

Subject: Western Wake Partners EIS

From: Bob Kelly <bobkelly@mindspring.com>

Date: Thu, 04 Feb 2010 17:02:51 -0500

To: "Wicker, Henry M JR SAW" <Henry.M.Wicker.JR@usace.army.mil>

CC: commissioners@co.wake.nc.us, council@townofcary.org, allcouncil@apexnc.org, dick.sears@hollyspringsnc.us, james.cobb@hollyspringsnc.us, tim.sack@hollyspringsnc.us, chet.vanfossen@hollyspringsnc.us, linda.hunt.williams@hollyspringsnc.us, parish.womble@hollyspringsnc.us, jholcombe@townofmorrisville.org, pmartin@townofmorrisville.org, llyons@townofmorrisville.org, sdiehl@townofmorrisville.org, ljohnson@townofmorrisville.org, mbroadwell@townofmorrisville.org, tmurry@townofmorrisville.org, rlk <rlk@mindspring.com>

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wilmington District
Regulatory Division
Attn: File Number 2005-20159
69 Darlington Avenue
Wilmington, NC 28403



Email address: Henry.M.Wicker.Jr@usace.army.mil

Dear Mr. Wicker,

I am writing in reference to the Western Wake Regional Waste Water Treatment Facility.

I have heard a few arguments expressed by WWP personnel and a few Town Council members that claim choosing a site other than Site 14 will increase the cost of the proposed sewage plant. Apparently these individuals are willing and able to overlook the errors made during site selection in order to supposedly save their town a few dollars; and apparently they can disregard the injustices being imposed on the New Hill minority community who will be impacted by the sewage plant.

There is insufficient data presented in the FEIS to challenge the costs shown in Table 2.7 of Section 2. Nevertheless, when the costs are analyzed, one finds there is very little difference in the cost of each project alternative.

Specifically the increase in cost compared to Site 14 is:

	Present-Worth Costs	Percent Increase
Site 14	\$520,118,000	
Site 19	\$541,426,000	4.1%
Site 21/23	\$535,098,000	3.1%
Site 30	\$526,018,000	1.1%

I find it very interesting that previous studies (Reference TM 05) ranked the original 12 sites according to the suitability of the site for a sewage plant. Cost was one of the items used for ranking. Site 14 was ranked 4th or 5th depending on the version of TM 05 one references.

The sites with the most favorable score, and presumably the lowest costs, were skipped over in order to choose Site 14.

Since sites that cost less than Site 14 were skipped over, it is inconceivable how the Partners can now state other sites will not be used because they will

cost more.

The FEIS needs to be rejected and the site selection process begun again, only this time, New Hill residents need to be included in the site selection, and we need a different set of consultants working with USACE to choose a site.

Sincerely,
Bob Kelly
3020 Olive Farm Road
Apex, NC 27502