated payoff or payback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Tomes, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I use the US 42 exit from I-264. Traffic is already terrible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peggy Kinnetz, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I'm concerned that the proposed VA facility will create a traffic bottleneck headache that will never be able to be corrected. There are better places to locate it that will better serve the patients. We need time to fully explore the impact of this on the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret Ballard, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>Terrible spot to put the VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLES WHALIN, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>THIS VAMC NEEDS TO BE LOCATED WHERE MOST VETERANS LIVE &amp; HAVE GOOD ACCESS. THAT IS NOT IN THE EAST END.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Anderson, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I am concerned about the impact on all parties involved - veterans, healthcare providers and neighborhood residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name, Location</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS - Nancy Kellond, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>This location is wrong for the Vets. Very few live in this area, and the space is too small.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS - John Rich, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>Traffic is bad now. With a Medical center we will be in traffic jams night and day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS - John Hood, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I'm concerned about the proposed East End Louisville VA site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS - Harriette Friedlander, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I'm signing this because the whole process has been fraught with problems. From overpaying for the site to poor response to the concerns of vets, and total disregard for community input it has been pushed through inappropriately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS - Kathlee Harrison, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I cannot bear the idea of having more traffic in this area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS - Carol Rosendaul, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I feel that this hospital will add far too much traffic in this area and is far to close to all the subdivision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS - Christine Berres, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I don't want the VA hospital to be built in the East End. Use that money to repair the fine hospital located off Zorn Ave. It is closer to the downtown hospitals the VA already uses for emergency cases for our Vets. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS - Brook Tafel, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>This location is not suitable for the additional load of traffic. Totally unacceptable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS - Candace Portman, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>Our Veterans deserve the extra time and attention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS - Joe Sullivan, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I'm not against the building of a new VA hospital, but feel this is the wrong location for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the amount of excess traffic congestion that will occur in an area already poorly designed and inefficient. In a city that continues to fail air quality standards, relocating ALL VA medical services to a suburban location farther from the highest population of veterans in the metro will only serve to increase the amount of vehicle emissions in the area and exacerbate both the air quality and urban heat island health issues of Louisville.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS - Tammy Kmetz, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I am signing because traffic is currently congested in the area so could not handle the increased volume nor allow for quick emergency vehicle access and the appropriated property is too small for the proposed facility. No one wins with this location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS - Elisabeth Read, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I am concerned that the site for va hospital will not be able to serve the veteran population effectively and efficiently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS - Marci Shuman, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>I don't think this location is correct for the hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM031-COMMENTS - Doug Deatz, Louisville, KY</td>
<td>The hospital will have a HUGE amount of very negative impacts on our area and our roads. As if a solution to traffic would be to widen Herr Lane ... and do what ... make it another ugly &quot;Westport Road type horrible transformation&quot;?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EM031-COMMENTS - Eleanor Stevens, Louisville, KY
Don't want VA hospital built on Brownsboro Rd due to traffic/congestion concerns

EM031-COMMENTS - Catharine Birch, Louisville, KY
We need more time to study the data accurately.

EM031-COMMENTS - Lynne Kelly, Louisville, KY
I feel the traffic problem which already exists will increase to where it will be unbearable. It is the wrong location!!!!!!!

EM031-COMMENTS - Joanne Weeter, Louisville, KY
The VA needs to be "co-located" in downtown Louisville, near the city's well established medical community.

EM031-COMMENTS - Beverly Kastan, Louisville, KY
I'm against the proposed location because of high congestion, traffic, in area. Now you can't move in traffic and sit at stoplights a long time. There is no where to go the way it is now even without the proposed V.A. Hospital.

EM031-COMMENTS - Mary Pfeider, Louisville, KY
Too much traffic

EM031-COMMENTS - Laurie Lyons, Prospect, KY
The proposed site just doesn't make sense in so many ways!

EM031-COMMENTS - Deborah Weeter, Louisville, KY
This project is very complex and locals need more time to absorb all information and respond appropriately to the planners of the project.

EM031-COMMENTS - Kyle Winkler, Louisville, KY
I am concerned about the impact of additional traffic in the already congested us 42 and us 22 corridor.

EM031-COMMENTS - Geoffrey Brooks, Louisville, KY
This was a very poor decision from the beginning and never made any sense to anyone who was following the issues concerning where to place the new VA Hospital. This has nothing to do with Nimbyism but simple logic.

EM031-COMMENTS - Marcy Suter, Louisville, KY
There is not enough room for a new VA Hospital on this property and it will cause too much traffic congestion at the Brownsboro Rd/Watterson Exwy interchange

EM031-COMMENTS - Cassie Boblitt, Louisville, KY
Local veterans are speaking out against the proposed location, if veteran care is truly a priority then we need to listen to our veterans. I am a veteran and I use the Robley Rex facility and I am asking for more time to determine a location that provides the best care and accessibility to our veterans. The proposed location will make care inaccessible to many vets in our community and that is a disgrace to those that served. Come on Louisville we are better than this!

EM031-COMMENTS - Fred Johnson, Louisville, KY
I'm a Louisville veteran who uses the Robley Rex VA Hospital. We need to invalidate the current plan to move the new hospital to the Brownsboro Road site. We need more time to determine a location that provides the best accessibility and care for veterans.

EM031-COMMENTS - Cindy Burell, Louisville, KY
I don't believe this is a good site for the veterans to travel to, plus the area is ridiculously crowded, the exit backs up to Westport Rd. and out on the expressway so it's dangerous.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EM031-COMMENTS - Stephanie Massler, Louisville, KY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It doesn't appear that anyone is happy with the proposed location - including the Vets. It seems the location is inconvenient for many. We need more time to consider other options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EM031-COMMENTS - Mary White, Louisville, KY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I live here</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EM031-COMMENTS - Lauri McDougall, Louisville, KY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The traffic simulations did NOT reflect current traffic flow on either side of I264 and brownsboro road. This is for both time spans presented. Additionally the person making the presentation was unprepared and unknowledgeable about the data (merely a button budget). The data intentionally MISREPRESENTS the traffic impacts!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EM031-COMMENTS - Penelope Gold, Louisville, KY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our family lives in Crossgate, and this project will have a tremendous impact on their property and quality of life there.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EM031-COMMENTS - Jean Koehler, Louisville, KY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE DEI is invalid and needs to be challenged. Traffic will be really bad in the current site selected and will degrade the value of my house and office building nearby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EM031-COMMENTS - Ann Adamek, Louisville, KY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We must have an extension of 60 days beyond 12-12-16 for public comment of the DEIS replacement for Robley Rex VA site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EM031-COMMENTS - Jay Flaherty, Louisville, KY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parties should be given the proper time to study the environmental impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EM031-COMMENTS - Sherry Humphrey, Louisville, KY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am opposed to the proposed Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center (VAMC) site at Kentucky Route 22 (Brownsboro Road). We are residents near this location and have not had enough time to prepare our case against this location. Please extend the deadline. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EM031-COMMENTS - Ed Henson, Louisville, KY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 day extension is a reasonable request.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EM031-COMMENTS - Ellen Shapira, Louisville, KY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think the Veterans would be better served if the hospital were elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EM031-COMMENTS - Stephen Koehler, Louisville, KY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I'm signing because I want what's best for the veterans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EM031-COMMENTS - Cara Magers, Louisville, KY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not believe the area will be able to adequately support additional activity created by the hospital traffic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EM031-COMMENTS - Anne Scholtz, Prospect, KY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is a horrible location. Very congested with existing residential and commercial development and far away from patients. The traffic is horrible already and will only get (much) worse!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EM031-COMMENTS - Tom Halbleib, Louisville, KY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The current site is NOT centrally located and easily accessible to the veterans most of whom live in the western and southern parts of Louisville.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EM031-COMMENTS - Adrienne Michels, Louisville, KY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The decision to put the VA hospital at Interstate 264 and Rte 42 was ill-conceived</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and not well thought out. Besides traffic and pollution issues, easy accessibility via public transportation is non-existent and easy accessibility to other physicians and subspecialties is also non-existent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM031-COMMENTS</th>
<th>Vicki Lurie, Louisville, KY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is not enough time given to read the entire DEIS. We need more time in order to properly evaluate and comment. The VA is rushing us!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM031-COMMENTS</th>
<th>Lisa Kaplin, Louisville, KY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is my childhood neighborhood and my parents still live there. That area is not conducive to a major hospital. The traffic patterns don't support it, there are not emergency routes that ambulances could safely drive, no hotels close by, too many schools leading to children being late to and from due to increased traffic...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM031-COMMENTS</th>
<th>Barbara Cooney, Chicago, IL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is important. Please sign.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM031-COMMENTS</th>
<th>Thomas Rademaker, Louisville, KY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is a bad utilization of the land available. VA Hospital is too large for site and traffic problems would cripple an already overburdened intersection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM031-COMMENTS</th>
<th>John Hicks, Louisville, KY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EIS is incomplete and invalid due to invalid and incomplete options. Considered an unavailable property and did not consider renovating existing facility. Terrible location for veterans due to veteran residence locations and unresolvable access and traffic issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM031-COMMENTS</th>
<th>Charles Westenhofer, Glenview, KY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bad location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM031-COMMENTS</th>
<th>Irene Yeager, Louisville, KY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is a common practice to have a document delayed and delayed and then issue it around major holidays, so the commenter have little time to respond. Thus the case currently?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM031-COMMENTS</th>
<th>Wayne Rentschler, Louisville, KY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am a VET. And I want what is best for my fellow VETS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM031-COMMENTS</th>
<th>Edward Dohn, Louisville, KY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are better places than here</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM031-COMMENTS</th>
<th>Lara Talbott, Louisville, KY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I travel through the holiday manor area several times daily and it is already so congested at may times during the day, I cannot even imagine the negative impact a hospital being built in this area would have on everyone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM031-COMMENTS</th>
<th>Steven Gardiner, Prospect, KY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As an Army veteran I am signing because the proposed site is ill-considered and backward-looking. Deep suburban placement of such facilities is inappropriate given the horrible public transit in Louisville and the demographic concentration of veterans in West and South Louisville. Note I write this as someone living in the East End only minutes from the proposed location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM031-COMMENTS</th>
<th>Tom Halbleib, Louisville, KY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our veterans deserve a more accessible and centrally located facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM031-COMMENTS</th>
<th>Roxanne Sturtevant, Louisville, KY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Brownsboro traffic makes the currently considered location a poor choice. More time is needed to consider the DEIS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM031-COMMENTS</th>
<th>Colleen Ryan, Louisville, KY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schu Montgomery</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyleen Parker</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>david kraft</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kkare Scales</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey Kraft</td>
<td>Longboat Key, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizzie Robinson</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kraft</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Elliott</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Rawls</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Lebre</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Windy Hills</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Aalen</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Elmes</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Roles</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Chappell</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara Estes</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona Lindsey</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Jenkins</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Burke</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Andriot</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Kissling</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Finley</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Fowler</td>
<td>Milltown, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The issue needs more time for study. I am very concerned about the location of the prosecution VA Hospital site. It seems I'll conceived.</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am against the VA best BF built in this space.</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I oppose the the new construction of the VA Hospital off hwy 22.</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I also want to protect Northfield and the surrounding areas from an adverse environmental impact on our community.</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be moving back in and the traffic will be unbearable</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross gate resident</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm signing this petition because more time is needed in order to adequately review the environmental impact statement and assess the impact to my neighborhood.</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My husband is a veteran. He and I have very serious concerns regarding the proposed location and its negative impact on veterans access to care;</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross gate and Northfield should be provided adequate time to review all documents.</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time required to review a 400+ page report the took 2 years to complete</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am signing because vets don't want this location and the location is too congested already!</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The VA hospital should never be considered for current location</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EIS study is insufficient as it compares two options that are not viable.</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not support the Brownsboro location for the new VA hospital.</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This intersection of highways 42 and 22 is already extremely congested. Why would anyone want to subject our veterans to this traffic nightmare?</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this location for the VA hospital will be devasting to the surrounding area and to veterans trying to get to the facility. It is already one of the most congested intersections in the city.</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned about the apparent uneven quality of the draft EIS which may make it inadequate.</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE CURRENTLY SELECTED SITE FOR THE VA HOSPITAL IS THE WRONG PLACE AND</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hoye</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Heuglin</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Kaufman</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Duncan</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Schaefer</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Kearns</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Shapiro</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanette Vale</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Mays</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikki Webb</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole Smith</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bailen</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Oliver</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer Holt</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Rhea</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Elmes</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Walker</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Speigel</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elwood Sturtevant</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Kirschenbaum</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Allgeier II</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Swain</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Burke</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Elder</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Baber</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Baber</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| John Salazar              | Louisville, KY | The recommended location for a fairly large health care complex on Kentucky Route 22 at an already congested interchange baffles the understanding of proper placement for such a facility. I live nearby and this is not a situation of "not in my back yard", it is simply an observer noting that this location is relatively
inaccessible, landlocked, has limited access points and without adding the increased traffic of the VA facility, already congested beyond belief. Come, observe the location and interchange of 42 and 22 during the day, it is BAD and no amount of modification of the roadways is going to alleviate the traffic gridlock. The plot of land is too tightly located in an area that has no good traffic resolution. Please reconsider.

**EM031-COMMENTS - Patricia Roles, Louisville, KY**
The VA is trying to rush the process of the draft EIS. This VAMC needs to be closer to were more Vets live, not Brownsboro Rd. Please sign this extension. For more info go to Growsmartlouisville.org. Thank you. This hospital is not a done deal!

**EM031-COMMENTS - Laura Blevins, Louisville, KY**
I do not think the area can handle the traffic. I can barely get out of Northfiels to get to work in the morning.

**EM031-COMMENTS - Debra Harlan, Louisville, KY**
I believe the chosen site is hopelessly useless to vets for access and ease of transport especially during peak hours when this area is in gridlock.

**EM031-COMMENTS - Melissa Bork, Louisville, KY**
I live nearby and believe locating the hospital there will make an already extremely congested traffic area exponentially worse. In addition, I am concerned that the hospital will negatively impact the noise in the area and the overall environment.

**EM031-COMMENTS - Bev Weinberg, Louisville, KY**
I want all aspects to be given careful thought before commenting.

**EM031-COMMENTS - Christine Shaw, Louisville, KY**
Extended time is necessary for due diligence.

**EM031-COMMENTS - Sharron Hilbrecht, Louisville, KY**
Please allow us the time to review the EIS in detail.

**EM031-COMMENTS - Chas Krish, Louisville, KY**
We need more time to review this extensive document.

**EM031-COMMENTS - Kirk Hilbrecht, Louisville, KY**
Crossgate and other cities will drastically be impacted by the new VAMC. We need more time to respond to the DEIS.
I am writing to vehemently oppose the latest EIS on the Brownsboro Rd. Site. I have lived in Graymoor Devondale since 1971, and over time, traffic congestion has increased to the point that cars are bumper-to-bumper along Hwy. 22, Hwy 42, Herr Ln., Westport Rd. and roads surrounding this proposed Brownsboro Rd. VA Site. I believe the decision was made long before this latest EIS. It saddens me that powerful leaders with money can go against our citizens and Veterans who have voiced strong opposition to this VA site. I challenge anyone with decision-making power to drive the streets mentioned above. I hate to see our taxpayer money used to the detriment to all but those in power. Sincerely, Ann Adamek, Graymoor Devondale resident.
Alternative B would be best for the vets. Alternative A is the worst due to traffic problems that already exist.

Liz Baber
Hello,

I am unable to make the public meeting on Nov 15th regarding the proposed VA Hospital near Brownsboro Road. Therefore, would like to submit my public comments via email.

I do not support building the VA hospital being built in the proposed location. There are other locations in Louisville that would be much better suited for this hospital.

The Brownsboro Road site a poor choice for accessibility. The proposed site is not well connected to public transit and is not well-suited for other modes of transit besides cars.

This site is a poor choice for the environment. The current site is a green space. Why develop green space when there are so many other sites in our city that already have infrastructure?

The site is a poor choice for Louisville as a whole. We can use this project as a economic development driver for our city. The project, located at this site, does not catalyze broader economic development for our city.

Please do not construct the hospital on this site. Consider an alternative, downtown site.

Thanks,
Jackie Cobb
The Eastern location makes absolutely no sense. I like the downtown, 9th street area. It is more accessible to those in the West End, is easy to get to from the east and although a bit further for those in the South Dixie area, still better than the current or proposed hospital. I hope you’ll do the right thing for the veterans and not for pure political reasons.

Jim Cowles
To whom it may concern,

As a Veteran who uses the Louisville VA Medical Center, I would like to give my opinion on the location of the new proposed facility.

I do not like the idea of having the facility site changed to a downtown location. I am sorry that the west end lost out on their opportunity to have a Walmart, but that and the desire for city officials to have more income flowing into the downtown area is not my concern. My concern is that the facility is located in a spot that will have ample FREE parking and one in which I feel fairly safe walking to and from my car regardless of the time of day or night. Part of the problem with the current facility is lack of close parking and not wanting patients to drive around forever looking for a parking spot and then having to walk long distances or shuttle to the building. A downtown spot would not fix this problem. Also I do not feel the traffic dilemma for patients would be any better in the downtown hustle and bustle then it would be at the Brownsboro location, especially for Southern Indiana patients, once the east end bridge is completed.

I think the politicians weighing in on this matter should remember, the facility is being built for the benefit of the veterans, not that of the city's economy.

Sincerely,
C. Guennouni
November 21, 2016

Comment Form
Draft Environmental Impact Statement
For Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus

The proposed site for the new Louisville Veterans Hospital at Watterson Expressway and Brownsboro Rd. is wrong, wrong, wrong.

Wrong for the veterans. Many will have to travel great distances from Dixie Hgwy, Taylor Blvd, West Louisville and Southern IN and encounter long traffic delays at this location. And, there is NO plan or space for future expansion. The veterans deserve better, much better especially considering this new facility will cost about ONE BILLION dollars or more by the time it is furnished.

Wrong for the taxpayers. That’s all of us. Our federal government paid about $13,000,000 for the site which has a documented value of no more than $8,000,000 to $10,000,000. Makes you wonder who is benefitting from playing fast and loose with our money or is the VA incompetence in managing development and construction really that bad. And based on the debauchal currently going on with the VA Hospital in Denver we can certainly expect nothing but hugh cost overruns and multiple time delays.

Wrong for the neighborhood/community. The traffic at this location is abysmal already without the additionally necessary traffic for the construction and the thousands of cars coming and going for the hospital staff and veteran outpatients. The proposed garage is supposed to hold 3000 cars, times a turnover rate of at least 3 equals about 15,000 in and out vehicles per day. Traffic on the Watterson already backs up to Westport Rd. at rush hour. And, there are currently over 4000 students in four schools off of Herr Ln. less than a mile from the proposed site. Parents are coming and going at these schools now and will be doing so often at hospital shift changes which will add to more chaos.

Alternate Site. Many other sites have been suggested at the public meetings, sites more centrally located, sites more economically beneficial, sites more in line with veteran’s needs and desires, and sites less expensive to develop. However, none of these were considered in the VA impact studies.

Help! We need the Veterans Administration to rethink this site now. Thanks for your consideration.

Walter Thomas Halbleib Sr.
Kentucky Air National Guard Veteran
Don't build new hospital. The quality of care by the VA is so poor that it is not worth it. Use the money instead to let us go out into the real hospitals for treatment.

Nobody gets fired at the VA so there is no incentive to treat Veterans with respect they deserve. I went to the Emergency Room at 5am recently and the only 2 staff members were just having a conversation. One was a janitor and the other I couldn't say. They had no intention of helping patients.
The writer is a ninety-two year old Air Force veteran of three-and-a-half years of service. I've been a patient on several occasions in the Robley Rx VA Medical Center. Many departments have been involved. In every instance I have been treated with care and respect. I have never had any complaint of any kind. I have been an advocate of replacement at the Brownboro Rd. site since the land was purchased. I have studied the access from each possible direction throughout the state and beyond. I had studied projected population estimates for the future decades. The only topic I've not be able to approximate has been the World War II veterans likely to visit the proposed site. However, in my studied opinion I have concluded that almost all of the adverse criticism of this site has been has been less than the positive benefits that can be expected once the new facility is in operation. My major personal concern has been for the obvious delay that will occur while others have their say on the subject, because I am not likely to live to see the opening of the new facility. Nonetheless, I am most optimistic that younger veterans will obtain the quality of benefits I would anticipate once the facility opens. The advantages of the Brownsboro road site far outweigh the other considered sites in my opinion. My ardent hope is that work will begin post haste and the continuing debates will cease. Each passing day without action is adding to the cost, not only as an economic issue, but as an improvement in the care of veterans.

Thank you for this opportunity to offer my sentiments.

            Charles L. Hansen
            Louisville, Ky. 40222
To Whom It May Concern:

Several years have passed since the VA purchased the Midlands property, a site that was extremely untenable at that
time due to the already existing traffic conditions in the Brownsboro Rd./US 42 corridor. Since then, in the one-mile
radius of the property, traffic has worsened because of additional retail expansion. Even now, there is advertisement
for new retail expansion in the Fresh Market center which means more cars and trucks in this area. Across from
Ballard High School is an unoccupied large field zoned for retail on a two lane road. On this same road are two
more schools, a nursing home, tennis center, a veterinary care center and a large retail development directly off
Westport Rd. What happens when this field becomes developed?

Then there are additional retail establishments on both sides of Lime Kiln Lane. I would be interested in knowing
what the air pollution levels are during an inversion as well as during daily use of these roads. We have students
housed in nearby schools who are breathing this air and who may have or will develop asthma from the increase in
pollution.

The IES is wrongly stating that the building of this hospital will have little adverse effect.
Adverse effects to whom? We would see an increase in air and noise pollution, drainage problems, congestion,
traffic jams and black topping of green space.

I have strongly objected to the construction of this site for years, at VA meetings, in writing, and signing petitions. I
know no one in Louisville who thinks this this is a good idea. I would like to see the VA survey the immediate and
surrounding sixth and fourth class cities to get reactions from those residing there. I complained at the last VA
Town meeting that the VA has never responded to statements or questions I have posed.
Once again, I am appealing to your good sense to stop this construction plan and to locate it in an area better suited
for veterans’ transportation needs and proximity to downtown hospitals.

Anne Stanley Hoffman
1809 Warrington Way
Louisville, KY 40222
Sent from my iPad
I am a disabled veteran, and if the VAMC is moved to west Louisville, I will move to a different city. Too much crime in the west end! I would worry about going there after dark! Don't move to the west end!
Hello,

I am a resident in the Crossgate community and would like to share my thoughts on the pending VA Hospital replacement location decision. In short, I do not believe the Brownsboro location is the ideal location for the hospital for a number of reasons:

1. If the true intent is to serve the vets of our community, **the hospital should be located closer to where a good majority of the population lives.** Most of the vets that will be utilizing the hospital do not live close, or even somewhat close, to the Brownsboro location. This will cause undue stress on people using the facilities as they will be farther away from their homes and families while undergoing treatment.

2. The Brownsboro **location is not conducive to higher volumes of traffic.** The section of Brownsboro Road that the hospital would be located on already sees an enormous amount of traffic and congestion. With years of construction and then with the hospital in full operation, there is not an effective answer to the traffic issues that will surely (and have been discussed in the Environmental Study) arise.

3. The VA hospital and its **patients should have easy access to as many medical resources as are available,** and Brownsboro Road is clearly not as convenient to medical staff/interns as other alternate locations downtown/south/west ends are. As it is my understanding that the VA hospital will utilize students, it only makes sense for the location to be closer to where the students and other resources are working.

4. **It is not too late to undo a bad political real estate deal.** It is clear that the purchase of the Brownsboro location by the government was based on political deals and handshakes, and not on what is best for the community. It is not too late to take a step back and decide what is actually best for the vets, for the neighboring areas of the hospital location, and for the city in general.

I appreciate your consideration and please do not hesitate to contact me if necessary.

Thanks,

Katie

Katie Jenkins, MBA, Principal
Talent Information Solutions
This email and any attachments may be confidential or proprietary. Any review, use, disclosure, distribution or copying of this email is prohibited except by or on behalf of the intended recipient. If you received this message in error or are not the intended recipient, please delete or destroy the email message and any attachments or copies and notify the sender of the erroneous delivery by return email. To the extent that this message or its attachments were sent without encryption, we cannot guarantee that the contents have not been changed or tampered with. Any advice expressed in this message is being delivered to you solely for your use in connection with the matters addressed herein and may not be used for any other purpose without our prior written consent.
I like all of the other people in Louisville, oppose the relocation site for the VA hospital. If we are truly a democracy, there is no choice but to reject this location and try another site that will work much better for the hospital.

Tom Jolly, MBA
Sales Associate
502-724-4472

David Day Real Estate
Hello, I am a resident of Crossgate and would like to take this opportunity to address a few comments regarding the Draft EIS for the Robley Rex replacement VA hospital proposed to be built on the former Midlands property off of the Watterson expressway and Brownsboro Road in eastern Jefferson County Kentucky zip code 40222.

1. The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet had already stated that the high volume of traffic on surrounding congested roadways below any passing grade and has given grades of F and D at best. This is even after a new interchange at the Watterson Expressway and US 42 and other road changes are made. The addition of 3000 more cars to this situation will not improve it and will make accessibility thru the ONE AND ONLY PUBLIC ENTERANCE to the hospital a 24/7 nightmare. The EIS traffic study done during mostly the summer and during the time that the Holiday Manor Kroger store was closed for renovation does not show true traffic patterns.

2. Being a land locked property offering absolutely no room for future expansion brings up the specter of Eminent Domain and how it will effect local businesses and neighborhoods. This has been a solution that the VA has used before, in New Orleans for example. Existing property values will plummet.

3. Storm water run off from the hospital will be directed to adjacent properties in Crossgate causing flooding in our homes. This would be in addition to Crossgate’s drainage that now is directed to the Midlands. Louisville MSD has said that until this is corrected nothing can be built on the Midlands property.

4. The VA ignores its own studies of where veterans who use the current hospital want the replacement hospital to be. They want it to stay where it is. See Davis study in 2009.

5. The EIS does not consider three viable sites as it states, but only two. The St Josephs site, after not being chosen was taken out of the running by its owners by their pursuing commercial development and slating such. It should not have been included for consideration in the EIS study.

6. There is nothing that can be said, no matter how hard you try, that can justify a 200+ foot building in an area that currently has nothing taller than 2 stories. It is not in the eye of the beholder as stated in the EIS if the hospital will be a visual pleasing addition to the landscape. It is pure and simply a monstrosity that will lurk over everything in the area.

7. Air quality will be impacted. It is already impacted by the high level of auto emissions derived from the high number of cars using the local roads. How will the addition of 3000 more cars to the mix not up the anti?

8. Sufficient utilities do not currently exist to serve the hospital. There are no enough electrical capacity or sewer line to easily tap into. Major new electric substation will need to be built and a long connection to a major sewer line, both likely to cause massive disruption of residential neighborhoods and many local business.

9. Due to the socio economic make up of the east end location of the proposed build most of the hospital workers will not be residents. They will necessarily have to come from other parts of the metro area. If driving they contribute to the congestion and air pollution. If not driving they must use public transportation which is woefully poor to the hospital local. This will
subject those workers to the whims of poor schedules resulting in extremely longer commutes to and from work than necessary.

There are many more issues that can be mentioned. I will let the experts elaborate. All in all the Midlands site is the wrong one. The best site based on veteran’s wishes id the existing location. The best site available now which is close to shovel ready is in the West End in the location that Walmart pulled out of.
Thank you for considering my comments.

Larry Kirschenbaum
1803 Grantham Court
Louisville, KY 40222
Larry_kirschenbaum@yahoo.com

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Hoping for a reasonably accurate schedule of timing on this major project.

Thanks in advance!

Dan
Daniel Ledwig
Strategic Global Accounts Manager-Federal Government
Honeywell | Security and Fire
1909 Harvest Dance Dr.
Leander, TX 78641
Office: 512-337-5823
Mobile: 626-536-1414

Dan.ledwig@honeywell.com
www.honeywell.com
Please reconsider the idea of placing the new VA hospital in the East End. We need to take care of our veterans that are most in need and those are not found living in the East End, but in the West side of the city. Use the construction of this hospital as a catalyst for jobs, security and revitalization to a neighborhood in the West End. 
there are several possible locations:
To Whom It May Concern,
As the widow of a 100% disabled Vietnam Veteran, I have both concern and experience with the VA hospital here in Louisville. I assure you the Brownsboro Road site is the best option for the veterans new hospital property. It is away from the downtown area yet convenient to the original VA hospital. It is right off the expressway with easy access with little impact to the surrounding area. Once the new property is up and running it would be so beneficial to use at least some of the original VA hospital for a nursing home facility. It is tragic that a city as large as Louisville does not have a nursing home for our veterans. Please thing of the ease and availability for these facilities from the veterans and their families view and not from the surrounding residents. Shame on those residents for not welcoming this with open arms. Our veterans deserve the best!!

Fran McCormick
2516 Clearbrook Dr.
40220
I am not a veteran, but I do live in Crossgate. While I do worry about traffic issues, property values, noise, etc. To me the worse things about the Midlands location deal with the service to the veterans. The property does not allow for any expansion for future needs and there can be no doubt that at some point in the not too distant future that the hospital will need to grow bigger. Another issue is that it is far removed from the doctors that will be coming there and when they do come there they and the ambulances will have to deal with the traffic congestion. During rush hours there have always been long lines of traffic at the lights.

This property would be better used as an expansion of the Zachary Taylor cemetery and the hospital would be better off being built closer to other hospitals which will undoubtedly be providing some consultations/services.

Larry Meyer
1907 Crossgate Ln.
Louisville, KY
Two days ago I was stuck in traffic on the KY 22 exit off of Watterson Expressway. Normally, this exit flows fairly well, but at 3:00 that day it was backed up quite a ways. While I sat there I thought about the ambulances and patients trying to get to the proposed hospital. It is very common (daily) for Interstate 71 North to back up all the way to the Westport Rd exit. I don't think our veterans should have to creep through the back up with sirens blaring when seconds count.
EM-0 5
From: Roger Ohlman
To: Louisville Replacement Hospital Comments
Subject: [EXTERNAL] New VA Hospital Comments
Date: Friday, November 18, 2016 5:56:54 PM

I support a West End location for the new VA Hospital. Land would likely be cheaper, it would be an anchor to promote a financially struggling community, provide easier access for many who do not have the means to get to Brownsboro Rd.

I think this is the right thing to do.

Thanks for giving me the opportunity to provide input.

Roger
Hello,

I wanted to make a comment to request that the VA hospital be built on the 34 acre lot where Beecher Terrace will be demolished. I live off Buttonwood Rd, right in the neighborhood behind the proposed Brownsboro site, though I work for Vision Russell with the Louisville Metro Housing Authority. Something that I have learned from living on the east end, while working in the west end of Louisville is accessibility is a luxury. In my neighborhood I do not believe anyone cannot afford a vehicle and by looking at the neatly manicured lawns and multiple cars I see going to and from most households, I definitely do not feel anyone is struggling to financially meet their basic needs. In Russell, there is not even a grocery store to purchase fresh produce, let alone a place for our nations’ veterans who have not been financially fortunate to access healthcare. There are not currently benches at most bus stops, I have never seen a bus shelter in Russell as well. Though we (Vision Russell) are working toward adding bus shelters and seating, someone who has served our country should not have to sit outside waiting for a bus to take them across town for a doctor’s appointment.

I invite you observe the current traffic situation in front of the proposed Brownsboro site. There is a heavy concentration of retail and residential land use, which results in frequent standstills in the middle of intersections following the on/off ramps of 71 and 264 and on Brownsboro road. The current arterials cannot support additional traffic and currently stand as incomplete streets as it is.

A hospital is a destination and would further compliment the Russell revitalization efforts underway. Russell has a very strong community and I know that there are many people who would love the opportunity to serve the VA hospital as it would be a development they/we would be proud of. On the eastend, we have it all; bring another hospital and add to our traffic woes. But the people of Russell want this hospital because it will not just be a hospital, but it will be social change, it will be hope, it will be the decrease in community crime, it will be the increase in traffic Russell needs to boost economic growth. It will be the future of Russell. Come and be a part of the change!

I’m in the process of designing a bus shelter honoring veterans, so we’re already getting ready!

Thank you for taking the time to read my e-mail,
Chloe Quiroga
Choice Neighborhoods Initiative Administrative Assistant
Louisville Metro Housing Authority
VisionRussell.org
EM-0 7

From:          jerry rice  
To:            Louisville Replacement Hospital Comments  
Cc:            Angela Leet  
Subject:       [EXTERNAL] Public comments  
Date:          Tuesday, November 22, 2016 2:52:05 PM

Sirs/Madams,

I wholeheartedly agree with Councilwoman Angela Leet's comments of November 15, 2016, in support of building the replacement VA Hospital in West Louisville.

It is a wise move, solving problems in both east and west ends of our community. The Brownsboro Road corridor is already terribly overcrowded with traffic. Why add needy veterans, including many seniors, to that mix of woes?

Sincerely,

Jerry L. Rice  
Former board member and past-president of the Louisville Historical League

706 Stivers Road  
Louisville, Kentucky 40207
An essential task to any site selection is to do a desire line analysis. This looks at all existing trips to determine the optimal spacial location for a new site. That is, where are VA patients and staff coming from and how are they getting there - drive, drop-off, or transit.

Lack of such a review of user travel patterns is a lack of due diligence. But bus access is critical. Those who cannot get to the site cannot be served. A downtown site would likely be best as bus routes radiate from downtown. It also has the advantage of being near other medical services and doctors reduce travel when they serve multiple hospitals.

The existing site at least maintains existing travel patterns.

Thanks,
Ted Stone
2830 Tremont Drive
Louisville, Ky 40205
Angela, Good job last night. My hope is perhaps our new President will "drain swamp" and include VA dept.. That group of bureaucrats is one of the most unimpressive cabals I've encountered. Jim

James F. Wilson, Senior Adviser (WRE Realty LLC)
Sperry Van Ness Ward Commercial Group
11001 Bluegrass Pkwy, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40299
(C) 502-303-1351 (O) 502-297-8797 (F) 502-498-5475
jim.wilson@svn.com  www.svnward.com

Each Office Independently Owned and Operated
Attached is my comment form for Replacement of the VA Hospital.

Please let me know if you could open it ok.

Carol Rawert Trainer
Veterans For Peace
Chapter 168 Louisville Contact
502-500-6915
CRawertTrainer@twc.com
Comment Form

Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center Campus

Name: Carol Trainer, & husband Harold A. Trainer

Organization: Veterans For Peace, chapter 168 president

Address: 10529 Championship Court  City: Prospect,  State: KY  Zip: 40059

Add to mailing list? YES

Comments:
My husband Harold Trainer is a retired veteran (USAF, Maj, Ret.) and I am a Vietnam era USAF veteran. We are against moving the VA Hospital to the Brownsboro site for these reasons:

1. The site is not large enough for expansion.
2. The site is not a worthy place of veteran healing. It hangs off a major freeway with ever increasing traffic. It will be noisy and polluted from all the traffic. What veterans will need is quiet space like they have at Zorn.
3. The ingress and egress of not only patient vehicles but especially of emergency vehicles trying to get in and out will be terrible and impact safety and lives.
4. It needs to be near U of L Hospital for easy access to medical facilities and services.
5. It needs to be closer to downtown where veterans who do not have good transportation can easily get there by bus or taxi. People in the East End can afford cars and transportation to other sites.
6. A majority of Veterans want it at Zorn.

Choices:

1st choice: I vote for keeping the hospital where it is at Zorn.

2nd choice: downtown near U of L Hospital.

Wishes for future use of sites

If the Zorn site is vacated, the site should be used as a combined Veteran facility including, Nursing Home, Rehab facility, Independent Living facility, and more.

If the Brownsboro site is abandoned, it should be used as an annex of Zachery Taylor Cemetery which is full. The Louisville veterans have a lot of veterans and definitely need more nearby burial space.

In closing, the whole deal of building at Brownsboro site reeks of complicity between politicians and developers. The veterans are not being heard. The VA is trying to ram this down our throats.

Signed

Carol Rawert Trainer (CRawertTrainer@twc.com, 502-500-6915)

Harol A Trainer (HatCom1@twc.com, 502-419-4083)
From: Mike Yeager
To: Williams, Judy; Louisville Replacement Hospital Comments
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) - not available on your website
Date: Friday, October 28, 2016 3:03:45 PM
Attachments: image002.png, image003.png

Thank you

Michael L. Yeager
Architect

611 West Main Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202
502-582-2500
www.knbarch.com

From: Williams, Judy [mailto:Judy.Williams@va.gov]
Sent: Friday, October 28, 2016 4:02 PM
To: Mike Yeager; Louisville Replacement Hospital Comments
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) - not available on your website

Mr. Yeager,

The document is now available on our homepage. www.louisville.va.gov
Just click on the NEW MEDICAL CENTER UPDATES button and the documents are located in the “Reports & Word Documents” section located to the far right. Please let me know if I provide any further assistance. Thank you.

VR,

Judy Williams
Public Affairs Officer
Robley Rex VA Medical Center
Louisville, KY 40206
(502) 287-5502

From: Mike Yeager [mailto:MYeager@knbarch.com]
Sent: Friday, October 28, 2016 12:54 PM
To: Louisville Replacement Hospital Comments
Subject: [EXTERNAL] EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) - not available on your website

Michael L. Yeager
Architect

611 West Main Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202
502-582-2500
www.knbarch.com
EM-037

From: "Brad Williams" <brad.williams@atlasied.com>
To: "Louisville Replacement Hospital Comments" <LouisvilleReplacementHospitalComments@va.gov>
Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2016 11:03 AM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] VA hospital location selection

To Whom It May Concern,

Please reconsider your site location for the proposed VA hospital. This area is very congested with traffic at most times of the day. I have lived in the City of Crossgate for 10 years and have watched the traffic steadily increase even through the addition of the 264 Westport road exit; which was supposed to alleviate pressure on US22/42. It did not. In fact it caused additional congestion on Eastbound 264 backing it up all the way into the Shelbyville road and I64 exchanges.

Now, on most weekdays, you can expect to find a solid gridlock on 264East from the I64 interchange east all the way to I71. My commute from J-Town used to take 15 minutes, now it can take up to 45 minutes+. This hospital plan is to be right in this route. **How will an ambulance deal with this gridlock?** Surface streets in this area are not any better. There are simply too many cars attempting to travel through this area for the roads, signals and highways to handle. **The first time a VA patient suffers due to bad traffic, I will hold the VA accountable** because we all knew about how bad this traffic is well before the hospital was built.

This area has outgrown the infrastructure and the addition of this large institution will cripple the local traffic and make commuting unbearable. My family will have no choice but to move to another State. I am a US Navy veteran of the 1991 Gulf War and my wife is a 29 year professional in the medical industry. We both see the need for a modern facility for our vets but both feel the facilities are already available throughout the community. Let the vet use any hospital in their community.

Thank You,
Robert Williams
I want to add my voice to all of those others who oppose the location for the new VA hospital at Brownsboro Road and Watterson Expressway. The public transportation on which so many veterans rely is inadequate to that location and the traffic around that location is already terrible and will be even worse if the hospital is built there. There is only one route for people heading east on Brownsboro crossing the Watterson and it is severely backed up from about three thirty p.m. on. The traffic can be backed up to Hubbards Lane and there is no alternative route. Then on the other side of the Watterson the backups are also bad trying to go west across the Watterson. My family lives about a mile and a half west of the Watterson and we avoid going east later in the afternoon as it is.

There are at least two much preferable sites either downtown or in western Louisville where traffic would have many alternate routes and where public transportation is far better.

Please reconsider locating the new hospital in the Brownsboro Road location and consider alternative sites.

Thank you,
Mary D. Peters
421 Oread Road
Louisville, KY 40207

Sent from my iPad
Hello,

I am unable to make the public meeting on Nov 15th regarding the proposed VA Hospital near Brownsboro Road. Therefore, would like to submit my public comments via email.

I do not support building the VA hospital being built in the proposed location. There are other locations in Louisville that would be much better suited for this hospital.

The Brownsboro Road site a poor choice for accessibility. The proposed site is not well connected to public transit and is not well-suited for other modes of transit besides cars.

This site is a poor choice for the environment. The current site is a green space. Why develop green space when there are so many other sites in our city that already have infrastructure?

The site is a poor choice for Louisville as a whole. We can use this project as a economic development driver for our city. The project, located at this site, does not catalyze broader economic development for our city.

Please do not construct the hospital on this site. Consider an alternative, downtown site.

Thanks,
Jackie Cobb
Still Deciding at the VA

Why is the choice so hard? Placement of the new VA hospital carries this scenario: at Brownsboro Rd. the hospital would cause pollution, increase traffic congestion, raise new environmental issues, present public transportation problems for veterans without cars, and is vehemently opposed by many residents of the area, homeowners who fear all of these negative impacts as well as a decrease in their property values. These citizens have given a great deal of time and effort to make their voice heard, including the mayor’s who supports another review for a different location and promises help with that.

In spite of these negatives, the VA Medical Center Director Martin Trexler says he will not consider alternatives as part of his decision making about building this billion dollar hospital. How can he answer his own question “...are we or are we not going to build at the Brownsboro Center” without considering inviting offers from western Louisville, Bullitt County and Radcliff. Before spending a billion dollars, research on all proposals and on their impact makes sense. Rigidity has no place in making a final decision.

