

Subject: Western Wake Partners EIS

From: Mimi Kelly <icedancr@mindspring.com>

Date: Thu, 04 Feb 2010 18:11:53 -0500

To: 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, parrish.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. The plans to locate this facility near the center of the unincorporated town of New Hill concerns me because:

Section 4, Environmental Consequences, Lines 230 - 233 state:

"Monitoring may also include a series of permanent and/or portable flow meters installed throughout the system in order to perform a flow balance."

How can one comment on the FEIS when the method of monitoring has not been decided?

The WWP and their consultants have been targeting the site in New Hill since the early 2000s, and they have had ample time to develop a monitoring system.

This is an example of poor workmanship with the FEIS, and is yet another reason the Final EIS should be rejected, and a different set of consultants utilized - ones that are not prejudiced towards using Site 14.

Sincerely,

Mildred Kelly

3020 Olive Farm Road

Apex, NC 27502