From:	Thomas.Smith@dot.gov
To:	Shawn Garvin/R3/USEPA/US@EPA; Steven.t.mcgugan@usace.army.mil; Gloria.Shepherd@dot.gov
Cc:	Ginger.Mullins@usace.army.mil; John Pomponio/R3/USEPA/US@EPA; Jeffrey Lapp/R3/USEPA/US@EPA; Mark Ferrell/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject:	RE: Buffalo Mtn.-King Coal Alternatives Development Mtg.
Date:	02/07/2013 02:29 PM

This will be Jason Workman for the WV Division of FHWA. He has a room in Charleston reserved and waiting responses to have such a meeting on Feb 14th. He has already received positive responses from all involved parties except EPA stating that they are available.

We understand that there may be a need to also include WVDEP because of their regulatory role in the development of the project.

Thanks
Tom Smith

Sent with Good (www.good.com)

-----Original Message-----
From: Garvin.Shawn@epamail.epa.gov [Garvin.Shawn@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 02:05 PM Eastern Standard Time
To: Steven.t.mcgugan@usace.army.mil; Shepherd, Gloria (FHWA)
Cc: Ginger.Mullins@usace.army.mil; Smith, Thomas (FHWA); Pomponio.John@epamail.epa.gov; Lapp.Jeffrey@epamail.epa.gov; Ferrell.Mark@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Buffalo Mtn.-King Coal Alternatives Development Mtg.

EPA recently received an evaluation of what may be practicable and less damaging alternatives to the currently proposed mine and highway designs for the Buffalo Mountain Surface Mine - King Coal Highway. EPA made a preliminary presentation of this information to the COE and FHWA in December 2012. After reviewing the presentation, all parties felt that it would be beneficial to have a follow-up technical meeting to better understand the alternatives analysis.

In addition, in January 2012, I had the pleasure of meeting Col. McGugan in Pittsburgh where we briefly discussed EPA's conceptual alternatives and the need for our technical staffs to meet further on this issue

I am writing today to propose that a meeting between the COE, FHWA, EPA, Consul and WVDOH be held in the next several weeks. As I discussed with Col. McGugan, this should be a working meeting, with the appropriate technical staff (we do not need to personally meet at this stage) and an agenda that assures adequate presentation and consideration of design details and alternatives.

The outcome of the meeting can be shared with broader stakeholders, but we believe that the review of the alternative at this time should be centered on the agencies and

applicant who are involved with the development of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. We all want to help assure that the environmental study and assessment of alternatives are well-considered. To help facilitate a productive and efficient meeting, attached, please find a proposed draft agenda that outlines issues to be addressed at the meeting.

I would appreciate if you could identify a contact with whom my staff can coordinate to plan the meeting. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or wish to discuss this issue further.

Thank you – Shawn

Shawn M. Garvin
Regional Administrator
EPA Region III