Frances O’Connor
505 Morningside Drive
502-896-0430
I would like to point to an existing site that could possibly fulfill the need for the new hospital, that is if the Brownsboro Rd. Site is not chosen. St. Catharine College Campus shut down in July of this year, and that campus is currently for sale. The listing can be viewed here: http://looplink.louisville.cbre.us/ll/20049039/2735-Bardstown-Road/

This site is located in Springfield, KY, which is in the geographic center of Kentucky, and within an hour’s drive from Louisville and Lexington. I would be happy to discuss this property further, as well what our community can offer as support and other incentives. Thanks!

Daniel B. Carney
Executive Director
Springfield-Washington County
Economic Development Authority
Office:(859) 336-0052
Cell: (859) 481-1437
fax:(859) 336-9410
daniel@sweda.org
I am sending this message stating my disagreement with the proposed location for the new Robley Rex VA Hospital. I am a veteran and am submitting this because of concerns/disagreement with the current proposed replacement hospital location. The new VA hospital needs to be located outside the city proper. This would make it easier for the veterans to get to it, especially the veterans, such as myself, who are getting up there in years. I know there are several alternative locations proposed. I am not voting for any one over the other. I disagree with the current proposed new location. Again traffic concerns come to the forefront. When you look at the age of who uses this hospital, ease of access MUST be in the forefront of a location decision. Thanks.
I travel each day by the proposed site of the new VA hospital...US22 and US42, and I always experience traffic. I work out of my house but take kids to school, pick up, drive to sports and run errands...no matter what time of day, there is congestion. When I travel the Watterson Xpray and exit onto US22 (as I do daily because one child attends school in the Highlands) there is an ABUNDANCE of traffic at 4PM-5PM. We sit and wait and wait.

I cannot imagine if a hospital were to be built at the proposed site.

I would love to move inward of the expressway but at this time cannot afford a move.

Please join me in the congestion and come see how terrible traffic is on a "good" day.

Thanks for considering the Ratcliff site or 30th street locations.

Sincerely,
Sarah
502-338-9718
Like our Mayor, Mike Weaver, I live in Radcliff. Last Friday, 23 December 2016, all the veterans in this area read in our local paper, with hope, that GIVING fifty (50) acres for the new VA Hospital would be considered. In the Sunday, 25 December newspaper, we all read that NO OTHER areas are being looked at. This is not only unjust, but confirms that the VA is closed minded when it comes to new ideas. Like Mayor Weaver, all of us must leave our homes two (2) hours before our appointments at the Louisville VA facility. Then, we spent another fifteen (15) to thirty (30) minutes looking for a parking space. The shuttle bus is not a viable help.

Thanks to the Obama regime, we lost the entire Armor Force and School to a place where they have NO firing ranges and limited space to maneuver the heavy vehicles, not to mention a species of endangered wildlife.

We hear nothing but NEGATIVE comments from the citizens of Louisville about the proposed location, even from the Mayor of Louisville himself. We also hear about helping the Veterans of this once great nation anyway possible, but this is no help to the Veterans in this area.

Since the proposed site was talked about years ago, I wondered about building a new facility some where along Gene Snyder Freeway. There are a lot of exits and open spaces which would accommodate this hospital.

Our new Veteran's Home, which is already overdue, is scheduled to open shortly. Not to be morbid, but the new Veterans Cemetery is just over the hill from the Veteran's Home, and the new VA hospital would be easily accessible to both entities.

We have a large variety of religious denominations in this area. Holiday Inn has a hotel just about two (2) miles from the location here in Radcliff, another hotel next to it, and a new hotel is scheduled for construction starting next year. A gas station, Wallmart Mini Store, Mc. Donalds, Colton's Steak House and other eating places are within two (2) miles of the Radcliff location.

A big plus for putting the hospital in Radcliff. Fort Knox is just five (5) minutes away with an Exchange, Commissary, and other military specific programs and facilities.

I speak for myself, but I am sure that other Veterans in this area feel the same way I do.

Pinky Bilz
Radcliff
270-352-4297
Hello,

I am a citizen of Radcliff, KY. For years I personally have watched several friends and family members drive to either the Louisville area or the Litchfield area to go to their VA appointments. I have witnessed numerous issues with both sites first hand. Since the Ireland Army hospital downsize, these issues have increased. Personally, relocating the VA to the proposed Radcliff area off of 313 seems to make the most sense. It has adequate road access to accept higher volumes of traffic, excellent land size, great location, and is already set up for utilities. Please consider this location as a serious possibility. I know Mayor Mike Weaver is planning on submitting the proposal in full before the 11th of January deadline if he hasn't already.

Thank you,

Johnathan M. Lybbert
KEEP THE VA WHERE IT IS!

Please see the attached.

Thank You

Dr. George Moorman, PhD, MPH, M(CSW), BSW, disabled Vietnam veteran
KEEP THE VA WHERE IT IS!

As we continue to play political ping-pong with the prospects of a new VA hospital, let’s not forget the real reason for this undertaking; better services for the veteran. The VA has become its own worst enemy. It is administratively top-heavy and most in those roles could care less of the plight of a veteran. I am beginning to believe that those requesting the building of a VA hospital in their backyard, also do so with consideration of the financial gains for their districts. Years after announcing the plan for a new VA we are still negotiating, politicking and neglecting the overall beneficiary of the project. We’ve spent taxpayer dollars developing plans, meeting, meeting, meeting and more meetings while forming transition teams. Transition teams added millions of dollars to already inflated managerial budgets and now that plans have stalled, these teams have replaced and/or forced out other committed employees. So far the only thing transitioning has been the rhetoric. It would be more feasible to rebuild the new hospital in phases on its present site.

PHASE ONE

- Immediate construction of a multi-level parking/administration structure on Zorn Ave. in front of present structure. This would house, director suites, HR, engineering, business, credit union, and fiscal offices.

PHASE TWO (upon completion of Phase 1)

- Move director’s suites, HR, engineering, business, credit union, fiscal offices into new administration structure.
- Move employee/valet/resident/volunteer parking to the parking structure.
- Move GEC/CVT, CNP into director’s suites.

PHASE THREE (upon completion of Phase II)

- Demolish buildings T20, T22, T27, 3, 4, and 5.
- Construct new hospital in areas previously occupied by employee parking, T20, T27, T22.
- Construct a domiciliary and mental health facility in areas once occupied by buildings 3, 4, and 5.

PHASE FOUR (upon completion of Phase III)

- Open new hospital.
- Demolish sections of old hospital.
- House nursing home, hospice and homeless in the domiciliary in areas previously occupied by building 3 and 4.
- Remodel remaining sections of old hospital to create a veteran/family/employee community center to house an auditorium; food court and nutritional offices; retail store; gymnasium with occupational/vocational/physical rehabilitation services; credit union, volunteer services, regional offices and library/information center.

PHASE FIVE (optional)

- Connect administration building with community center and community center with main hospital with covered pedways.
- Build CBOCs (optional) in Bullitt County, Radcliff and West Louisville.
Dear Sir or Madam,

As a Navy veteran of the Vietnam War I am pleased to offer my opinion on the proposed VA medical center in Louisville. I strongly support and urge you to retain the existing VA medical center off Zorn Ave and not relocate it.

I believe that the existing VA medical center should be maintained and improved especially since most current veterans requiring medical assistance are very familiar with it’s location and are used to its parking and admittance procedures. Traffic congestion is also minimal at this location. It seems to me that the extreme amount of money to be spent on a new facility could be applied to modernizing the existing building and I expect that would result in a savings. To me, keeping the hospital at this location is the most feasible and best option.

The proposed site for the VA medical center off Brownsboro Rd is in an area already with terrible traffic and it will become much worse with the possible addition of such a large hospital. The road system in that area will also need major changes which will add a myriad of problems in order to navigate the area. Veterans don’t need to have their blood pressure raised in just trying to see a doctor. Thus, I am totally opposed to building the facility in that area.

Really, as I look at this problem, I see a solution. Why can’t veterans be issued a voucher for medical assistance to be used at any hospital? Why do veterans need a separate entity to take care of their health issues when there are already well-qualified hospitals that can attend to their needs?

Sincerely,

Robert Vail
A week ago I sent you an e-mail expressing my opinions about the new VA Hospital to be built on Brownsboro Road. I hope you had a chance to read it.

I just returned from a community meeting in Radcliff about this same subject. We almost went over the limit of people allowed in the meeting hall. There must have been 250 to 300 people, with many more wanting to attend. This gives you an idea of the support this community has for the hospital to be built here. Mayor Weaver was very adament and solicited comments from the crowd. When it was time for questions, I stood up and asked Mayor Weaver: "In the local newspaper you gave a personal invite to the VA powers that be to attend this meeting. NOBODY FROM LOUISVILLE SHOWED UP." I have an idea that you think we are all a bunch of hicks here and not worth your time. We are extremely positive that the new VA Hospital should be built here, all you have to do is come here and ask our citizens.

Pinky Bilz
Radcliff
270-352-4297
EM-049

From: Melinda Gallagher
To: Louisville Replacement Hospital Comments
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Robley Rex Replacement VA Center
Date: Wednesday, December 28, 2016 2:40:40 PM

I am writing to say that the Brownsboro Road site for a new VA hospital in Louisville KY is a terrible consideration. The traffic on the Watterson is backed up past the Brownsboro exit each afternoon due to traffic on I 71 North. That situation would increase exponentially and existing entrance and exit ramps would be blocked. Not occasionally. This would be a daily occurrence that would result in critically ill Veterans having lengthy delays in getting treatment.

When there are other options, why would you choose one that is doomed from the onset? Please do not build the new Louisville VA hospital on Brownsboro Road.

Thank you for your consideration,

Melinda Gallagher. LCSW
Greetings,

The location of the new VA medical center has been discussed for several years. As a veteran of the US Army I would like to add my voice to this decision making process.

I believe that those voices that are in favor of a downtown location have some significant merit on their side:

Good transportation options:
The interstate system: Interstates 65, 64 and 71 have a clear drive to the area. This makes the possibility for a West End VA facility a good choice
The area is also well served by TARC the local bus service

Near other hospitals:
A downtown - West End location would be part of a richer network of hospitals and other institutions

A boost to redevelopment of the area.
The new VA medical center will take some years to build. During this time the investments made in the West End would make the area of the medical center a vibrant urban community rich with amenities like restaurants, neighborhoods, etc.

Please consider the West End a proper investment for veterans, the community and the Louisville area.

Thank you,

Frank Schwartz
US Army 1966-68

2014 start up: "Cohousing Planning Group"
For more information: www.cohousing.org
email cohousinglouisville@gmail.com
If interested, please call me at (502) 589-0967  Frank
We would like to respectfully request the Hospital Replacement Committee reconsider the site proposed for the new hospital. The site proposed area in Louisville is not user friendly or easily accessible for any VA member. Many members of the VA are of older age, and Louisville traffic and people are not congenial for older VA people. The city of Louisville does not seem to want the location of the new hospital and are not willing to help find a better site. They seem to be worried about the traffic, and we would be too. They are trying to change the VA plans and maybe VA should reconsider where they want to build.

The new VA center located in Radcliff, KY would be an ideal area for the VA hospital. The small town attitude and the easy accessibility of Radcliff from 65 hy and US 31 W, would be a huge benefit. Radcliff host probably 70% of the eligible veterans in Kentucky. Many, many veterans retire in Kentucky, in Radcliff, just outside Ft. Knox. We are closer to Ft. Knox, Ft. Campbell and many areas that have to use the Louisville VA Hospital. Driving to the VA hospital off Zorn in Louisville is very dangerous for people not aquainted with the area.

Available and useful land, a VA center (that will need a hospital close by), the military base and the want, need, and desire of a community that would like the hospital, need to at least be considered and maybe looked at very closely. Money could be saved and VA needs met in Radcliff, Ky.

Thank you for reading and hopefully considering Radcliff, Ky land donation for the new VA Hospital.

Thomas (VA Veteran) and Susan Foresman
As a resident of Crossgate I am well aware of all the reasons and issues that have been raised for not having the new VA at the Midland site. I had the opportunity to read and hear Mayor Fisher's remarks about the new VA Hospital being built there. I agree that the Veterans should have the best Opportunities we can extend but are being offered better sites.

The midland area has problems with transportation already overloaded and not enough public options for Veterans and hospital staff or visitors. There are environmental issues including water, air pollution, congestion, and access to and from this site.

I hope that all of the new options as well as downtown and current spaces are being seriously considered.

Thank you. Stephanie Speigel.

Have a great day! ☀️
The Eastern location makes absolutely no sense. I like the downtown, 9th street area. It is more accessible to those in the West End, is easy to get to from the east and although a bit further for those in the South Dixie area, still better than the current or proposed hospital. I hope you’ll do the right thing for the veterans and not for pure political reasons.

Jim Cowles
The hospital needs to be built immediately.
No more of this waste of time like the bridge project.
The current location is appropriate.
Thank you
Bruce Blue

Bruce E Blue
Chair & CEO
Freedom Metals, Inc.
1401 W Ormsby Ave.
Louisville, KY 40210
502 400-3321 direct
502 637-7657 fax
502 593-4738 cell
Dear Ms./Sir,

As a tax paying citizens and your employer I expect and demand a written response to these comments.

Citizen Request: That Veterans Administration immediately abandon considering the POORLY chosen “preferred” site at 4906 Brownsboro Rd and stop the proposed VAMC 1,030,500 sq. ft., nine-story hospital, water tower, parking garages for 3,000 vehicles, benefits center and medical clinic village from intruding into a residential area.

Our home property values will decline; many of us are retirees and will not be able to recover financially.

One of the very close existing traffic interchanges is the second worst in Jefferson County; nearby is the ninth worst. The VAMC ongoing traffic will contribute 10,000 daily trips by patients and staff. Ask any resident of Crossgate, Northfield, and Graymoor-Devondale and nearby small cities and they will tell you the existential fact that roadways are already near gridlock several times each weekday. We hope the Veterans Administration is concerned about the quality-of-life for residents, 4,000 Herr Ln corridor schoolchildren and visitors. Our “country roads” were not built for current traffic and there are no funds to construct improved passage.

Construction would be a multi-year noisy, dusty daytime nightmare. Vibrations from blasting and drilling through two deep strata of stone threaten structural stability for near-by residences. There is acute danger of disturbing water flows in the area with the depth of drilling that could flood basements.

--[if !supportLists]-->4.

The local Air Pollution Control District “believes an Air Quality Analysis is warranted to understand the impact of traffic” generated by the project.

--[if !supportLists]-->5.

Our citizens/neighbors on Calimar Ln may well be impacted by the “locked gate” use as an emergency route via Eminent Domain and medical necessity. Many children and companion
animals would be threatened with speeding vehicles. The surrounding area neighborhoods will be barraged by a night and day stream of wailing ambulance sirens.

Our charming, serene landscape will be blighted by tall commercial-type buildings, additional noise and air pollution for many residents of our local cities.

---[if !supportLists]--->7.

---[endif]-->Fi Finally, the only scientific study our local area Veterans that is available find that the majority of them want to stay served where they are at the Robley Rex VA Medical Center.

---[if !supportLists]--->8.

---[endif]-->T There has been a national epidemic of VA mismanagement over the last several years. Local area citizens close to this project in Louisville for years report random and illogical changes, misrepresentations and a lack of transparency for the “preferred” Brownsboro site.

James Aalen, 6804 Crossmoor Ln, Graymoor-Devondale, KY 40222
To Whomever Makes Decisions - Good or Bad

In a previous survey that obviously was ignored - almost 70% of veterans who utilize the VA hospital opposed the Brownsboro Road location….
Why was it even considered?
Was there an economic impact study done?
Most of the VA Veterans that use the VA Hospital live in the west and south parts of the city so it makes no sense building the hospital in the East End.

The Brownsboro location has little transportation to get there and it also leaves no room for growth and expansion.

How has $30 million already been spent on the VA hospital at the Brownsboro Road site?
The property sold for over $12 million which was an exhorbant fee to begin with… did line somebody’s pockets and believe those somebody will be the ones to benefit… not the Veterans.

And if I recall the VA was offered 42 acres free of charge that the county owns at Exit 112 off Interstate 65 and Preston Highway.
Something is wrong with this picture.

Someone benefited but definitely not the VA veteran - who is the one we should be concerned about.

Joan Sue Mihalovic
EM-057

From: Liz Staab
To: Louisville Replacement Hospital Comments
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Brownsboro Road location for the new VA Hospital
Date: Tuesday, January 10, 2017 10:56:51 AM

I would like to go on record as **vehemently opposing** the Brownsboro Road location for the relocated VA Hospital. The traffic situation at the US 42 and US 22 area is already out of control. The added volume will send this area into chaos not to mention that many other east end locations have much more acreage, such as off Old Henry Road. I live one mile from the proposed location and will not be able to avoid the traffic. PLEASE block this relocation from going any further.

Liz and EJ Staab
7314 Wesboro Road
Louisville, KY 40222
(502) 426-8851
To whom it may concern:

I am a resident of Windy Hills off of Brownsboro Road and I live on Indian Ridge Road. These are my comments regarding the proposed VA hospital site at Brownsboro Road and I-264.

I will preface this by telling you that I am the daughter of a Major in the Marine Corps who fought on the Pacific Rim during World War II, my uncle was a Sergeant in the Marine Corps, and served in Korea as a forward officer. My husband was a Sergeant in the Marine Corps Reserves for eight years and served during Desert Storm. In addition to these facts, I am also a social worker.

Our family vehemently opposes the Brownsboro Road proposed VA hospital site at this location. I am baffled as to how this site came to be designated in the first place. All one would have to do on any given weekday is to post traffic cameras or traffic control monitors from Hubbards Lane looking east toward I-264, and from Lime Kiln Road looking west toward I-264, as well as monitor the traffic congestion that happens on both East and Westbound lanes on I-264. Traffic is already heavy all day, and is near impossible during peak travel times in the mornings and afternoons as it is today. It won't take long to tell you that this area is already a traffic nightmare even while the proposed site sits as a vacant lot.

Additionally Christ Church sits on the corner of Indian Ridge Road, and on Sundays LMPD has to be posted on our street to monitor traffic coming out of the church as well as our street to prevent accidents.

As for the weekday traffic situations it is extremely difficult to get in or out of our street, as there are no traffic signals. Even if there were, it would only create more of a traffic nightmare because none of the traffic signals at Blankenbaker Lane, Hubbards Lane, Rudy Lane and I-264 all the way up to Holiday Manor are not in sync. Between the hours of 3 PM and 6 PM during the week it can take as long as 53 minutes to travel from Chenoweth Lane to Holiday Manor shopping center.

While are a proud Marine Corps family, and as myself a social worker, I do support the Veterans Administration, however I believe that there is a much better site available in other parts of town to make this new VA Hospital site possible. We beg you not to add to the traffic on Brownsboro Road or the East-West I-264 and the I-71 junction by placing the VA hospital on the vacant lot as proposed on Brownsboro Road.

Most Sincerely,

Chris and Barbara Martin
608 Indian Ridge Rd.
Louisville, KY 40207
v/text/FaceTime - 502-640-5458
Email: bjmartin01@gmail.com
Sharron Hilbrecht  
1900 Crossgate Lane  
Louisville, KY 40222  
January 10, 2017

Dear Ms. Williams,

I will not try to add anything to the comments submitted by Grow Smart Louisville through the attorneys from Frost Brown Todd. They have much more skill than I do in dealing with NEPA laws. Anything I would say in my response to the DEIS, I have said before over these past 4 1/2 years in my responses to both the PEA and the EA. Nothing I have said in the past has seemed to make a single bit of difference to the very, very poor decision to build the new VAMC at the Brownsboro site. As a government-contracted planner confided in me after one of the meetings at the Clifton Center, "This is a terrible site, but it's my job to make it fit."

I do want it to go on record that I believe this whole process has been flawed from the beginning. About 4 years ago, my colleagues and I met with one of the PR people from Jonathan Blue's team. He confided to us with a laugh how they manipulated the system in their favor. They had hired men to go to sit VFW posts "in plaid shirts and ball caps" to buy beer for veterans and badmouth the downtown option, thus skewing opinion of the veterans who happened to be there. He told us how they walked the sale through backdoor channels all the way to Sec. Shenseki. After the decision to purchase the property was made, we learned how they hired and paid Medal of Honor recipient Dakota Meyer to come to the public meeting in April 2012 to shame the neighbors who opposed the Brownsboro site. When other people tried to get involved to get a sampling of veterans' opinion, Blue's lawyers issued cease and desist letters to those folks, threatening them with million dollar lawsuits if the deal didn't go through. He sent members of his team to the Crossgate City Council meetings to intimidate the neighbors and hear the plans for fighting the purchase. Once the land was purchased, without the required EIS, every follow-on study was skewed so that the outcome favored the VA. Light, air, and noise pollution issues were minimized. Traffic issues were dismissed. The VA tried to make it look like a million square foot hospital complex with two 8-story parking garages was consistent with a planned development design that the site is zoned for. The VA blew off members of Congress who questioned the purchase price and the wisdom of the location. And when the head of the Veterans Affairs Oversight Committee denied further funding for continuing the site in the summer of 2016, Senator McConnell stuck funding for it onto a must-pass omni-bill at 3 a.m. the day before the vote.

Virtually NOBODY thinks this is the right site for the new hospital. The VA refuses to
listen to neighbors, the Kentucky Medical Association, the mayor of the city of Louisville, the Metro Council representative for this district, and many of the veterans who all believe there are better options. I'm not sure why the VA even has rules if it refuses to follow them.

It is obvious to everyone that the VAMC should go downtown where the Louisville medical campus is located. The Louisville VAMC is already referring all neuro cases to other hospitals. All of the medical students are already downtown and would be able to easily access the patients at a downtown VAMC. Most of the other VAMCs around the country are located next to a university teaching hospital. Putting the new VAMC at the highly congested, cramped Brownsboro location makes absolutely no sense at all. The VA should stop throwing good taxpayer money after bad and reopen the site-selection. If it takes another year or two, what would it matter if a better location could be found that serves the veterans, the community, and the taxpayers? It makes more sense than spending one billion dollars on a project that doesn't belong in this location.

Find a new location and then turn the Brownsboro site into an annex to Zachary Taylor National Cemetery and honor the veterans in both life and death.

Respectfully,

Sharron Hilbrecht
To whom it may concern:
I live on Carlimar Lane that would become a back entrance to the new VA Hospital. I was present at the meetings to discuss the proposed location and was told on several occasions that Carlimar Lane would only be an emergency exit and would most likely be blocked off. Now I have learned that the back entrance will be used when the other entrance US42 becomes congested. It will be used to take the pressure off of an already highly congested area. This would also increase the traffic considerably on my street Carlimar Lane. Using the back entrance would offer direct access to Westport Road and the Watterson Expressway. Making Carlimar Lane a major thoroughfare will cause even more issues as this street is not made to carry the amount of traffic it will see if this proposed site is approved. After hearing all of the comments from the Veterans themselves concerning the selection of this site. Also seeing how it will affect the traffic patterns in the area this proposed site is the wrong site to choose and an alternative selection should be sought. Please reconsider the selection and do the right thing by our Veterans who deserve it. Cramming the VA Hospital into this site would be a great injustice to them and to the people who will pay for it.
I am writing in response to the VA Environmental Impact Statement and in opposition to the location for the future VA hospital complex at Brownsboro Road in Louisville.

As a long time resident of the area I am concerned about both the immediate, short term effect of the hospital on area traffic and resources and its impact on the long range viability of the northeast corridor as residential community. The placement of a complex of this scale and density will necessarily transform this community from a residential one to a urban/professional center. The total projected expenditure of this project is now in excess of one billion dollars, making it the one largest construction projects in State history. (As a comparison in scale - UPS World Port cost one billion dollars). All of this on a 35-acre site with woefully inadequate infrastructure to support a project of this scale.

VA planners and officials have failed to address the mid- to long-term impact of the hospital on traffic, as well as ground water/flood control. The current EIS submits that the current road systems are adequate and that expansion of area roads be made will be needed upon completion of the project. They are currently graded by state road engineers as near failure. The specific road and infrastructure improvements will need to made by the State of Kentucky and are not on the State's six-year plan. The current budget environment will make it unlikely that these improvements will be made within the next decade.

I ask that you reconsider the selection site for the new VA Hospital and make a thorough study of alternate VA hospital locations.

Thank you.

Frederick Mark Stiebling
4923 Grantham Place
Louisville, KY 40222
This location is not suitable for the hospital. It is already too congested and this will make it worse. Why is this being forced on the residents who have made it clear it is just not a good location.

In addition there are areas that could benefit from this project to a greater degree. The West end seems like a logical place since they are starving for development in that area.

John Kaikis

Sent from my iPhone
The Brownsboro Rd site is a terrible spot for the VA hospital. The VA paid way too much for it, far above market value. The appraiser on that transaction should lose his license. Sell the land and recoup our losses and put it closer to downtown. The west end site is closer, cheaper and better. Thanks.

Edward Hysinger
4415 Rudy Ln
Louisville, KY
40207
502-897-7775
The idea of a new VA hospital on Brownsboro Road is absolutely absurd. The traffic at Brownsboro and the watterson is so bad in the morning/afternoon now that I can't even begin to imagine how bad it would be if there was a VA hospital in that area also. Is it not more cost effective to remodel the current location or buy the property in Bullet County?

Thanks,
Shawn
Dear Sirs:
I am writing to express my respectful opposition to the location being considered for the new hospital.
While the property is close to the busy Watterson expressway, the traffic around the area is already extremely heavy. An addition of hundreds of cars and trucks and ambulances will create the need for additional lanes and redesign of the whole area. I realize that a small new exit from the expressway was created immediately after the property was acquired, however, reentering the Watterson has not been addressed.
There are three shopping centers and numerous other businesses, as well as a school, clustered around both sides of the expressway exits and the overpass. Traffic leaving the hospital would have to compete with already overflowing and backed up lanes trying to access the expressway entrance. The local elementary school, Dunn, adds gridlock every school day at the Rudy Lane light which is adjacent to the overpass. Ambulances would be hard pressed to access the hospital during work and school hours.
My street, Rudy Lane, frequently is backed up all the way to my house and beyond due to the traffic. I am approx .6 MI from Brownsboro Road. The air quality is already deplorable in the summer with numerous air quality alerts every summer.

My wife has worked at the present VA and at U of L surgery department for many years and frequently tells me that the patients would prefer the new hospital be rebuilt where the present one stands.
Thank you for your time.

Herbert Mattingly
2407 Rudy Lane
Louisville KY 40207
It is unfortunate that Uncle Sam overspent on the Brownsboro Rd. Location, but I, a veteran of USAF, strongly feel that strategically, that is the best location to build.

The concerns over traffic issues are very overrated and no groups of traffic will come and go in mass, except, perhaps, for employee shift changes.

I live within 1 mile of that location, but would travel much further for quality care.

Michael B Lubeach
mikeroe@bellsouth.net

Sent from my iPhone
Others have stated the obvious about how bad the location is. I join them in protest.

The only reason I can see that this site is still under consideration is that after grossly overpaying, abandonment would be embarrassing.

The site is better suited for a hotel, multifamily housing and supporting retail and restaurants than a hospital.

Please look elsewhere.

Michael Shaikun
5907 Burlington Avenue
Louisville, Kentucky 40222
There is too much commuter congestion at I-264, US Hwys 42 and 22 now. The new hospital should be located downtown near the other hospitals and treatment centers. Denis Wiggins
Sent from my iPhone
i agree with putting new va at brownsboro rd.
I would like to express my strong concerns over proposed construction of the Robley Rex Veterans Medical Center at 4908 Brownsboro Road, Louisville, Kentucky 40222.

This has long been an area of heavy traffic congestion. The medical center will be placed adjacent to the second most congested intersection in Jefferson County, KY. Jefferson. The population of Jefferson County, KY and the surrounding metropolitan area is almost 1,300,000. The area in which the proposed medical center is to be built is a densely populated area with homes built within 10 yards of the medical center site. Meetings with Veterans Affairs personnel have indicated that consideration is being given to using residential streets in quiet subdivisions where children play as access for emergency and utility vehicles.

There is one high school, one middle school and 3 elementary schools within a 6 block radius of this site. During periods when school is about to start or is letting out the traffic is horrendous. The traffic from the medical center site will create even more delays for children stuck on school busses trying to reach their homes. The site runs parallel to I-264 and the construction of the center will prevent any future expansion or exit modification for this incredibly busy stretch of road.

The VA’s proposed medical center will include a 1,030,500 square foot nine story hospital, water tower, parking garages for 3,000 vehicles, benefits center and medical clinic village. It will add 10,000 daily vehicle trips in the area. Ignoring zoning, air quality issues and what the majority of veterans want. The vast majority of veterans live far southwest of the Brownsboro location. In addition to making the veterans and their families sit in endless traffic, they will have a much longer drive.

The last consideration and a very important consideration is the simple fact that the site is way too small for the facility. There is absolutely no room for expansion. It makes little sense to place the medical center in a location that has no consideration for the future. It has been mentioned several times that the site is more suited to an annex of Zachary Taylor Cemetery which is about two blocks away and is approaching maximum capacity.

Please listen to your constituents and the veterans.
Sincerely,

Cathy E. Johnson
6706 Bedford Lane
Louisville, KY 40222
502-386-0088
Thank you Ted. These are helpful. and thank you for attending the meeting last night. I'm sorry we did not make our location well known to you and Martina.

Cheers,

Randy

--
Randy Strobo, JD, MEM
www.strobobarkley.com
direct: 502.409.9956
rstrobo@strobobarkley.com

On Tue, Jan 10, 2017 at 9:14 AM, <5thmortonstone@gmail.com> wrote:

The EIS for the selection of a site for the VA hospital in Louisville is flawed for the following reasons:

1. The site selection process did not include an origin-destination study to determine the origins of all trips to the existing VA hospital to determine the optimal geography center of demand together with means of access to such a location, based on current patterns of access (especially transit) to the current location. Will this is only one input to a reasonable decision, it is a necessary one.

2. Council on Environmental Quality guidelines make clear site selection cannot be prejudiced by such actions as purchasing a site. To suggest that one can select a site under the procedural mechanism of an Environmental Assessment and then carry that decision forward into an EIS, doesn’t pass the laugh test or legal precedent.

3. The changes to the preferred alternative that add additional functions (clinics in other sections of Louisville that will be closed with operation consolidated to the new site) invalidate the traffic analysis by not accounting for the associated new trips. The shift of traffic conditions from Level of Service (LOS) E to breakdown conditions can happen easily, causing gridlock that can overflow onto I-264, a very dangerous condition. There is no alternative roadway development that can relieve this condition.

Thank you, Edward Stone

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
I just wanted to comment as both a veteran and a nearby resident: The hospital should not be located here. The traffic congestion already in this area would be a deterrent for most, if not all patients. The added numbers of vehicles would make this situation impossible. Think Shelbyville Road near the malls at 5 o’clock and this is likely what the traffic would be like through out the day and worse at change of shift times! We veterans deserve the best and this location is not it. Other locations would be far better for both patients and this congested area.

Thank you for your consideration,
Albert B. Hoskins III MD MACP
Major MC US Army 1973-1975
Anyone who travels Brownsboro Road and Highway 22 daily understands the impact that additional traffic from a hospital will have on the area. There is only so much traffic one area can sustain. There are daily backups at the Watterson/Brownsboro junction, not to mention traffic backups on Brownsboro Road.

The best solution is to utilize and expand the Zorn site which is familiar to the veterans or develop a downtown site near an already existing medical community.

Why create additional traffic and environmental woes building a hospital on a parcel of land that is already inadequate to meet the needs of veterans in the years ahead?

Mary P. Sheridan

Sent from my iPAD
I firmly believe the current selected location for the new VA Hospital is a flawed location for several reasons:
* Veterans don't live the in East end of Louisville
* not adequate busline service
* downtown location is better suited for doctors offices and other services
* free land offer from a group in the west end area of Louisville. What a great income generating boost for the area!

Kristen English
502-417-8008
For 16 years we have lived one street west from the Brownsboro Road and I-264 exit. This hospital site is unacceptable for traffic reasons.

1. Browsnboro Road (US 42) is backed up every afternoon and evening with several private and public schools joining homeward-bound commuters. The traffic is growing worse as the northeast corridor extends into new developments in Oldham County.

2. There are frequent accidents on I-71 which back up traffic for miles, and redirect traffic entering and leaving Louisville onto Brownsboro Road passing the hospital site.

3. The access from the hospital site to Browsboro Road is directly into the middle of this mess. At times the new hospital will have no access in or out, for staff, patrons and ambulances.

The selection of this site was made without full anticipation of the growing traffic problem, and how the hospital would add to this problem. This is not a neighborhood matter of “Not in my Backyard”. The hospital will cause a major problem for the City of Louisville as it grows to the northeast along the Ohio River.

Allan Atherton
702 Antrim Rd.
Louisville, KY 40207
502-895-7178
aatherton@twc.com
Hello,

My thoughts on the site of new VA hospital is build it anywhere but the proposed site at Brownsboro Rd. & Watterson exchange. Too much traffic & environmental issues would complicate that site.

Thank you
Carole Sutton
I do not feel this is an appropriate site for the VA hospital. They should leave it where it is currently located or find another location. This area is too busy as it is... A lot of traffic flow now & if VA is located here, there will be very bad traffic issues. Also, I do not feel this is an appropriate site for a VA hospital.

It is more a residential area.

Thank-you for letting me voice my opinions & concerns. Patti Del Grande

Patricia Del Grande RN, BSN
Hospitalist Coordinator
Baptist Health Louisville
4000 Kresge Way
Louisville, KY 40207

502.896.7873
502.896.7363 fax
pdelgrande@BHSI.com
BaptistHealthLouisville.com
While this location may be in the very best interest of the developers, it does NOT best serve the Veterans and certainly ruins the already congested venue of a good community. Non-political and less greedy common sense also dictates otherwise!
To the Hearing Committee:

I am a veteran who regularly visits the patients at Robley Rex Hospital. I live in St. Matthews, roughly midway between the hospital and the proposed location. I have actively opposed the Brownsboro location since it's inception primarily because of the traffic congestion there. That is not the only reason this site doesn't make sense. Other veterans I've talked with feel they would be better served with a more accessible location that is centrally located with respect to the region. Some of the recent offerings of donated land south of Jefferson County are intriguing alternatives to the apparently finally decided upon location made by the Veterans Administration. Regardless of where the new hospital is built, enough time and money has been wasted and construction needs to begin! My veteran brothers and sisters deserve no less!

Respectfully,
Charles E. Wachowski, Sr.
I believe the VA site proposed at Brownsboro and I-264 is a terrible idea and will lead to all the more congestion in an already congested area.

Dave K
To VA Officials:

I am writing in opposition to the selected site for the future VA location at Brownsboro Road.

I have lived in the area for over 32 years and know that this is absolutely the wrong place to locate this much needed facility to meet the needs of our veterans.

The traffic it would generate would make this area impossible to navigate for the veterans and for those that already live and work in this area. This area is already highly congested with morning and afternoon commuters coming not only from the adjoining neighborhoods, but also from those coming in to Louisville on I71 from Oldham County and those coming and going out US22 and US42, not mention traffic headed to and from downtown Louisville. My understanding is that there is no plan in place to improve the roads to meet these needs anytime in the near future.

The land that has been purchased is entirely too small for such an enormous facility. The size of such a huge multi building development will aggravate the flooding problem that has already been an issue in the surrounding neighborhoods.

There is no doubt that this is not a compatible development for the surrounding area and will not only cause monumental traffic snarls, but will make the much needed care of our veterans much less accessible to them.

I implore you to please reconsider the selection site for the new VA Hospital and take a thorough study of the new choices that have been offered, at no cost to the taxpayers, that will definitely be far more convenient and thoughtfully chosen, with the future care of our Kentucky and Indiana Veterans in mind.

Thank you for your consideration,
Theresa Stiebling
The Mayor of Radcliff, Kentucky have set aside 50 acres of land for the Veteran Administration to build the new Hospital here in Radcliff which will offer easy access to Veteran because of less traffic, convenience for parking. It will make the commute for Veteran all around Kentucky less stressful and require less travel time without all the traffic congestion.

Thanks
Emanuel Hill
Since the website did not provide confirmation my comments ere received, I am forwarding them to this email address to ensure my comments are received. Please see the following and know I look forward to receiving your responses to my questions.

Thank you
Yvette Winnette

Will the VA and agencies responsible for funding the project to relocate the current hospital, regional business office and three satellite clinics join veterans, state and local governmental agencies, residents, business owners and schools that will be impacted by this project work with a third party, like the Udall Foundation, that specializes in “conflict resolution” to improve relations and resolve conflicts?

Udall Foundation

http://www.udall.gov/AboutUs/AboutUs.aspx

The Udall Foundation was established by the U.S. Congress in 1992 as an independent executive branch agency to honor Morris K. Udall's lasting impact on this nation’s environment, public lands, and natural resources, and his support of the rights and self-governance of American Indians and Alaska Natives. The 1998 Environmental Policy and Conflict Resolution Act created the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution as a program of the Udall Foundation to assist parties in resolving environmental, public lands, and natural resources conflicts nationwide that involve federal agencies or interests.
EM-084

From: Yvette Winnette
To: Louisville Replacement Hospital Comments
Cc: Yvette Winnette
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment Submission
Date: Wednesday, January 11, 2017 12:08:13 AM

Since the website did not provide confirmation my comments ere received, I am forwarding them to this email address to ensure my comments are received. Please see the following and know I look forward to receiving your responses to my questions.

Thank you
Yvette Winnette

Page 80 Section 3.5.2.1 Brownsboro Site

While it has been pointed out to the VA on numerous occasions by numerous residents the DEIS failed to evaluate and include the underground water from active springs that flow approximately two blocks (Carlimar Lane, Community Way, Greenlawn Road, Bedford Lane and Crossmoor Lane from the southwest corner of this site.

Since this area already deals with ponding during storms, residents need detailed information from the VA on how the VA will prevent adding to this issue. Residents deserve to know what to expect from the VA during the construction phase and ongoing operations.

Residents need specific details relative to the site’s elevation of 10-12 feet and the actions the VA will take during the construction and ongoing operational phases of this project. A basic review of DEIS exhibits and rendering suggests that residents will be left to deal with what the VA allows to run downhill.

Will the VA follow current environmental regulations/guidelines or default to the outdated policies/guidelines used for the DEIS?

Page 157 Figure 4.1-2

Street view reflects no traffic (vehicles or pedestrians) or parked vehicles on Carlimar Lane and Bedford. This is not an accurate view of these locations and for the sake of presenting an unbiased DEIS the VA should add photos of all traffic corridors during peak times and rush hour periods specific to these corridors.

Additionally, when including photos of the proposed the emergency entrance at Carlimar Lane, the VA should include photos in the DEIS of Carlimar Lane during both daytime and evening hours to ensure the photos include cars parked on the street and children at play.

Again, including photos of empty streets and not including photos of residential streets the VA
indents to use demonstrate the DEIS has used questionable information to create a biased DEIS.

1. Describe the VA’s approach to ensuring the DEIS is corrected and includes photos that more accurately reflect traffic and pedestrian volume at peak hour periods specific to each area.

**Page 175 Section 4.4.2.1 Construction**

Raising the issue of drainage changes that will create temporary increases in sedimentation in storm water drainage without addressing the VA’s actions to mitigate and prevent these issues is a glaring omission of the DEIS.

2. What regulation/guidelines/policies will the VA reference and enforce to prevent runoff damage incurred by residents during the construction and ongoing operational phases of this project?

3. Who will have oversight over the VA to ensure all regulations/guidelines/policies are in compliance?

4. How will the public access to compliance reports and violations made by the VA or any subcontracted vendor?

**Page 176 Section 4.4.2.1 Construction**

While the DEIS includes a statement that “Procedures would be taken during construction to discover existing voids”, the DEIS needs information to state their procedures and policies after the construction period. The term “procedures” is quite vague. It does not cite the agency that will provide the “procedures” or have compliance monitoring and oversight.

5. What current/pending policies/guidelines use to discover voids?

6. If state policies/guidelines are stronger than the VA’s, will the VA implement state policies/guidelines?

**Pages 176 - 177 Section 4.4.2.1 Construction**

7. Since the VA states in the DEIS “Adherence to this standard to the requirements of the Kentucky Revised Statute 350.420” does this mean the VA will comply with the stronger of federal or state regulations?

8. Why was this particular regulation singled out?

The last paragraph in Section 4.4.2.1 Construction is too vague and unacceptable. The DEIS must state the short and long term actions the VA will take to minimize the impact of blasting
as well as ponding, sedimentation and hazardous waste runoff suffered by residents in the area.

As written in this section of the DEIS one may think the VA will develop the “Contraction Best Management Practices” during the project based on permit requirements. Additionally, the VA should state they would comply with the stronger of federal, state or local governmental agency permit requirements. While it could be an assumption, the “Best Management Practices” should mandate that all permits are required and must be approved before the work covered by the permit begins. Lastly, the DEIS should state who will have oversight of the Best Management Practices and securing permits in a timely manner.

9. What are the VA’s short and long term plans to protect residents and business owners adverse outcomes related to blasting, ponding, water, sedimentation and hazardous waste runoff?

