

Subject: Western Wake Partners EIS

From: Bob Kelly <bobkelly@mindspring.com>

Date: Thu, 04 Feb 2010 17:05:21 -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. Some of the reasons given by the USACE in response to citizen concerns are troubling, and give the impression the USACE is not performing their duties. For example:

Reference Appendix A Public Involvement: App_A12d_CommentResponses.pdf

"Response I.5: Consultants working as third-party contractors for USACE were required to sign a conflict of interest disclosure statement prior to beginning the NEPA process, stating that they have no direct or indirect financial interest in the planning, design, construction, or operation of the WWRWMF project, except with regard to preparing the EIS for USACE. The consultants also had to make full disclosure of the scope and extent of the firm's and its subcontractors' prior to involvement in the project."

It is inconceivable that it did not occur to anyone at USACE that the same consultants who had worked on this project for years; who participated in the original site selection; and participated in preparing the SEPA Draft EIS (which was described by the hearing officers as inaccurate, incomplete, and inadequate) would not have a conflict of interest if they continued working on the project.

While the consultants may not have a direct financial interest in the project, they definitely have an interest in ensuring their reputation and the reputation of their employer is protected.

Irrespective of the errors made by the consultants and Partners, once the consultants and Partners chose Site 14, it would be detrimental to the consultant's career if they suddenly admitted they made a mistake, and now supported another site.

USACE's decision to utilize highly prejudiced consultants is a dereliction of duty and ensures a comprehensive, impartial review could not be performed.

The Final EIS should be rejected, and the site selection process begun again, only this time, the residents of New Hill should be treated as equals when it comes to making decisions on where to locate the sewage plant.

Governments refusing to listen to citizen input lead voters to take action, much like the action that was taken in the recent senatorial election in Massachusetts.

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