10. How will the VA work with state and local agencies to ensure their “Best Management Practices” address all that would be impacted by vague or incomplete management practices?

Page 179 Section 4.5.2.1 Construction

During the construction phase reference to the “Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control Plan must be prepared that details measures to trap 80 percent of the total suspended solids” leads to numerous questions.

11. What happens to the other 20%?

12. What happens to the 80%?

13. How and when will hazardous waste be removed from the site during construction and ongoing operations of this site?

Since Carlimar Lane is a residential street that will not support trucks and a significant increase in traffic moving through Graymoor-Devondale the DEIS must state the VA must designate a “Construction Entrance” and have oversight that enforces use of the designated Construction Entrance. The VA must take this action before the first shovel of dirt is moved or the first piece of equipment enters the property.

14. How will the VA assist residents and Graymoor-Devondale city officials with directing traffic trying to access the site during construction and ongoing operations away from residential streets?

Page 197 Section 4.8.2.2 Operations

While there is a reference to “mixed land use”, it would be more difficult for non-
governmental companies to acquire property in the same manner as a governmental agency like the VA. Due to the site’s failure to meet several VA requirements for growth, fears related to eminent domain must be respected.

The fact that the VA chose a site that is in a residential setting, land locked and of questionable size for the project, dependent on state agencies supporting their anticipated transportation needs and then supports this choice with what appears to be a biased DEIS is a great concern for everyone but the VA.

15. What has been the VA’s experience with taking advantage of their options to apply “eminent domain” over the last 25 years?

16. How do those sites and their DEIS and final EIS compare to the Brownsboro site?

Page 210 Section 4.11.2.2 Operations

Additional information in needed to explain the “increase in VA employees” totals as reported.

17. Are these the numbers related to the current hospital site?

18. Since there are varying reports on the number of beds for the hospital, how many inpatient beds are there at the current location and how many beds will be at the Brownsboro site?

19. Are the numbers reflected inclusive of all VA employees that will move to the Brownsboro site?

20. How many employees does the VA project to add once construction is completed and operations begin?

21. Does the VA own or lease the site where the Regional Benefits office is located?

22. Does the VA own or lease the sites where the satellite clinics are currently located?

23. How were additional staffing projections for the Benefits Office and satellite factored into traffic projections?

Page 213 Section 4.12.2.2 Construction

Graymoor-Devondale streets were built (design, construction and maintenance) to support residential traffic needs only and will not support the weight of vehicles removing any types of waste from the site or any increase in traffic. Any construction vehicle, employee, regulator or contractor as a means to enter or exit the site should not use Carlimar Lane. Instead the VA should establish a Construction Entrance/Exit with immediate access to the expressway prior to starting any construction activity at the site. Under no circumstances should the VA allow
travel through residential streets by their construction vendors, contractors, employees or regulators.

14. What route will vehicles and pedestrians use to transport construction and hazardous waste away from the construction site?

15. What actions will the VA take to ensure that during construction and ongoing operations to ensure vendors, employees, contractors and regulations do no access the Brownsboro site by parking on residential streets?

Page 218 Section 4.13.2.2 Operation

Residential streets from Westport Road or Herr Lane to the back emergency gate at Carlimar Lane will not support emergency vehicles “when there is an accident” for numerous reasons. First, the Westport Road, Herr Lane and 264 interchanges already suffer from numerous accidents each day that significantly impact traffic flow. Drivers are already clogging residential streets to avoid these accidents. Secondly, on-street parking is allowed on all of the residential streets in Graymoor-Devondale. That said emergency vehicles would be required to navigate a route around parked vehicles. Lastly, while these are residential areas most of the streets do not have sidewalks. Pedestrians, other drivers and emergency vehicles will all be at risk for accidents. Due to significant safety concerns the VA should abandon use of residential streets for emergency or any other access to the Brownsboro site.

16. Describe in detail the circumstances, frequency, types of vehicles and agencies (federal, state, city) that will be allowed access to enter the VA site in the event of an emergency.

17. Describe in detail the definition the VA will use, enforce and report for “emergency access” to the Brownsboro site.

18. What training and materials will be used to train VA employees during construction and ongoing operations to ensure use of the Carlimar Lane gate is restricted?

19. How will the VA share these training materials with federal, state and local agencies that provide services and protection to the residents in Graymoor-Devondale?

20. Assuming there will be no exits, how will the VA monitor, track and then report entrances made through the “emergency entrance” at Carlimar Lane?

21. How and when will these reports be made available to other federal, state or local agencies?

Page 251 Section 5.13 Transportation and Traffic

22. Regarding “service and supply deliveries scheduled to avoid morning and evening peak
hour traffic”, does this mean residents in the area will be subjected to additional noise from heavy trucks during late night or early morning hours during construction and ongoing operations?

23. Describe the VA’s “feasible and practicable” definition and subsequent implementation, monitoring and compliance with deliveries and scheduling

24. Will it be stated in contracts (services and products) with the VA vendors that vendors will not be allowed to use the Carlimar Lane entrance.

Deliveries that add to traffic or noise and air pollution should be restricted to late morning - early afternoon hours only.

25. Since the expansion of the Brownsboro Road corridor as listed in the DEIS is a direct result of the VA Hospital relocating the Brownsboro site in a residential setting surrounded by residential streets, how will the VA advocate for and help fund the financial impact building and expanding the VA Hospital and its additional services will have on KY residents?

DEIS failed to address, at any site, the VA’s Communication Plan for Construction and Ongoing Operations

26. How will the VA communicate with surrounding cities, residents and business owners that will be impacted by construction?

27. Will the VA’s communication plan and actions rely on current, dated or pending policies/guidelines?

28. Will the VA communicate in a manner consistent with that of a “good neighbor”?

29. How will the VA ensure cities, residents, schools and business owners impacted by construction are notified in advance and then updated when power outages occur that are related to construction activities?

30. How will the VA ensure cities, residents, schools and business owners impacted by construction are notified in advance and then updated when MSD services are interrupted that are related to construction activities?

31. How will the VA ensure cities, residents, schools and business owners impacted by construction are notified in advance and then updated when water outages occur that are related to construction activities?

32. How will the VA ensure state and local agencies, cities, residents, schools and business owners impacted by construction are notified in advance and then updated when hazardous waste removal transports occur?
To Whom this may concern:

I am opposed to the relocation of the VA hospital at the Brownsboro Road site. All anyone has to do is spend several days monitoring traffic at this site to see how unsuitable it will be for the VA expansion in terms of traffic congestion and related pollution; its lack of frequent public transportation access; inaccessibility to the centralized medical community; and impact of the building itself on the surrounding residential neighborhood. I do not believe it will be easily accessible to veterans who need the services of the VA. There have been two additional offers of property which can be suitable for the VA hospital needs. I hope this decision will be reconsidered and rescinded.

Thank you,

Paula Hale
322 Zorn Avenue No. 3
Louisville, KY 40206
Dear Sirs,

A few months ago, I moved into a neighborhood across Brownsboro Rd from Zachary Taylor Cemetery, one block from the Watterson Expressway & Brownsboro Road interchange. I have never in my life experienced such a daily traffic mess in one small area such as this poorly designed intersection. All of this is well-known to anyone who even travels through this area once in a while. But I will give one specific example of the traffic mess. If you wish to take the Watterson east bound there and eventually take I 71 west to downtown Louisville, the turning lane only has room for 4 cars. Consequently just for that single turn amidst many options, the traffic backs up in the left lane. Then, once you turn left onto the entry ramp, often throughout the day, the right lane of the Watterson Expressway is blocked by a long line of cars and trucks trying to turn right into the entry lane for I 71 EAST. It is a scary dangerous situation because somehow the driver has to squeeze into the lane and, with poor visibility, dart into the fast traffic lane of the Watterson.

That is just ONE example of the different traffic snafus that occur in that area many times a day.

Moreover, many drivers run the red traffic signal lights and block the intersections, further jamming up the traffic. There must be about 8-10 options for drivers through that interchange and all the intersections are constantly blocked by inconsiderate drivers. However, how can you blame them? Like everyone, they just want to get through the intersection.

Consequently, any sane driver of that area knows it is ludicrous to add more traffic mess with a new veterans hospital and to hear the VAMC state that there would NOT be any significant effect on the traffic with the new hospital. It makes no sense at all the make a terrible traffic mess worse by building a hospital by that interchange. As has been well-documented, most of the veterans who would use the hospital do not even live near that suburban location and that other sites in downtown Louisville and west Louisville would be more suitable.

Kenneth Karem
738 Wicklow Road
Louisville, KY 40207

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Good morning. Could you please confirm that comments will be accepted on-line until 11:59 pm this evening? Thanks.

Tom FitzGerald

O for a world where everyone respects each other's ways  
Where love is lived and all is done with justice and with praise  
O for a world where goods are shared and misery relieved  
Where truth is spoken, children spared, equality achieved  
O for a world preparing for God's glorious reign of peace  
Where time and tears will be no more and all but love will cease.

"O For A World" by Miriam Therese Winter, 1987
The Brownsboro Road location is not the right location for the new VA hospital. There have been several offers of land for free to the VA to accommodate the needs of the veterans in the south and west ends of Louisville. These locations should be highly considered. Free sites have been offered in Bullitt County, Dixie / Ft Knox area and the west end of Louisville. Please consider these sites as a better alternative to the Brownsboro Road location. They offer a better location for the concentration of veterans and employment opportunities for those located in these areas. Any of these sites would be a great location and accessible to those that need the services of the VA hospital. MAKE THE CHANGE - do not make a $1 billion dollar mistake. These areas are wanting the economic growth that the VA can provide. It will be a win-win situation for all involved.

Bridget Sheehan

Please do not make a $1 billion dollar mistake!
The proposed new site on Brownsboro Road for the replacement VA Hospital in Louisville is not the correct location for this hospital. This is a poor choice environmentally and economically. The location does not allow for expansion and does not meet the building code for the area. The land will have to be built up which will cause flooding into the homes that surround it. The plans are being adjusted to the land bought and not for the needs of the veterans - now or in the future. The traffic that this location would create would be beyond the limits that this area can handle. The traffic is already at maximum level. The infrastructure that the VA is saying the state of Kentucky could do is not even in the plans yet.
The majority of the veterans are located in the south and west end of Louisville and the replacement hospital should be built in those areas to accommodate the majority of the veterans. This would add an economic benefit to those areas. The majority of the workers for this replacement hospital do not live in the Brownsboro area and would have to travel and face the horrible traffic as it is even today. They will experience extensive waiting time to get off and on the expressway in this area. Plus, public transportation to this location is limited. I can not imagine what construction of the hospital and any infrastructure needs will mean for this area.
It does not make sense to build this hospital in the Brownsboro location. I feel that the land transaction was not done illegally. There are still questions concerning the pricing of this deal and the environmental studies done. The decision was made without representation from the Louisville area, nor a local veteran on the selection committee. This deal has not been transparent from the beginning.

I am hoping that the VA Administration will select a location in the south or west end of Louisville to benefit the veterans and give them the service that they deserve. Use the Brownsboro site to expand the Zachery Taylor Cemetery for future burial sites for our veterans. The current location is running out of space and this would provide a great service to our veterans.

Please do not make a $1 billion dollar mistake!

Thank you,
Bridget Sheehan
Moving the hospital to Brownsboro Rd Area would tremendously increase an already heavily trafficked area. Traffic congestion is terrible from the Watterson to Lime Kiln Lane.

--

Best,

Billy Worden
To whom it may concern,

This Idea that Mike Weaver has addressed about bring the VA Hospital to Radcliff is the dumbest thing he could of ever come up with. First off this is a way for Weaver to get his name out for reelection. But for the real issues.

First is the years it would setback the new construction. I am assuming new environmental studies, new building plans etc. My guess it could be another 10 years.

Second Doctors, Is he real, Louisville has all the Teaching colleges and that is where the VA gets a large portion of its Doctors. I don't forsee them driving to Radcliff.

Come on Folks get real this is a no brainer and should not even be considered.
Does it not make more sense to locate the VA hospital in Radcliff which is in an area that is less populated, has simple access from every direction and most of all has probably the largest concentration of Veterans in the area, compared to Louisville. People complain about how seniors should stay off the roads because they impede traffic flow and cause accidents—why put all those folks in the middle of downtown Louisville where the driving conditions are horrendous for the younger population, let alone the elderly. Then there's the issue of parking, let's drive around for 30 minutes to find one, makes so much sense to me!! The donated site in Radcliff has more than enough space for the facility and parking, let alone it has the most simple and direct route coming from I 65 which requires one (just one) turn to get to destination.

In short, to me it just doesn't make sense to put this new facility into an already overcrowded, hard to reach, hard to park area when THE OTHER OPTION IS TO MAKE IT SIMPLE AND UNCOMPLICATED FOR THE VETERNS who in the end are the ones that are supposed to be the beneficiaries and for whom it is being built for. It's not supposed to be about making it convenient for the doctors and staff that currently reside in Louisville and would rather not commute to the Radcliff area—it's about the Veterans!!!!!!!
I would favor building the new VA hospital at any site other than the Brownsboro
Road at the Watterson Expressway location. The Bullitt County potential site has the
advantages of less traffic and donated property. The Radcliff, Hardin County, and the
south Jefferson County, former General Shale Brick Co., locations are also
reasonable alternatives.

Hal Miller   Louisville 40207
EM-093

From: Elizabeth Baber
To: Louisville Replacement Hospital Comments
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Plea
Date: Wednesday, January 11, 2017 11:00:44 AM

For the sake of our veterans, please select a site that will ease the burden of Vets getting the service they deserve without fighting the traffic nightmare that occurs off highway 22/42. Many of those who seek the services of the VA hospital are not used to this much traffic and this should be a consideration in a site selection for a new hospital.

Please, please put you ego aside in selecting such a terrible site and think about the needs of those who have served us for so many years.

Respectfully,
Elizabeth Baber
I would like to suggest the VA look into converting the former St. Catherine College campus in Washington County, KY, as the site for the VA Hospital no one wants in Louisville. Our community was negatively impacted when the Dept. of Education closed the college and I believe the VA Hospital would be warmly welcomed as a great way to reuse the campus.

Sharon Sutton
Willisburg, Washington County, Kentucky
Judy:

For what it’s worth, building the VA hospital at the Brownsboro Rd location, in my opinion, would be a terrible mistake. I moved to the area last August, and had no idea how bad the traffic is on Brownsboro Rd, particularly the area near the Watterson Expressway interchange. I lived in St Regis Park for 30 years, moved to my current residence September of 2016, and will not live here much longer if the traffic and congestion continues to increase. I know this project has been debated for years, but until you live here and have to deal with the already unbearable traffic, a rational forward thinking person wouldn’t consider building any Hospital on the current selected site. Bound to be better options to consider!

I’m willing to be part of the solution, not another complainer. How may I help?

Glenn

Glenn Pike
Founding Partner
Louisville Insurance LLC
901 Lily Creek Rd Ste 201
Louisville, KY 40243
502-473-5454
www.louisvilleins.com
EM-096

From: mcainl75@twc.com
To: Louisville Replacement Hospital Comments
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Replacement RobleyRex VA Medical Center
Date: Wednesday, January 11, 2017 10:11:47 AM

No one who has been at the Holiday Manor/ Watterson Expressway site between 7:00-9:00 a.m. or 4:00-6:00 p.m. would choose to build a hospital here. The situation at this site means there are at least four hours each day during which emergency vehicles or personnel would have little or no access.

L. McArthur
I submitted comments to this email address on behalf of Grow Smart Louisville on December 28, 2016, but I received no acknowledgment or confirmation. A hard copy of those comments (24 pages) was also sent via U.S. Mail. Can you please confirm that those comments were received?

Thanks for your immediate attention to this request.

Tim Hagerty

Timothy J. Hagerty
Attorney at Law | Frost Brown Todd LLC

400 West Market Street | 32nd Floor | Louisville, KY 40202-3363
thagerty@fbtlaw.com | www.frostbrowntodd.com

NOTICE: This electronic mail transmission is for the use of the named individual or entity to which it is directed and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. It is not to be transmitted to or received by anyone other than the named addressee (or a person authorized to deliver it to the named addressee). It is not to be copied or forwarded to any unauthorized persons. If you have received this electronic mail transmission in error, delete it from your system without copying or forwarding it, and notify the sender of the error by replying via email or by calling Frost Brown Todd LLC at (513) 651-6800 (collect), so that our address record can be corrected.
I live near the proposed site of the new hospital. I have the following questions and comments,

Why did the Federal Government pay nearly twice the price for the land than the real market dictated? Yes, it's a desirable site but it was also purchased during the worse economic downturn in decades. No serious bidding or negotiating for a site was conducted. One can only conclude some political debts were paid off or a moron handled the deal.

When people do not want a development built in their back yard one of the reasons always seems to be traffic. In this case it is true. Again, a moron can sit and observe the traffic during rush hours and see the road system in the area of Highways 42 and 22 was and is poorly designed. We live with gridlock on a daily basis; additionally, the impatient drivers just run the traffic lights all the time. The worse part of the road intersections is right in front of the hospital site. Major road and intersection re-designing is a must and it will be expensive.

I just finished 40 years in the real estate development and management business...over half involving Federal and State governments. This by far is the most poorly conceived and executed project I have seen in over 14 states, including the DC area.

I am sure the money you paid the Seller is long gone but I see no upside to continuing down the path you have chosen for this project. Find a better and more suitable site.

--
John P. Hancock, CPM, HCP
President
Allegiant Property Consultants
717 Waterford Road
Louisville, KY  40207
Phone: (502) 649-0263
The site on Brownsboro Road makes very little sense. The location is in the most affluent part of Louisville and not well served by public transport. Shouldn’t the location be near the population most in need of the VA? The traffic congestion in that area is terrible now. The hospital will worsen. The University of Louisville School of Medicine has an important role in the staffing of the hospital. If a new hospital needs to be built, shouldn’t it be near the School and convenient for the doctors to staff? During the Cold War, there was a need to decentralize the hospitals in the event of catastrophic attack. Those conditions no longer exist. A new hospital should be in the downtown medical center.

Finally, a case was never made that the existing hospital could not be remodeled to bring in line with 21st century needs. Certainly, that would be dramatically more cost effective.

Thank you for considering these comments. The whole issue seems to have been very poorly addressed.

Lloyd Taustine, MD

Medical Arts Bldg., Suite #3334
Louisville, KY 40222
tel. 502.458.9004
fax. 502.458.9842

This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, you are hereby notified that the Taustine Eye Center does not consent to any reading, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message. Please notify the sender immediately and destroy the transmitted information.
To Whom it May Concern,

The purpose of this email is to express my concern about the proposed location for the new Veterans Administration hospital in Louisville, Kentucky.

I believe that the location at the intersection of Brownsboro Road and I-264 is too small to handle the expected patient load, now and in the future.

Moreover, the roadways surrounding this location are already overwhelmed during the daily rush hour periods. The requirement to support vehicular traffic into and out of a major medical treatment facility will create unprecedented traffic congestion for the residents in and around Windy Hills and Indian Hills, Kentucky.

Therefore, I respectfully request that an alternate location be selected as the site for the new Veterans Administration hospital in Louisville, Kentucky.

Thank you very much for your consideration of my input.

Very Respectfully,
Doug Maurer
742 Wicklow Road
Windy Hills, KY 40207
I believe the site on Brownsboro Rd. is a poor choice for the hospital. I agree that it would cause traffic issues. My main reason is that there are much better sites in the city. Clearly the west end could benefit from a large hospital. The jobs and other businesses that might be developed in the same area (restaurants) would give the area a boost.

Laurie Callander
I greatly oppose the dot

Sent from my iPhone
EM-103

From: Bryan Harmeling
To: Louisville Replacement Hospital Comments
Subject: [EXTERNAL] VA Hospital
Date: Wednesday, January 11, 2017 8:35:25 AM

As a local resident of Windy Hills and an Architect in town I have some opinions on the site selection of this hospital. I personally believe that the site does not lend itself at all to a Hospital of this size, and that it will cause a lot of headache with regards to traffic, etc. I understand that the current location and existing VA hospital is run down, there is no parking, etc. I actually did some work to the SICU suite years ago. My suggestion would be to find a more reasonable site that will lend itself to less problems.

Bryan Harmeling, Assoc. AIA
Stengel-Hill Architecture
613 West Main Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202
502.893.1875
502.893.1876 fax
www.stengelhill.com
As a former resident of Louisville whose son attended Ballard High School, I am aware of the traffic woes and snarls near the proposed site. That is reason enough to look elsewhere. I have avoided driving in that area since he graduated.

As a current resident of Jeffersonville, Indiana and wife of a Vietnam Veteran who gets 100 per cent of his healthcare at VA, I hope you will consider proximity to the many Veterans who access services from Southern Indiana. A downtown or west end Hospital allows easy access from untolled bridges. PLEASE return to the original idea of a downtown hospital near to other medical resources. Travel to the Brownsboro site will be expensive for us, stressful and not accessible for medical specialists to practice there.

As a community member, I think locating in the distressed west end of Louisville is an exciting option. It is accessible from highways and will be an economic driver for that area, with a ready workforce.

We find the care through the VA system is excellent. Don't ruin it by building at the Proposed Brownsboro site.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

Carolyn A King
615 East Maple Street
Jeffersonville, IN 47130
This email is regarding Radcliff's plea to get the VA hospital there. I'm a former employee of Radcliff and can tell you there government is corrupt and not people you would want to deal with. There are plenty of people across Louisville and surrounding areas that would benefit from the hospital there in Louisville. I worked there 4 years and there turnover was for police and fire was insane. They treat there employees like garbage and the police dept has been sued multiple times for there corrupt actions. I will attach 2 open records I had gotten from when I worked there. They took two hundred thousand from the county to put a rescue pumper in the northern half of the county they put the pumper in the city (which only responded in the city) and outfitted an old truck with tools to run in the county. They took 147,586 from the state fire commission for a fire training center they never completed or used for the purposes they were agreed to in the grant. JJ Duvall then runs for judge executive a few years later bragging on the hundreds of thousands of dollars he has put in the bank for Radcliff. Yet they never paid a dime to the state or the county for the money they took and didn't use properly. If you dig into there past you will find lots of reasons you don't want to deal with these people. Thanks

Sent from my iPhone
To Whom It May Concern:

I have lived in Louisville some 50 years and believe strongly that you should reconsider plans to build a new VA Hospital near Brownsboro Road and I-264 East.

1. The proposed site is NOT centrally located.
2. The proposed site is in an already-congested area.
3. This site would be better used for a new veterans cemetery.

If the present Robley Rex site cannot be renovated to meet veterans' needs, I hope you will look at new sites recently proposed including in west Louisville, Bullitt County, and Hardin County.

I believe the best scenario would be to build smaller medical facilities at each of these three properties to supplement the existing hospital. And, you could still create a new veterans cemetery at the Brownsboro Road site.

Please consider the opinions of the people of the Louisville area.

Thank you.

Patty McDowell
2302 Wetstein Avenue
Louisville, KY  40205
(502) 454-7193
Hello,

we are marketing the two land parcels just off of the corner of Interstate 65 and the Outer Loop and wanted to see if the VA would consider these sites for the new Hospital. Please see the attached marketing flyers and Aerial with the property description and let me know if you have questions. Thank you,

Doug Butcher SIOR | Senior Vice President
CBRE | Advisory & Transaction Services | Industrial
6060 Dutchmans Lane, Suite 100 | Louisville, KY 40205
T + 1 502 412 7641 | F + 1 502 423 1849 | C + 1 502 744 7641
doug.butcher@cbre.com | www.cbre.com/doug.butcher

Follow CBRE: Facebook | @CBRE | @CBRELouisville | Google+
INDUSTRIAL LAND WITH IMPROVEMENTS

5400 MINOR LANE
Louisville, KY 40219

PROPERTY FEATURES
+ 206.5186± Acres Available
+ 215,266± SF of Building Improvements
+ Zoned EZ-1 / R-4
+ 1.6 Miles to I-65
+ 4.4 Miles to UPS Worldport
+ 5.5 Miles to Ford LAP
+ 5.7 Miles to Louisville International Airport
+ For Sale: $19,000,000.00

CONTACT US

DOUG BUTCHER, SIOR
Senior Vice President
+1 502 412 7641
doug.butcher@cbre.com

www.cbre.com/louisville
DEVELOPMENT LAND

906 WEST CLAY ROAD
Louisville, KY 40219

PROPERTY FEATURES

+ 61.37± Acres Available
+ I-65 Frontage and Visibility
+ 3.2 Miles to I-265
+ 3.4 Miles to Ford Louisville Assembly Plant
+ 3.7 Miles to UPS Worldport
+ 5.3 Miles to I-264
+ Zoned C-2 and R-7

+ For Sale: $8,900,000.00

CONTACT US

DOUG BUTCHER, SIOR
Senior Vice President
+1 502 412 7641
doug.butcher@cbre.com

SCOTT GILMORE
Senior Associate
+1 502 412 7639
scott.gilmore@cbre.com

www.cbre.com/louisville
Dear Review Committee,

When I moved to Louisville over twelve years ago there was official talk being reported in the local newspaper about the need for and prospect of a new VA medical center. It is profoundly inexcusable that we are still only reading about its future. Delays and bickering must certainly degrade morale of the really good men and women who work to provide healthcare services to our veterans. They too are caught up in this seemingly endless saga of if and/or when to build— to say nothing of the impact it has on our veteran population in the catchment area.

We have all had our say by this juncture so please start construction. At some point in this life most of us have experienced the unpleasant feeling of not being welcome someplace. Amazing how that works out, we can learn to accept change and become good neighbors or keep our distance and die with resentment. I live within a rock throw from the proposed and approved Brownsboro Rd, site am a twenty-two year military veteran and I, like thousands of other area veterans, would like to live long enough to see a groundbreaking for a new facility.

If, after legal and thoughtful consideration by the agencies entrusted with making these monumental decisions, it has been concluded Brownsboro Rd is the best alternative then, build it!

It would appear our Nation will continue to produce veterans far into the future, adequate and accessible healthcare is the very least we can provide to those who served. These are facts upon which my friends and neighbors can all agree. So, it just comes down to the question of, "Not in my back yard" as to whether it is a VA hospital or another strip mall.

I prefer a VA hospital at the Brownsboro Rd location.

W. Dan Farris
wdan@ldd.net
502 930 6304

Sent from my iPad
It is without question that the process surrounding the **Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center** raises great suspicion of impropriety.

As has been well documented, the VA purchased the site at Brownsboro Road without completing an EIS, as **required by law**. In addition, the purchase price was well above the appraised property value, denoting a pre-determined “site selection” as well as possible corruption.

Upon receiving a copy of the DEIS, it was clear that the VA failed to evaluate proper site alternatives. In summary, the DEIS:

- does not adequately compare alternatives in regard to access issues for veterans as public transportation options are extremely limited
- does not adequately evaluate the impact on traffic-related issues including noise and congestion
- does not contain any reasonable alternative sites
- does not provide adequate analysis of veterans’ ability to receive emergency care in a timely manner as it would require transport to the downtown medical campus.

I know from personal experience, that the Brownsboro Site is a tremendous gamble on the part of the VA. The location is too heavily congested and too far away from emergency medical care. The current location at Zorn Avenue, although much closer to the University of Louisville Medical Center, was still too far for my uncle. He passed away as a result.

There is significant insight in the fact that the Brownsboro site does not fall within the planned development zoning designation as determined by Metro Louisville government.
I respectively ask those responsible for this decision to listen to the voices of the veterans, the physicians, the city officials and the citizens of Louisville who know the inappropriateness of this site for a new VA hospital.

Regards,

Lou Ann Fenwick
Brownsboro Rd is a terrible location for a new VA hospital. It is congested as is and will be much worse. Ideally, the new hospital should be in the downtown medical complex so as to share scarce medical resources with the University Medical School. Demographically, the users of the VA live closer to downtown. Don't make a mistake that will be irreparable for the next 50 yrs. Thank You, W Sterrett Foster MD
My wife and I bought our home in Crossgate thirty years ago near the planned site of the VA medical center. As a long-term resident I can say that traffic is already almost gridlock in the neighborhood in the mornings and afternoons with the high school personnel, elementary school parents and teachers and other commuters in the area. Adding hundreds of hospital workers and patients will prove disastrous. It is unfortunate that the EIS did not accurately represent the current situation and the probable impact of the medical center construction.

Andrew
--
Andrew B. Rawls
502-338-8024 cell
abrawls@gmail.com

4920 Grantham Place
Louisville, KY 40222
502-429-0463
Jan 5th, 2017

Robley Rex VAMC
Replacement VAMC Activation Team Office
800 Zorn Avenue
Louisville, KY 40206

Dear Mr. Trexler,

After reviewing the Environmental Impact Study (EIS), the Region II members of the Military Order of the World Wars have decided that we can no longer remain neutral in the discussion concerning replacing the Robley Rex VA Medical Center off Zorn Avenue. It is not our desire to see the project delayed but the results of the survey indicate that the sites recommended for the replacement medical center are too limited and do not meet the needs of our veterans in the community. Our veterans want and deserve an updated medical center but they need to be able to access it. A large percentage of our veterans that utilize the center are located in the South and West of the city.

It would be tragic that every time another site became available that the project was delayed. However, considering the numerous alternatives that are currently available and that development has not begun, the newly made available sites should be evaluated for accessibility to our veterans before being haphazardly dismissed.

Our recommendation is that at a minimum the following sites in addition to 4906 Brownsboro Road off the Watterson Expressway be evaluated;

a.) 2 sites in the West End of Louisville,
b.) 42 acres of county property off of Interstate 65 and Kentucky 245, the exit for Clermont and Bardstown.
c.) and others.

The evaluation of these additional sites should be expedited and limited in nature. Our intent is not to delay the replacement of the medical center but it would not do our veterans’ service if we dismissed viable sites located near the area that our veterans live.

Respectfully,

Charles D. Estes

Jeffery Daus
Region II Commander
Military Order of the World Wars

Christopher Smrt
Ben Butler Chapter Commander
Military Order of the World Wars

Charles D. Estes
Brigadier General
US Army, Retired
1-270-307-7148
1-270-769-9233

Louisville Chapter Commander
Military Order of the World Wars

Roger Green
Frankfurt Chapter Commander
Military Order of the World Wars
I read the report- what I find missing is an analysis of the Veteran population within 50 miles of the center?

The key issue is who will be using it? for what type of services? where do they live and do they have the means to get to the facility?

Len
Interesting that one of the reasons to leave the existing facility is not having room to expand. Yet when I look at the new plan - where is the room to expand on this plan?

Len
reading the analysis I take exception to replacing this facility as it has "outlived its useful life". The B52 bomber has also outlived its useful life but continues as a mainstay of the Air Force. Any building, properly maintained, can last way beyond any calculated "useful" life.

I teach my kids it is far cheaper to continue repairing and using and old car compared to buying a new car. The analogy fits here. Why aren't you fixing the existing facility? And the issue the "new technology" doesn't fit is difficult to accept (note - I originally wrote hogwash but thought better of it!).

And exactly what it to become of the old facility? Will that be dumped back to the city to figure out what to do? OR- is there some unknown investor just waiting to grab this property - at sale prices of course_ and build new condos and apartment buildings on it?

If you think I may be hinting that there was collusion and corruption on the purchase of the Brownsboro site - you are correct.

Len
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Dan Moyes
Address: 9315 Overton Rd
City/Town: San Antonio
State/Province: TX
ZIP/Postal Code: 78217
Email Address: dan.moyes@labatenv.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
This is a confirmatory test of the website and data-gathering tools. Although, I'd like to take this opportunity to say that I think this is the very best EIS I have ever seen.

Dan
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Kenny Graven
Address: 6715 Crossmoor Lane
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: kenny.graven@vulcanhart.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):
This is a neighborhood area surrounded by (4) schools within a rock throw. All you need to do is drive thru the proposed VA area at 8AM or 5PM & any reasonable person would know that a major hospital right in the middle of a traffic nightmare is crazy! It is surrounded by homes & retail business. There obviously is many more suitable places for the VA. Somebody had to be getting paid to even consider this location! Concerned neighbor!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Fred Johnson
Address: 710 Lexington Place
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40602
Email Address: fredwjohnsonjr74@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

There is a saying in the military that goes, “Do not rush to failure.” I believe that is what we are doing by continuing with the planned relocation of the Robley Rex VA Medical Center to Brownsboro Road. The Veterans Administration bought the proposed site in 2012 for $12.9 million before conducting a full impact assessment. This should give us pause to consider the legitimacy of the decision in the first place. It begs the question of Why would we pay $12.9 million if we didn’t know if it was an environmentally satisfactory parcel of land? I’ll avoid any accusations, but I would like to know the answer to the question before we commit up to $1 billion in construction of the hospital.

Furthermore, the findings of the study are not conclusive. The Brownsboro location was deemed the “preferred alternative” over the other choices despite potential “adverse” effects as determined in the recently released draft of the environmental impact statement. The best course of action was to keep the hospital at its current location on Zorn Avenue; however, the facilities there “have reached the end of their serviceable lives.” How long will it be before those “serviceable lives” expire? That is an important question because I suggest we extend the assessment period to include a new location for consideration.

All three of the courses of action that were examined were in East Louisville. None were considered in West Louisville. I want a location in West Louisville to be identified and included in the impact study. Veteran accessibility and preference must be the most important factors measured in determining the best course of action. They were not included in the Environmental Study and I have not found a source that addresses those two concerns.

As a consumer of VA services, I will not drive to Brownsboro Road for medical treatment. It’s too far. I could almost make it Fort Knox in the time that it takes to get to Holiday Manor. I am fortunate to have a car. Many of our veterans must rely on public transportation. A location in West Louisville is much more accessible to our veteran population, particularly those that need VA services most. There are 59,000 veterans in Louisville alone. I think we need to determine where they live and their transportation requirements before we decide on the location of the hospital. Furthermore, a hidden feature in the relocation proposal is the closure of three outlying VA treatment centers that further reduces veteran accessibility. This needs to be eliminated from all courses of action.

There’s another reason I think we should put the VA hospital in West Louisville – the people that live there have earned it. They deserve the significant positive economic impact the VA will bring to members of our most underserved communities. The failure of the Food Port and WalMart is heart wrenching. We must show our commitment - in a tangible way - to help bring progress to everyone in our city, not just those who reside on the East Side.

And, let me dispel an absurd rumor that I’ve heard tossed about: But, veterans will not go to West Louisville. I served in Desert Storm, Bosnia, Gulf War II and Afghanistan. I would be honored to go there, especially if it helps our city and our citizens. In fact, it’s what I have seen and done in Mosul, Kabul, Baghdad, and Sarajevo that makes me want the VA on the West side as much as anything. I’ve spent that last 30 years rebuilding other countries. I want to rebuild my own country.

Let us not rush to failure and accept the Veteran Administration’s determination that Brownsboro Road is the best location for the VA hospital. It is not. Let’s take just a little more time to consider all the factors, particularly veteran accessibility and preference, before we make a mistake that the veterans who have served our nation will have to live with for the rest of their lives. I don’t think that’s too much to ask.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Debra Richards Harlan
Address: 1734 Chichester Ave
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40205
Email Address: debraandted@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I am astonished at the assessment that a gridlocked highway access only site could possibly pass muster for a medical facility whose clients are dependent upon fast access, fast egress in an emergency, pedestrian access to goods and services for hospital employees and clients, and public transit options that do not include rides in Jonathan Blue's private plane or fancy car collection!
Has anyone ever tried to access hwy 22 during big peak hours?! Is there not the lousiest public transit and pedestrian access on the planet in this corner of pristine farmland?!
Build this downtown! 18th and Broadway comes to mind.
**Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ingrid Johnson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>3424 Glenview Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Glenview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ingridjohnson@icloud.com">ingridjohnson@icloud.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:**

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

---

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):**

I oppose building a new VA hospital at the Brownsboro Road location without first determining if there is location more convenient to Veterans - possibly in West Louisville. It appears to me that the voices of the veterans themselves were not fully taken in to consideration when choosing a location for the new hospital.

Before more money is spent moving forward with the proposal I would like to know why a decision was made to use the Brownsboro location before the environmental impact study was completed.

Why are we closing three other facilities?

I look forward to hearing that veterans' concerns are being taken into consideration.

Best,

Ingrid Johnson
**Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)**

Name: Mark Ray  
Address: 401 Brookview Rd  
City/Town: Louisville  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 40207  
Email Address: mark@mark-ray.com

**Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:**  
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

---

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):**

The Brownsboro Road site (about one mile from my house) is totally incompatible with the proposed hospital. The VA overpaid for an inadequate site and is now trying to put lipstick on this pig in a poke. Traffic in the area is already bad, even after the addition of the slip ramp to Highway 22. I recognize that plans are in place to rebuild the I-264/US 42 interchange, but that project should be completed and a new traffic study commissioned before the VA makes a final decision.

The only sensible location for the new VA hospital is downtown in the medical complex. Unfortunately, that location was rejected based on the complaints of older veterans who don't want to drive downtown and will sadly no longer be living when and if the new hospital is ever built.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Ann Guarnieri
Address: 2416 Stannye Dr
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: aguar64@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
After reading the newly released draft EIS, I can find no reason for building the new VA at the Brownsboro Road location. The report speaks for itself and no prudent person given the report and asked to select a site would select alternative A. Alternative A has more negative impact effects than alternative B and C combined. Costs alone could be the deciding factor, and not only construction costs, but costs to the many Kyiana veterans having to make their trek to an inconvenient and distant site. But, beyond costs, why would the Dept of VA, with its tarnished reputation for providing inadequate services to our nation's service men and women, continue their fight against the very men and women who give them their very reason to exist? Can we not make it easier for our service men and women by locating the VA in an area that is accessible and affordable for all? I hope the legislators from this area take a fresh look at this report and make a decision that benefits the communities' needs as a whole, and not the few who may benefit financially from the deal.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
Address 2
City/Town Louisville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I am absolutely opposed to putting the hospital in this location. It is not in keeping with the nature of the neighborhood. And, despite the report, there is no question that an already horrible traffic situation will be made even worse. (And it IS CURRENTLY A HORRIBLE TRAFFIC SITUATION!)
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Richard Wathen
Address: 4201 Hill Top Rd.
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40207
Email Address: rawathen@aol.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I am against the Brownsborow location. There is NO way it will be able to handle the traffic.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town Louisville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
It seems rather obvious that the Browsboro site will add to the congestion in the area and another site should be used for this needed facility.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Jim Smith
Address: 371 Noland Pike
City/Town: Simpsonville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40067
Email Address: smith2008@mac.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

As a retired veteran, I find the proposed site at I 264-Brownsboro Rd. is unacceptable. Traffic congestion at the current site coming off and on I 264 in both east and west directions is already very bad. As is the Brownsboro Road traffic itself at that intersection. All veterans, but especially elderly veterans and their caregivers are going to find it daunting to get to and from this proposed site.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tyler Thompson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>3740 Upper River Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tthompson@kytrial.com">tthompson@kytrial.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The Brownsboro exit is already very dangerous due to backed up traffic. I think someone should conduct a hazard analysis on the impact of more cars and trucks at this location backing up even more vehicles onto the Watterson. It is dangerous to have traffic traveling at 65 miles per hour that must come to an abrupt stop due to exit traffic backed up onto the expressway and numerous cars trying to change lanes and avoid it. I can not in my wildest dreams imagine someone doing something to make this situation worse and I fear it will be if a hospital is built at this location. I drive by here frequently and around 5:00 the traffic always seems to be backed up far onto the Watterson at this exit and very hazardous to navigate. The traffic congestion there needs to be remedied, not exacerbated. I fear someone is going to be killed or seriously injured if it is not fixed. The last thing needed is for it to be made worse.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town Ky
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
DO NOT GO DOWNTOWN!!!
Traffic is horrible there. Off the gene Snyder is fine.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Jonathan Domena
Address: 201 Big Oaks Drive
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40229
Email Address: cdomena@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I would propose for the VA hospital and facility to be built on the property currently empty between Broadway to Maple St. Between 17th to Dixie Hwy. Then next on Dixie Hwy to Dr. WJ Hodge from Maple to Broadway. This might provide enough property and if not some can be acquired from Brownforman giving tax credits.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Mary Reed
Address: 4318 1/2 Whitmore Avenue
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40215
Email Address: indianrose40215@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Good afternoon, this is just a suggestion for a new VAMC. How about building a new one at the location that WalMart backed out of their plan at 18th and Broadway? It is closer to local hospitals and the area would get a little boost in business if it were to happen. It would be easier for a lot of veterans to access. Of the veterans I know (including my brother), they dread having appointments at the Zorn Avenue location because of the distance, some of them have trouble finding/getting transportation to get there. If it were to be built at the 18th and Broadway location there are many more bus routes available. I do hope my suggestion is considered. Thank you.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):  
Building a new VA hospital at Brownsboro Road off I-264 will create traffic gridlock in the area for both the veterans and residents who live in that area. Please do not construct the hospital here.
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- **Name:** Tim Wohlford
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**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

How about just giving 'em vouchers to be used with private facilities? Seriously, the hospital situation in Louisville is already precarious enough, and such an injection of patients into the system might just stabilize the situation?
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name Allison
Address Stewart
Address 2 1809 Bainbridge Row Dr
City/Town Louisville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code 40207
Email Address alli.stewart@jefferson.kyschools.us

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

To whom it may concern,
I am extremely concerned about such a large hospital being placed in a residential area that already has traffic issues. To put such a large structure next to homes makes absolutely no sense. First, the impact on the residents of this area will be devastating. Also the traffic, noise, air pollution and aesthetics will negatively impact these neighborhoods. The VA isn't being environmentally friendly by causing more smog, air pollution, noise and waste. This is not a good model for a healthy city. The hospital at Brownsboro is also. It the best option for veterans. Traffic and location here aren't ideal. In addition there is no room for expansion and it is not easily accessible. The current location at Zorn Ave is a great location with little traffic and great accessibility. In addition it is close to downtown. The residents of Brownsboro and tree veterans deserve the best. The veterans deserve a great hospital in an ideal location with easy accessibility and room to grow. The residents deserve preservation of their neighborhoods and smart development that doesn't increase traffic, noise, pollution. I strongly suggest keeping the current site or perhaps moving downtown. Sincerely,
Allison Stewart
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Jessica S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lynnjesb@yahoo.com">lynnjesb@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:**

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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**Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):**

The VA utilizes many physicians from University Hospital as well as other community partners. In that effort, the hospital should be downtown where it is easier for patients to be transferred between facilities should the need arise.

Traffic: The area cannot handle the amount of traffic that a 6 story hospital would bring. The Westport Road interchange was already beyond capacity before it even opened and interchanges at 22 and 42 are the same way. The area will be gridlocked with traffic which hurts veterans, staff and the neighbors who live in the surrounding area. As traffic stacks up, the air quality could be worse as a result of unnecessary idling. The current location is not in a high traffic area.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Teresa Bridgewaters
Address: 2350 New Millennium Drive
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40216
Email Address: teresa@tmgky.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Ms Williams and Replacement VAMC Activation Team,

As you and your team continue to plan and discuss the best options for providing the most advanced healthcare for our Veterans, please consider building a new, state-of-the-art facility at 18th & Broadway. The site currently consist of approximately 19+ acres, with the possibility of acquiring nearby acreage for added amenities and/or a parking structure.

A new Robley Rex VAMC campus at this location could be the most cost effective and convenient location proposed to date. This site is bounded, on the East and West sides, by State road Highway 31W, which is a direct route to and from Fort Knox. It is a major public bus transportation transfer hub, for both North/South and East/West connections and minutes from the downtown medical and medical research campuses. We learned that many Veterans, who depend on VA medical care, live in West and South Louisville and many of these Veterans have asked us to present this location to the VA again for consideration.

In the year 2009, we met with Congressman John Yarmuth to discuss the potential of this site for the new facility. At that time, it appeared that all site requirements could be easily met; according to the list of requirements Congressman Yarmuth shared with us.

This location could provide a convenient, comfortable, safe, and healing environment for our Veterans and, as Councilwoman Angela Leet says, "be a first step in conquering the east/west divide, which could truly begin to unite our community in ways we’ve only imagined”.

The approved subdivision plat can be accessed using the following link.


After review of the document, please let me know if you have questions, need additional information or would like to meet to discuss in further detail.

Thanks you for your attention and consideration.

Teresa Bridgewaters, President
TMG - The Mardrian Group, Inc.
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Respondent skipped this question

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:
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**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The proposed VA hospital should not be built at the Brownsboro Road location as it is unwanted by the people of the neighborhood and-more importantly-by the veterans it looks to serve. As evidenced by the surveys given to our veterans, this location would be difficult to access and add undue hardships. There are vacant spaces and buildings all over this city that could use some additional commerce but this location certainly isn't it. Traffic there is already awful and this new addition would make the area nearly impassable. Just because the land was bought at far too high a cost does not mean good money has to be thrown at a bad decision.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Doris Morrow
Address: 115 Spruce Lane
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40207
Email Address: doris.morrow@outlook.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I am opposed to the VA hospital being built the Brownsboro site for the many reasons others have pointed out: inaccessibility to veterans south of Louisville, traffic congestion even if the intersection is reworked, and especially if a fly-over, and environmental concerns.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

There are plenty of properties in areas where the majority of Veterans live, moving the VA Hospital out where it would cause a hardship to those veterans that need the services the most is cruel to them. That area is already over populated and is unwanted by the area residence. Think about how this affects those wanting to use the facilities, not those who that will be making the largest profit off the selling of the land. The VETERANS are what matter not the investors.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: [Redacted]

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The traffic around that area will get worse, that area is so congested, plus it is not centrally located. The proposed downtown around 9th street will be better and will revitalized downtown area.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

---

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

VA's preferred alternative is not large enough to accommodate future expansion. It is very short-sighted to built on a site this small. We all know in 60 years you will need to double the size of the facility and will not have the room for it. Additionally, public transportation options are limited compared to a Downtown or West Louisville location. Also, based on the appraised value increasing from $9.85M to $12.9M in 2 years, today the same site could be sold for $19M at a net revenue to the VA of $6.1M which could easily buy larger sites in West Louisville.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Louisville made a big mistake when the Walmart deal fell thru. Let's not make another one by not using the Walmart property for the VA hospital. Read some of the articles that discuss what an impact some development would mean to that area of our city. Also it doesn't take a math major to see that some one in our city has made a bundle on this transaction (4.9 mil to 13.9 mil) in less than 6 years. WOW this deserves an investigation. Again the people in the western part of our city don't seem to deserve anything.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I am a US Army Corps of Engineers employee and a resident of the neighboring City of Crossgate, so this project strikes a very mixed chord with me.

As a CoE employee, I want our relationship with the VA to flourish and succeed for years to come. This will ensure excellent care and service to our veterans and job security and opportunity for the DoD at the same time.

But just as we are looking out for our men and women that have bravely served our country by giving them the best opportunity for medical care, we should also be keeping the other American citizens in view as well.

This Brownsboro Road location may have seemed a good fit at first, but if anyone took the time to dig just below the surface before this land investment was made, it would have revealed itself to be a poor and forced choice.

The site is restricted, both in size and access. It is closed in on 3 sides, leaving the only option for future expansion being an immanent domain seizure of either Crossgate land or Greymoor Devondale land. This would be a terrible injustice to those citizens these veterans risked their lives to protect. And the traffic, as I'm sure everyone is mentioning, is already strained during peak hours of travel. What do you think this will do? It certainly won't make my morning commute through Ballard HS traffic, and the terrible US42/I-264 interchange any quicker or smoother. It will stifle the roadways in the area and strangle the surrounding community. People won't want to go to businesses in the area and the home will become less desirable and the property value will drop. No one would want to do this to a wonderful community.

After sitting in on various VAMC forums and meetings, I have also learned of various other factors and concerns for this project. The lack of "legitimate" alternative site is a major concern, as many people have offered up other seemingly viable, and possibly with better economic impacts, sites. West Louisville and South Louisville immediately spring to mind. Both areas could greatly use the jobs, the stimulation, the modern facilities and the subsequent impact of having thousands of new people in the area on a daily basis. The veterans expressed their willingness to help revitalize a struggling area in our city just as they've done overseas in struggling wore torn countries. Let them do that.

Selfishly, I do not want to be living in a construction zone for the next 4-7 years. My boys are 2 and 3 and they love our Crossgate neighborhood and all the other little kids that also live here. These next 4-7 year are the formative years of their youth. And now it will be riddled with air pollution, noise pollution, safety risks that come with contraction zones, massive contraction traffic, and way too many other concern to list here. I want my kids to be safe, as everyone should, and this adds a major new safety concern to their young lives. Not to mention our quality of life will drastically change. As it is, we love the fact that our yard offers us a quiet little retreat in a neighborhood located in a big city -- the birds, the wind, the clean air -- it is a big part of what drew us to this house. At night the sky is surprising dark and we can stargaze... but with the construction coming, and then the working hospital all of these things will be stolen from us. The glow of the hospital site lighting will steal our night skies... goodbye astronomy, astrology, meteorology and our relaxation. The pollution from the disrupted earth during construction, the accompanied sounds of machinery and digging and blasting and building will rape our little backyard nature retreat... goodbye zoology, botany, biology, geography geology and our sanity and serenity.

Do the right thing. Consider not only the needs and best wishes of the people of this Brownsboro area, but consider the needs of the people in other potential sites' surrounding areas, their economy and sense of inclusion in this city. But, finally, consider the veteran's needs and best wishes. They don't want to be in east Louisville. Give them an area that allows for the easiest travels, best future growth and greatest impact on all.

Thank you for your consideration. I sincerely hope you take in the concerns of the countless voices that will be effected by this massive decision.

Charles Krish
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Alec Taylor
Email Address: alectee@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

I would like to echo Councilwoman Angela Leet's comments regarding the inferior location of the Brownsboro site for the purpose of serving the future patients and helping transforming the surrounding community. The environmental impact study performed does not appear to address one of the most important aspects of any new development: its ability to influence and transform the neighborhood and community.

There are many areas within the service zone that are in desperate need of a catalyst that would add jobs, improve infrastructure, and bring about a sense of community within neighborhoods. The Brownsboro location identified is not one of those areas. While this site may be adequate to address the physical need to build a new structure, it does little if anything to maximize the benefit to the community and the future patients that come with the construction of a facility like the one proposed.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Christine Swan
Address: 3025 Mid Dale Lane
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40220
Email Address: christine2rswan@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

November 16, 2016
RE: Replacement Robley Rex VA Medical Center
The VA is for Veterans so please consider a location close to west and south Louisville where the greatest population reside.
Christine Swan
Louisville, KY 40220
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Nancye Tuell
Address: 518 Indian Ridge Road
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40207
Email Address: notuell@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I really am against this site here as the traffic at rush hour is already so bad that I can't even take the interstate home. At rush hour it is backed up to or past the mall. Part of this is due to I-71 backing up. I already have a problem in the morning just getting out of our neighborhood. I can only imagine it will get worse. The only thing that may help could be two dedicated lanes turning directly into this facility. I am still against this going here due to the already congested traffic at Brownsboro Road. All I say is good luck anyone getting to work on time.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Please consider re-opening evaluation of other sites for the VA Hospital. Most veterans oppose the Brownsboro site, the neighborhoods oppose the site, and from an economic, convenience, traffic, logical, medical need or literally any other standpoint, this location makes absolutely no sense. It is as if the VA saw the land, purchased it, and THEN considered the multitude of obstacles and challenges it will face should the hospital be constructed on that site. Please, for once, do right by our veterans, re-open consideration of alternative sites that make more economic sense, that actually takes into consideration what the veterans want, and look at sites that are viable as a matter of common sense. The VA has a real opportunity here to do the right thing, and then receive some MUCH needed good publicity for doing so. The positive political optics of this are simply self-evident if they would just listen to the people. The negative reaction if they proceed forward are just as evident.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Courtney Gadansky
Address: 2410 Glenview Ave
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Please do not build the new VA hospital off of Brownsboro Road. The traffic at Brownsboro and the Watterson is already well-beyond capacity during rush hour.

In addition, it is clear that veterans will have access to better care and more services if they are closer to downtown.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town Louisville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

For seventeen years (1989 to 2006) I was the executive director of Habitat for Humanity. Volunteers and partner families built more than 230 homes during the time, a majority of them in the Russell Neighborhood.

I know firsthand how important development, infrastructure, jobs, security, education, transportation, and services are for this neighborhood.

The opportunity to build a new veterans hospital in the Russell Neighborhood should be researched. Spending construction dollars in Russell will anchor development. Operating a hospital will provide jobs, hope, and a dynamic future.

The current proposed location in the east end is a boondoggle of the worst sort. The developer who pocketed millions of tax dollars when he sold the property to the government should return that money. It served no greater good for the community; it enriched one individual.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: robert bouhl
Address: 7106 shefford lane west
City/Town: louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40242
Email Address: bobber09@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I wish to comment on the new VA hospital being considered for the Brownsboro Road location. I have lived in this area most of my life, Northfield (US 42) and now Brownsboro Meadows (KY 22), and current work in Fenley Office Park at US 42 and Lime Kiln Lane. I am very familiar with the traffic on both the major roads and the surrounding "feeder" streets. I had also reviewed the proposed changes to the Watterson and US 42 interchange that are also in the works that is supposed to be both independent and in conjunction with the proposed VA hospital. Quite simply the current infrastructure of main roads and feeder streets will not be able to handle the influx of traffic that this hospital will cause. One immediate concern is the morning and afternoon traffic due to five schools in the immediate vicinity and the potential overlap in shift changes at the hospital. Currently in the morning and afternoon traffic is congested at multiple locations around where the hospital is proposed. These are US 42 and Rudy Lane for Dunn Elementary and US 42, KY 22, Herr Lane and Westport Road due to Wilder Elementary, Kammerer Middle School, Ballard High School and St. Albert the Great school. No amount of redesign of an intersection at Watterson and US 42 will alleviate the problems the neighborhood streets currently handle. Prolonged waits are not uncommon trying to get out of my neighborhood from Wesboro onto Herr Lane and Hayward onto KY 22. Adding several thousand cars per day into this congested area will not go unnoticed or not have a significant effect on travel time. You will have medical staff coming and going for their assigned shifts, you will have visitors coming and going daily plus any number of other people coming and going each day. Along with people perhaps going out for lunch or to run errands in the immediate vicinity on a daily basis.

Unfortunately the current neighborhoods in the area contribute to some of these problems because of their access streets and the accompanying locations of traffic lights. Also the current businesses in the area, whether it be the newly enlarged Krogers, Fenley Office Park, LimeRidge Park, the Panera and Fresh Market near Dunn along with the office park behind them. All of these locations will be adversely affected by a significant increase in automobile traffic and the cascading delays in traffic caused by all of these additional cars that are far in excess of what these streets were designed to hold. Simply widening Herr Lane will not significantly alleviate anything. KY 22 and US 42 cannot be realistically widened so all of this traffic will not be able to dissipate in an efficient manner.

I am not going to suggest where or how you find another site since that is not the purpose of my correspondence. Simply as a person who lives, works and drives frequently in this area I am very cognizant of the current traffic woes around here. Putting a hospital that would then bring thousands of cars into this already congested area is just not sustainable. I don't know what kind of traffic studies or hypothetical analyses have been performed, I do know that it won't work and we who reside in this area will be left to deal with it after the hospital would have been built. And then what recourse will we have to those who have tried to cram a square peg into a round hole?

Please reopen the site consideration process.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Marc Orr
Address: 529 Michigan Ave
City/Town: Elizabethtown
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 42701
Email Address: marc.orr_ky@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I think the VA needs to reconsider. I think a site in West Louisville would be a win-win for reasons that others have provided. Additionally, a west side location would allow access over non-toll bridges from Indiana (Sherman Minton and 2d Street Bridge) as opposed to the toll bridges on the central/east side of the city. As a veteran living in E-town KY I would have no problem (would actually prefer) driving into town/west side vs. driving to the nether regions on the east side of the city.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Bruce Gadansky
Address: 4110 Hayfield Way
City/Town: Prospect
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40059
Email Address: dogsimple@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Sirs,
While I do as a veteran served by the VA understand the need for upgraded facilities, it is my conclusion that modernizing Robley Rex and adding a multi-floor parking facility would be a considerably more economical and cost-effective solution while eliminating further disruption to an already busy traffic area, where Zorn Avenue construction would be minimally disruptive. I urge you to look at what is already in place. There's no reason that vets cannot receive excellent care at Robley Rex with an upgrade to the facilities already bought and paid for at a far lower impact than creation of a new facility.

Thank you for your consideration
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Email Address chelsearealproperties@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

Traffic Study: The separation distance between the intersections of KY 22/42 and the VA entrance is less than 400 feet which is well below the standard spacing. This will cause a failing condition. Signals timed together would only cause the "LOS" to degrade further down KY 42. The answer is to provide a full traffic circle in front of the VA entrance to keep the traffic moving.

Air Quality: When a NEPA process EIS is performed all potential environmental impacts must be scoped. This includes an (AQA) air quality analysis for (CO) carbon monoxide. This is so very important for quality of life issues when your "right of way" like KY 22 is so close to the travel lane.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Greg Zahradnik
Address: 1239 Royal Ave
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40204
Email Address: zengr@juno.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Please do not build at the Brownsboro Road site (1). This has been the worst option from the beginning, and will be forever remembered as a catastrophe. All citizens deserve better.

Expanding and modernizing the current locations and satellites is best for veterans, stakeholders, government agencies, and members of the public.

This option has the least damaging potential environmental impacts from any alternatives, and is the best way to mitigate impacts. You don't seem to include this as one of the 3 options, so if this best fits in as (3) The no action alternative, then so be it.

(2), the alternative to construct and operate the replacement campus at the St. Joseph site would be the next best alternative.
### Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>James W. Elder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>2009 Glenview Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40222-6345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwelder3@twc.com">jwelder3@twc.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

---
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Having read the October 2016 draft EIS and attended the EIS Public Meeting November 15, 2016, here are my objections to locating the new VA Medical Center at the Midlands site near KY22 and US42.

First, Veterans, the sole clientele of the facility, will be poorly served by a Midlands location. The present Zorn Avenue site is relatively easy to drive to compared to the traffic mess that will be at the Midlands, even with planned and hoped for road improvements. Bear in mind that it is not just the present Center being proposed for the site, but also three clinics and the VA Regional Office, all being planned to locate at the Midlands. Traffic complications abound at the Midlands entry point. A big re-do of Ky22, the street in front of the Midlands entrance, will be required. A nearby two lane but busy street proposed to help with traffic, Herr Lane, has schools on it, each with its own rush hour. The Midlands site will be a mess for Staff and for the Veteran Patients to access and to leave. An argument put forward that the Midlands site is, “just one more exit along the interstate,” totally misses the effect of the traffic challenges for both Staff and Patients.

Second: Doctors. There are over 270 doctors assigned to the Robley Rex Medical Center, and about 167 of them are from the University of Louisville Medical School. Here is the word from UofL:

Each day [UofL] sends a total of 106 residents and fellows to the Rex Robley VA Hospital. Approximately 2/3 of the residents and fellows are solely assigned to the VA but are required to return to the medical center campus for half-day continuity practice clinics each week. Many additionally have to return to the medical school campus for their required daily or weekly didactic and clinical case conferences - some of the major conferences in medicine and surgery can be teleconferenced but due to limitations of the teleconference space/availability many residents need to travel back and forth between the VA and the campus. Approximately 1/3 of the residents and fellows, after making morning rounds at the VA, are on call for future consults and may have to return to the hospital if requested throughout the day and night.

I truly believe that the veterans would get better and more timely care at a downtown site, and the resident/fellow educational environment would be greatly enhanced with the VA on the downtown medical campus.

John L. Roberts, MD
Vice Dean for Graduate Medical Education and Continuing Medical Education

The doctors’ commutes would be extended by each way by several miles extra distance and time, plus the traffic snarl both in and out at the Midlands location, and Vice Dean Roberts’ comments reflect that fact.

Third, residents near the Midlands site do not want the Midlands getting a facility with an effective, “footprint,” far larger than just the 34 acres of the Midlands. The alleged benefits do not look like benefits to the residents. It won’t bring jobs people here are seeking. On EIS page 250, Section 5.10, is the absurd sentence, “No adverse socio-economic effects were identified.” That is just not believable. The notion that loading up traffic to the point that streets are snarled every day won’t depress home values or adversely affect living within a mile of the facility, is just ridiculous. If the VA wants to lift a locale’s socio-economic situation, the 9th Street location should be considered more seriously.

That first point again, the Veteran Patients. The large majority of them have said they want the new facility built at the present location on Zorn Avenue. Someone at the VA has claimed it cannot be done. Sharpen up your drafting pencils and build it there. And use the Midlands site as the much needed Annex to the nearby Zachary Taylor National Cemetery, which is full. It CAN be done!

Thank you.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Nancy Moser
Address: 1611 Two Springs Place
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40207
Email Address: oppermoser@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

It doesn't take an EIS, just eyesight, to know that the proposed VA hospital site on Old Brownsboro Road will create traffic problems that the area cannot handle. This is already a bottleneck and I can't imagine what it would be like with the congestion a hospital would create. A residential area that includes a high school, middle school, and lower school is not the proper location for a hospital. Those of us who live here know why this site was selected and it was a political payoff. Maybe that should be looked into.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Nathan Bayne
Address: 310 Hidden Oak Way
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: natebayne@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I am strongly opposed to the relocation of the VA hospital to the Brownsboro Road site. I do not live in the surrounding neighborhoods, but I do travel frequently along the Watterson Expressway and am seriously concerned about the impact of this project on what is already a traffic nightmare and the corresponding effect of the traffic on the patients, care providers, and families that will be stuck in the daily traffic jams that surround this area. Just yesterday, I sat in traffic for nearly a half hour to travel the short distance between US60 and the Brownsboro Road Exit just to gain access to I-71S. This happens multiple times a week, and is not just limited to the “rush hours.” We avoid this area at all costs until the evening hours due to the regular existing congestion and can only imagine the negative effect of additional hospital traffic. It is my judgement that the existing configuration of roads and turning lanes (generally backed up on the Watterson overpass and adjoining streets) will be especially difficult for VA patients unfamiliar with the area to navigate.

In addition, I have believed all along that locating the hospital closer to existing medical resources is a smarter and more responsible action. Our veterans deserve the best care with quickest access to doctors and resources in the existing medical complex near downtown. This only makes sense given the proximity to University of Louisville physicians and interns that help provide care to the VA.

The Bridges Project has already greatly increased access to this area and reduced travel time. I believe a project of this magnitude should not be forced into a location that has many negatives and discounts the needs of our veterans that depend on public transportation. We should use as much existing infrastructure as possible, without adding to an already burdened road system in a suburban location.

I feel strongly that this project needs to proceed quickly, but urge that it not be located at this insufficient site.
Thank you.
Nathan Bayne
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Ann DeSanctis
Address: 7318 Glen Arbor Rd.
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: ann.desanctis@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

As Louisville re-urbanizes, re-use of existing sites as well as thoughtful planning of all land use becomes paramount to making Louisville a 21st century city that is going to attract the type of people we want to create a robust, vibrant economy. Alternative A, at the Brownsboro site, is a good example of infill development that would not only benefit veterans (because of its accessible and central location) but would also benefit the city itself.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Dominic Gratto
Address: 2805 Woods Club Rd
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 402416278
Email Address: dominicgratto@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The selected location for the VA Hospital (at 42/22 and the Watterson) is not a suitable location for such a development. The area is already congested with too much traffic for the existing infrastructure. The added traffic from the hospital would just make it worse. Additionally, the use doesn't fit - this is a residential area. The tract of land would be better suited for a green space. There are no public parts in this part of town. Keep the VA hospital downtown where it can be better serviced but doctors that already work in the other hospitals downtown. The location at the Watterson and 42/22 makes no sense from a land use perspective. It isn't adjacent to anything similar.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Ramona D Lindsey
Address: 2321 Peaslee Rd.
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40216
Email Address: rlindseyinfo@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The DEIS is invalid because there are no true alternatives to compare to the Brownsboro Road site since option 2 (St. Joseph site) is no longer available.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Please consider a site in West Louisville. The VA would be a good development for this part of the city. Furthermore, The DEIS is invalid because there are no true alternatives to compare to the Brownsboro Road site since option 2 (St. Joseph site) is no longer available.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Joyce Stanley
Address: 75 Ted Turner Drive, S.W.
Address 2: Suite 1144
City/Town: Atlanta
State/Province: GA
ZIP/Postal Code: 30303
Email Address: joyce_stanley@ios.doi.gov

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):  

Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
do not want VA hospital at brownsboro rd site
**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cordell G Lawrence Jr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>3011 Lightheart Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cordell.lawrence82@gmail.com">cordell.lawrence82@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Good Morning,

My name is Cordell Lawrence Jr. and I am resident of Glenview Hills. I was recently elected as a councilman for the City of Glenview Hills. Neighbors frequently share how passionate they are about relocating the VA hospital to a location that will do the greatest good for Veterans as well as those who suffer from devastating poverty and poor health. We also often forget that Veterans frequently suffer from both poverty and poor health.

The current proposed site is surrounded by the cities of Northfield, Glenview Hills, Glenview, Crossgate, Windy Hills and Indian Hills, which are among the most affluent neighborhoods in our region, while the West End is by far the most economically disadvantaged neighborhood in our region. Additionally, when Veterans clearly indicate via official surveys that the current proposed location is neither desired nor practical it is time for strategic longterm planning to come into play in order for alternative sites to be considered. While our community is eternally grateful for the influx of federal dollars to construct the new VA hospital, we also must inform the VA that they are missing what us in the community clearly see as a strategic error that's on the fast track. It is our duty to speak up and inform the VA that they are making a misguided decision that will impact our entire community for generations to come.

- Where can a nearly 1 billion dollar investment do the greatest good? The West End
- Where can a nearly 1 billion dollar investment break the cycle of devastating poverty and poor health? The West End
- Where can a nearly 1 billion dollar investment tear down decades old physical and psychological barriers? The West End
- Where can a nearly 1 billion dollar investment employ neighbors that currently suffer from devastating unemployment? The West End
- Where can a nearly 1 billion dollar investment become a magnet for longterm and sustainable economic development? The West End
- Where can a nearly 1 billion dollar investment create a world class hospital located near the majority of veterans? The West End
- Where can a nearly 1 billion dollar investment change the trajectory of generations of Americans within our community? The West End

The location of this hospital is a golden opportunity to chart the course for improving our entire community that only comes along a precious few times in one’s lifetime.

Please do not take this decision lightly. It's time for innovative and strategic thinking to deliver the greatest good for our Veterans and our community.

Sincerely,

Cordell Lawrence Jr.
Councilman
Glenview Hills City Council
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Please seriously consider what would happen if the VA hospital were to be built at the proposed location in Louisville, KY. The traffic is already horrendous in this area and additional traffic from a large hospital would make everything even more of a snarl. This area of Brownsboro Road already cannot handle the current traffic. Not to mention that at the proposed location there are not many disabled vets living close by and the vets would be better served at the location in the West End. Furthermore, business is good in the area of Brownsboro Road and the West End could use the economic boost from businesses that might pop up to serve the hospital.

Thank you,

Kate Harrison
3104 Runnymede Road
Louisville, KY 40222
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Donna Sketo
Address: 6100 Baylor Court
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: donnasketo@aol.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Concerns are not being addressed as related to the impact to the environment for the proposed Brownsboro Rd Site:
1) Studies conducted by outside agencies found as stated in the Traffic Impact Analysis from several years ago that the traffic congestion in this site already operates at an unacceptable level of service. Additionally, it states that the proposed VA hospital would have an additional significant negative impact on the area. Even with the proposed road improvement plans, that same analysis indicates it would only “mitigate” some of the negative impact associate with the proposed VA hospital. The definition of the word “mitigate” means only to lessen the severity. So, the Traffic Impact Analysis is clearly stating that the road improvements related to a new VA hospital at this site will not resolve but only lessen the severity of the significant additional impact on traffic in an area where the traffic is already operating at an unacceptable level of service. There will be an increased volume of over 4,200 vehicles daily related to the hospital.
2) The original Traffic Impact Analysis Report in the VA’s presentation a couple of years ago reflected a more negative impact on the traffic in 2018 with the hospital than without it. The VA’s own traffic study rate the traffic a “D” even with the proposed road improvements.
3) With the significant additional traffic for the hospital, air quality would be impacted as logic dictates that more vehicles cause more pollution. Additionally, there would be increased pollution/decreased air quality from the construction and on-going operation of a hospital.
4) The Brownsboro Road site has 36 acres, which is significantly less than the current hospital location and previously proposed sites. Given the projected veteran population growth over the next 10 years as well as the potential construction cost of $900 million - $1 billion, it would seem that logic would dictate utilizing a site that has additional acreage to continue to allow for expansion past the next 10 years. The Brownsboro Road site is much more limited due to being more tightly constrained on all sides as well as significantly more congested with a heavier population concentration.
5) The existing green space would be eliminated and surrounding views limited by the proposed hospital at the Brownsboro Site whereas other proposed sites would still have green spaces due to the additional acreage.
6) Associated security lighting would increase nighttime ambient light levels in the surrounding areas negatively impacting adjacent residential neighborhoods at the Brownsboro Road Site.
7) From an aesthetic viewpoint, the construction of a water tower and an 8-story garage will tower over the surrounding buildings in the immediate area.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The location was picked without a thorough process in place and was in fact purchased (at a terrible price) long before public input was solicited. Shame! The new complex should be close to where the Veterans who use it most live. Consider another use for the wasted investment and complete the study on the location being in West Louisville.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Lauren Montfort
Address: 6909 Greenlawn Rd.
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: lauren.k.montfort@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I am a resident living near the proposed VA hospital site. I support Veterans and believe they should get the best care possible. However, this is not the proper place for a new facility.

Traffic is terrible in this area. During rush hour, I often wait at a complete stop, on the Watterson Expressway, just to get off at this exit. It would be extremely difficult for veterans to negotiate this already congested area. I also do not believe EMS will be able to quickly access this site as the proposed road in and out is only two-lanes. There is no way this road can expand.

In addition, this site is small. I have spent time visiting at the old VA hospital on Zorn Ave. The proposed site would not offer much, if any, more space for parking. Patients will have to wait just as long for valet parking assistance.

This new hospital should be a place for even more future growth as needed. This site will never allow for expansion due to its size.

This proposal fails to consider where other hospitals are located in relation to this site. This property is inconvenient for EMS emergencies to or from other hospitals.

I have never met anyone against a new VA hospital. However, I don't know anyone who thinks this is the right location. The people in this community have good reason for opposing this site. Please listen to the community and place it where it is best for the veterans who deserve it.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Minnie Wilson
Address: 1616 cedar street
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40203
Email Address: mimiandme55@Gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Thank you for allowing me to have an opportunity to make a comment. I am a resident of the Russell neighborhood of west Louisville. I have lived here for 30+ years I own my home and I work for Norton Health care. I'm close to retirement. When the Walmart deal fell through I was disappointed. Recently I understand that there is a possibility the VA hospital could possibly be built at 18th and Broadway. This would be monumental for west and southwest Jefferson County. The location is perfect logistically for the population of disabled and retired vets in Jefferson County. The stabilizing force of a hospital in our community would be miraculous on so many levels. It would bring needed healthcare to young and older veterans who are underserved. It would bring careers from CEOs to House keeper's Nurses to dietary workers. The economic impact alone would improve the lives and lifestyles of thousands of citizens for generations to come. I humbly and selfishly pray it can be placed at 18th and Broadway. Thank you MLW
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Leslie Broecker
Address: 4001 Running Water Lane
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40241
Email Address: lbroecker@att.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

It makes no sense to put the new VA Hospital on Brownsboro Road. It will destroy the area and neighborhood. Why not put it in a part of town that needs the revitalization? The West End, Portland, or west of Downtown are far more beneficial to our community. Come on, this is a no-brainer. PS. Shame on the VA for over-paying for this property. Shouldn't that money have gone to helping Vets?
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Patrice Huckaby
Address: 5400 Hempstead Rd
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40207
Email Address: millypath@gmail.com
Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):
We are very much opposed to building a new VA hospital at the Brownsboro Road site. We are newcomers to the area and are already rather surprised at the clogged traffic pattern on 22 / 42 at the entrance to where the new hospital would be placed. It makes no sense to put this facility here, when it is obvious that there are other places in town which would be either more well suited to such a new installation or would be in a location that would be in closer proximity to existing medical facilities. More importantly, it would be located more conveniently for those people who need to use the VA's services. Please reconsider this construction project. It is too much money to spend on something that so many people are opposed to. There are other parts of Louisville that would benefit -- indeed, would be thrilled to have -- the collateral business that the hospital might generate. Thank you for this consideration. Thomas and Patrice Huckaby
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Michelle Black White
Address: 7201 Graf Springs Drive
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40241
Email Address: mbwhite618@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The VA should either be located in downtown Louisville to give Vets access to the benefits of being part of a regional medical center or it should be located in the area of town where the highest number of Vets reside to give them easier access to the facility. The proposed location off 22 would put the facility in an area of town that already suffers from monumental traffic delays and limited public transportation options. The VA should sell the property (for what they overpaid), recoup their losses, and find a solution that actually helps Vets have access to the benefits they deserve.
I am a draftee Korean War veteran who uses and appreciates the Louisville VA on Zorn Avenue. I consider your "preferred" Brownsboro Road site for a replacement hospital totally inappropriate. I fully support the petition for putting the new hospital at the "Heritage West" site in Louisville's West End at 30th Street and West Muhammad Ali Blvd. This site is ideal, being near other medical/hospital facilities downtown and easily reached by bus, car, or walking. There is much open space for parking. The site would cost nothing, I am told, since the city owns it. Please reverse your choice of the Brownsboro Road site and choose the Heritage West site for which there seems to be widespread approval in this community.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Leslie Marcum
Address: 4313 Stoltz Ct.
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40215
Email Address: rickyred999.rm@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I agree with so many other people about the Iroquois homes area, isn't it already owned by the government? It's a very large area, easy on easy off, expressway access. Also it's not nearly as congested as the other area in the eastend. Here is another suggestion, why not let the vets go to the hospital of their choice, the Doctor of their choice, etc. Then there would be no need to build a hospital anywhere. Everyone would win. I am a Navy veteran of the United States Navy, Vietnam Veteran also having served four years active duty, two and a half years on the Vietnam coast refueling ships, I was on the USS Chemung AO-30. I also believe I was exposed to Agent Orange from the waters because I was so close to the rivers emptying into the ocean from Vietnam. I am 68 years old, I've had triple by-pass open heart surgery. I am retired, on social security and Medicare, and because Medicare doesn't cover everything I have to pay for a supplement out of my own pocket. I would like to go to the VA HOSPITAL but I hear there is a long time waiting to be seen. I don't think that a veteran should have to wait to be seen. That is why I suggest letting us see the doctor who we want to see, NO CHARGE to us. At least have clinics where a veteran could go for just regular checkup and minor illnesses that don't require hospitalization, for free. But the site where the Iroquois Homes were located would be the most logical place especially monetarily wise, thank you, Leslie Marcum, former QM3 aboard the USS CHEMUNG AO-30.
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| Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: | I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list. |
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**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):**

I am a resident in the area of the Brownsboro Rd location. Adding a facility of this size to the area would be a big mistake. This surrounding half dozen traffic lights on Brownboro are already completely oversaturated with traffic. 264 backs up every day because of the exit to 71N, blocking lanes to the Brownsboro exit. All you have to do is drive on 264E and watch a semi to fully understand the problem. Almost every semi on that route is headed to 71N. At least 75% of them will be in the center lane, then move to the right lane after the Westport exit, because their GPS is telling them the 71N exit will be on the right. But first comes the Brownsboro exit, so these trucks all move from the center lane to the right lane to the center lane again. When I get home from work at 9pm it's not a big deal, but you add hundreds of cars into that mix at rush hour with those trucks moving lanes back and forth? Good luck. Overall, this is just a terrible location to add traffic to, and it's not like this area needs and economic boost either. West End or South End could really be impacted by this type of development. I will strongly oppose the Brownsboro location at each opportunity to do so.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Chester Millstead
Address
6039 Sweetbay Drive
City/Town
Crestwood
State/Province
KY
ZIP/Postal Code
40014
Email Address
millsteadc@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I am a combat disabled Viet Nam vet. I totally happy with my VA care. However i don't think we need a new hospital we just need more parking at Zorn. Just because it's 60+ years doesn't make it dysfunctional. I am 80 year years old and run like a SWISS WATCH. Don't listen to the whiners they would not be happy if hanged with a new rope.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: John Schwartzlose II
Address: 5505 bardstown road
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40291
Email Address: schwartzlose2@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Brownsboro Road, nearest the Watterson Expressway, is extremely congested, each day. Traffic is extremely dense and is difficult to navigate, on good days, at this junction.
The proposed VA healthcare facility, very near this spot, near Brownsboro Road, is a horrible entity for this location. This location is also a bad choice for the VA and for veterans seeking medical care.
The former Iroquois project homes location would be suitable, in many more respects.
The 17th Street location, recently positioned for a WalMart, would be even better. It's locale is good for vets, VA employees, citizens of western Louisville and for the city at large.
Please reconsider these two, or other, more suitable locations. Brownsboro Road would be bad for all of us.
Thank you.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: John Shea
Address: 8207 Old Gate Rd
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40241
Email Address: jpshea@bellsouth.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I have attended many meetings over the last 10 years. Two years ago we were told at the beginning EIS meeting that the new hospital was a done deal for location, land having been purchased by the government but not the VA. Local residents have had 10 years to get acquainted with the new VA Hospital.

What had been planned for the site would have been more intrusive than a new VA hospital. I am a veteran and I live about one mile from the planned hospital. The areas growth is in the northeast and having access to Indiana is a bonus. Traffic for this hospital is less than commercial and building heights are less than commercial so it is all a plus.

The only negative is the over payment of eight million dollars to the associate of the mayor and 3rd district representative. That money could have been used to purchase the homes in the adjoining neighborhood. That over payment just looks bad.

Please go ahead and start the project so that it can be used for the veterans coming home.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: shirley schmitt
Address: 940 burning springs circle
City/Town: louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40223
Email Address: tjkitty@bellsouth.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

All the veterans want it to stay at Zorn. Zorn is a beautiful property, that's private and would be perfect. Obviously no one cares what the veterans want. Downtown is too congested now and it's hard for anyone not familiar with it to get around. Would be even harder to older and sick veterans. Zorn is already owned and easy to get to.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Marty  
Address: Bybee  
Address 2: 4001 Running Water Lane  
City/Town: Louisville  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 40241  
Email Address: martysbybee@att.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

What a missed opportunity if you build the new VA Hospital on Brownsboro Road. Not only is it a really bad location, but you're taking an opportunity away from our city. This hospital could revitalize neighborhoods. Please don't choose to destroy ours.
**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pam Isaac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>3702 wiano drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>crestwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pami9281@gmail.com">pami9281@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

---
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**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

do not build it as Brownsboro rd.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Bryan Hancock
Address: 6405 Regal Rd
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: trophy421@twc.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement
Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

Hello,

My name is Bryan Hancock, and I am writing to go on record that I am not in favor of building the Robley Rex VA Medical Center replacement at 4906 Brownsboro Road at the Watterson Expressway. I am a homeowner living near this location, and have listed my reasons for opposing this below.

Traffic:
Living in the area and using the roads near the proposed site frequently, it is plainly obvious that the road system will not be able to absorb the additional traffic created by a new hospital, even with the planned improvements.

Effect on veterans:
Many points have been made about local residents not wanting to be inconvenienced by this hospital, but it must be remembered that the veterans using the facility would be just as inconvenienced as residents at this location due to the traffic issues. This also holds true for hospital employees and physicians.

Lack of room for expansion:
The site is relatively small for a facility of this size, and expansion will be problematic if needed in the future.

Citizens’ faith in government:
If this hospital is built at this location, it will be painful for all involved, far, far into the future. This will erode citizens’ faith in their government to make prudent decisions and act as a good steward of taxpayer money. I make this point relative to the traffic issues and lack of room for expansion; another point could be made that the VA overpaid for the property by a considerable amount (this is now a sunk cost that does not justify building the hospital on this site).

If this is allowed to happen, it will be a disaster! And it will remain a disaster far, far into the future. Please, do not allow this ill-conceived plan to proceed!

Sincerely,
Bryan D. Hancock
6405 Regal Road
Louisville, KY 40222
(502) 423-8774
trophy421@twc.com
**Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Carla Broecker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>8515 Brownsboro Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cinclou@att.net">cinclou@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:**

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

---
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**Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):**

Please reconsider the Brownsboro location for the new Veteran's Hospital. There are other parts of the city that would benefit from having the hospital there. And other parts of the city are far more convenient for those you serve. The Brownsboro corridor is already too congested. Thank you,
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Donna C. Phillips, Ph.D.
Address: 3126 Talisman Road
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40220
Email Address: dcphillips822@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I support building the new VA hospital in west Louisville. First, it is unfortunate that those who did the initial site reviews overlooked a site in west Louisville. There is plenty of room there, there are many veterans there, and there are a lot of people who would love to have federal jobs. Second, the proposed WalMart would only provide low incomes with state support for the employees. This is unacceptable to me.
Thanks very much!
Donna
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town Louisville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I think the idea of building the Veterans Hospital in the west end is wonderful. They need the development and revitalization in the area. It would be wonderful to create a vital business where there is none. The east end is already vital and over developed. Other business would spring up and employment would be created.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

Anyone thinking of establishing the new hospital at the Brownsboro Road site, need only to travel east along the Watterson Expressway at about 5:30 PM. I do this several times a week and the traffic is mind-boggling. The backup from I-71 impacts the Watterson, so that you are stop and go, often from the Shelbyville Road interchange. The additional off ramp that was constructed at the Brownsboro interchange has done nothing to ease this. Placing the hospital there would be a nightmare.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Manning Warren
Address: 195 Westwind
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40207
Email Address: mgw333@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

This is to express my opposition to locating the new VA hospital at the proposed Brownsboro Road site. The draft EIS does not responsibly address the increased traffic congestion at that exchange that could result in gridlock and a consequential reduction in accessibility for patients. I would encourage consideration of a West End location both to provide greater accessibility and economic development in that area.
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**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

*Respondent skipped this question*

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:

*I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.*
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**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

*Respondent skipped this question*
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):
I believe insufficient consideration was given to the location of the hospita.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Email Address: mmzinniel@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I find the environmental assessment inadequate, particularly in regard to Alternatives. Only two alternatives were presented, which obviously disregards many other locations that likely would prove to be more accessible, less environmentally damaging, and less costly. Why were more alternatives not studied? Why was there not at least one alternative in the west and in the south of the city?
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town Louisville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The Brownsboro Road location is not a good site for this new hospital. There is not enough room and the traffic would be horrendous. It is already bad there and this would make it nonfunctional.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Chandler Bainter
Address: 1315 Hull St
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40204
Email Address: BainterJr@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Very often a new development projects are objected to simply because of the NIMBY (not-in-my-backyard) factor, but I do not think this is the case with the new Louisville VAMC. Yes, Louisville NEEDS a new facility for our great Heros, the Vets, who need medical attention. I have long been concerned with the location of the new VAMC.

Was data pulled to identify what parts of the city, the state, the region, that the vast majority of the patients reside? I am concerned that the limited public transportation will become a deturant for Vets and their families to seek medical attention timely & when needed. The current favored site is further away from the central area of town, where easy transportation is available.

The residents in the area, along with the Mayor of Louisville and their City Council representative, are giving stronger, more detailed reasons why the new facility should not be built on your proposed site. There are plenty of other properties available in Louisville that should be considered, including some near what some call the Louisville Medical District in the downtown area. Why wouldn't the VA want to be near those facilities where collaboration and easy transfer of patients could be done when needed?
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Robert Sullivan
Address: 7905 Circle Crest Rd
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40241-2809
Email Address: rsulli@bellsouth.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The Brownsboro Rd site is not a good location for a new VA hospital. The location is not conducive to the heavy traffic it will bring to an already backed up traffic pattern. Please look elsewhere within the city such as downtown or west end. Thanks.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name Sara L Seyal
Address 2104 Cardinal Harbour Rd
City/Town Prospect
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code 40059
Email Address sallyls@aol.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I am strongly opposed to the site at Brownsboro Road and I-264 for the new VAMC. I have driven through that intersection for 27 years and the traffic is already unbearable during peak traffic periods 7:30-10:00 and 2:30-6:30; it is heavy at all times of the work day into the evening. Though a new exit ramp from East-bound I-264 was added and the exit ramp to US 42 widened, the traffic still backs up onto I-264 in the afternoon. The traffic from either direction on US 42 approaching the I-264 overpass interchange is always heavy and it can take as long as 10 minutes to travel from Rudy Lane to Lime Kiln Lane in either direction. Adding additional traffic from staff and patients to the existing traffic seems like a huge mistake.

There is also little public transit available to the area, and the site is less accessible to the least-affluent areas of town than the current Zorn Avenue location, which is closer to downtown and has better public transit access. There are never traffic jams on Zorn avenue in relation to the VAMC.

I strongly oppose the Brownsboro Road location both for its negative impacts on local traffic that is already over-capacity for the local roads, and its poor accessibility to the majority of the residents of our city and surrounding area.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
**Respondent skipped this question**

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

---

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The preferred location is a horrible choice. It's far from the population it will serve, traffic is already too congested in that area, and the price for land there is about the most expensive in the city. Very poor choice.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town Louisville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I believe the new VA Hospital should be built in the West End, but not too far from downtown. I have read some comments about crime, but this project and the willingness to invest would probably help.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Steven Schmidt
Address: 6501 Mount Batten Court
City/Town: Prospect
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40059
Email Address: sls7748@aol.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE do NOT put the new VA hospital on the proposed site at Brownsboro Rd. and the Watterson Expressway. This area is a NIGHTMARE now for traffic and getting worse by the day. There are many, many good locations in downtown Louisville where there is a medical infrastructure in place to support the hospital. I also like the idea of putting it in the West End near downtown to help economic development in that area. Please listen to the people who live in the proposed area. NO ONE that I know is in favor of the proposed site. We cannot stand more traffic, noise or pollution. Thank you for letting me express my concerns. Steve Schmidt
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Will Crawford
Address: 6805 Main St
City/Town: Westport
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40077
Email Address: willcrawford1@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The proposed location for the VA Hospital at HWY 42 and I-264 is the worst possible place to put this hospital. That intersection is already nightmare and most times of the day and is almost impassable at rush hour. Cars are constantly blocking the intersection at both Rudy Ln and the Interstate. There is no room for more cars to go through that intersection.
A more suitable location would be down by the other hospitals where there are hotels for family members to stay. Or in the Russel neighborhood which could use the development.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Christopher Boone
Address: 12001 Log Cabin Lane
City/Town: Anchorage
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40223-2274
Email Address: chris@boone.ws

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
As a veteran and taxpayer, I would hope the VA would use this opportunity to invest our $1 billion in the West End of Louisville. There are sites available and this area of Louisville is underserved and has large pockets of poverty. This hospital will bring jobs and other investment that would be a boon to this area of town. It's time our government policies change to reflect the needs of our poor and make appropriate investment in their respective places of living. This area also has numerous existing transportation options for vets traveling to and from, contrary to the site currently being considered.
Sincerely,
Chris Boone
USAF veteran
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The area is already very congested. It would be a disaster to add this hospital in that location. We live off Brownsboro Rd and it took over an hour to get through that intersection and out US 42. It would be a disservice to the veterans and all the many people to complicate the situation any further and also how it would impact the environment. Thank you for considering my comments.
**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Aaron Yarmuth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>222 E Witherspoon St Unit 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ayarmuth@gmail.com">ayarmuth@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

---

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The VA was not given a good comprehensive list of available properties during the public request for proposal time period. If they would consider one additional option from the Metro Government, I believe they will find a new option that is vastly superior to all other options: A 27-acre property inside of I-264 on the west side of the city, which the VA could acquire for $1 from the Metro Government.

This property is also closely positioned to the Russell Neighborhood, which recently won a $30 million grant from HUD Choice Neighborhood Initiative. The redevelopment would coincide with a new medical center to transform the community, while serving all the needs of the regions veterans, and the stated goals of the VA site selection process.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I'm a veteran and I think you should leave the Va hospital where it is for multiple reasons. 1-why not renovate the current building instead of using more space to build new. This can save money that could be better spent on veterans and care, helps save green space, and is better for the environment. 2-the current location is convenient for all areas of town. If you move it, it will be harder for people to get there, including workers. 3-traffic is horrible around brownsboro and watterson already. How will this impact veterans? The current location can be accessed from multiple roads to avoid sitting in traffic.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Reynolds Johnson  
Address: 603 Foxfire rd  
City/Town: Elizabethtown  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 42701  
Email Address: reynoldsjjohnson@aol.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

Bullet County location for the hospital will serve all vets in the surrounding counties and save millions on land purchase. It also leaves room for expansion if needed.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):  
Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Why can't there be a site in Indiana to consider?
West end is definitely a no go for me.
Leave it where it is and build a parking garage on site?
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: larry jones
Address: 9003 harwich place
City/Town: louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40242
Email Address: 9003larryjones@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I strongly urge you to reconsider the Brownsboro site. I have lived in this area for 15 years. It is too crowded and congested. DO NOT BUILD THE V.A. Hospital HERE. There land is too confined.
West end worries me because of track and safety. With all the shootings happening in the west end I would not feel comfortable walking from the parking lot to the hospital.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Email Address: alison.adams@twc.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The Brownsboro site should no longer be considered as the site of a new VA Hospital. Traffic in this area is already a nightmare during morning and evening rush hours, before and after school, even during lunch. Whenever there are accidents on I264 and especially I71 occur traffic is often at a standstill. In the event I71 is shutdown, the surrounding roads are impacted for miles. Accidents on I71 happen frequently. Any study or investigator that tells you traffic will not be impacted is simply lying.

While positive economic impact is welcomed, it is not needed in this area of Louisville like it is in so many others, particularly the west end. With the decline of Walmart to build in the area, a perfect building site is available, as is an area in dire need of economic development. Think of the number of jobs available to west end residents and the opportunity to create small businesses including restaurants and transportation and doctors office buildings, etc.

I'm not writing because I don't want a new hospital in the area. I want to help an economically deprived area flourish while giving our veterans the care they deserve. Numerous studies for a Walmart have already been conducted. Cost savings could be made by not having to do them again.

I hope you will consider an alternative location in Louisville's west end.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional) 
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: 
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

It would have been nice if the va had sent a notice to the 100000 or more local vets on this meeting. I personally would have been but to show the empty chairs and say 15 vets were their makes it sound we don't care and that is not true.just another way the va uses to project their agenda not wanting feedback from us who use the facility.the news channels should have asked tracker why he thought only 15 vets showed up......disgusted with the whole process.they pay 3 mil more than land is worth they make residents made cause the location will be worse than Zorn.then after this has been out for years 2 other counties amazingly find land to donate to the va.ha what a joke the 300.00 hammers and 800.00 toilets are still very much in play.that's why Denver's va hospital had so much budget overruns.mishandled from the get go just like ours will.be but I will be dead before they break ground in my opinion.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):  
Please, use common sense and build where veterans can get to their health facility and help the community to grow. The West End Sight. Thank you.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Email Address: [REDACTED]

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The proposed Walmart site is ideal for the new VA hospital due to its proximity to other hospitals and easy access to public transportation.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: David True
Address: 3804 Lola Dell
City/Town: New Albany
State/Province: IN
ZIP/Postal Code: 47150
Email Address: trsimagery@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I was born in Louisville and now reside in Southern Indiana. The Brownsboro Road area is not a good choice for this facility. The traffic pattern has been changed 3 or 4 times in the last 20 years and nothing seems to help. It is high-density suburban home area with with side streets. Please consider another location for this facility.
INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, December 21, 2016 8:11:18 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, December 21, 2016 8:14:36 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:18
IP Address: 66.38.90.75

PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Denver C. Matthews
Address: 3942 Midway Rd.
City/Town: Brandenburg
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40108
Email Address: denver_m@rocketmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Respondent skipped this question
#132

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)

Started: Wednesday, December 21, 2016 8:01:24 AM

Last Modified: Wednesday, December 21, 2016 8:14:38 AM

Time Spent: 00:13:13

IP Address: 192.180.92.211

PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Clifton Cherry
Address: 7004 Sunny Vale Way
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40272
Email Address: ccherry_bellsouth.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I believe a site in the Portland or West End area would be a great choice. Many of our local veterans are located here. The east end is accessible by bus, but traffic problems already exist in the Brownsboro Road area. The Sheperdsville area will be difficult to reach for many vets unless Louisville provides bus service from downtown. The West End will benefit the most by having it located there.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Robert Walker
Address: 4709 Asbury Park Terrace
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40241
Email Address: Rwalkant@aol.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The Brownsboro Road location is a terrible option. Traffic is gridlocked in that area now for much of the day with out a hospital on site. I sometimes drive miles out of my way to avoid the intersection of 42 and the Watterson now. That site was chosen without regard to the infrastructure or environment of the area.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Harold  
Address: 9301 villa fair Ct.  
City/Town: Jeffersontown  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 40291  
Email Address: cruisncouple@bellsouth.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: 
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

If a community is willing to give land free to build. That means they care about and support all veterans. That community would be a good partner and friend to the new va hospital. What I can tell on tv the land they are offering in Bullitt County looks perfect and a great location to major highways. Thanks for your time!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: John Leach
Address: 835 Marigold Dr.
City/Town: Jeffersonville
State/Province: IN
ZIP/Postal Code: 47130
Email Address: jleach63@att.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Stay with the Brownsboro Rd. site.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Karen Bakken  
Address: 2250 Wynnewood Circle  
City/Town: Louisville  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222  
Email Address: karenbakken@bellsouth.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I live in the Northfield community which will be GREATLY IMPACTED if the VA hospital is built at the Brownsboro Rd. site. Please consider my concerns about this site:
*The Brownsboro intersection is already VERY CONGESTED & CANNOT ACCOMMODATE the hospital.
*Veterans need their hospital to be convenient to other downtown hospitals in case resources from other hospitals are needed for their care.
*The initial "deals" made by the owner of the Brownsboro Rd property & the political "powers that be" are extremely suspicious. People are not blind to the "under the table" actions that took place!

Thank You for your consideration of another site for the VA Hospital.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Liz Robison
Address: 205 Louise Way
Address 2: #16
City/Town: Mt. Washington
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40047
Email Address: lizrobison3@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
There is so much overcrowding in downtown and east end areas we need to make a safe easy access for our Veterans. Some already have enough issues getting around and even care givers need not have the stress of getting them to and from. Please consider the move to Bullitt County.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Barbara Robison
Address: 380 Kool Springs Dr
City/Town: Shepherdsville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40165-8807
Email Address: gtr1411@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):
My husband is Vietnam-era veteran and we would love the Bullitt County Site taken into consideration as not only is it where we live but will have better access and the land is FREE. Our community has a positive attitude towards welcoming the veterans hospital to our area and with direct access to I-65 it would have easy access for both private and public transportation without having to be concerned about nearby neighbors being upset about noise and pollution such as the east end Louisville has caused. It would be a positive for veterans of Nelson, Bullitt, Hardin, Jefferson, and Spencer counties as well as the Fort Knox area which if I am not mistaken the Fort Knox Hospital has recently closed.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Jessica Oliveira  
Address: 5004 Garden Dr  
City/Town: Shepherdsville  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 40165  
Email Address: thoughtsofgreatness@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I am glad they are wanting to put a VA hospital in the Louisville area. However, I think the hospital should be put on the donated land in Bullitt county. It's a better location than Brownsboro Rd, because traffic is horrible in the east end and it's not convenient.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Steve Parrish
Address: 9319 Taylorsville Rd
City/Town: Jeffersontown
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40299
Email Address: steve@underwoodparrish.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I feel the Brownsboro location is a bad idea due to excessive cost and traffic problems. A location in the West End would serve the community much better due to lower costs and far fewer traffic problems. Thanks.
| Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional) |
|-----|---|
| Name | Hugh Miller |
| Address | 125 Park Hill Lane unit 203 |
| City/Town | Mt washinton |
| State/Province | KY |
| ZIP/Postal Code | 40047 |
| Email Address | dougmiller1000@gmail.com |

| Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: |
|-----|---|
| Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above. |

| Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments): |
|-----|---|
| I would welcome the new V A hospital in Bullitt County. Out neat the Fair ground close to I65 |
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Lisa Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>3068 Horsefly Hollow Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Lebanon Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I'd like to see the VA hospital in Bullitt County.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Holly Parker
Address: 127 Kool Springs Dr.
City/Town: Shepherdsville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40165
Email Address: holly.parker127@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The Bullitt County property that is being offered as a donation is located right off the 65 from exit 112. Would be a great location and not crammed and crazy busy like Louisville. The location is no more than 30 minutes away from the Louisville location. As a veteran, I hate having to fight traffic and I think the VA should consider this as an option.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Tonya hembree
Address: 323 Inverness ave
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40214
Email Address: gordonfan40165@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

I want the va to come to Bullitt county.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The new hospital should be built on the property already purchased by the V.A. There is no problem with the traffic at the present hospital except for not having enough parking spots. The traffic getting in and out actually flows quite well.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Carol Brashear
Address: 179 Fifth Street
City/Town: Charlestown
State/Province: IN
ZIP/Postal Code: 47111
Email Address: cmaceva@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I think you should consider putting the new VA hospital in the River Ridge center here in Clark County Indiana. Interstate 65 and 265, I-71 and I-64 all have good access to the new Lewis and Clark bridge so access would be easy for Kentucky vets to get here. The infrastructure in the whole area is being upgraded from when it was the Army Ammunition plant from WWII, Korea and Vietnam Nam, and is now being developed as an industrial park. There is a lot of land available to build as large a facility as you want for now, or to expand later. And you will not have private home owners unhappy about the disruption, since this could all be brand new and built to suit the needs of our veterans! There is even room to build physical rehabilitation facilities and assisted living residence for those in need. Think about it. You can easily sell the Hurstbourne property at a good profit, please those unhappy neighbors, and move to the Sunnyside of Louisville.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

Bullit County seems the most obvious choice in my opinion. Louisville traffic is horrible! For the Vets who are not feeling well getting stuck in traffic is not an option. I do not see why an agreement is so hard. Vets deserve better. Thank you.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I think the VA should move to Bulliet Co. Sell the other property
**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

*Respondent skipped this question*

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

*Respondent skipped this question*
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):
I think the Bullitt county location would be safer and easier access to all veterans across Kentucky
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Barbara Watkins
Address 1: 1202 Pickings Place
Address 2: Unit 102
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40243
Email Address: barbwat@ymail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I have been following the news regarding the site for the new VA hospital and I cannot understand how that site was ever chosen. I am the mother of a veteran and I work in that area of Brownsboro Rd and the traffic flow in that area is extremely heavy all the time. When the elementary school is dismissed in the afternoon, it is gridlock. It simply does not make sense to build that huge of a facility with that much additional traffic at that site. I do not believe that the VA received accurate info when studies were performed before purchasing that piece of land. I certainly am not in favor of locating the new facility at the Brownsboro. I think the West End location would be a better fit.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Nancy Jenkins
Address: 1278 Audubon Drive
City/Town: Shepherdsville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40165
Email Address: nancyj1278@hotmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Please consider the Bullitt County Site. As the spouse of a veteran who will likely use VA Medical services in 2018 after he retires, I believe the Bullitt County site is the best alternative. I frequently have to drive through through the intersection of I-264 and Hwy 42 & Hwy 22. It's always congested through the intersection, regardless of which direction I travel on Hwy 42 or coming from I-264 onto Hwy 42. I also drive I-265 and exit at LaGrange Rd several days a week; again a very congested intersection especially close to Ford's shift start & end times. The Zorn Avenue location has the same traffic congestion problems as the other 2 sites and it's very difficult to determine where to go and then finding a convenient parking space is next to impossible. The I-65 interchange with Hwy 245 is busy but rarely congested. It would be extremely convenient for vets from out in the state who, like my husband, would never go to Louisville if we didn't both work there. It would be easy to navigate and provides quick access if a veteran needs to travel to the downtown Louisville medical center if a vet is referred to a specialist. The interchange is undeveloped but has all the utilities at the site. Essentially, it's an empty canvas so the VA can paint its own picture of a "dream VA Medical Facility". The land is being offered free to the VA, not because it's worthless but because Bullitt County values our military and wants to honor those currently serving and the vets. Almost half of Fort Knox is in Bullitt County and many of the soldiers from Ft. Knox live in Bullitt and the surrounding counties. Sell the overpriced property on Hwy 22 at I-264 and recoup the money spent. Build the new Robley Rex VA Medical Center in Bullitt County.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Rebecca Munoz
Address: 3042 Fairway Dr.
City/Town: Floyds Knobs
State/Province: IN
ZIP/Postal Code: 47119
Email Address: rebecca.m@twc.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I do not think the Brownsboro Road option is a good one. It does not leave room for growth and does not have enough green space. We need the community to support Veterans, as there is already a huge disconnect between the civilian population and those of us who have served. Let's find a property that both the community and Veterans can get behind and leave politics out of this process. This whole process is putting delay on providing the best care possible to those who have served our great nation. Respectfully submitted, Veteran, and VA employee Rebecca Munoz
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Please consider the land being donated in Bullitt County. That land is definitely more centrally located, especially for the soldiers in and around Ft. Knox. The land is free and would be a significant savings with which to implement other necessary needs and expenses.
INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, December 22, 2016 7:54:39 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, December 22, 2016 7:55:07 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:27
IP Address: 74.137.49.17
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):  Respondent skipped this question
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Brandin Carey
City/Town: Hillview
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40229
Email Address: bcarey502@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Consider the Bullitt county location. It would be more convenient for more people. I think it would be beneficial for more people to operate the hospital in Bullitt county.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Chuck Stidham  
Address: 5155 State Road 62  
City/Town: Georgetown  
State/Province: IN  
ZIP/Postal Code: 47122  
Email Address: cestidham@aol.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

---

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

VA Medical Center Director Wayne Pfeffer, talking about 4906 Brownsboro Road said “The size, the location, the utility availability, the cost of construction, it was just the perfect site,” as a veteran I support the plan the VA already has in place. About $30 million already has been spent on the project, including $12.9 million to purchase the Brownsboro Road site. As for the transportation to Brownsboro Road, you can get there on the city bus, I opposed building the hospital in the west end or near downtown, I support building the hospital at 4906 Brownsboro Road and they should start the construction as soon as possible.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: lawrence r rosen  
Address: 7008 green spring dr  
City/Town: louisville  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 40241  
Email Address: larrosen33@aol.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Robley Rex VAMC, (Att. Judy Williams)

December 22, 2016

NEW VA HOSPITAL

Kudo's to Congressman John Yarmuth and former Mayor-for-life, Jerry Abramson for having obtained the Federal Funding that has brought us to the present position with respect to replacing the decaying and obsolete Zorn Ave VA Hospital.

And shame to Mayor Fisher for his failure to support the decision to build the new hospital without further delay at the chosen Brownsboro Road site. His opposition has inspired competition such as that from the Government of Bullitt County which has offered to give 42 acres free of charge to induce the authorities to locate there.

Opposition to the chosen location arises from the "not in my backyard" crowd from the City of Crossgate. That is understandable. But, the Environmental Impact Statement shows that this is not a reasonable position.

However, the new hospital will be a jewel in the crown of the area for decades to come and will provide needed employment and retention of employment across a wide area.

The location should be easily accessable (which is the case of the Brownsboro site) and is not meant to a tool to eradicate sub standard housing in a blighted area as some would now propose).

I am a vet, unlike many of the critics and second guessers who do not use the VA and who have never served in our military at all. Included in my active duty was a tour of 2 1/2 years at sea all in Asia, on the Flagship of the Seventh Fleet. We Vets want the hospital built ...and built at Brownsboro without further delay which is costly to the Vets who need the new and updated services the new hospital will provide.

Make America and Louisville Great -- Build the Hospital.

Larry Rosen

Lawrence R. Rosen
Larry Rosen Co.
7008 Green Spring Drive
Louisville, KY 40241
#159
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## PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)</th>
<th>Respondent skipped this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:</td>
<td>I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Please build on the donated land in Bullitt County
**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rebecca Martin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>3719 Locust circle E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Prospect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bill.martinjr@yahoo.com">bill.martinjr@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Please consider seriously building the new VA hospital in West Louisville. We need to invest in the West End and offer job opportunities and resources to the many who live in the West End. There are valid reasons for using the West End property for this new endeavor and the need for development in this part of town is well documented.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

- Name: Karen Park
- Address: 411 Virginia Ave
- City/Town: Louisville
- State/Province: KY
- ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
- Email Address: parkkaren41@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I am writing to ask that the decision to build a new VA hospital be reconsidered. Building it in the west end of Louisville makes so much more sense and is more practical than having it in the east end. Many of our veterans live in the Westend and many are homeless. Building the hospital in the Westend would not only service a larger number of our vets, but it would also bring an economic boost to a community that sorely needs an influx of businesses.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

I think the West Side needs this hospital. Imagine the improvement in employment and health care this would bring.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: David Lopez
Address: 1402 Perwinkle Ct
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40291
Email Address: dtlastmove@att.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement
To the City of Louisville and the Department of Veterans Affairs. I am 26 year, totally disabled veteran of the Army. I have lived in at least 30 of the United States and served on three continuant's defending our country. The new VA hospital should be placed within have the Louisville city limits for the following reasons. We have vets traveling any where up to 100 miles to get services from the VA. The current location or a location in the west end is centralized enough for either drive in by car, public transit, and by the air since the Air Port is located within 20 miles. In the west end all public works options are available already. That location is also close to highway exits coming from all directions. This is all the logical reasons for my supporting the west end location. The following reasons are my personal thoughts as to why the location NEEDS to remain the Louisville city limits. I was living in Atlanta Georgia when the members of the VA office there denied my request for disability due to the fact that employees there had been denying minority veterans due to there stealing their my by making claims by dead veterans. In my 26 years I have lived in 30 states and I can tell you which states and what counties that minority soldiers and veterans should avoid due to narrow minded white people who do not want minorities in there counties. I was on active duty in my dress uniform in Oklahoma City for a Army conference where I was denied services at a restaurant for no other reason than my Asian/Native American ethnicity. I only moved to Louisville Kentucky 4 years ago from Hawaii and I have already know that Bullitt county and others in Indiana and Kentucky should be avoided by minorities. I personal experiences with Bullitt county people have not been positive with a large majority of them flying the confederate flag on their vehicles. For those reasons I strongly recommend that the Bullitt county location be taken off the table. I do not believe that the Department of Veterans Affairs wants to intentionally add insults to the injuries of its customers the veterans of the United States of America by having them have to travel through a county that is known by all people in Louisville as being a racist county.

David T. Lopez
U.S. Army Retired
 Totally Disabled Veteran
dtlastmove@att.net

P.S. If needed I would be willing to make this statement in front of any board in person.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: David Lopez
Address: 10402 Perwinkle Ct
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40291
Email Address: dtlastmove@att.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

To City of Louisville and the Department of Veterans Affairs

I would like to add this comment to my original statement posted on the evening of the 22nd Dec 2016. Unless you have been living under a rock you should have seen the national news CNN and MSNBC and the world has seen the viral video on the Internet showing a white woman in the act of unleashing her racial attack on two minority women at a mall in Louisville. These women could have been U.S. Veterans, Doctors, Nurses, or religious leaders in our society. This video clearly reflects the views of those who only see all people in our society through a white only/privilege lens regardless of their position or status in our society. This incident is not a isolated incident and clearly shows that the racial diversity needs to be added to the focus and decision making process for any future VA hospitals. I would be willing to bet my retirement check against any one that this woman is a Bullitt county resident. She is a prime example of a large majority of Bullitt counties finest. In my original statement I stated that I have been singled out and discriminated against in and out of the uniform for my Asian/Native American ethnicity in the public and by a federal employee at the VA across the United States. With the rise of road rage incidents with people shooting into vehicles without knowing who is in the vehicle and the fact that Kentucky is leading the nation as having the highest rate of guns per capita, a new VA hospital in the heart of Bullitt county is a recipe for disaster for minority veterans. I know that the VA is not knowingly going to place minority veterans lives at risk just for some free land. If saving money is the primary concern then why doesn't the VA use the unused land on Fort Knox and take advantage of a hospital that is only using less than 20% of the building due to cut backs? In closing the views and concerns of minority veterans need to be given the same value and weight of those who make a claim that the new VA hospital should be placed in there community.

Thank You
David T. Lopez
U.S. Army Retired
Totally Disabled Veteran
dtlastmove@att.net
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Linda Scanlan
Address: 4814 Crandall Lanesville Rd NE
City/Town: Corydon
State/Province: IN
ZIP/Postal Code: 47112
Email Address: indy828@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
My husband is a vet who utilizes the facilities at the current Zorn Ave. location. That location is great if there were a way to upgrade the hospital while in use. The Breckenridge location is next best. Now I would definitely like to leave our input on the other 2 locations. The land that was just donated to VA from Bullet Co is way too far out of the way for most people who have to use many forms of transportation to get to the hospital. It is not practical for most people in the Louisville metro area. Finally, the downtown site is definitely a "no"!!! We do not want to risk our lives driving through the area that had the most murders in the Louisville area. Also, remember that a huge amount of patients are using wheelchairs. I'm sure those patients would worry about getting mugged or worse just getting from their car to a hospital entrance. Please upgrade Zorn Ave or get started ASAP on the Breckenridge Rd. site.

Thank you for allowing our input,
Sincerely,
Don and Linda Scanlan
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: James
Address: Panek
Address 2: 1299 Senate Circle
City/Town: Radcliff
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 4016p
Email Address: jrpanek@twc.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

It makes absolute perfect sense to locate the new VA hospital in Radcliff. With the recent loss of the Fort Knox hospital, the thousands of veterans who currently work and live in the area are extremely concerned about the future of their care. Co-locating the VA hospital near the newly built Veterans Home, Veterans Cemetery, Fort Knox and easy access to I-65 would be the ideal location.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town Shepherdsville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
As a veteran I believe Bullitt County would be the perfect place for the new VA hospital. Very easy access off and on right next to Interstate 65. Really couldn’t ask for a better spot. I just like many vets, we hate to drive downtown Louisville, East end. So PLEASE take a hard look at Bullitt County to move to, believe people here will except the hospital with open arms.

Thank you,
Ralph H. Jenkins, Jr
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Deborah Quartermouse
Address: 275 west peaceful court
City/Town: Shepherdsville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40165
Email Address: deborah521@peoplepc.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
We would love to welcome Veterans to Shepherdsville. I think bring a VA hospital to Bullitt County KY would be very wonderful
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Ken Barker  
Address: 1035 Scenic Drive  
City/Town: Radcliff  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 40160  
Email Address: musicxprt@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I am not certain why this hospital should be built in Louisville. 1. There is a huge amount of public criticism regarding traffic and other concerns from resident in Louisville. 2. A large veteran population of veterans resides in Radcliff and surrounding communities in Hardin County. 3. The hospital should be closer to other services veterans would utilize, including facilities on Fort Knox saving our beloved veterans time and efforts when needing medical care and attempting to take care of other matters. Put the VA hospital where it should be - in Radcliff, KY or where it will be welcomed by the local residents.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name [redacted]

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments): Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I believe the current proposed site off of Brownsboro Rd and the Watterson for the new VA hospital to be not only inadequate and inconvenient for most of our veterans, but will also create havoc and traffic nightmares for all whom live and/or work in that area including myself. This area's roads are already too heavily traveled and backed up big time during morning and evening commutes. I have two small children and being able to take them back and forth to school will be an absolute nightmare more so than it already is if this Brownsboro proposed site is developed. Please consider one of the many other alternate sites that have been publicized in recent days/months.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Lizi Squires
Address: 648 Seven Oaks Lane
City/Town: Irvington
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40146
Email Address: e.okonek1990@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I believe the Radcliff location would be the best location to better serve the veteran population. The location is close to a large veteran population. There is already infrastructure to support the veteran community that the new hospital could expand upon with a new VA Vet Center and veteran retirement home. It would be easier to travel to and cause less issues than the Brownsboro location.
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Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
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PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Daniel Carney
Address: 124 W Main St.
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: daniel@sweda.org

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments): Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
Address 2
City/Town louisville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I think the Bullitt county free land option is the best bet, I take my Dad to the VA now and the traffic is awful and Brownsboro road would be just as bad. There would be easy access from I-65 for every vet.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Thomas Brewer  
Address: 9104 Lakeridge Drive  
City/Town: Louisville  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 40272  
Email Address: mbtb60@aol.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

I wish to offer the possibility of building a new VA center on the old Waverly Hills property (a former TB Facility). This facility is located in the Valley Station area, on Dixie Highway. The southwestern area of Louisville is greatly in need of development, and it offers easy access from Fort Knox and surrounding counties. This property has sat idle for years and it would be a great location for the hospital. It is located on Dixie Highway, close to East Pages Lane. I can only imagine what an economic boost it would provide to this whole area of Louisville. Access would be straight up Dixie Highway from Ft. Knox area, or from Snyder Freeway to Dixie Highway, or from Watterson Expressway(east or west) to Dixie Highway and then south on Dixie Highway. This site would be much easier for veterans (some of which are elderly) to navigate to. It can be very frightening to elderly people to be forced to drive in a big city on unfamiliar expressways. It could also provide auxiliary medical personnel—which are greatly needed—to this area. As the hospital grows, the medical personnel would follow. The Brownsboro Rd. area already has many medical personnel in its area, and it is adding more and more daily! Build it in an area which has lost many of its medical options (doctors, radiologists, etc.)!!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Rev. Brett Kelien
Address: 10254 W SR 256
City/Town: Lexington
State/Province: IN
ZIP/Postal Code: 47138

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

As a veteran the LAST place I want to be and or see the new hospital is in the west end of Louisville. With all the drugs, murders, and thefts that occur in the west end why would anyone want to build there? I remember when the west end was a GREAT place but that day has past. Many of the senior vets are not in good shape and some punk thugs could and would rob the vet as well steal their vehicle or carjack it. PLEASE DO NOT even consider the west end.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Use the old River Road Country Club (located at Zorn and River Road) as your outpatient clinic and install an incline elevator to the VA Hospital.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Dr. George Moorman, PhD, MPH, M(CSW)
Address: 2440 Eagles Eyrie Ct. #5
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40206
Email Address: dr.georgemoorman@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement
Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

As we continue to play political ping-pong with the prospects of a new VA hospital, let’s not forget the real reason for this undertaking; better services for the veteran. The VA has become its own worst enemy. It is administratively top-heavy and most in those roles could care less of the plight of a veteran. I am beginning to believe that those requesting the building of a VA hospital in their backyard, also do so with consideration of the financial gains for their districts. Years after announcing the plan for a new VA we are still negotiating, politicking and neglecting the overall beneficiary of the project. We’ve spent taxpayer dollars developing plans, meeting, meeting, meeting and more meetings while forming transition teams. Transition teams added millions of dollars to already inflated managerial budgets and now that plans have stalled, these teams have replaced and/or forced out other committed employees. So far the only thing transitioning has been the rhetoric. It would be more feasible to rebuild the new hospital in phases on its present site.

PHASE ONE
- Immediate construction of a multi-level parking/administration structure on Zorn Ave. in front of present structure. This would house, director suites, HR, engineering, business, credit union, and fiscal offices.

PHASE TWO (upon completion of Phase 1)
- Move director’s suites, HR, engineering, business, credit union, fiscal offices into new administration structure.
- Move employee/valet/resident/volunteer parking to the parking structure.
- Move GEC/CVT, CNP into director’s suites.

PHASE THREE (upon completion of Phase II)
- Demolish buildings T20, T22, T27, 3, 4, and 5.
- Construct new hospital in areas previously occupied by employee parking, T20, T27, T22.
- Construct a domiciliary and mental health facility in areas once occupied by buildings 3, 4, and 5.

PHASE FOUR (upon completion of Phase III)
- Open new hospital.
- Demolish sections of old hospital.
- House nursing home, hospice and homeless in the domiciliary in areas previously occupied by building 3 and 4.
- Remodel remaining sections of old hospital to create a veteran/family/employee community center to house an auditorium; food court and nutritional offices; retail store; gymnasium with occupational/vocational/physical rehabilitation services; credit union, volunteer services, regional offices and library/information center.

PHASE FIVE (optional)
- Connect administration building with community center and community center with main hospital with covered pedways.
- Build CBOCs (optional) in Bullitt County, Radcliff and West Louisville.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Branigan Williams  
Address: 2264 Brandenburg rd  
City/Town: Leitchfield  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 42754  
Email Address: kyarmywife@live.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I think it would be great to have a VA hospital closer to home such as radcliff. Right now we are having to drive hours away then you add time for traffic and an hour for the time change. My veteran becomes very anxious when he has an appointment in Louisville.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name        Chris Dugger
Address     120 Travois Rd
City/Town   Louisville
State/Province  KY
ZIP/Postal Code  40207
Email Address    cdugger@duggerfamily.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I contact you in strong opposition to the Brownsboro Rd location for the new VA facility. The surrounding road infrastructure can barely handle the current traffic load and is in a state of near gridlock at peak times every day. Find a sight that provides you the flexibility to build an efficient center that does not burden your patient base and erode the lives of many thousands who live in the area. The rumors are that you rushed to buy the property for a friend of Senator McConnell. If true that will be exposed during the years of painful construction and be a scandal. Please think in a non-bureaucratic manner and reconsider this ill-advised site

Thank you

Chris Dugger
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):  
None
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Steve Atcher
Address: 1209 Johnstown Rd
City/Town: Elizabethtown
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 42701
Email Address: steveатель9@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Please locate the new Veteran's Hospital in Radcliff, KY. Radcliff has offered a free 52 acre site, with the necessary per-construction site work done, utilities in place, more than adequate space for ample parking and easy access to I-65. Located just south of Fort Knox, this is a site that offers quick access from all directions and easy close access to I-65. The entire veteran-rich Hardin County population supports this idea and will welcome the hospital with open arms. Please reconsider your previous decision and locate the hospital in Radcliff.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Charles Hinckley
Address: 119 Calumet Loop
City/Town: Elizabethtown
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 42701
Email Address: charles@networkrealtyky.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I grew up in Louisville and I appreciate all that it offers. However, when looking for a place for the VA hospital there is no better place than Radcliff off highway 313. It provides easy access to major highways and there is no other community in Kentucky that supports our Veterans than Radcliff. Also with Fort Knox being in Radcliff, what better way to solidify the future of Fort Knox and support our Veterans! The decision should be what's best for our Veterans with that thought in mind Radcliff is the best choice.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: David C Drobny
Address: 119 Apple Ln
City/Town: Elizabethtown
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 42701
Email Address: drobny119@comcast.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
This comment is in regards to the proposed location for the NEW Robley Rex VA Medical Center. I am a veteran. I use the Robley Rex VA Medical Center. I DO NOT wish the new medical center to be built in downtown Louisville as the current proposal states. It needs to be built outside the main city area of Louisville. If built inside the city main it will have the same problems the current Medical Center has, difficult to get to. Fighting the city of Louisville traffic is horrible and as we age, that only gets worse. A lot of veterans will not use the current Medical Center because of it's location and the traffic/roadways you have to travel to get to it. A location outside the city main is needed. Several alternative locations have been proposed, especially the Shepardsville and Radcliff areas. I am not voting for either but an alternative location needs to be decided on that is outside the Louisville city area that is convenient for all to get to.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: James Hartzell
Address: 1501 Cypress Drive
City/Town: Radcliff
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40160
Email Address: jdhartzell@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

A new VA hospital in Radcliff would make it so much easier for myself and other veterans to access the hospital. Also, with the VA Nursing Home in Radcliff it would make sense to have a VA hospital here to also take care of our veterans both now and in the future. Please, I beg of you, do not put it on Brownsboro Road which would be just as hard to access and park as Zorn Ave is now.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Thomas Foresman
Address: 460 Audubon Ct
Address 2: 460
City/Town: Radcliff
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40160
Email Address: stforesman@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Emergency care for veterans is vital for their care. Traveling through Louisville at 8, noon, or 5 could be deadly for a veteran needing care. When you arrive at the hospital it may take as long as a hour to see a doctor. Heart attacks or other emergencies can't wait that long.

Having a hospital close to the new Veterans Center in Radcliff makes perfect sense. The Center will be full of older veterans who WOULD NOT SURVIVE a trip thought Louisville traffic to either the Zoin location or the new proposed hospital location. Emergency care means just that, emergency.

The current location has very poor parking and is up and down hills. If you have a physical disability, it is unusable for the disabled vet.

I understand that you are not considering an other location, but request you visit Radcliff, have a mock response to a critical veteran and understand why people a requesting the new hospital be located in Radcliff. Not only is it the best, economical, and beneficial, it is the Right location for the new VA hospital. Please consider, come to Radcliff and look at what we have to offer. Sincerely Tom Foresman (VA member)
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):
I guess this is the curse of living in southern Indiana but nobody seems to talk about the southern Indiana veterans and how many miles it would add if it the new hospital is built in bulliet county.
**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>John Vezeau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>6709 Greenlawn Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johnvezeau@yahoo.com">johnvezeau@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Proposed VA Hospital
Flaws with Environmental Impact Study

Unexamined Aquifers
• The proposed construction area is located on a large limestone geological formation in which there are large aquifers. There have been no studies of the impact of disturbing these aquifers with construction activities: blasting, digging, and increasing grade level.
• The only studies that have been conducted relates to surface water run-off, and even these studies do not indicate the presence of known small springs and ponding areas.
• These aquifers currently exhibit themselves as a dozen or more active springs in and among the housing directly to the south of the proposed construction area. Some homes currently require one or more sump pumps to run almost continuously.
• There is great concern that construction activity will increase flooding issues in an already challenged neighborhood.

I live in the City of Graymoor-Devondale, and I'm very concerned about traffic coming through our small city streets to the new VA hospital. These concerns are not addressed in the draft EIS.

The southern end of VA property lies within the boundaries of Graymoor-Devondale. I understand that an entrance to the VA property will be opened onto the now dead-ended Carlimar Lane. If this proposal is not done with proper attention to details, many homeowners will be adversely affected.

A few facts:
• The Graymoor-Devondale streets are very narrow, often only allowing one lane of traffic to move if cars are parked on both sides of the street.
• Parking on the streets is unrestricted.
• There are no sidewalks for pedestrians.
• The streets are not constructed for heavy traffic, especially truck traffic. For verification, check with Graymoor-Devondale City Engineer.
• Many children in the Graymoor-Devondale neighborhood play on and around the streets. Steady traffic would cause safety issues.
• A Carlimar entrance to the VA property will encourage VA traffic to move down a narrow, congested city lane to get to Westport Road.

Policy Requirements:
• Restrict all truck traffic and delivery vehicles from the Carlimar entrance.
• Design the Carlimar entrance to the VA property so that it slows in-bound and out-bound automobile traffic -- possibly reducing volume of traffic.
• Have a public meeting with Graymoor-Devondale officials and residents who will be affected by the VA traffic. Listen and respond to their concerns.

Thank you for considering these points.

John Vezeau
December 1, 2016

John Vezeau
6709 Greenlawn Road
Louisville, KY 40222-6658 USA
502-426-2681 (home)
johnvezeau@yahoo.com
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Rene Colocho
Address: 6475 Hardinsburg Rd
City/Town: Cecilia
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 42724
Email Address: rcolo005@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I know this is an uphill battle but it would make more sense to build the new VA facility Hardin County. I know that Jefferson has more veterans but how many of them are actual retirees that actually use the VA system. You might want to consider the shift of veteran population and you will see that Jefferson county is going down compared to Hardin County. It is a pain to get drive to Louisville and ultimately, it should be about making easier for us veterans compared to economic growth of a particular city.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
William Parker
Address
324 Emmaus Circle
City/Town
ELIZABETHOWN
State/Province
KY
ZIP/Postal Code
42701
Email Address
Billicy@bbtel.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I would like to make the following statement: I am a retired CSM E9 who spent 26.5 years in the US States Army. I made my home in the Radcliff/Elizabethtown area in 1973. I am a Korean & Vietnam Veteran. I often makes trips to VA Clinic, Zorn. If it is possible, I would like to see the new Veterans Hospital built in Radcliff, Ky, for the benefit of the community and her veterans.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: William Parker
Address: 324 Emmaus Circle
City/Town: ELIZABETHTOWN
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 42701
Email Address: Billicy@bbtel.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Respondent skipped this question
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

It seems that it would make much more sense to relocate to a city that wants the hospital. Louisville's mayor and a group of its citizens have concerns about the impact the new VA center would have if located at the site. Radcliff has offered fifty acres for free for the new center that already has the infrastructure. The Radcliff location is centrally located and would be easier to reach. It would be located closer to a higher number of veterans. It makes little sense to dismiss considerations without a closer evaluation, the positive benefits of choosing Radcliff over Louisville.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name        Kurt Humke
Address     4017 Rosemont Ave
City/Town   Louisville
State/Province  KY
ZIP/Postal Code  40220
Email Address  humke@live.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I think locating the new VA at the Brownsboro location is a terrible idea mainly because of traffic. I've read many articles in the Courier Journal and they also list environmental impacts being negative as well. I live in the Hikes Point area but travel to that end of town quite regularly, and I can tell you the traffic already is terrible. I can't imagine putting a hospital in that area. During rush hour there are back ups on 264 for up to a half mile sometimes, and that is even with the new lanes and exits that were added recently at Westport and Brownsboro. And with the backups that occur to get onto 71 north from 264 east bound will also make things worse for that area. I am in favor of keeping the hospital where it is. If it is feasible to build on the site while the current hospital remains open I believe that would be best for all concerned parties. Since I live so close the Baptist and Jewish hospitals off of Breckinridge Lane I am well aware of the congestion a hospital amongst a bustling retail and restaurant community can be. I feel bad for the ambulance drivers that have to negotiate those areas when they are busy. There is no where for traffic to move to when an ambulance has to get through that area. So in conclusion, I think an alternative location to the Brownsboro area will be in the best interest for all.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Mabel Allen
Address: 730 HWY 992
City/Town: Hardinsburg
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40143
Email Address: mabel.d.allen6@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I think the facility should be built in Hardin Co, or maybe use the buildings located at Fort Knox, KY. Lots of tax payer money put into the WTU and now no longer in use.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Sylvester Guzman
Address: 2505 Alanmede Road
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40205
Email Address: sjguz@bellsouth.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

For those of you who want the VA Hospital be build downtown think about this. The majority of Veterans are elderly and are driven to the Hospital by their spouses. Let's not make Grandma take Grandpa to the Hospital downtown to fight the traffic, one way streets and all the construction that's taking place. Veterans that live out of town are not familiar with the downtown area. Let's not put this elderly people thru this, they have enough problems as it is. Let's build it in the east end off the watterson X-way where it would be easy to access. Also don't make me go all the way to Radcliff every time I need my hearing aids checked.

Thanks,

S. Guzman (502)458-3426
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I want the VA center to be in Radcliff, Kentucky. It would be great for the community. People could have great access to the center if it was located in Radcliff. The one proposed to Louisville is inconvenient to most people because of traffic and wait time. Please consider the Radcliff property......
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Diane Sego
Address: 932 Rhonda Court
City/Town: Radcliff
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40160
Email Address: doj888@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Placing the VA hospital at Brownsboro Road will only intensify the anguish for veterans as they endure the nightmare traffic and time required to get there to even get treatment they have earned! The Radcliff location is more centrally located for many seeking VA care. It is easily accessible for veterans coming from north or south. Placing the hospital in Radcliff will strengthen the care of our veterans hoping to live out their days in the new veterans living facility! Before the government wastes many more millions, just regroup now, admit that the Louisville location is NOT the best option for aging, confused, frustrated families trying to navigate the VA health care system. Do the right thing for once ADMIT THE ERROR the government will make in moving forward on Brownsboro Road. That location will soon have more problems included the same old parking problem as the current VA...the location is not big enough, not traffic compatible, not wanted by many in that area, etc! So stop Now and do the right thing, sell that land, find THE BEST location to serve those that have to use VA and move forward in Radcliff. My Dad, Brother, and Husband all died at the current VA hospital. So, believe me, I know too well the headaches of dealing with VA health care!
### Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>George Gootee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>104 Jeferosn St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Radcliff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gwgootee@aol.com">gwgootee@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

### Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

This is an opportunity for the VA to prove their primary concern is the veteran. With a heavy population of veterans, Ft Knox, and the recent addition of the Veteran's Home in Radcliff, there's no place more uniquely qualified than the Radcliff area to build a new veterans hospital. With free land, easy access, and an enormously supportive community why would you go anywhere else?
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

For my entire life (over 40 years), I have been affiliated with the military community. My father, step-father, grandparents, husband and several other family members and friends have all either served or are still serving. Believe me when I say that I am familiar with the VA, and the challenges of receiving the timely and appropriate care that our veterans not only deserve but are entitled to. I have spent decades watching the frustrations of inconvenient missed appointments due to traffic or missed work due to multiple trips. I have seen too many people be sent farther than the nearest clinic for no good reason and go without the care they are entitled to. I have heard countless accounts of traffic accidents and near misses over the years to or from VA appointments. I've even fought rush hour traffic in Louisville with small children in tow, often through ongoing construction, to help my vets keep an appointment. The purpose of a VA hospital is to serve our veterans, most of whom are elderly now and not residing in the city of Louisville. With the need to replace the facility located off Zorn Ave., you have an opportunity to improve the quality and access to this care for all veterans living in Kentucky. By refusing to consider the offer that the city of Radcliff presents, you are willfully continuing the practices that have given the Veterans Administration its poor reputation. Please set politics aside and listen to our veterans on this issue. They are, ultimately, the reason for the new facility in the first place.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Rocky Gannon
Address: 167 Byerly Blvd
City/Town: RADCLIFF
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40160
Email Address: rocky.gannon@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I do not believe the Brownsboro area is the right place for the new hospital. The area is congested. I know there has to be better locations and also has to be close enough for doctors and training of doctors. Radcliff might not be right, but it would be better than Brownsboro.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Do NOT place the hospital in Radcliff. Lousy site (restricted roads), nothing in area to do once someone drops a vet off, mayor and council fight all the time.

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Patty McDowell
2302 Wetstein Avenue
Louisville
KY
40205
pmcdowell@rocketmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I have lived in Louisville some 50 years and believe strongly that you should reconsider plans to build a new VA Hospital near Brownsboro Road and I-264 East.

1. The proposed site is NOT centrally located.
2. The proposed site is in an already-congested area.
3. This site would be better used for a new veterans cemetery.

If the present Robley Rex site cannot be renovated to meet veterans’ needs, I hope you will look at new sites recently proposed including in west Louisville, Bullitt County, and Hardin County.

I believe the best scenario would be to build smaller medical facilities at each of these three properties to supplement the existing hospital. And, you could still create a new veterans cemetery at the Brownsboro Road site.

Please consider the opinions of the people of the Louisville area.

Thank you.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

The hospital should be built downtown near the other hospitals to take advantage of the other resources in the area. It would allow for redevelopment in the area, add jobs downtown, close to transportation and lodging for patients, and not impact greenspace.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Kelly Gerstle
Address: 13608 Broken Branch way
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40245
Email Address: kellyraecasper@hotmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

By choosing the Brownsboro Rd location, it is evident of government corruption and cronyism at the expense of the tax payer. New locations should be considered that will save tax payer money, utilize donated land, and consider local community impacts.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The East Louisville site is the wrong place for a new VA hospital. The increased traffic alone is reason not to put it there.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The traffic is already terrible in the proposed brownsboro area and is quite out of the way for the majority of city residents. Traffic backs up daily at the watterson exit ramp and the on ramp to 71 without adding a large facility to the area. The suburban infrastructure is not built to accommodate such an influx of traffic.
The off-ramp to Brownsboro Rd is already very congested at afternoon rush hour. It is often backed up to Westport Rd in the afternoon, making it already a challenge to exit 264-E onto Brownsboro. The on-ramp to 264-W is also already difficult to enter throughout the day due to congestion at the turning light. Brownsboro Rd in general has too many people traveling on it now. It really wasn't made to handle the load of traffic it currently has, much less a large medical institution. 5,000 more cars per day traveling on Brownsboro Rd is not realistic, nor is it sustainable. This is a mostly residential area of town -- there are just a couple of grocery stores, a few restaurants, some service businesses, and a few smallish office buildings. There is nothing "big" here and that's because this was not the vision for this area of town.
Surely there is a location more suitable for a new VA Hospital. Easy in and out is key, and the proposed Brownsboro Rd location does not have that.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Ashley Cole
Address: 1134 Delmar dr
City/Town: Radcliff
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40160
Email Address: ashleyky78@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Radcliff! The best site for the VA is the in Radcliff on land donated by the city.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Email Address: jasonsed@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I am a resident of Louisville that lives near the proposed site of the new VA hospital off US42 and I want to express my negative opinion of the location selection. I am definitely against this site being used for a VA hospital and this is largely due to the already over-crowded and congested traffic in that area. I have written to and updated the metro traffic division several times about traffic in the area over the years and no matter how many changes they make in the lights, there seems to be no way to decrease the congestion at peak and even non-peak hours. There are just too many cars in a small area and there is no way to effectively manage them. Adding more cars will absolutely make the problem worse and decrease the property and personal value of living in that area. There are other locations that seem more suitable for a large hospital and I ask that those be considered instead of the location off US42.

--Jason Sedlaczek
1912 Rudy Ln
Louisville, KY 40207
502-471-1526
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Marla
Address: 4231 ashleywood ct
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40241
Email Address: marlacensus@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I oppose the Brownsboro Road location for the new VA hospital in Louisville. I think it should be downtown where public transportation and more amenities exist.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Terrible location for a hospital in an already congested area. It really could be rebuilt in same area it's in now, or move to downtown in the area with most other hospitals.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Edward Stone
Address: 2830 Tremont Drive
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40205
Email Address: 5thmortonstone@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The EIS is flawed and a Record of Decision should not be issued because:
1. The site selection process should have provided an origin/destination survey of site users to locate the optimal geographic position with respect to trip-making demand and then considered whether such a site is accessible to users based on their transportation needs.
2. The EIS fails to address reasonable alternatives. The NEPA statute requires that alternative consideration not be prejudiced by such actions as the purchase of a site before site selection.
3. The preferred alternative has changed over time through expansion of its mission to include clinics whose function and operations will be transferred to the Brownsboro Road site. The traffic analysis did not adequately address the trip generation that will occur as a result of this expanded operation and its resulting impact on the local road system and the interchange of Brownsboro Road with I-264.
Thank you.
Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The crowded location of this current plan is very concerning and disappointing. The traffic in this area for most of the day and most every week is horrific and I can’t imagine adding more. There are 4 schools in a VERY short distance from this location. With that being said, the environmental effects that this project and its longterm location to the residents, students and the public, seem to be too much for the amount of space in this area. Space to breath literally and figuratively should matter to ALL people not just veterans! We share this space. Hoping and praying for a better location for ALL! Thank you!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Janet
Address: Hartzell
Address 2: 1501 Cypress Drive
City/Town: Radcliff
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40160
Email Address: jdhartzell@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

As the wife of a military, VA disabled veteran this would be such a blessing. Louisville traffic is awful and the proposed site is no better. Also, this would keep me from having to have someone take us to the VA and bring us back. This is truly a blessing and with the new nursing home would be an asset to Radcliff. Also, we have many volunteer organizations from whom the VA hospital would benefit.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

1) There is already far too much traffic at US42/22. This will be an even greater problem for any emergency vehicles needing quick access to the hospital.
2) The property is too land locked for any future expansion
3) With only a single point of entry, there will not be proper access in an emergency.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Kellie Young
Address: 2907 Lightheart Rd
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: kellie@gocards.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I am highly concerned about the potential placement of a new VA Hospital at the Watterson and 42. We already experience high volumes of traffic leading to gridlock during morning commute. Drivers already experience frustration which can lead to poor driving decisions (which I see on a daily basis). Adding additional traffic to an already congested area without prior road enhancements will make an already challenging area DANGEROUS.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I'm a concerned citizen and employee whose office resides in the Northfield area, and I respectfully ask that the VA reconsider its selected location for a new hospital. Very heavy congestion and already over-crowded traffic lanes wouldn't provide a warm welcome for veterans seeking needed care in a stress-free environment. The difference between arriving at an appointment after having a driving experience filled with heavy traffic, long waits at red lights and regularly blocked intersections versus traveling well regulated driving paths with merely typical traffic hassles can mean a patient who is anxious and elevated and a patient who is ready to listen to medical professionals with a clear mind. That should be a real concern. The selected location for the new hospital simply does not have available infrastructure (nor the space to adequately build it) to make this project successful. And, at long last, can't we just offer our veterans a simple victory?

The details for how this property came to be selected are sketchy and reek of cronyism. But thanks for the opportunity to comment and I do hope you'll listen to the overwhelming number of concerned citizens asking that a West End or South End location be considered instead.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Heather harter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>3101 Runnymede rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:heatherroemke@hotmail.com">heatherroemke@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

This residential area simply cannot handle the traffic that would result from a hospital. It would become a traffic nightmare. That area is already backed up enough because of the traffic jams that occur daily on 71!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Joan Sue Mihalovic
Address: 6700 Fallen Leaf Circle
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40241
Email Address: joansue1940@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
To Whomever Makes Decisions - Good or Bad

In a previous survey that obviously was ignored - almost 70% of veterans who utilize the VA hospital opposed the Brownsboro Road location.... Why was it even considered? Was there an economic impact study done? Most of the VA Veterans that use the VA Hospital live in the west and south parts of the city so it makes no sense building the hospital in the East End.

The Brownsboro location has little transportation to get there and it also leaves no room for growth and expansion.

How has $30 million already been spent on the VA hospital at the Brownsboro Road site? The property sold for over $12 million which was an exhorbant fee to begin with.... did line somebody's pockets and believe those somebody will be the ones to benefit... not the Veterans.

And if I recall the VA was offered 42 acres free of charge that the county owns at Exit 112 off Interstate 65 and Preston Highway. Something is wrong with this picture.

Someone benefited but definitely not the VA veteran - who is the one we should be concerned about.

Joan Sue Mihalovic
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**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

*Respondent skipped this question*

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

Please place new facility where it will be most convenient for those who use it the most and where the services can be expanded not reduced. Placement in the east end will create a traffic nightmare for both veterans and residents.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Carol Olorunsola
Address: 2004 Croghan House Dr.
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40207

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):
Although many of the comments deal with the congestion issue, my concerns center primarily around access for veterans, the majority of whom, live west and south of the site. Since outpatient clinics are also being closed, I assume that the new hospital will become a primary care center as well. If the Veterans Administration is attempting to decrease the number of veterans seeking care from their facilities, this is one way to accomplish. After the longest war and veterans returning with serious physical and mental issues, care should be accessible to the majority of veterans, not a minority who live in the east end. Without a car, this areas is not very assessable through public transportation. Moreover, with 3 schools reached through buses and teenage drivers, it will be tough for am ambulance to get through at certain times of day. These are the reasons that 70% of the veterans were against this site. It is unfortunate that we cannot honor their service by listening to their concerns, at the very least.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Anne Nash
Address: 720 Waterford Rd
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40207

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The veterans do not want Hwy 22 to be the sight of this hospital. The veterans want the site to remain at Zorn. There is room there to accommodate the upgrades. There is room in front of the existing building for a 6 story parking structure. There is room behind the existing building for a new state of the art hospital, and the existing hospital can be turned into a long care facility.
Further, there is great need for an extension to the existing Zachary Taylor Cemetery which would be perfect at 22. The traffic impact would be horrific in this already bad traffic area. Widening the roads to make the area an 8 lane or 6 lane roads is ridiculous and solves nothing. This is the wrong spot for this hospital.
Let's pay homage to the vets who serve our country and give them the space they need at the location they want. Zorn Ave!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I am opposed to the VA Hospital being built at the Watterson and US 42 interchange. The traffic congestion in that area is already bad and adding another 5000 vehicle trips will make it intolerable. I also feel that by placing the VA hospital at the interchange, it will cause a decrease in the value of the homes in the area. The traffic congestion that would be caused by the hospital is unthinkable as there will only be the one exit out of the property going through the light on to US 42 and at the watterson West exit. The traffic there already backs up during peak travel times that can take several light changes to clear and adding more traffic is certainly not going to help the situation. Also, the traffic on a crumbling bridge will make for even more hazards.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
City/Town: [Redacted]
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: [Redacted]

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I fully support the comments submitted by one of my neighbors:

In a previous survey that obviously was ignored - almost 70% of veterans who utilize the VA hospital opposed the Brownsboro Road location.... Why was it even considered?
Was there an economic impact study done?

Most of the VA Veterans that use the VA Hospital live in the west and south parts of the city so it makes no sense building the hospital in the East End.

The Brownsboro location has little transportation to get there and it also leaves no room for growth and expansion.

The traffic congestion on US22 and the Watterson at US42 exit is already horrific. You cannot add any more traffic on these roads.

If I recall the VA was offered 42 acres free of charge that the county owns at Exit 112 off Interstate 65 and Preston Highway.

Something is wrong with this picture.

Someone benefited but definitely not the VA veteran - who is the one we should be concerned about.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town Louisville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The VA hospital should not be built at the brownsboro road location because the area is super congested as it is. Here is a suggestion...send out a poll to all veterans and see what their feedback is on the location. Give them options. I recently read an article about someone willing to donate land in the south end for this project to take shape. That sounds like a win/win situation to me.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Pam White
Address: 7415 Wesboro Rd
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40242
Email Address: phwhite19@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

There are a number of good reasons to consider building in a place other than the Brownsboro Rd site but the most important reason is the number of Veterans served and where they travel from. The overall numbers appear to indicate that the population of Veterans live on the West and South sides of Louisville area. From what I read 70% of Veterans in a pre-proposal survey were opposed to the Brownsboro Rd site.

The traffic concerns and congestion for local residents are real but what really matters is whether it will serve our Veteran population, in the case it clearly won't. Please consider another site for the new VA hospital.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>David Plummer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>7019 Chippenham Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:heatmiser5@juno.com">heatmiser5@juno.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The proposed location is seriously flawed from a traffic congestion standpoint. Traffic discussion begins on Page 131. Palmer Engineering traffic study begins in Appendix B. Travel times were "simulated" and do not appear to reflect the currently reality let alone the traffic increase. Peak times from Interstate to Lime Kiln less than 4 minutes? The study does not define the "peak times" either. I live in Windhurst Acres (one exit prior) and know from personal experience the interstate traffic comes to a complete standstill from I-71 back to Westport Road during rush hour. This addition of 3000 beds would add to the congestion both for the local community and veterans trying to seek care.
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**PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):  
**Respondent skipped this question**
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Shannon Kelting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>7604 Devondale Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:keltingfamily@att.net">keltingfamily@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

As a grand daughter and daughter of American Veterans I fully support the idea of building a new VA medical center in the metro Louisville area, in order to replace the aging Robley Rex hospital on Zorn Avenue. However, I do NOT support the new medical facilities and previously UNANNOUNCED consolidation of VA offices and support services being built at the Brownsboro Road location. The facilities need to be built near other regional medical services or at a larger site that is less land locked so the VA can accommodate all of its services and future expansions. The Brownsboro Rd. site is just as land locked as the Zorn Avenue facility with even less room for future growth. This location simply doesn't make sense, but the VA appears to have put blinders on the project leaderships’ eyes and earplugs in its leaders’ ears, because the community does not want this facility at the Brownsboro location. I am a resident of the city of Graymoor-Devondale; which is adjacent to the Brownsboro Rd. property. We moved to this neighborhood from out of state nearly 5 years ago because it is well established, quiet, near great schools, and has property values on the upswing. I fear that a new VA hospital, plus other support services being built at the Brownsboro Rd. location will negatively impact all those positive attributes. I am greatly concerned with the risk of property values being negatively impacted by this large scale and ever growing facility being built, in what I would consider a mostly residential area with only low density commercial businesses. According to the Kentucky Department of Transportation the Brownsboro Rd & I-264 area is one of the top 10 most congested traffic areas in Jefferson County. How the VA concludes no impact is astonishing. By adding facility of this scale to our neighborhood, traffic is only going to get worse. Plus The City of Graymoor-Devondale just learned and informed its residents that the VA impact report states that now there are more VA offices moving to the proposed site than has ever been disclosed to the public, the VA is proposing that our Herr Lane be expanded to 3-5 lanes which can only negatively impact properties along that road and most likely force homes to be demolished. This project is growing in size, scope and as everyone suspected and now knows an obvious lack of transparency with the citizens that it will impact the most! Veterans Administration please choose a new site, regardless of your reckless decision to purchase overpriced residential land at Brownsboro Rd. before you evaluated other better offers around the metro Louisville area.

Sincerely,

Shannon Kelting
Graymoor-Devondale resident
**Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Della Jones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>218 N Lorraine St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Radcliff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:creationsp91@gmail.com">creationsp91@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:**

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

---

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):**

Please considering building the new VA Hospital in Radcliff Ky. We have lost our hospital on Ft. Knox post and we need our veterans from radcliff and surrounding areas to be able to get service closer than Louisville Ky. Please and Thank You.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town Louisville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I have lived near the proposed site for 23 years and have watched the growth of commercial buildings and private residences in this area. It is already so congested that adding a VA hospital would have a huge negative impact on the Brownsboro road area. Place it downtown where there already exists a large medical complex.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Robert Miller
Address: 1405 Carlimar Lane
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: robert.miller15@twc.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I live several blocks from the proposed back entrance to the new site for the VA Hospital. When the VA made public this location as the future site of the new VA Hospital I had concerns about the impact it would make on our street Carlimar Lane. I went to the meetings and voiced my concern and I was told that the back entrance to the VA (Carlimar) Lane was only going to be open in case of emergency and that it would be blocked most of the time. Now I learn that this back entrance is going to be used when the traffic on US42 becomes congested. US42 will constantly be congested thus my street will become as busy as Herr Lane. Carlimar Lane will be used as a cut through street to get to the Watterson Expressway and Westport Road. Yet another negative impact the VA Hospital will have on our neighborhood. Please reconsider the location of the Hospital to a more positive location.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Robert S White
Address: 7415 Wesboro Road
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40242
Email Address: rswhite2009@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

As a retired vet, I would be one of those who would benefit from the VAMC eastern Louisville location. It would be within walking distance; however since I live near the location I know fully well that new VAMC location would be a poor choice. Not only is the I-264/Brownsboro Road interchange poorly equipped to handle the increased traffic, but the surrounding roads that would also act as feeders to the VAMC would become a nightmare. Herr lane and US 22 are mostly two lane roads that are already overwhelmed for extended periods of time. The students at the four nearby schools would be placed in greater danger because of the increased traffic. Few people in this area would use the VAMC; better to relocate it nearer to those who actually need its services i.e., on the west side of town.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Erin Nutt
Address: 2210 Wynnewood Circle
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: erinnutt_2000@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I implore you to not build the VA at the Brownsboro Rd location. I live in Northfield and the traffic would be detrimental to our daily lives. It will also be horrible for the home values in our area. Thank you!
The new Kroger Holiday Manor wanted to add a second story above their present parking area when they remodeled and expanded the store. However they were not allowed to do that. Now the Powers that Be want to build a VA Hospital with 5 - 6 stories. Why would they allow this hospital that will have more than 2 stories be allowed to build in the same area?? There is something fishy about that!!!
Yes, building the hospital on that corner will cause a lot of traffic congestion which already is highly traveled. Also, the fact that more veterans live in the West and South Ends and surrounding areas rather than this East End area... it seems that putting this Hospital where it is more accessible for more of our veterans would be the most intelligent decision. This East End area is not the correct place to build this VA Hospital!!!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town Louisville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The Brownsboro Road location for the VA Hospital is one of the worst choices possible. This location is already traffic-heavy. The vets need an easy to access spot.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Matthew Esterle
Address: 1803 Girard Dr
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: eseemme2@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
My understanding is the new VA hospital would add 5,000 or more vehicle trips per day to the area where Hwy22 intersects Hwy42. This is an extremely congested traffic area already. In addition, the extra traffic of a previously undisclosed alternate exit will impact my neighborhood and endanger my grandchildren. The streets in this neighborhood are not intended to handle those extra cars.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town Louisville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
With the ever growing options becoming available at little to no cost, the VA needs to re-evaluate their current flawed location. The traffic and environmental implications for the proposed site are flawed and need to be looked into further. The majority of veterans and neighbors have expressed concerns about the proposed location and feel that there are better alternatives.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

West Louisville desperately needs investment. Brownsboro doesn’t want the congestion. Please place the new hospital in West Louisville to help be the catalyst needed for developing a marginalized area, where a large population of veterans live.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

It makes much more sense to have the VA hospital in the west end than in the east end. People live in the west end because they don't have options. That includes options such as transportation to get to the east end, something that people in the east end have. In addition, traffic congestion at the suggested site in the east end is already bad. Placing the hospital in the west end could create an anchor to improve commerce around the hospital: fast food restaurants for patients and staff, possibly expanding to other services people could access coming and going from the hospital: everything from dry cleaning to groceries. The west end is in dire need of economic development; it makes no sense to place the hospital where there is sufficient economic development and keep it away from the area of the city that needs to be developed.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Timothy O'Dea
Address: 7410 Falls Ridge Ct.
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40241
Email Address: tgodea@hotmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Please reconsider the decision to relocate the VA Medical Center to the Hyway 22 site, for ALL of the previously documented reasons. It would cause horrific problems.

Thank you for your consideration.
INCOMPLETE
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: JAMES Johnson
Address: 6909 Chippenham Rd
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: jamestjohnson@bellsouth.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Thomas L Huckaby
Address: 5400 Hempstead Road
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40207
Email Address: tleohuck@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
As a Viet Nam-era Army veteran I object to the proposed location off of Brownsboro Rd. for the new Louisville VA hospital. It makes no sense to me to place it in the northeastern edge of Jefferson County when so many of those who might benefit from the hospital are likely to live in the western, southern and central areas of the county. I wonder if a demographic study of the area (considering both the distribution of veterans and those most likely to NEED the hospital) would support the current proposed site. I doubt it.

Would the relative isolation of the proposed site be of any benefit to veterans from a quality of care standpoint? The high concentration of medical facilities in the downtown area suggests to me that there must be benefits of collaboration or cooperation among those institutions. Could that close proximity provide care options that each one, if operating in isolation, could not offer? If the VA hospital were located closer to others, wouldn't veterans have some of those same opportunities?

And while the primary mission for the hospital must be to satisfy the medical needs of our veterans in an economical way, I think some consideration could be given to the economic impact to the area in which it is to be located. How can it make sense to purchase pricey land in an area that needs no economic boost when it might satisfy some of the previously-mentioned goals in another area of the county that could desperately use such a boost?

Like many others, I suspect that politics and special influence played too big a part in the Brownsboro Road decision. With the Veterans Administration already strapped for cash and such a high unmet need among veterans for medical care, it is obscene and unconscionable that we are spending precious dollars in this way. Revisit the decision!

Thomas Huckaby
Spec 5, 1970 - 1972
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Mark Smith
Address: 4206 Westport Terrace
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40207
Email Address: marknewton08@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
This was a scam for the purchase price and back door politics and fleecing of America. This project does not fit what so ever and anyone who knows this city knows that for sure. I will not support this selection at all.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: JAMES Johnson
Address: 6909 Chippenham Rd
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: jamestjohnson@bellsouth.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Anthony Perito
Address: 1512 Applewood Lane
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: tonyperito@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Presumably, the people whose interest should be foremost in this matter are the veterans in need of medical service. Has it been shown that the facility on the current site cannot provide this? The location off Zorn Avenue and I-71 appears to offer the kind of accessibility for the current veteran population without complicating the residential community surrounding it. The Brownsboro Road site does not resemble that situation in the least. It is an already congested area which would only become more congested with the addition of a hospital and ancillary buildings. Veterans' care should be the top priority and making it more difficult for them to access the facility doesn't seem a good solution. Brownsboro Road makes the least sense relative to environmental impact by virtue of what is already there.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Terry Vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>170 coffman ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>vine grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vince5262002@yahoo.com">vince5262002@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Quite frankly, I was born and raised in the hardin, meade county area, and us so called locals get sick and tired of veterans, military personnel, and every other thing that has to do with the government! This mayor in Radcliff is stating how many veterans are in this area...approx. 14,000...but there's approx. 52,000 in the Louisville metro area. He says that its an inconvenience for these local veterans to have to drive to Louisville, he must not have given it much thought about the 52,000 that will have to drive here. Also, there is only one civilian hospital in this area, and quite frankly, its not the best in the world. By contrast...there are many well established civilian hospitals in the Louisville metro area...so these are the main reasons I think your board has made the right, and ONLY decision to construct this hospital exactly where you're proposing to place it.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Sharron Hilbrecht
Address: 1900 Crossgate Lane
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: shilbrecht@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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To Whom It May Concern,

I will not try to add anything to the comments submitted by Grow Smart Louisville through the attorneys from Frost Brown Todd. They have much more skill than I do in dealing with NEPA laws. Anything I would say in my response to the DEIS, I have said before over these past 4 1/2 years in my responses to both the PEA and the EA. Nothing I have said in the past has seemed to make a single bit of difference to the very, very poor decision to build the new VAMC at the Brownsboro site. As a government-contracted planner confided in me after one of the meetings at the Clifton Center, "This is a terrible site, but it's my job to make it fit."

I do want it to go on record that I believe this whole process has been flawed from the beginning. About 4 years ago, my colleagues and I met with one of the PR people from Jonathan Blue's team. He confided to us with a laugh how they manipulated the system in their favor. They had hired men to go to sit VFW posts "in plaid shirts and ball caps" to buy beer for veterans and badmouth the downtown option, thus skewing opinion of the veterans who happened to be there. He told us how they walked the sale through backdoor channels all the way to Sec. Shenseki. After the decision to purchase the property was made, we learned how they hired and paid Medal of Honor recipient Dakota Meyer to come to the public meeting in April 2012 to shame the neighbors who opposed the Brownsboro site. When other people tried to get involved to get a sampling of veterans' opinion, Blue's lawyers issued cease and desist letters to those folks, threatening them with million dollar lawsuits if the deal didn’t go through. He sent members of his team to the Crossgate City Council meetings to intimidate the neighbors and hear the plans for fighting the purchase.

Once the land was purchased, without the required EIS, every follow-on study was skewed so that the outcome favored the VA. Light, air, and noise pollution issues were minimized. Traffic issues were dismissed. The VA tried to make it look like a million square foot hospital complex with two 8-story parking garages was consistent with a planned development design that the site is zoned for. The VA blew off members of Congress who questioned the purchase price and the wisdom of the location. And when the head of the Veterans Affairs Oversight Committee denied further funding for continuing the site in the summer of 2016, Senator McConnell stuck funding for it onto a must-pass omni-bill at 3 a.m. the day before the vote.

Virtually NOBODY thinks this is the right site for the new hospital. The VA refuses to listen to neighbors, the Kentucky Medical Association, the mayor of the city of Louisville, the Metro Council representative for this district, and many of the veterans who all believe there are better options. I'm not sure why the VA even has rules if it refuses to follow them.

It is obvious to everyone that the VAMC should go downtown where the Louisville medical campus is located. The Louisville VAMC is already referring all neuro cases to other hospitals. All of the medical students are already downtown and would be able to easily access the patients at a downtown VAMC. Most of the other VAMCs around the country are located next to a university teaching hospital. Putting the new VAMC at the highly congested, cramped Brownsboro location makes absolutely no sense at all. The VA should stop throwing good taxpayer money after bad and reopen the site-selection. If it takes another year or two, what would it matter if a better location could be found that serves the veterans, the community, and the taxpayers? It makes more sense than spending one billion dollars on a project that doesn't belong in this location.

Find a new location and then turn the Brownsboro site into an annex to Zachary Taylor National Cemetery and honor the veterans in both life and death.

Respectfully,

Sharron Hilbrecht
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Yvette Winnette
Address: 1415 Techny Lane
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: yvettewinnette@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Page 80 Section 3.5.2.1 Brownsboro Site

While it has been pointed out to the VA on numerous occasions by numerous residents the DEIS failed to evaluate and include the underground water from active springs that flow approximately two blocks (Carlimar Lane, Community Way, Greenlawn Road, Bedford Lane and Crossmoor Lane from the southwest corner of this site.

Since this area already deals with ponding during storms, residents need detailed information from the VA on how the VA will prevent adding to this issue. Residents deserve to know what to expect from the VA during the construction phase and ongoing operations.

Residents need specific details relative to the site’s elevation of 10-12 feet and the actions the VA will take during the construction and ongoing operational phases of this project. A basic review of DEIS exhibits and rendering suggests that residents will be left to deal with what the VA allows to run downhill.

Will the VA follow current environmental regulations/guidelines or default to the outdated policies/guidelines used for the DEIS?

Page 157 Figure 4.1-2

Street view reflects no traffic (vehicles or pedestrians) or parked vehicles on Carlimar Lane and Bedford. This is not an accurate view of these locations and for the sake of presenting an unbiased DEIS the VA should add photos of all traffic corridors during peak times and rush hour periods specific to these corridors.

Additionally, when including photos of the proposed the emergency entrance at Carlimar Lane, the VA should include photos in the DEIS of Carlimar Lane during both daytime and evening hours to ensure the photos include cars parked on the street and children at play.

267 / 304
Again, including photos of empty streets and not including photos of residential streets the VA indents to use demonstrate the DEIS has used questionable information to create a biased DEIS.

1. Describe the VA’s approach to ensuring the DEIS is corrected and includes photos that more accurately reflect traffic and pedestrian volume at peak hour periods specific to each area.

Page 175 Section 4.4.2.1 Construction

Raising the issue of drainage changes that will create temporary increases in sedimentation in storm water drainage without addressing the VA’s actions to mitigate and prevent these issues is a glaring omission of the DEIS.

2. What regulation/guidelines/policies will the VA reference and enforce to prevent runoff damage incurred by residents during the construction and ongoing operational phases of this project?

3. Who will have oversight over the VA to ensure all regulations/guidelines/policies are in compliance?

4. How will the public access to compliance reports and violations made by the VA or any subcontracted vendor?

Page 176 Section 4.4.2.1 Construction

While the DEIS includes a statement that “Procedures would be taken during construction to discover existing voids”, the DEIS needs information to state their procedures and policies after the construction period. The term “procedures” is quite vague. It does not cite the agency that will provide the “procedures” or have compliance monitoring and oversight.

5. What current/pending policies/guidelines use to discover voids?

6. If state policies/guidelines are stronger than the VA’s, will the VA implement state policies/guidelines?

Pages 176 - 177 Section 4.4.2.1 Construction

7. Since the VA states in the DEIS “Adherence to this standard to the requirements of the Kentucky Revised Statute 350.420” does this mean the VA will comply with the stronger of federal or state regulations?

8. Why was this particular regulation singled out?

The last paragraph in Section 4.4.2.1 Construction is too vague and unacceptable. The DEIS must state the short and long term actions the VA will take to minimize the impact of blasting as well as ponding, sedimentation and hazardous waste runoff suffered by residents in the area.

As written in this section of the DEIS one may think the VA will develop the “Contraction Best Management Practices” during the project based on permit requirements. Additionally, the VA should state they would comply with the stronger of federal, state or local governmental agency permit requirements. While it could be an assumption, the “Best Management Practices” should mandate that all permits are required and must be approved before the work covered by the permit begins. Lastly, the DEIS should state who will have oversight of the Best Management Practices and securing permits in a timely manner.

9. What are the VA’s short and long term plans to protect residents and business owners adverse outcomes related to blasting, ponding, water, sedimentation and hazardous waste runoff?

10. How will the VA work with state and local agencies to ensure their “Best Management Practices” address all that would be impacted by vague or incomplete management practices?

Page 179 Section 4.5.2.1 Construction

During the construction phase reference to the “Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control Plan must be prepared that details measures to trap 80 percent of the total suspended solids” leads to numerous questions.

11. What happens to the other 20%?

12. What happens to the 80%?
13. How and when will hazardous waste be removed from the site during construction and ongoing operations of this site?

Since Carlimar Lane is a residential street that will not support trucks and a significant increase in traffic moving through Graymoor-Devondale the DEIS must state the VA must designate a “Construction Entrance” and have oversight that enforces use of the designated Construction Entrance. The VA must take this action before the first shovel of dirt is moved or the first piece of equipment enters the property.

14. How will the VA assist residents and Graymoor-Devondale city officials with directing traffic trying to access the site during construction and ongoing operations away from residential streets?

Page 197 Section 4.8.2.2 Operations

While there is a reference to “mixed land use”, it would be more difficult for non-governmental companies to acquire property in the same manner as a governmental agency like the VA. Due to the site’s failure to meet several VA requirements for growth, fears related to eminent domain must be respected.

The fact that the VA chose a site that is in a residential setting, land locked and of questionable size for the project, dependent on state agencies supporting their anticipated transportation needs and then supports this choice with what appears to be a biased DEIS is a great concern for everyone but the VA.

15. What has been the VA’s experience with taking advantage of their options to apply “eminent domain” over the last 25 years?

16. How do those sites and their DEIS and final EIS compare to the Brownsboro site?

Page 210 Section 4.11.2.2 Operations

Additional information in needed to explain the “increase in VA employees” totals as reported.

17. Are these the numbers related to the current hospital site?

18. Since there are varying reports on the number of beds for the hospital, how many inpatient beds are there at the current location and how many beds will be at the Brownsboro site?

19. Are the numbers reflected inclusive of all VA employees that will move to the Brownsboro site?

20. How many employees does the VA project to add once construction is completed and operations begin?

21. Does the VA own or lease the site where the Regional Benefits office is located?

22. Does the VA own or lease the sites where the satellite clinics are currently located?

23. How were additional staffing projections for the Benefits Office and satellite factored into traffic projections?

Page 213 Section 4.12.2.2 Construction

Graymoor-Devondale streets were built (design, construction and maintenance) to support residential traffic needs only and will not support the weight of vehicles removing any types of waste from the site or any increase in traffic. Any construction vehicle, employee, regulator or contractor as a means to enter or exit the site should not use Carlimar Lane. Instead the VA should establish a Construction Entrance/Exit with immediate access to the expressway prior to starting any construction activity at the site. Under no circumstances should the VA allow travel through residential streets by their construction vendors, contractors, employees or regulators.

14. What route will vehicles and pedestrians use to transport construction and hazardous waste away from the construction site?

15. What actions will the VA take to ensure that during construction and ongoing operations to ensure vendors, employees, contractors and regulations do no access the Brownsboro site by parking on residential streets?
Residential streets from Westport Road or Herr Lane to the back emergency gate at Carlimar Lane will not support emergency vehicles “when there is an accident” for numerous reasons. First, the Westport Road, Herr Lane and 264 interchanges already suffer from numerous accidents each day that significantly impact traffic flow. Drivers are already clogging residential streets to avoid these accidents. Secondly, on-street parking is allowed on all of the residential streets in Graymoor-Devondale. That said emergency vehicles would be required to navigate a route around parked vehicles. Lastly, while these are residential areas most of the streets do not have sidewalks. Pedestrians, other drivers and emergency vehicles will all be at risk for accidents. Due to significant safety concerns the VA should abandon use of residential streets for emergency or any other access to the Brownsboro site.

16. Describe in detail the circumstances, frequency, types of vehicles and agencies (federal, state, city) that will be allowed access to enter the VA site in the event of an emergency.

17. Describe in detail the definition the VA will use, enforce and report for “emergency access” to the Brownsboro site.

18. What training and materials will be used to train VA employees during construction and ongoing operations to ensure use of the Carlimar Lane gate is restricted?

19. How will the VA share these training materials with federal, state and local agencies that provide services and protection to the residents in Graymoor-Devondale?

20. Assuming there will be no exits, how will the VA monitor, track and then report entrances made through the “emergency entrance” at Carlimar Lane?

21. How and when will these reports be made available to other federal, state or local agencies?

Page 251 Section 5.13 Transportation and Traffic

22. Regarding “service and supply deliveries scheduled to avoid morning and evening peak hour traffic”, does this mean residents in the area will be subjected to additional noise from heavy trucks during late night or early morning hours during construction and ongoing operations?

23. Describe the VA’s “feasible and practicable” definition and subsequent implementation, monitoring and compliance with deliveries and scheduling.

24. Will it be stated in contracts (services and products) with the VA vendors that vendors will not be allowed to use the Carlimar Lane entrance.

Deliveries that add to traffic or noise and air pollution should be restricted to late morning - early afternoon hours only.

25. Since the expansion of the Brownsboro Road corridor as listed in the DEIS is a direct result of the VA Hospital relocating the Brownsboro site in a residential setting surrounded by residential streets, how will the VA advocate for and help fund the financial impact building and expanding the VA Hospital and its additional services will have on KY residents?

DEIS failed to address, at any site, the VA’s Communication Plan for Construction and Ongoing Operations

26. How will the VA communicate with surrounding cities, residents and business owners that will be impacted by construction?

27. Will the VA’s communication plan and actions rely on current, dated or pending policies/guidelines?

28. Will the VA communicate in a manner consistent with that of a “good neighbor”?

29. How will the VA ensure cities, residents, schools and business owners impacted by construction are notified in advance and then updated when power outages occur that are related to construction activities?

30. How will the VA ensure cities, residents, schools and business owners impacted by construction are notified in advance and then updated when MSD services are interrupted that are related to construction activities?

31. How will the VA ensure cities, residents, schools and business owners impacted by construction are notified in
31. How will the VA ensure cities, residents, schools and business owners impacted by construction are notified in advance and then updated when water outages occur that are related to construction activities?

32. How will the VA ensure state and local agencies, cities, residents, schools and business owners impacted by construction are notified in advance and then updated when hazardous waste removal transports occur?
**Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)**

Name: Jennifer Jaber  
Address: 2200 Glenview Ave  
City/Town: Louisville  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222  
Email Address: jennifer.m.jaber@gmail.com

**Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:**

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

**Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):**

My husband is a veteran and served in the Iraq war. Based on knowledge of both potential locations and the ability of majority of Vets to easily access the VA, we oppose the Brownsboro site has a location given lack of access to public transportation, lack of community resources surrounding the location, horrible traffic patterns and high traffic congestion already at proposed Brownsboro location (merging location of two interstates), and low VA population within close proximity to that site and thus resulting in more difficulty for VA patients to get to their appts.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Build the hospital in Radcliff. It is Central Kentucky. No traffic and free land.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Sharon Leighty
Address: 2308 Falllsview Rd
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40207

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The Courier Journal recently listed the area near the intersection of Brownsboro Rd and the Watterson Expressway as the second most congested of the Louisville area. I can assure you that veterans will be no more happy than I am when they get stuck in that traffic. At certain times of the day it can take almost a half an hour to get to my gym. A distance of 1.9 miles. Adding to that congestion when there are other available options is not fair to the veterans or the local residents.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Building a VA center in Radcliff is a no brainer! Do the right thing for our Vets!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Phillip Finerson
Address: 404 Bryan St
City/Town: Elizabethtown
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 42701
Email Address: pfinerson404@comcast.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

It would be more convenient to have the VA hospital in Radcliff KY.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Celia Gregory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>186 Creekvale Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Vine Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gregorycpg@yahoo.com">gregorycpg@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

As a veteran, I believe it will be beneficial to have the new complex constructed at the new proposed site in Radcliff, KY. It will help with the traffic problems, that we currently experience when visiting the Robley Rex complex. Parking is also a huge problem and the new proposed site will help with that as well. They is a great number if veterans that reside in the Radcliff area and having the complex built locally will reduce the mileage that we rack up when having to visit the Robley Rex complex. Also, if the complex is built locally, it will result in a great number of jobs that can benefit local residents.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Joseph
Address: 95 Summit Drive
City/Town: Brandenburg
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40108
Email Address: emsine@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

As a long time service member and now veteran, having medical service close by is a concern. I have worked as a Retired Service Officer and dealt with many issues but medical services is the number one issue veterans voice concerns. Sitting on the Retiree council provides great insight to the needs and desires of our veteran population. Please let their voice be heard and put their needs ahead of politics.
**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Louise Jones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>1314 Amanda Jo Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Elizabethtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>42701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:louise.jones.civ@mail.mil">louise.jones.civ@mail.mil</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I hope we take into consideration of all that Vets that are here in Radcliff that do not have transportation that miss out on the care that they need because it's located in Louisville. We have the population to support a VA-hospital here and the Vets should not be penalized because of lack of resources (no transportation to reach the facility). They have did a lot for this country and it's said to turn our back on them because they need help. I hope this will give the people in charge of this to listen to the people it would affect.
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Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Anticia Abrams  
Address: 106 Patrick Court  
City/Town: Elizabethtown  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 42701  
Email Address: anticia.abrams@yahoo.ca

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I am in agreement and fully support the new VA Hospital to be located in Radcliff, KY. The land that is being donated is centrally located which would benefit all those who are serviced here.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Build this in Radcliff, we are centrally located with easy access off the highway with less congestion. This would help to ease the traffic on Bardstown Rd and bring a great asset to the VETS in Hardin county.
#263

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)

Started: Wednesday, January 11, 2017 6:16:05 AM

Last Modified: Wednesday, January 11, 2017 6:24:35 AM

IP Address: 162.201.112.27

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
   Name: [Redacted]
   City/Town: Louisville
   State/Province: KY

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
   I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
   Please do not Build in the west end of Jefferson Co. To many problems in that area for old people to drive and be by themselves. Most veterans say the same about the area. Would be BEST to Build near I-265 in Jefferson Co, Bullitt Co even Harden Co, Easy access for most people.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

I believe the best place for the new VA hospital is in Radcliffe, KY. As a retiree living in the Radcliffe area, I think it makes more sense to have in Radcliffe. Thank you.
**PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
- Name
- Address
- City/Town: KY
- State/Province
- ZIP/Postal Code
- Email Address

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:
- I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
- Radcliff would be the perfect spot to have the New VA hospital
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Ruben Ochoa  
Address: 265 Trappers Ridge Court  
City/Town: Vine Grove  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 40175  
Email Address: ruben.g.ochoa@comcast.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

BUILD this Hospital in Radcliff, KY!!! Area is conducive to a majority of the retirees in KY, is centrally located in KY, low traffic in the area and also the land is being donated by the city of Radcliff.
This site was ill conceived from the beginning. With behind the scenes dickering with someone wanting to turn a fast buck with a government without proper knowledge or care of the real value of the land suited for a hospital site. Typical, but how can the VA even consider a site with only one exit entering into one the most congested intersections in the county, competing with an expressways off ramp. Another xway exit will do nothing for exiting the site. Local residents will fight opening other entrances into their private neighborhoods. Even should the government wish to fight that, traffic in those neighborhoods would be more than streets were designed to handle, creating even larger bottlenecks. The va should quit wasting taxpayer money and due Proper due deligence on a realistic site! To continue plans for this site is beyond good sense, it's ludicrous !Thank u.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I feel that as a veteran, hearing other veteran's complaints, and seeing the system first hand that having the VA medical center in Radcliff, Ky would so wonders for the local community. It would reduce traffic going to and coming from Louisville, help the Radcliff economy (visitors from out Radcliff would be more likely to spend a little money while in Radcliff for gas and whatnot), and best of help the Radcliff, Elizabethtown, and Fort Knox veterans. It just makes sense to have a VA center near a major military base, it would be stupid to place it 50 miles away from where many users of the VA live and work.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Sheila Ward
Address: 1707 Cowling AVE
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40205
Email Address: sward0111@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I am a member of Thomas Jefferson Unitarian Church, which is in the immediate area of the planned VA site. I avoid evening events at the church due to the stand-still traffic in the area. It will be much worse with a new hospital installed. Vets will need helicopter service to get there. Please reconsider this decision. Vets deserve a facility they can get to on time for appointments, surgeries, and certainly emergencies.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
William Worden
Address
1906 Round Ridge Road
City/Town
Louisville
ZIP/Postal Code
40207
Email Address
wordrecllc@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The additional traffic that would be added to an already heavy trafficked area, will cause tremendous issues.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Please put the VA Clinic/Hospital in Radcliff KY. Thank you.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Steven Richards  
Address: 2810 Yates Chapel Road  
City/Town: Cecilia  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 42724  
Email Address: stevenrichards68@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Building the hospital in Radcliff would be more conducive to most retirees of Kentucky by being centrally located. Also the area would be better suited for traffic and the land is being donated.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Clark Rhea
Address: 2308 Newmarket Drive
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: crhea@kaci.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The selection of the Brownsboro Road site for the VA hospital was the worst possible site that could be selected and was in violation of NEPA. The selection process was completed without the proper environmental impact studies being done. This site has significant issues including a major traffic problem, as well as other environmental issues. A proper traffic study has not been done. A proper traffic study would show that this location is not a viable site for a VA hospital.
#274

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 11, 2017 7:29:55 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 11, 2017 7:32:17 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:22
IP Address: 143.85.163.18

PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Please move VA Hospital to Radcliff, KY
#275

**Collector:** [Web Link 1](Web Link)

**Started:** Wednesday, January 11, 2017 7:33:38 AM

**Last Modified:** Wednesday, January 11, 2017 7:40:39 AM

**Time Spent:** 00:07:00

**IP Address:** 173.242.138.235

---

**PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
*Respondent skipped this question*

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

---

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Radcliff, Ky. is the ideal location to build the VA hospital.  
Thissen, James H.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Jennifer Thomas
Address: 419 Nevis Drive
City/Town: Elizabethtown
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 42701
Email Address: jaythomas301971@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

As a spouse of a Retired Veteran, I feel it would be beneficial and feasible for the VA Hospital to be built within the Hardin County of Kentucky area. It would be close to one of the biggest military installation (Fort Knox); and we definitely have the land to add the hospital to our community. As my husband gets older, it would definitely make it easier and helpful to be service near his hometown area. Please reconsider your option to build in a community that is not in a central location to the military. Please consider bringing the VA Hospital to Radcliff, KY.

Sincerely,
Wife of a retired Veteran
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Debra Harlan
Address: 1734 Chichester Ave
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40205
Email Address: debraandted@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I stand with those who feel the selection of the Brownsboro Rd site was inappropriate to the needs of veterans in terms of ease of access, care, emergency assistance, and employee access via alternative modes of transit. Gridlock cannot serve the veteran community or the people who earn their livings at the VA.
I support an urban option close to hospitals downtown such as the Ninth St corridor or 18th and Broadway. No amount of design can cure Brownshirt if it's landlocked site and zero access to transport or emergency transport to other facilities. Better to expand at Zorn than build a mistake.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

**Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)**

- Name [REDACTED]
- Address [REDACTED]
- City/Town [REDACTED]
- State/Province KY
- ZIP/Postal Code [REDACTED]
- Email Address [REDACTED]

**Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:**

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

**Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):**

move hospital to Radcliff
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: DEWAYNE PITTMAN
Address: 1250 SUNSET DRIVE
City/Town: RADCLIFF
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40160
Email Address: dewayne.pittman1959@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

BUILD THE VAMC IN RADCLIFF, KY
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: stephen waters
Address: 77 nalls lane
City/Town: radcliff
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40160
Email Address: swsrca@aol.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Personally, I would love to see the VA Hospital relocated to Radcliff. For me, like so many others, it would be so much handier to get to. But more importantly, I think it would be more desirable to locate in a community where we are welcome. Unlike the Brownsboro Road area in Louisville. This just brings back bad memories of how so many of the returning vets were treated 45 to 50 years ago. A "healing" place should be in a positive environment.
#281

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)

**Started:** Wednesday, January 11, 2017 8:29:52 AM

**Last Modified:** Wednesday, January 11, 2017 8:31:05 AM

**Time Spent:** 00:01:13

**IP Address:** 66.87.19.245

---

### PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

*Respondent skipped this question*

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:

*I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.*

### PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Build hospital in radcliff ky
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Denise Moriarty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>7411 Creekton Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:drurydenise@hotmail.com">drurydenise@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Kent French
Address: 70 meff ct
City/Town: Vinegrove
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40176
Email Address: kent.french@us.army.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Radcliff to bowling green has 95 percent of your va veteran. Louisville is not the place based on traffic and location. Radcliff is the best and most cost effective for Fort Knox to Bowling green.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Denise Moriarty
Address: 7411 Creekton Drive
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40241
Email Address: drurydenise@hotmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

To Whom It May Concern,

I'm writing to oppose the relocation of the VA Medical Complex to the Brownsboro Road campus.

Currently, this area is a traffic disaster. A glut of traffic lights, on ramps, off ramps and lanes too narrow to accommodate the traffic volume all converge to create an area that is congested, if you're lucky; being deadlocked through three or four light cycles is the norm if you're trying to get around between 3:00-7:00 p.m. The highway is also frequently backed up at these exits because the surface roads are stymied by too many traffic lights and too many cars and too little space.

With rapid growth in this part of town, there is no way these roads were designed to handle the current volume of traffic. All you have to do is look further east on Brownsboro/KY 22 where the road collapsed last year. According to new reports, that narrow two-lane road carries 12,000 vehicles a day.

It appears this location is an unpopular choice with the veterans who utilize the VA or the residents of the area. I would ask that other locations be given priority over the Brownsboro Road location.

Most Sincerely,
Denise Moriarty
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town Louisville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

For heavens sake, put the new hospital where the people who use it want it to be. My husband did have a suggestion, which is to put it at the large property at 7th. and Algonquin. This location is easily accessible, and would provide a greatly needed boost for the neighborhood.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Daniel Ray Covington
Address: 4005 Cumberland Dr
City/Town: LaGrange
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40031
Email Address: Danco49@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I'm a participating client at the VA Hospital here in Louisville on Zorn Ave. I'd like to pass along some of my thoughts and observations about moving the new Hospital facility to the Brownsboro Road location. The first observation I have is the obvious. It's location looks like a terrible choice. Traffic, access, neighborhood all seem to create huge barriers from beginning. These can probable be resolved but they are not easy or economical. Especially traffic which would be very expensive and may never be palatable to anyone. It will always be a problem. Access from the watterson is already an issue. The hospital will make it far worse. My second concern is that you have purchased a small lot for such a large complex with parking issues. You have no room for further expansion in the future. After the initial construction of the facility any future work will require a great deal of inconvenience from traffic and parking again. This lot in my observation is far too small for what your needs will be from the beginning. I would think, given your status as a teaching facility as well, a campus type location would better suit your needs. Personally, I'd just as soon you keep the Hospital right where it is. Perhaps build an east end clinic on Brownsboro road that would serve eastern Jefferson county, Oldham county and those further east, as well as south east Indiana locations now that the east end bridge is done.

Given all of the locations on the table (if they truly are on the table) If you must move the hospital my choice would be downtown.

Thank you,

Dan Covington
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Robert L. Gatz
Address: 4421 Rockwood Dr.
Address 2: N/A
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40220
Email Address: robertlgatz@bellsouth.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

V.A Hospital need to be on Browsboro Rd. site
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Bring the VA Hospital to Radcliff KY
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Radcliff would be an excellent location for the new VA Hospital.
### PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)</th>
<th>Respondent skipped this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:</td>
<td>I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: **Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):**

I would like to encourage you to consider bringing a VA hospital to Springfield, KY. It is a central location between Lexington and Louisville. I am originally from Campbellsville, live in [redacted], and teach in [redacted]. My father, still in [redacted], is a veteran who goes to VA in Lexington. That is a 1.5 hr haul. There have been times we have worried if he would even be able to make the drive due to his health. That's not fair to me having to worry over my father needing medical attention. We have St. Catharine's campus, that was closed, available for this project. The need is there. The location is there. We should make this happen. This would cut my father's drive time down to 40 minutes instead of 90 minutes. I pray you consider this need for my father and many others.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Marco Louisse
Address: 3107 Runnymede Court
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: louissemc@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Like many of my neighbors I am concerned about the impact on traffic that a large medical center would have in this already congested area. Every day when I drive my children back and forth to school, I go down Brownsboro road over the 264. The multiple traffic lights result in long lines of cars and lots of waiting. Adding an additional 5 to 10,000 cars per day to this area would be a complete disaster. Also, ambulance traffic generated by emergency room patients and transfers between hospitals would make this traffic problem even worse.

Finally, the location of the center bears no relationship to where the bulk of veterans live in the greater Louisville area. I have great respect for our veterans, but they deserve to have a medical center that is in a convenient location so that they can take advantage of the medical benefits they deserve.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I believe the new VA Hospital could easily be located in Springfield KY on our now empty Saint Catherine College campus. We are very centrally located with very good roads leading in and out. Plus, a very beautiful and peaceful setting for recuperation.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Angela Haydon
Address: 419 North Walnut St
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: angelahaydon@nellsouth.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

We'd LOVE to see and serve our veterans at Springfield's, now vacant, St. Catharine College Campus!
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
This does not affect me or anyone I know, so I don't care.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)</th>
<th>Respondent skipped this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:</td>
<td>I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

| Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments): | Respondent skipped this question |
**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>JAMES Johnson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>6909 Chippenham Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jamestjohnson@bellsouth.net">jamestjohnson@bellsouth.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I have been using the VA as well as the private sector for healthcare since 2007. The VA has a great system set up in this region and they are trying to improve what they have already accomplished. People that are not registered at the VA are in no position to criticize or complain about what the VA is doing, they don't know the system. I have lived about two blocks from the proposed site at Brownsboro road for 40 years and I have never witnessed any opposition to development in the area. The St. Thomas seminary property was rezoned residential and now it is saturated with homes, condos and apartments, no opposition. There of been many subdivisions developed in Brownsboro Rd. area in the last few years without problem I don’t understand. When I was sent to Vietnam in 1969 I didn't complain. I trust the VA's decision build the hospital at Brownsboro Road and the Waterston Expressway.

Thanks
Tommy Johnson
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional): **Respondent skipped this question**

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments): **Respondent skipped this question**
Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The only reason they are pushing for the VA Hospital to be built at Brownsboro and the Watterson intersection is that the DOCTORS live out there. They don't want to bother with having to come downtown anymore. I had a good doctor downtown who moved his office out to the east end. I asked the receptionist why. She said the doctor lived out there and didn't want to drive downtown every day anymore. The receptionist said this was a hardship on her because she could not afford to live out there. Imagine what a hardship it will be for veterans to try to get a ride out there. Most will simply not go.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Sharon Albert
Address: 2844 West Market St
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40212
Email Address: albertsharon59@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I am a concerned citizen. I am not a veteran, nor do I live or work in the Watterson/Brownsboro Road area where the new hospital is being planned. I am in the area frequently. The area is already gridlocked with traffic during daylight hours. The land being considered for the hospital has one way in and out and lacks room for expansion. There are other areas in Louisville as easily accessible from interstate roads. VA officials should have the strength to resist whatever political pressures caused this very bad decision. It does not take a genius to see that the site is the wrong one! Support our vets, not politicians!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: sam phillips
Address: 1132 s 3rd, #1
City/Town: louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40203
Email Address: sphillips6183@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The Brownsboro Rd site is terrible selection for the new VA hospital. This site provides no synergy by its isolation from medical facilities. It is not suitable to the surrounding area. Please find an alternative location.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Yvette Winnette
Address: 1415 Techny Lane
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: yvettewinnette@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Will the VA and agencies responsible for funding the project to relocate the current hospital, regional business office and three satellite clinics join veterans, state and local governmental agencies, residents, business owners and schools that will be impacted by this project work with a third party, like the Udall Foundation, that specializes in "conflict resolution" to improve relations and resolve conflicts?

Udall Foundation

http://www.udall.gov/AboutUs/AboutUs.aspx

The Udall Foundation was established by the U.S. Congress in 1992 as an independent executive branch agency to honor Morris K. Udall's lasting impact on this nation's environment, public lands, and natural resources, and his support of the rights and self-governance of American Indians and Alaska Natives. The 1998 Environmental Policy and Conflict Resolution Act created the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution as a program of the Udall Foundation to assist parties in resolving environmental, public lands, and natural resources conflicts nationwide that involve federal agencies or interests.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

- Name: [redacted]
- Address: [redacted]
- City/Town: [redacted]
- State/Province: KY
- ZIP/Postal Code: [redacted]
- Email Address: [redacted]

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
- I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I think Saint Catherine College would be a GREAT place for the new VA hospital. Buildings are already there. That will save thousands if not millions of dollars building a new building.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
City/Town Louisville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Bullitt County would like for the new VA hospital to be built in our community
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

St catherine campus, springfield ky
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I believe the best possible spot for the VA hospital is the vacant land in the west end. There are several reasons for this, none of which are the ridiculous NIMBY concerns that my neighbors in the east end have. 1) Veterans are spread throughout the city, and having an easily accessible location is important. Both the east end and west end locations have easy access to the Watterson, but the west end location is more accessible and more affordable to visit in terms of transportation costs for the very population that has to think in those terms. Most veterans in the east end are well enough off or well enough supported by family that finding the gas money to visit the hospital isn't a concern. The population that does have to be concerned about that is located more closely to the west end location. 2) The west end location is an empty space where a planned development has fallen through. We need services like this hospital in the west end to make it more attractive for other businesses to invest in the area. We can only organically grow an area's economic health if we choose to invest in the area. Letting it sit, wasted and unused, will have no benefit. Likewise, the east end location would see no real benefit. That area is already built up. Businesses and property values are already in a good spot. The hospital would do nothing to help in that regard.

Counties outside of Jefferson are non-starters. We have the most vets here in town. The only options are the east end or the west end location. I think for the good of the community being served, for the good of the community that needs businesses and services, and to halt the urban sprawl by bringing development back toward the city center, the west end location makes the most sense.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I am concerned about the challenges of creating so much impervious surface near an area that has had flooding in the past (the adjacent neighborhood).

I am concerned about the increased traffic in an area so close to schools that have a large number of students who walk to and from school...thinking decreased safety and increased air pollution.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Paul Medina
Address: 3506 Pinecone Circle
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40241-2725
Email Address: paulmedina@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I simply must object to the proposed location of the new VA facility at the Brownsboro Road site located next to the Watterson X-way for the following reasons:

1. There is simply not sufficient roadway infrastructure to handle the additional thousands of daily cars that will need to access the hospital, all at a chokepoint of the exit of the highway. Limited entrances will force a massive backlog of throughput. Traffic will ensue.

2. Shift change of medical personnel will undoubtedly occur at the same time that 4 schools within 1 mile of the site (Ballard High School, Wilder Elementary, Kammerer Middle, St. Albert's Parish) are either receiving or dismissing children (times ranging from 7-9am and 2:20-3:20PM) - adding to the already maxed out traffic pattern. So again, more traffic.

3. Quite simply, 32 acres (or whatever the size) simply isn't large enough for any modern hospital environment. The CURRENT hospital (which is being replaced because supposedly there is no more room to expand) sits on 47 acres. In addition, the Louisville area supports other auxiliary sites, which as I understand, are supposed to close. How is a 32 acre site, with limited access points for traffic, supposed to expand sufficiently to handle the increased load?

4. The economics and rationale are definitively tilted towards a Downtown location, proximate to the University of Louisville hospital and Medical school. The Downtown area, particularly with Nulu, can handle a variety of expansions, in a commercial setting, and the variety of streets, cross streets, and intersection of 3 highways all make Downtown an ideal situation for a major modern hospital site, which should be pointed out is good enough for the majority of the area's major hospitals (Jewish, Norton's, Norton Children's, Univ. of Louisville) as well as other major medical offices, the James Graham Brown cancer treatment, and other major Norton facilities, as well as Hosparus. The close proximity and availability of other doctors, nurses, staff, and the economic impact to the city can't be underestimated.
Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Please put the VA at the former foodport site. There is interstate access, bus lines that can more quickly get to the resources downtown, and a community that would benefit from the construction. It's a win-win-win. The Brownsboro area site is just traffic and lawsuits waiting to happen.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The site proposed on Brownsboro rd right off the exit seems too close to the one here off of zorn. I think it still needs to be in Jefferson County, but on the west end of downtown.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Albert Grote
Address: 364 E. Millwater Falls
City/Town: Shepherdsville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40165
Email Address: albertgrote@hotmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Put it were it was planned or choose Bullitt County, Radcliff would cause problems with traffic no direct highway route that was not congested. In Jefferson county pick is not favorite but it has been purchased already but could be sold in time 1st choice. but 2nd would be Bullitt county. rather not drive to Radcliff.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):
I feel the St. Catharine college campus would make a great va hospital
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Providing veteran benefits, especially healthcare, should be a number one priority of our government. The people and government of Bullitt Co KY welcome the opportunity to provide that type of support. Our County governments offer is sincere and will save the VA 100's of thousands of dollars and the ease of access from the Louisville metro area, Ft Knox/Elizabethtown area is an added plus. The overall cost of doing business is significantly less in Bullitt Co as well. Resell the overpriced land in eastern Jefferson Co and move the operation to a growing and welcoming Bullitt Co
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**PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

**Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Robin Williams -pardon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>1218 hwy 44 west lot 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>shepherdsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robinmegbrandi@yahoo.com">robinmegbrandi@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:**

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

---
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**Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):**

I think it will be great for Bullitt county to have a VA hospital close by because like my dad hes a veteran and has dementia and Parkinson's and my mom has health issues and depend on us to drive out of our way to get him there specially in the winter its too far of a drive to risk ur life and his. We also need a veterans nursing home out here to!!! Thanks Robin Pardon
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town Louisville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

To Whom It May Concern:

As a resident and home owner in Glenview Hills, and a medical professional, I have to ask who came up with the idea for building a new VA hospital at the Waterson and Route 42 location?! This traffic unfriendly exit, and location is already a nightmare at high travel hours. I can’t even imagine what it will be like in this entire area with the influx of 3 shifts of medical professional staff, support and maintenance staff, trying to get in and out for work. Why would any city planner think it would be a good idea to build a hospital in an area with traffic flow problems that have existed without resolution for years? What will sick patients, and their distraught family members endure trying to get to this facility at any time of the day. It won’t be just an exit problem either. This hospital will increase traffic on Lime Kiln Lane, and on Rt 22 and north and south 44 as people try to make their way to banks, grocery stores, restaurants, etc. Lime Kiln Lane will become a super highway as people opt to use it to skirt around and avoid the Brownsboro Rd exit. They will probably short cut through Northfield neighborhood as well to avoid some lights. I know that’s what I’d do coming from the south and west ends and downtown areas.

Who came up with this plan anyway? I know nothing about city planning, and even I can see this train wreck coming. This will be one of the biggest mistakes not only with the traffic nightmare that will increase exponentially, but also making the lives of our sick Veterans and their families even more difficult. Haven’t they given and suffered enough?!

Doreen Cleary, PT
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Steven Phelps
Address: 295 Lovers Leap Lane
City/Town: Shepherdsville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40165
Email Address: roselps@windstream.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I wish to address the choices if potential sites for the new VA Hospital to be constructed in the area surrounding Louisville Ky. While I understand that money and time have been dedicated to the Brownsboro Rd. site I am of the firm belief that the site in Bullitt Co just off I65 at exit 112 would prove to be a much better choice. People will complain about having to drive to Bullitt Co. They already complain about driving to Louisville. They already complain about the amount of traffic around any site considered in Louisville. With the new center to service Veterans from many many counties I believe having the spacious area that Bullitt County offers solves so very many problems for the Veterans ultimately reducing costs. I would strongly urge the community to look closely at the Bullitt County site because it will save money, increase access, serve more Veterans and provide a much improved experience for our Veterans. Thank you for your consideration.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Del Drury
Address: 205 Mclane
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: deldrury@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The former St. Catherine's College would be an ideal VA hospital. For one thing, it is halfway between the VA in Louisville and the one in Lexington. It could possibly save money due to the VA not having to pay so much of the transportation cost of the outlying patients. Also, at one time it had medical equipment set up for teaching nursing and xray classes - I don't know if that's still there or not.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Ashley Smith
Address: 1279 wards branch Rd
City/Town: Lebanon
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40033
Email Address: leelee3902@icloud.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I think bringing the VA hospital to Washington county ky would be a wonderful idea!!!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Nana Conley
Address: 231 East Kentucky Street
Address 2: #A
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40203
Email Address: 1nasuco@att.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
There are three conditions that need to determine the location for the new VA Hospital:
1) User friendly or convenient for veterans
2) Job creation for Louisville and Jefferson County
3) Community friendly - conditions and environment must present a supportive and respectful interchange between patients/hospital and the community.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Kelly Coomes
Address: 205 Madison Ave
City/Town: 40004
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40004
Email Address: kelly.coomes@bardstowncable.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):
Please consider St. Catharine College as the new location of the VA Medical Center. It would be perfect in such a great little town!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Please consider the St. Catharine College campus for the new VA hospital in Kentucky.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Va Hospital should be built at Shepherdsville, Kentucky. Easier access for veterans living in the West and South ends of Louisville. Traffic on Brownsboro Road is congested, whereas access to Shepherdsville would not have such congestion.
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### Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Chloe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>165 Fredericktown road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chloedwards14@gmail.com">chloedwards14@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

---

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

### Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The St. Catherine College campus would be a perfect place for a VA hospital. As an employee of Flaget Memorial I can say there is definitely a need for one in the immediate area.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I think the previous St. Catherine College campus would be wonderful for a new VA Hospital. All major interstates are close by and more importantly our aging veterans would not have to encounter all the traffic problems.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
This needs to be located in the old St. Catharine College in Springfield, KY. Beautiful place with nice buildings that need saving and for once make something easy to get to for our rural veterans!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Lisa Hood
Address
204 West High Street
Address 2
#2
City/Town
Springfield
State/Province
KY
ZIP/Postal Code
40069
Email Address
lisahood42326@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I would like to suggest that the VA facility be brought to the St. Catharine College grounds. The former college, SCC, is the perfect site with numerous buildings and would need only minor improvements to be full functioning. We are also centrally located in the state and our rural community would love to be home to the new VA facilities. We are within 25 min drive of 3 national guard post as well.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Please consider St Catharine College for a VA hospital!! I work in the medical profession and Central Kentucky is in dire need of a facility that is easier and closer for our Veterans. Most of my patients must drive a minimum of 1 hour to get to the nearest VA hospital. Many times the patient is very ill and this long travel makes the situation worse. This location would offer closer care and may improve overall health. This location would be ideal. Please consider it very carefully.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I read a feed on Facebook about using the St Catherine college property in Springfield Ky for the new VA hospital location. I think this would be a great idea as the property already has buildings and would save a lot of money to use what already is there. The location of that property is centrally located in the state so very easy for all to get to.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Hayley Leonard
Address: 495 Gibson rd Perryville ky
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40468
Email Address: leonardhayley@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

I believe it would be an excellent idea to have a va hospital in the small town of Springfield. Not only is it small and peaceful it would be a great place for these veterans to go to heal without the mess of a large city. These buildings at what was previously st Catherine provide that space for many different types of services including the metal and physical aspects.
Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The Brownsboro Road site is unreasonable. There is already serious traffic congestion around this site. Also, there is no room for possible future expansion. Better sites include the downtown Louisville medical district close to other medical resources. Also, west Louisville such as the prior Foodport site or the site of the proposed Walmart. Public transportation would be very convenient to these sites to assist Veterans without their own transportation. Also, it could bring jobs and other economic benefits to that part of the city.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Jennifer Hunter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>1023 Pembroke Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Bardstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhunter26@hotmail.com">jhunter26@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

Bringing the VA hospital to the St Catherine would be a benefit for many reasons! The beauty of the Campus itself is enough to help the veterans feel better when looking out their hospital beds at the beautiful county side! I would love to come work for the VA if their campus was in Springfield!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Phyllis Tungate
Address: 357 North Street
City/Town: Lebanon
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40033
Email Address: ptungate3@hotmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I think this would be a great place for the VA hospital. This men and women need a good hospital to go to after there service to the country
### Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gregory Weeter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>935 Riverside Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:greg@riverlandsmarine.com">greg@riverlandsmarine.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The VA did not follow the NEPA process. The VA purchased the site at Brownsboro Road without completing an EIS, as required by law.

The VA's choice of site was predetermined, resulting in a biased EIS.

The DEIS lacks the sufficient data to support the claimed need for additional VAMC capacity in the Louisville area or to evaluate the potential alternatives to address that need.

The DEIS does not provide criteria for evaluating alternative sites for a new VAMC.

The DEIS does not provide justification for closing the three CBOCs or consolidating the Veterans Benefits Administration office.

The DEIS does not contain any reasonable alternative sites. One of the site evaluated in the DEIS (Zorn Avenue) is not considered a viable site, and the other site (the St. Joseph property) was already sold to another developer.

The DEIS does not provide adequate analysis of the quality of care for veterans at each site and their ability to receive care in a timely manner. The Brownsboro site will actually have substantial negative impacts to veterans, as the distance from Louisville's downtown medical campus and the U of L medical campus puts the health and lives of veterans in further risk when emergency care is needed.

The DEIS does not adequately compare alternatives in regard to access issues for both veterans and employees.

The DEIS does not adequately evaluate the impact on air quality.

The DEIS does not adequately evaluate the impact on traffic-related noise.

The Brownsboro site does not fall within the planned development zoning designation as determined by Metro Louisville government.

The DEIS provides no real analysis on the transportation network of the area and travel times for veterans and physicians to and from the site.

The site will increase traffic problems at an area that already has major problems.

Our Vest deserve a better location.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
As a daughter in law of a deceased veteran (that got hardly any help) from the government I am in support of using the St Catharine College in Springfield as the new location of the VA hospital. We really need a boost in our community and this would bring jobs to our area. Thanks for your time.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Debbie Harrod
Address: 131 Meadow Lane
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: debbie.harrod9007@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I think St. Catherine College Campus in Springfield would be a great location for the new VA Hospital.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Desmond E. Hoorn Sr.
Address: 14 Collinbrook Drive
City/Town: Rineyville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40162
Email Address: desmond.e.hoorn.civ@mail.mil

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I would like to see the Regional VA Hospital to reside in the proposed site of Radcliff, KY. This location, in my opinion, be a good centralized location for central KY and in addition would bring additional revenue for Hardin County, KY.
**PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

**Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mr. &amp; Mrs. R. L. Collins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>142 circle Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address 2</td>
<td>Shepherdsville Ky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:**

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):**

Shepherdsville would be a good location because it would be just off I 65
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
This debacle has been going on for far too long. Let's make a decision and get the hospital built, please!!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Saint Catharine in Springfield Kentucky would be a great location for the new VA hospital. Please consider our community.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Tammy Obryan
Address: 49 Cartwright Rd. Apt 2
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: tlo310@hotmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Springfield is an excellent place for the new VA hospital. Win for all involved. No problem with extra traffic here.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name Amanda Glass Smith
Address 117 Lone Oak Drive
City/Town Shepherdsville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code 40165
Email Address nursemandy@twc.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
We would love for the VA Hospital to come to Bullitt County Ky.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Tonia Clark
Address: 262 Miller's Ridge
City/Town: Lebanon Junction
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40150
Email Address: toniatmc1@hotmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Praying Bullitt County gets the chance to build a VA hospital!
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):  
this college is the state of the art!!!!!!!!!! would be so great for the va... please look very hard at this location. I would hope this could be bought with out a restate agent..... thanks
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

- Name: Noelle Raque
- Address: 107 Fenley Ave
- Address 2: Apt W4
- City/Town: Louisville
- State/Province: KY
- ZIP/Postal Code: 40207
- Email Address: noelleraque@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I think it's wonderful that the VA build on the Brownsboro Rd property! I dropped many clients off at the Zorn location, hopefully you will have better parking for veterans and drop off and pickup locations.
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**PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

- **Name:** [Redacted]
- **Address:** [Redacted]
- **City/Town:** Louisville
- **State/Province:** KY
- **ZIP/Postal Code:** [Redacted]
- **Email Address:** [Redacted]

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

---

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

PLEASE do NOT put the new VA center at the Brownsboro location. That is entirely too crowded already. This isn't the place, the newspaper noted, to post preferences, but I will say, Bullitt Co. would be my preference.
The site of the former St. Catharine College would be ideal for the new VA hospital. Its central Kentucky location evens out travel time for veterans. Lack of traffic congestion makes access much easier than Louisville locations.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Having received my nursing degree from Saint Catharine College, I believe turning the campus into a medical facility for veterans would be excellent. I would love to see the facility put to good use. I also think it would be able to provide a lot of care to veterans who are local and who also rather not travel to a big city. Having a local hospital in Springfield, KY would be wonderful and good for the community! Please greatly consider this!! Thank you for your time!!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Karen Greenwell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>384 Sharon Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Shepherdsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karengreenwell@twc.com">karengreenwell@twc.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

As a resident of Bullitt County for over 26 years, I fully support the VA coming here to our community.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Veronica Combs
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40202
Email Address: veronicac@cflouisville.org

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):
Dear Replacement VAMC Activation Team,
This letter represents a written response to the draft Environmental Impact Statement conducted as part of the process to replace the Robley Rex VAMC on Zorn Avenue. The EIS considered three new locations and recommended Alternative A, the Brownsboro Road site.
The report considers many factors that will influence the neighborhood and proposed location of the new site, including an increase in traffic and environmental justice issues. The report does not adequately consider the impact of these two issues on the health of Louisville residents in general and low-income veterans in particular.
This letter will address increased air pollution in an already congested area and the environmental justice impact of building a veteran’s hospital in a location farthest from the low-income people most likely to use it.

Air Pollution and the new EPA Ozone Standards
The EIS does not adequately consider the impact of the increased air pollution due to increased traffic in the area. The proposed location already suffers from traffic congestion and the report points out that any new development in this area – whether it’s a hospital or a commercial development – will exacerbate this problem. The traffic analysis gives one section of the affected roadways a failing grade during morning and evening rush hour.
The draft EIS only accounts for the inconvenience for individuals in cars using the road, it does not take into account the effect of increased air pollution on neighborhood residents and hospital patients. The World Health Organization has named air pollution as the number one environmental public health risk. Cities around the world are taking steps to reduce car traffic as a source of air pollution.
In fall 2016, the WHO launched the Breathe Life campaign. The campaign is designed to motivate city leaders to ban diesel trucks from roadways to improve air quality. As part of this effort, the organization created a dashboard that citizens can use to understand pollution levels in their cities. According to the dashboard for Louisville, PM2.5 levels are already 10% above recommended annual exposure limits.
Patients using the hospital, employees working there, and residents living in the nearby neighborhoods face increased risk of several chronic problems (listed below) as a result of building the new VA hospital in an already congested area. Although the draft EIS addresses some of the health effects of air emissions, the following evidence from the research literature should be presented and considered in the final selection of the site for the new hospital.
Particulate matter, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and ozone have well-established causal relationships with chronic respiratory and cardiovascular problems. The American Thoracic Society has identified these pollutants as health risk indicators for high-risk populations, including veterans. The EIS should consider the cumulative impact of these pollutants on hospital patients and community residents.
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negative outcomes for human health and are subject to nationwide ambient air quality standards, monitoring and control requirements under the Federal Clean Air Act.3
Previous studies have found correlations between the health effects of pollution from traffic sources and asthma and other breathing disorders, cardiovascular disease, lung cancer, pre-term and low birth weight births, and premature death. There is also emerging evidence about the potential connections between air quality and obesity and Parkinson’s Disease. The following citations describe the evidence for these health effects in more detail, though the evidence cited here is far from comprehensive.

Asthma and other respiratory diseases – Air quality and respiratory diseases such as asthma have been found to be associated with poor air quality.4 5 By age 18, children exposed to higher levels of PM2.5, NOx, and elemental carbon (created by burning fossil fuels, especially diesel) are five times more likely (7.9% vs. 1.6%) to have underdeveloped lungs (80% of normal) compared to teenagers living in communities with lower pollutant levels.6

Cardiovascular disease – Air pollutants, including ozone and particulate matter, have been linked to cardiovascular mortality and respiratory disease and illness.7 Particulate matter from roadway vehicles may exacerbate cardiovascular disease, leading to an increase in hospital visits and premature death.8 In a Los Angeles study, researchers found that people with an increased exposure to 10 µg/m3 of PM2.5 had an increase of 5.9 percent in the thickness of artery walls.9

Lung cancer – Several studies, including two meta-analyses, have concluded that occupational exposure to diesel engine exhaust may increase the risk of lung cancer.10, 11 In 1999, the State of California concluded that diesel engine exhaust is a carcinogen, and a 2000 California risk assessment attributed 70 percent of the cancer risk from air pollution to diesel engine exhaust.12 On-road diesel trucks represent the largest emission source of diesel engine exhaust PM in the state.13 If the proposed Brownsboro location is accepted, Louisville’s new VA hospital would be located right next to a busy interstate highway.

Premature death and mortality – Poor air quality may also be associated with premature death (defined as dying before one’s average life expectancy). WHO estimates that air pollution causes approximately three million premature deaths worldwide each year.14 WHO also estimates that there is an increased risk of dying of between 0.2 and 0.6 percent for each increase in 10 µg/m3 in ozone.15 Specifically in relation to the presence of particulate matter, WHO reports that average life expectancy decreases by 1.5 years when you compare cities at the highest and lowest PM levels.16 In addition to premature death, poor air quality is also associated with mortality. Mortality rates from respiratory illness in the most air-polluted cities compared to the least air-polluted cities are 1.26 times higher.17 In a 2008 draft study, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) states that there is a 1–8 percent increased risk of mortality for every 50 µg/m3 of PM10 and a 1–3.5 percent increase in mortality for every 25 µg/m3 of PM2.5.24 Jerrett et al. (2005) concluded that there was a 1.17 relative risk of all-cause mortality associated with an increase of 10 µg/m3 in PM2.5 and Ostro (2006) found PM2.5 levels to be associated with mortality.18 Specifically, a 10 µg/m3 change in two day average PM2.5 concentration corresponded to a 0.6 percent increase in all-cause mortality.19

Exposure to Air Pollutants in Vulnerable Populations – Some populations are more vulnerable to the negative health impacts of air pollution exposure. The elderly and the young, as well as populations with higher rates of respiratory disease such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), and populations with other environmental or occupational health exposures (e.g., indoor air quality) that impact cardiovascular or respiratory diseases may be more sensitive to adverse health effects.

A 2011 study of 326 outpatients at the Cincinnati VAMC found that, “COPD prevalence is higher among Cincinnati veterans than among general U.S. population. COPD is under-recognized by both health care providers and veterans.20

Placing the new VA hospital next to a busy interstate roadway and congested surface streets will increase health risks associated with air pollution. The increase in traffic congestion also increases the likelihood that Louisville will fail to comply with the new lower limits for ozone that went into effect in 2016. This statement from the draft EIS: “Increases in VAMC workforce and patient clinic stops would be realized of the alternative selected. Scope 3 GHG emissions are estimated to be the same for all alternatives.” is an insufficient analysis of the impact of the hospital on pollution levels.

Further, the report does not take into account the fact that Louisville may soon be found to be out of attainment with the Environmental Protection Agency’s new ozone limits.

The Air Pollution Control District in Louisville tracks pollution levels and the city’s compliance with national standards designed to protect human health. The National Ambient Air Quality Standard for ozone is measured as an 8-hour average. An ozone exceedance occurs when the highest 8-hour average for each day is greater than the NAAQS. The NAAQS was lowered from 80 ppb to 75 ppb in 2007 and from 75 ppb to 70 ppb in 2016.

According to a June 26 article by Jim Bruggers in The Courier-Journal, “Getting placed in an ozone penalty box by EPA can tarnish a city's image and can potentially require more work by businesses and individuals to reduce emissions.”21 In the same article from The Courier-Journal, APCD director Keith Talley said that the preliminary numbers show the community likely will be designated out of compliance after the EPA reviews the final numbers following an ozone season that extends into the early fall.

Data from the APCD November meeting report shows ozone levels for the last several years. 22 Exceedances are on the rise.

According to the Air Pollution Meeting District Board Meeting Minutes from November 2016, ozone exceedance days...
According to the Air Pollution Meeting District Board Meeting Minutes from November 2016, ozone exceedance days are on an upward trend. Placing the hospital in an already congested area will contribute to this problem, and put at risk the city’s compliance with federal ozone limits.23

Environmental Justice Impact

The draft EIS states that the site selection process must take into account the impact on communities of color and other vulnerable populations, such as low-income individuals. A review of census data on veterans shows that the Brownsboro Road location is not close to the low-income veterans most likely to use the facility. Veterans with higher incomes are more likely to use the Veterans Choice Program, which allows vets to use private physicians instead of VA doctors.24

An analysis of 2014 census data from factfinder.census.gov shows that veterans living in the zip codes farthest from the proposed site have significantly lower household incomes (average of $49,507) than people living in the zip codes closest to the proposed site (average $145,033).

The 7 zip codes farthest from the proposed site have significantly higher percentage of people living in poverty (11%) than the 7 zip codes closest to the proposed site (4%). This means that people of lesser means and resources will have to expend more time and money to reach the hospital.

Veterans living in the 40025 zip code have the highest average income, $480,394, and is close to the proposed site. 40210 has the second lowest average income, $29,110, and is far from the proposed site.

The 2012 national average for veterans living in poverty was 6.9%.25 The zip codes surrounding the proposed site all have rates of poverty lower than the national average.

Three of the zip codes farthest from the proposed site have the highest rates of veterans living in poverty in Jefferson County:

• 40212 at 20%
• 40211 at 16%
• 40210 at 20%

These same 3 zip codes, farthest from the proposed site, have the lowest median household incomes in Jefferson County:

• 40212 at $26,713
• 40211 at $25,943
• 40210 at $19,778

These data show that the issue of access to healthcare for low-income veterans should be studied in greater detail before a site is chosen for the new hospital.

Thank you for considering this research and the related recommendations. The Institute for Healthy Air Water and Soil would be happy to discuss any of the information presented here, and to answer any questions you have.

Please contact me at veronicac@clouisville.org or 812-987-6076.

We look forward to your response.

Veronica Combs
Executive Director
The Institute for Healthy Air Water and Soil
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):
I think the idea of moving out of Louisville and to the old St. Catherine College facility in Springfield Kentucky is a great option to consider. The facility’s are already constructed and vacant ready for occupancy. It is centrally located for all of Kentucky and close to southern Indiana.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Cecilia Mitchell
Address: P O Box 1812
City/Town: Frankfort
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40602-1812
Email Address: thefarsidefarm@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I support the offer to use the St Catherine College site at Springfield. Nobody wants to go or through Louisville to get their medical treatments - they're already ailing and access to Springfield KY is the easiest.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Respondent skipped this question
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Barbara Aronhime
Address: 2511 Harmony Road
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40299
Email Address: barbaraaronhime@ymail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I believe the St Catharine facility in Springfield, Ky would be an excellent opportunity for the Veterans Hospital. It is ideally located in Central Ky and very accessible. Plenty of land for additional parking and buildings. This is my hometown, I graduated from there and currently have a son in the military. Excellent opportunity all the way around, please consider.
| Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional) |
| Name | Margaret Godshall |
| Address | 118 Armory Hill |
| City/Town | Springfield |
| State/Province | KY |
| ZIP/Postal Code | 40069 |
| Email Address | margogodshaw@att.net |

| Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: |
| Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above. |
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**Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):**

I think this would be great place for VA. It is centrally located, there are new building already there beautiful grounds.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Michael Hall
Address: 1152 Croake Station Rd
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

This would be amazing for me and many of my friends and family who are all veterans. Currently from our town there is at an hour or more drive in either direction to get to a VA hospital. I am a veteran who has applied for benefits following my honorable discharge. It would be so beneficial to have a VA hospital in central KY so that I could utilize my benefits. I am not able to miss work for the long drives and waits out of town to the only VA hospitals in our state. So many families would benefit from the purchase of St. Catherine’s by the VA.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Linda Burkart
Address: 1645 Taylor Avenue
City/Town: LOUISVILLE
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40213
Email Address: lindafburkart@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
We don’t see anything wrong with the hospital at Zorn. Need more parking. Take the administration buildings out and have the offices somewhere else. Don’t like the East end area the traffic is so bad. We don’t go in that area it is so bad. There is not enough ground there to build and expand. We like Bullitt co. or the one in Radcliff. They also closer to Fort Knox that we think is a good idea.
 PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Respondent skipped this question
Hello,

The proposed site on Brownsboro Rd is truly a bad decision. Not only will it cause major traffic in the area but for the price to develop, I’m sure the VA could use our tax dollars more efficiently. Springfield, KY would be a wonderful place, with plenty of land and also a boom to the local economy since St. Catherine College closed. Or maybe Radcliff, KY or even Bullitt County, KY. My father, Gregory Bailey Griffith and grandfather, Ralph Reuben Griffith both served this country and I’m sure that both would want it located outside of the city.

Thanks
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: joan schuhmann
Address: 7212 shefford lane
City/Town: louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40242
Email Address: jschuhmann12@twc.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
not a good choice. Traffic is already terrible at this intersection & there is no room for future expansion
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: MARY KEENE
Address: 130 MCMURTRY LANE
City/Town: SPRINGFIELD
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: mkeene0008@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Christian Drury
Address: 11296 south Preston highway
City/Town: Lebanon junction
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40150
Email Address: cldrury1@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Please build the hospital in Bullitt county. Accessible location, central and direct access to I 65. No traffic problems. Free land! No getting lost in the city.
**Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)**

Name: MARY KEENE  
Address: 130 MCMURTRY LANE  
City/Town: SPRINGFIELD  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069  
Email Address: mkeene0008@gmail.com

**Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:**

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):**

Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Craig Herald
Address: 3577 Lincoln Park Road
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: craig.herald@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):
St Catherine College in Springfield, KY would be an excellent facility for the VA to utilize.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I believe Springfield the past home of St Cathern College would make a fantastic VA facility. Our central location would be a big draw. Springfield is a welcoming supportive community and think we would partner well with such a venture!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Tonya Hembree
Address: 323 Inverness ave
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40214
Email Address: gordonfan40165@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I vote that the new VA hospital go to Bullitt county. It is a much better location with more conveniences for our vets due to traffic congestion And a much safer location for them with a bigger parking lot.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Nell Haydon
Address: 149 Lebanon Hill
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: springfieldmainst@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Please consider former St. Catharine College in central Kentucky for your Louisville KY new location.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
- Name: [Redacted]
- Address: [Redacted]
- City/Town: [Redacted]
- State/Province: KY
- ZIP/Postal Code: [Redacted]

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Please consider Springfield, Ky as location for next VA.
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**PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

- **Name:** Nell Givens
- **Email Address:** nellzie04@gmail.com

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

---

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I recommend the St. Catharine's site in Springfield as a place for the future VA. This is an available site with countless opportunities for space and expansion if needed.
I have lived in the Brownsboro Road corridor for all my 63 years of life. The increasing amount of traffic over the years is tremendous. To add the proposed VA Hospital will cripple the area with the added traffic. I strongly oppose it and hope that an alternative site will prove to be a better location! Thank you! Mary Hazelip
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Kellie Reynolds
Address: 2646 Bearwallow Rd
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: reynolds.bearwallow@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

We would LOVE to see the VA take residence in the old St Catharine College facility. It would be a beautiful and economic location. Please consider!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Mary Henry
Address: 3112 springstead circle
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40241
Email Address: mthenry11@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: shamrock o'cull
Address: 102 marie dr
City/Town: bardstown
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40004
Email Address: pangurban7508@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I would like to see the Saint Catherines campus in Springfield, Ky used as the new VA Hospital.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The VA Hospital should really consider the location in Springfield, KY. I am from there. It's an awesome town.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I think the building at St. Catherine College is an amazingly wonderful idea just bc you already have facilities. Some remodeling, I am sure, would need to be done but still way more inexpensive than building from the ground up. And it's also centrally located in the state for easier access for all veterans. The VA does amazing work and I think you should really consider this option.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

St. Catharine College, located in Central Kentucky, would be an amazing location for any VA facility. Contact Sales Agent Michael Hale with consulting company Sell With Hale Realty at 859-481-3293
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: John Rakutt
Address: 2623 Ballantrae Circle
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40242
Email Address: molaryacht2@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
If you have never driven through the area of Hwy 42, Brownsboro Road across the Watterson from Rudy Lane and turned right onto Hwy 22 (old Brownsboro Rd) going past the entrance of the proposed entrance to the VA hospital any weekday afternoon from about 2:30 past 6:00 pm any evening or the opposite direction from about 7:00 am on till around 8:30 am then you will understand why this is such a terrible location for the VA. Traffic is horrible there. If there happens to be a backup on either I - 71 north or Westport Road going east in the afternoon then you just may as well forget getting through that area in any less time than about 30 minutes (just from the Rudy lane light past the 42-22 intersection which backs up past Blankenbaker). Please use some common sense and think what additional congestion would be caused by the VA, much less the other development that developers are wanting to create in that same area. Gridlock is the best way I can describe it. I have lived in my current location since 2002. I am qualified in describing traffic in this area.
Build the VA elsewhere please.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Donna Mattingly
Address: 342 W MAIN ST
City/Town: LEBANON
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 400331321
Email Address: snowbird342@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

The unexpected loss of St. Catharine College has devastated our communities here in Central Kentucky. To utilize that beautiful complex for a VA Hospital would truly make lemonade of the lemons. I sincerely urge anyone and everyone considering the location of the site for the new VA Hospital to take a good look at this location. It is the most centrally located site available now, in this entire state, which would make it accessible to many Veterans -- and with no "traffic" concerns, as with other sites under consideration. Please consider this. It would be AWESOME!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Please build the new VA Hospital in Bullitt County Shepherdsville Kentucky! It would be very convenient and centrally located! The property has been donated to the VA to build the hospital on!!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

We need this!
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PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Trip moats
Address: 495 ford dr
City/Town: Mount Washington
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40047
Email Address: trip0717@hotmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Please consider the bullitt co site for our new V.A. Hospital. Easy access to I 65 and also a central ky. Location for all. As a veteran I think this would be a wise choice as bullitt co. Is offering the land to operate this great facility for free.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Karen Smith
Address: 834 Booker Rd
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: jklbs2001@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
We are a great community and would love to have the VA
I think Saint Catherine's college would be a wonderful place for the VA hospital. It's beautiful and serene and that is what the men and women who fought for our country deserve.
As a former army wife, veteran's wife, and a nurse I believe it would be extremely beneficial to have a VA hospital locally. Right now my husband has to drive an hour in either direction, one way, to get the help he needs from the VA. He is unable to take off work to go to appointments because they are so far away. It is truly sad to see how many of our veterans are not getting the help they need because of how far the travel is. One simple thing that could be fixed potentially. Central KY needs more options for our veterans. Not only would the VA hospital benefit veterans with their health care, but it would also benefit their families with more job opportunities.
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## PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>[Redacted]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

## PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

I would like to see the hospital relocated to Springfield at the old St Catharine College campus.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Ben Schecter
Address: 7709 Greenlawn Rd.
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40242
Email Address: schecter@twc.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments): Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ashley colvin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>2728 bardstown road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ashleycolvin2011@gmail.com">ashleycolvin2011@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The benefits of having this hospital on the old St. Catharine campus would be outstanding for our community. Also will provide great service for your veterans who desperately need something closer for their medical needs. Please consider it.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Derek Edlin
Address: 110 Lookout Court
City/Town: Bardstown
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40004
Email Address: d.edlin@hotmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I believe St Catherine College would make an excellent site for a VA hospital. Most of the buildings are fairly new and would only require remodeling. Also, Springfield is centrally located in all directions of KY.
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**PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

- **Name:** [Redacted]
- **Address:** [Redacted]
- **City/Town:** Louisville
- **State/Province:** KY
- **ZIP/Postal Code:** [Redacted]

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

---

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I support and highly recommend the new VA Hospital to be located in Bullitt County. I believe this location is the best option available.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Alicia OCull</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>3342 Lebanon Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aocull@kyol.net">aocull@kyol.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement
Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I'm writing to give my comments on the location of the new VA hospital. I've read the articles and understand that you prefer a location in Louisville KY. I'd like to encourage you to take a ride to Springfield, KY to visit the St. Catharine College Campus. The campus closed in July 2016 leaving vacant several new buildings and dormitories. These buildings could easily be adapted to office, patient rooms and rehab centers. Plus the grounds are beautiful with stunning views of adjacent farms.

There are several reasons to consider our area:
1) Springfield is the geographic center of Kentucky. We are easily accessible from Louisville from Hwy 150, Lexington from the Bluegrass Parkway and south central Kentucky from Hwy 55. The biggest benefit is no traffic congestion. The campus is located right off the new bypass so the infrastructure is in place.

2) The facility is beautiful with new buildings, beautiful landscaping and ample parking. Plus the open air and beautiful views could benefit the patients. Visiting a beautiful retreat like center relieves stress on the patient.

3) There are other medical facilities within a 30 minute radius of the area so ample support is available. Also trained medical staff are available to hire. Our local airport offers stat-flight services.

4) Re-purposing existing buildings is better for the environment.

St. Catharine Campus is the perfect set up for the VA medical facility. Its time to think outside of the box. Large medical facilities do not have to be in large cities. Please take the time to visit the St. Catharine campus to see if it will work for the VA hospital before making your final decision. It'll be worth the trip!

Sincerely,
Alicia O’Cull
Springfield KY resident
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Nikki Nally
Address: 2640 Hardesty Rd
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: paintedlady_1@bellsouth.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I live in Springfield and used to work at the college. My dad has to go to the VA in Lexington or Louisville 1-2 times a month and it's an all day trip for him to drive all that way from Lincoln Co. If they would move into this facility dad could come here where it's only an hour from him and then we could spend time together! I have to go for counseling there now. I'm supposed to be once a month but it's so hard for me to get enough time off work to go do this. This is a great idea and the only valid use of this place I can think of! Please do this! You have no idea how much it will help my dad...
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Steve Cardwell  
Address: 2629 Stonemill Drive  
City/Town: Elizabethtown  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 42701  
Email Address: scardwell1980@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

If Louisville does not want the new VAMC built there. The Mayor of Radcliff KY has offered free land for the new VAMC to be built in Radcliff, which is just outside of Fort Knox. With all the retirees and veterans in this area it is best to built it here in a place will welcome the VAMC.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The movement of the VA to Springfield is not only cost efficient, but practical with its location to Ft. Knox and Louisville...
Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Vehicle traffic is improperly evaluated in the study. Usage rates will be greater than estimated in the assessment. Road improvements planned are inadequate to address traffic concerns.

The decline in the quality of life for nearby residents is not adequately considered in the assessment.
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**Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)**

Name: Matthew Breunig
Address: 1387 bardstown road
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: breunir18@bethlehemhigh.org

---

**Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:**

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

---

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):**

As a local teenager I would be honored for my city to be the home to such an amazing program/establishment. I live a minute down the road from Saint Catherine College, as such the school has always been apart of my life. It was heartbreaking when it shut down. Not only do I fully support this plan but I am eagerly awaiting to see what comes of this.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

As a Ky taxpayer, why should I pay for utilities and road improvements that will not be funded by the VA. And why are you even moving the site when veterans have said they prefer it remain at the Zorn Ave site....
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I am a strong supporter of the purchase and development of the new VA hospital in Washington county on the site of the old St Catharine College.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):
If it can't continue as a place for further education then it's a great idea for a VA hospital. It would be greatly appreciated by many who r not able to drive in Louisville it would be so much easier to get to. No big city.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: David Greenwell
Address: 395 Wilkerson Rd
City/Town: Bloomfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40008
Email Address: dgreenwell@bardstowncable.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The campus of St. Catharine College in Springfield Ky should be considered as an alternative to constructing a new facility. The campus has state-of-the-art facilities that would require minimal modifications in contrast to the construction of new facilities. It is centrally located and has room for future expansion if necessary. Relocation to this campus has the potential for a greater, positive economic impact.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I live near the proposed Brownsboro Rd. site, and from someone who is driving past that site every day, please know that it would be a traffic nightmare. It's already terribly congested, especially during rush hours. Imagine veterans and their families trying to navigate that mess, particularly those that are not familiar with the area. It's simply unnecessary with all the other sites that have been offered.

I am also originally from Springfield, KY and know that community well. I think the previous St. Catherine College campus would be a wonderful location for the new facility. It is easy to get to, centrally located in the center of the state, and the community would be so supportive. Please consider that wonderful location.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Deanna R Chesser
Address: 1969 Tatum Ridge Rd
City/Town: Willisburg
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: us, 40078
Email Address: jdchesser2008@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I am currently a non-traditional student who is in the last semester of my junior year at the University of Kentucky. I am a Psychology major who's ultimate goal is to become a clinical psychologist. I recently learned of Mr. Steve Hale's attempts to draw the Veterans Administration’s interest to Springfield, Kentucky. I would like to express how much the Veterans Administration would be wanted and accepted in Washington County. Not only are we a community who cares for the well-being of our own, but we care for the well-being of those who live in surrounding counties. That being stated, many are not physically able to commute to the larger cities like Louisville and Lexington. The wonderful thing about Springfield, we are geographically located almost center of our state. This allows commuting for individuals from more distal counties, the ability to receive medical treatment without driving a much greater distance. I hope that the Veterans Administration will keep Springfield in mind and weigh the advantages of having the Veterans Hospital in our community. I would love to have the opportunity to serve those who selflessly sacrificed, so I could have a life of freedom and liberties.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Ben Schecter
Address: 7709 Greenlawn Rd
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40242
Email Address: schecter@twc.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The environmental impact statement references the traffic study performed by Palmer Engineering. The Palmer study clearly demonstrates very significant traffic impact with the Midlands site. Notably, these impacts can be seen in Table 9 of the study which indicate delays (without third party traffic improvements) of US 42 KY 22/Northfield intersection; KY 22 WB/L, resulting in delays up to 10 times worse than presently exist. Even with third party traffic improvements (which are not guaranteed), the resulting score is an F under every scenario. Indeed, what is currently a 1 minute delay for pm traffic goes to a 6 minute delay with a build. This is the most important intersection of the study because it most directly will affect egress from the site for employees, patients, visitors, and neighborhood residents. With an unacceptable finding under any scenario, this is a significant impact minimized by the EIS. The report does recognize that additional traffic improvements by KY will be required to make this viable; yet there is no indication that the proposed projects at Section 5.3 are being pursued by KY or will be built. Several of the proposals are impractical or unrealistic, and all require significant expenditure by KYTC. The ONLY item that makes any sense would be a flyover ramp. This cost should be paid by the VA and would greatly alleviate burdens that will be imposed on the visitors, employees, and patients at the VA. Without this, as the study suggests, people will be waiting up to 6 minutes simply to exit the facility in the afternoon.

The study also identified that the buildings will be out of character for the area. The parking garages, in particular, are too large at 8 stories. Serious consideration should be placed at building some parking underground -- something that would minimize the visual impact and, frankly, could provide significant additional parking if parking is built under the office building and other green space.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I do not believe the Brownsboro site is a good fit for the new VA hospital. I live in the area and see on a daily basis the traffic congestion that already exists there. It is worse when there’s a wreck on the Snyder and people try to use US42 as an alternate route.
Has there been a count of how many vets live near the proposed site?
I'm sorry that so much money was spent to purchase the land but I just do not feel that a hospital is a good fit for this space.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Karlee
Address: 59 St Rose Lebanon Road
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: knewton@communicare.org

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I think a VA would be a wonderful thing to make St. Catharines.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The St Catherine Campus in Springfield Ky would make an awesome facility for your VA Hospital. Centrally located for convenience and you would find the city of Springfield and Washington County to be an exceptional group to work with.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>virginia ing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>10102 merioneth dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>lou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:uniquelypinky@att.net">uniquelypinky@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

I SAY BUILDING IT IN BULLITT COUNTY IS A GOOD THING. THE LAND IS FREE. YOU CAN USE THE EXTRA MONEY TO HELP THE VETS.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The city of Springfield would be an amazing location for a VA medical center. I am a local physician assistant and feel very strong regarding this. Springfield is an ideal location due to the centrality of its placement in Kentucky. It would be easily accessible to all parts of Kentucky. That is what our veterans deserve. An easily accessible location not just to Louisville residents but to the entire state. You will find a highly skilled work force here with work ethic to make this facility highly successful!!
**Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Deberah Hurt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>6216 Highway 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:deberahurt@yahoo.com">deberahurt@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:**

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

---
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**Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):**

The newly closed St. Catharine College Campus in Springfield, KY would be an excellent place for the new VA Hospital. It would be a plus for our community and for the veterans. Springfield is centrally located in the state and only 50 miles or less from any major city. The campus is beautiful and would be a peaceful environment for our veterans. The buildings are already there, but I don't know what the difficult of putting in medical equipment would be if any. Everything is ready to go: cafeteria, offices, classrooms, laboratories, residence halls, the health/sciences building, library and so much more. It would save the state of Kentucky money and help out a community. Please take a serious look at Springfield as the new home for the VA Hospital. Thanks
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I live off of Brownsboro rd and the Watterson, even with and exit at Westport rd and Brownboro the traffic now getting on and off the Watterson is already awfully. It is already constantly backed up at the light at Thortons where the were going to build this hospital. It is an aweful location for this type of facility which does not have the room or capacity for a hospital. Not to mention the percentage of veterans in this area is very small. Please No to Brownsboro rd location!!!!
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Robert Reynolds
Address: 2646 bearwallow road
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: rreynolds.bearwallow@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Springfield Saint Catherine's college location makes perfect sense. Save money and location is perfect for the entire state.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Build in Radcliff
Q1: **Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)**

Name: Stan Wilcox  
Address: 7519 Greenlawn Road  
City/Town: Louisville  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 40242  
Email Address: wilcoxtan@gmail.com

Q2: **My mailing list and contact preference is:**  
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: **Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):**

I am absolutely stunned that the Brownsboro Road site is even being considered for building the new VA Medical Center. The published environmental impact study clearly is not fact based and is completely void of hard evidence that it will not be detrimental to the environment. The quality of life for residents of this region will be severely diminished as the traffic congestion in this area and associated vehicular air pollution is already a heavy burden. More often than not daily rush hour traffic is usually backed up to and well beyond the highway 22 exit on eastbound I-264 to I-71. Ironic that the construction of a new health care facility will be ultimately detrimental to the health of all citizens, not just veterans. I am a retired Air Force veteran who believes that this poorly represents the overall best interests of the community. There are better locations with sufficient acreage on the outer perimeter of Louisville or beyond that will provide better access for veterans that live outside the metro area that can avoid the delays and congestion by driving through the city to gain access to medical care. Please do not build in this location. It defies logic, with or without "studies". Be prepared for a massive exodus of homeowners in this area, along with the loss of tax revenue and the associated crime that follows.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Stan Wilcox
Address: 7519 Greenlawn Road
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40242
Email Address: wilcoxstan@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Amanda Morris
Address: 164 Roney road
City/Town: Lebanon junction
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40150
Email Address: morris.amanda77@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Having the VA in Bullitt County would be the perfect in the middle place. So many vets have a hard time driving. Placing another VA in Louisville would be horrible especially in either area people are rallying for it to go. I think this is something that should be up to the VETERANS! Not any political forces or outsiders but the veterans. They are the ones who have to use these facilities!
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town Louisville
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Please consider St Catherine college in Springfield KY as the future VA location.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Respondent skipped this question
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name 
City/Town
State/Province  KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

As a resident in the area driving past the proposed VA site at Brownsboro Road and the Watterson Expressway daily - I ask that you seriously reconsider building at some of the alternative location - as the traffic around this area is already a complete nightmare (especially during rush hours). The added congestion will not serve patients, staff, emergency vehicles, or the local residences. Please reconsider one of the alternative sites (i.e. Not Brownsboro/Watterson)
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Mary Carey
Address: 211 E Virginia Ave
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: maryscarey@att.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I suggest you move the hospital to central Ky, making it more accessible for veterans all over Ky. St Catharine College site offers room for growth and is not in a highly congested area like the Brownsboro site. The Brownsboro site is a nightmare to navigate with heavy backed up traffic. St Catharine College site is best suited to provide easy access for more Veterans than a Louisville site. Please seriously consider centrally locating this much needed hospital for the state as a whole.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Donald Luke McGuffey
Address: 1049 Siloam Road
City/Town: Bradfordsville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40009
Email Address: dlmcguffey@hotmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

As a disabled Veteran living in Marion County Kentucky moving the VA hospital to Springfield Kentucky would make my life so much easier. Thank you for your consideration.  D. L. McGuffey, LCDR, NC, USN (Ret)
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: [Redacted]
Email Address: [Redacted]

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Leave the VA where it is!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Joyce Hopkins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jh2514@att.net">jh2514@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Why is the VA moving the hospital when the veterans have indicated they want to remain at the current Zorn Ave location. And if the VA is going to all of this trouble to relocate why are they not building a larger facility in the move.
**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Springfield, Ky at St. Catharine college old campus would be an excellent choice for the new VA hospital.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Kathi Huntsberger
Address: 1326 Claybrook Lane
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: kj_huntsberger@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
We would love to see the VA Hospital moved to the St. Catharine College campus. Many buildings would already be suitable for the facility. Please consider it.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

I live in the the area next to where the proposed hospital is planned. I cannot imagine any extra traffic in this area. It is horrible now. Backups on the Watterson are very dangerous now with semi trucks flying past the standstill traffic trying to exit onto Hwy 42 and Brownsboro Road (where the entrance to proposed hospital is planned). Also traffic is so backed up that turning into or trying to get out of the shopping centers or the City of Crossgate is a nightmare! Why, when there are so many options being offered would you even think about forcing our Veterans to navigate this already terribly congested area and imagine how much worse it will be with all the extra traffic??? This was a very bad purchase for way too much money. Rebound by looking at some of the "free" land that is being offered in areas that will be more accessible to our men and women that deserve to be thought about in this decision. Don't build this monster right in the middle of one of the already busiest and most traffic congested areas in the city. Do right by the Veterans and listen to what they are asking for.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Kim Neuner
Address: 1918 warrington way
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40222
Email Address: kjneuner@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I would prefer the VA center to be built anywhere but the Brownsboro rd site! There is already too much congestion in this area! Thanks
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: John Barber
Address: 503 Browns Ln
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40207
Email Address: barberjf@live.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
As a concerned Louisville citizen I think the recent proposal to relocate the VA to the former St Catherine college near Springfield is a great idea. I have visited this campus before and think it would be a great setting for healing, located centrally in the state. The facilities are up to date and likely available at a discount and would keep congestion away from the already overwhelmed Watterson Expressway. Please consider the repurpose of this campus as an efficient and effective use of existing resources.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Tona Smith
Address: 107 Oak Drive
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: tonasmith90@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Springfield has much to offer as it is centrally located, buildings in place, room for expansion and an environment that is calm, safe and welcoming. Infrastructure can expand the way it needs. Come for a visit!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Walter burgin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>404 wildflower lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Campbellsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>42718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:walterburgin78@yahoo.com">walterburgin78@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is: Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

St Catherine Springfield ky
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I am extremely concerned that the gov would not take the benefits that would gentrify the west or south end on building the VA. My friends near the hwy 22 don't want it. We do!! Bring the hospital and help something positive in the west end, please
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Rebecca
Address: Keller
Address 2: 205 East Peaceful Court
City/Town: Shepherdsville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40165
Email Address: rkel3947@windstream.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Bullitt County is an ideal location for the new Veterans Administration hospital! Having lived here for over half of my life, I've consistently experienced the spirit of respect for others, and especially for our military. Centrally located, great traffic flow with continuous improvements to our highway system, and an ever growing business community make it the best choice for the new hospital. We welcome you with open arms.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Would love to see you come to Springfield ky. The old St Catherine site would be perfect for the V.A
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: L. Michael Gozia
Address: 7004 Apple Orchard Lane
City/Town: Crestwood
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40014
Email Address: mikendonnag@twc.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
The property has already been purchased and I, a disabled Vet live in Oldham Co. so I say build the new hospital at the I-264/Brownsboro area.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Jonathan Mann
Address: 209 Armory Hill
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: johnathanmann@bellsouth.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The Saint Catherine college campus would be a central location and a cost effective route for the VA hospital. It is a modern facility that with few modifications, could provide a great setting for healing our veterans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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To whom it may concern:

The Kentucky Resources Council, Inc. (Council), herewith incorporates by reference as if fully set forth below, the written comments of Grow Smart Louisville dated December 28, 2016, and those of the City of Crossgate and other cities submitted January 11, 2017, regarding the deficiencies in the DEIS.

It is apparent from both the words and actions of the VA that the VA has prejudged the matter of the location of the replacement hospital, and has framed the environmental documentation under NEPA so as to rationalize the choice of the Brownsboro Road site rather than to provide full and fair consideration of a range of reasonable alternatives.

40 CFR 1506.1 imposes limitations on actions by federal agencies in order to protect the integrity of the NEPA review process, including the obligation to take "no action concerning the proposal" "which would ...(2) Limit the choice of reasonable alternatives."

The VA has through acquisition of the Brownsboro Road site prior to completion of the site-specific Environmental Assessment and the subsequent Environmental Impact Statement, prejudiced a full and fair evaluation of alternatives; instead framing the scope, purpose and need, and analysis of impacts so as to provide post hoc justification for a decision rather than a fair consideration without bias, of alternatives.

The Council concurs that the process has become so tainted that the only remedy consistent with the policy and purposes of NEPA and the case law, is withdrawal of the proposed DEIS, revision of the agency NEPA regulations, and assignment of the development of an EIS to one of the cooperating agencies or to an independent consultant.

The recent statement attributed to VA Medical Director Martin Trexler further underscores that, notwithstanding NEPA, the agency is not seriously evaluating siting in an even-handed manner. According to a recent Courier-Journal article "VA to consider site for hospital," Mr. Trexler stated at a recent veterans' town hall meeting that "Today in the process the only question is are we or are we not going to build at Brownsboro Center[.]") "That is the only site being considered by the VA today."

It could not be more clear that the VA is simply "going through the motions," and is rationalizing rather than analyzing alternatives for the hospital siting. That Mr. Trexler's comment is not simply an outlier is confirmed by the comment from VA spokeswoman Judy Williams in an article appearing in today's Courier-Journal confirming that the VA remains focused on building the hospital at the Brownsboro Road site "until something changes. And we have had no indication of that."

For the reasons stated above and in the attached comments, the Council requests that the DEIS be withdrawn.

Cordially,

Tom FitzGerald
Director
Kentucky Resources Council, Inc.
P.O. Box 1070
Frankfort, Kentucky 40602
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
   Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
   I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Please consider moving your facility to the St. Catharine College campus near Springfield, KY. This facility is beautiful, peaceful, modernized and the veterans could benefit from this location. The location offers housing, dining, athletic facilities and a peaceful atmosphere. The community was hit hard with the closing of the campus and could also benefit from the move.
This community would be the perfect location for a VA hospital. We are a community that believes in family, caring and helping others in need and supporting your community in times of need. This hospital would provide the care that our veterans need and deserve vs traveling hours away to receive care. I have worked in healthcare for many years and quality care is most important and this community would provide that!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
*Respondent skipped this question*

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

---

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

My father was a veteran and when diagnosed with cancer, we traveled back and forth until he gave up and stop fighting. I would like to continue his fight for him by helping and if the hospital was closer(springfield). It's a beautiful, holy ground and would be a great site for a hospital and office. Newly building, hardly no construction needed!!! The family of John Key
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Lori Rawlings
Address: 304 Partridge Run Rd
City/Town: Shepherdsville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40165
Email Address: lrawlin@hotmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Retired NaThe Bullitt County site is a great place due to easy access and its central location to so many veterans. I feel like the Hardin county one is not central. I have to plan way ahead to go out of my way to Fort Knox to do my shopping. Please don't make me do it for my health care also.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Kimberly Morris  
Address: 280 Plenmar Dr  
City/Town: Shepherdsville  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 40165  
Email Address: morrisakimberly@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Bullitt County would be an excellent site for the new VA hospital. The location is very easy access off I 65. Why would you even consider turning down free land? The excess money could be used to help veterans even further.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: [Redacted]

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
Please consider Metro Louisville, as it would be the most accessible location to vets of all economic standing.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
Rhonda
Address
Riney
Address 2
228 Lakeview Dr
City/Town
Springfield
State/Province
KY
ZIP/Postal Code
40069
Email Address
riney david@bellsouth.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
As a resident in Springfield, KY, I am strongly in favor of a VA hospital at the current St. Catharine location.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)  
Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

Springfield wants you to make your new home here! Will never find a better place! We love what we have in our small town and take pride in the community and all that surrounds us! We hope we can support you in Springfield, KY soon!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name
City/Town
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I believe Bullitt County is the perfect spot for the new VA hospital. It is in a location that is easily accessible by the surrounding counties. Not to mention donated land. Many of the patients that would be able to use this facility may not have transportation to go all the way to Louisville for treatment.
**Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)**

- **Name**: Patricia Martin
- **Address**: 1811 Crossgate Lane
- **City/Town**: Louisville
- **State/Province**: KY
- **ZIP/Postal Code**: 40222
- **Email Address**: pmmarti@icloud.com

**Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:**

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

**Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):**

My father was a POW in WW II and my brother was a Vietnam marine. I am a RN working in a 400+ bed hospital in Louisville. Brownsboro Road is a terrible sight for the hospital. This site cannot manage the traffic. The proposed site is too small for the structure. Everyone in Louisville believes the selection of this sight is wrong.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):

Traffic is already a mess during rush hour in this area and the VA hospital will only complicate matters!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Karen King
Address: 385 Lakeland Drive
City/Town: Lebanon
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40033
Email Address: kjking@marioncountyky.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Central Kentucky - Springfield KY would be a perfect location for a New VA Hospital to provide service for so many Kentucky’s Veterans. I work in economic development in Marion County and a proud US Coast Guard Disable Veteran. I utilize 100% of my benefits from the VA, as does my husband. PLEASE CONSIDER THIS AMAZING LOCATION.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Collette Riley-Lyedian
Address: 1022 Polley Drive
City/Town: Bardstown
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40004
Email Address: collette1318@hotmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I heard a comment regarding movement of the VA hospital and a recommendation to rebuild at the St. Catherine College campus. The location is central in the state, a beautiful campus and will save tons of tax dollars to use a pretty existing group of buildings rather than build from the ground up else where. Thanks for taking the time to read my thoughts.
Collette Riley
# Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

**Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Chris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>9024 boston rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>40107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:buckwheat105@gmail.com">buckwheat105@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:**

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):**

Please use st catrines for va hospital
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Liz Robison
Address: 205 Louise Way
Address 2: #16
City/Town: My Wasington
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40047
Email Address: lizrobison3@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

We have so many areas of over crowding our roadways it would be beneficial to have the VA Hospital in the location in Bullitt County. Access in several directions including interstate. Please consider this location. Just look at the overcrowding and horrible access in the Louisville location. No possible way to improve on roadway. It only makes sense to aid the veterans in traveling to and from. Thank you.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province KY
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I think the Bullitt County site would be a wonderful opportunity for the VA facility and veterans traveling there for care. Being right off of I-65 is easy access and not a congested area like the Brownsboro area would be.
#450

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)

**Started:** Thursday, January 12, 2017 2:37:03 PM

**Last Modified:** Thursday, January 12, 2017 2:37:47 PM

**Time Spent:** 00:00:44

**IP Address:** 184.53.33.171
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**PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

**Q1:** Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

- Name
- Address
- City/Town
- State/Province
- ZIP/Postal Code
- Email Address

**Q2:** My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

---

**PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement**

**Q3:** Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

*Respondent skipped this question*
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Terry Hubbard
Address: 516 N. Walnut ST.
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: terrylryan1957@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via U.S. Mail at the address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

The property that is available would be Perfect for the new VA... They would be accepted greatly our community.
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Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name
Address
City/Town
State/Province
ZIP/Postal Code
Email Address

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Bullitt county would be the prime spot for the new VA hospital. It would be right between Louisville and Radcliffe. Right off the highway. Perfect spot.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Please take over the St. Catherine campus in Springfield KY as the new VA hospital.
PAGE 1: Comments for the Louisville VAMC Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Troy Thurman
Address: 7906 Trillium Dr
City/Town: Louisville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40258
Email Address: tandjthurman@aol.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

PAGE 2: Scoping Comments for the Louisville VAMC environmental impact statement

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accomodate your comments):
It is time to give the West End a chance. We need to give that community every opportunity we can. As a veteran and a resident of this city, I want to do my part to support those who need it most. The West End is closer to mine and many other veterans as opposed to the other considered locations. It is time to do the right thing for the right reason.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Amy Bailey
Address: 4312 zoneton rd
City/Town: Shepherdsville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40165
Email Address: amybailey@realtymp.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Seriously I've met no veterans who want hospital built at Brownsboro rd area. Being without Ft Knox hospital's great reduction No available care exists for real veterans who populate surrounding counties. Build it along I65 either in Bullitt County or Hardin county where veterans Home is located Build a care center at brownsboro.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Sherri Osbourne
Address: 111 Armory Hill
City/Town: Springfield
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40069
Email Address: sherri5440@yahoo.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I think that the St. Catharine College campus would be an ideal location for the new VA Hospital. Springfield is centrally located for everyone to be able to obtain services. I also think that the use of the buildings that are already available would save millions of dollars. The City of Springfield I think would be very advantageous to all concerned. I have two sons that are veterans and many family members who are veterans and this would be the ideal site for all to come to.

Not only is Springfield centrally located, it is very easily accessible. Please give this location your utmost consideration. Thank you.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)
Name: Tim Hogg
Address: 928 Alpar Lane
City/Town: Shepherdsville
State/Province: KY
ZIP/Postal Code: 40165
Email Address: hoggt@live.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):
I truly feel the Bullitt co. Location for the new VA hospital is the perfect location easy access for all surrounding areas right off I 65 without the hassle of driving through the downtown traffic. And close for our Jefferson co. Residents to access as well. Bullitt co. Is a very patriotic county with a lot of hospitality and we would love to give back to our veterans that have made there sacrifices for our freedom. So let's join together and give our vets a wonderful place to receive there healthcare.
Thanks, Tim Hogg RN.
Please consider Bullitt County's offer of free land for the VA if things don't work out well with the current Louisville site. It is only around 30 minutes away and right off the 65, which will make it very accessible. Bullitt County is growing and would be a great place for a VA hospital. The residents of Bullitt County love our Veterans! I'm even a veteran myself and so is my husband. Thank you for your time.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Respondent skipped this question

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

I wish to provide my comments anonymously. Do not add me to the mailing list.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

Please consider the offer from Bullitt County for the free land for the VA Hospital. To consider 'buying' land somewhere else is a waste of money. Think like a business, not the government.
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Vicki Chandler  
Address: Po box 88  
Address 2: 1285 Happy hollow rd  
City/Town: Clermont  
State/Province: KY  
ZIP/Postal Code: 40120  
Email Address: vicpooh2@gmail.com

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:  
Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.
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Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

I think this is a great idea we need more help for our veterans and will bring more jobs to the Shepherd area count me in!
Q1: Please enter your name and contact information if you wish to be added to our mailing list (Optional)

Name: Suzanne N. Watkins
Address: 1167 Peaceful Way
City/Town: Shepherdsville
ZIP/Postal Code: 40165
Email Address: suzywatkins@remax.net

Q2: My mailing list and contact preference is:

Please contact me via email at the email address I entered above.

Q3: Please enter your comments here (This field will expand as you type to accommodate your comments):

BullittCo property has easy access and centrally located to accommodate the needs of our veterans. Please consider this location.