

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Mon 1/23/2023 8:46 PM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@lewesbpw.com>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Scott Sipprelle

Address

412 Bay Ave

Optional

Lewes, DE 19958

United States

[Map It](#)

Email

ssipprelle@gmail.com

Phone

(917) 691-7216

Comments

After reviewing the options, I greatly prefer Option 3B. The location of the current WWTF is simply wrong. Do not throw good money after bad by investing in a location that will continue to be stressed by flooding and climate concerns. Further, as the area surrounding Lewes continues to see overdevelopment, there will be additional volumes seeking treatment at this facility. Find the right place for a WWTF that will last 50 years, don't put band-aids on a crippled facility.

3B is practical and economic. Let's go with that.

Thank you for soliciting community input.

Scott Sipprelle

Fw: New submission from Contact Form

Kristina Keller <KKeller@LewesBPWDE.gov>

Tue 1/24/2023 8:11 AM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@lewesbpw.com>

[INTERNAL EMAIL]

From: production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Sent: Monday, January 23, 2023 7:57 PM

To: Kristina Keller <KKeller@LewesBPW.com>

Subject: New submission from Contact Form

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Peggy Louie

Email

mlouie2538@aol.com

Message

I found the WWTF planning workshop useful and I thank you for the work that went into preparing the report. Will any of the options allow BPW to reduce rates to customers? The current rate of \$107.94 PER MONTH seems outrageous. I moved to Lewes in August 2022 from New Castle County. In New Castle County, our rate FOR THE YEAR was a little over \$300 (significantly less than the Sussex County rate). In New Castle County, our bill was based on usage per 1,000 gallons. Yet in Sussex, it apparently is a flat rate charged to all customers. Can you change your rate structure going forward and lower the rates?

Sincerely,

Peggy Louie

P.S. I like the option that "Barbara" suggested about looking into alternatives such as Nouriva; that one sounded intriguing.

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Tue 1/24/2023 9:31 AM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@lewesbpw.com>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Joseph Pika

Address

17 Surf Ave
Lewes, Delaware 19958
United States

[Map It](#)

Email

jpika@udel.edu

Phone

(302) 723-6426

Comments

I watched with great interest the presentation on January 23. I had previously skimmed the longer report. The schematics used during the presentation were very helpful.

I'm writing to oppose Option 2C in the strongest terms possible. Given the array of alternatives of comparable or even lesser expense that utilize existing outfall options, I find it totally unacceptable to discharge treated waste water into the ocean or into the inland bay, another option that was discussed. Any disturbance to the dunes in Cape Henlopen State Park would constitute a violation of Delaware's longstanding commitment to preserve an area gifted to Lewes and Sussex County 340 years ago. That would amount to environmental sacrilege, in my view.

Thus, I am totally opposed to employing an outfall in either the ocean or the Inland Bays. Land irrigation or continued use of the canal outfall timed to coincide with the outgoing tides are clearly preferable.

Among the options, I found those under #3 most desirable. Partnering with the county is the most responsible path forward. Land irrigation strikes me as preferable to using the canal outfall, but if that proves impossible, then tidal discharge (relying on the holding tanks at the treatment facility) is the next most acceptable option.

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Tue 1/24/2023 2:44 PM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@lewesbpw.com>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Mark Prouty

Address

35998 Tarpon Dr
LEWES, Delaware 19958

[Map It](#)

Preferred Option

Option 1: Hardening the existing WWTF

Comments

Comments regarding WWTP options to protect against sea level rise and storms:

1. The report adds subsidence value of 0.26 feet to the needed protective elevation for appurtenances. This amount does not modify the high water elevation by which design should be based. The correct elevation for the design 2050 flood should be 9.13 ft. and the critical equipment elevation should be 12.13 ft.
2. The report does not provide information on the cost of financing and what the debt service means to individual properties connected to the proposed facilities. A discussion of the financing and expected costs for each EDU to retire the debt and to pay for the O&M costs would be beneficial. A reflection of any grants in aid could be addressed in this discussion. Also, the cost associated with operations of a County alternative should be added to the discussion so system users could evaluate what the yearly cost to each homeowner might be for each alternative.
3. An option for hardening the plant without using berms should be investigated. For instance, Sequencing Batch Reactors with effluent equalization and disc filters can be used to meet effluent requirements. Reusing some tankage with corrected wall height

could be used for sludge digestion. Top surfaces of tanks could be used as platforms for sludge dewatering and effluent filtration.

4. There was no discussion of hardening the collection system. Costs for modifying pump stations was not included. It is important to note that all scenarios will fail if flood waters are allowed to reach the toilets and shower drains in the older, low-lying homes of the collection systems. The salt water that will drain into the collection system will cause the pump stations to operate continuously and the microbes that treat the wastewater will be killed by the highly saline influent. All the money spent to modify and/or harden the facilities will be for naught if the seawater is allowed into the collection system. This is the case for all alternatives.

5. While I understand the desire to utilize stream as an alternative for Sussex County, by doing so we are missing an opportunity to contribute, in a small way, to the battle against sea level rise. By staying with a corrected spray irrigation plan we could assist in fighting land subsidence through the replenishment of the groundwater. Also, by utilizing solid set sprinklers, rather than center pivots irrigators, a forest could be planted over the spray fields. (Trees can take up a substantial amount of CO₂). There are similar systems in the region that have the trees managed by a pulp and paper industry for selective culling (Berlin, Maryland). The solid set sprinklers also are a benefit to the operators of the spray site because equipment maintenance is lessened and irrigation can take place very easily during some of the warm days that happen in the winter (center pivot systems are often shut down for the winter and cannot easily be restarted on short notice). In concert with a nutrient removal process, such as at Sussex County's other spray site, effluent could safely discharged in a manner that would be more environmentally sound.

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Thu 1/26/2023 1:55 PM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Leslie and Bill Newman and Wolff

Address

5 LEWES AVE
Lewes, DE 19958
United States

[Map It](#)

Email

lesliejkn626@gmail.com

Phone

(130) 254-0244

Preferred Option

Option 3a: Partnership with Sussex County & Utilization of Existing WWTF Outfall

Comments

We actually don't have strong feelings between choices 3A and 3B. We leave that up to you.

We believe that keeping our current plant (choice 1) is not an option and going it alone is not a good financial choice.

Listening to the comments on Monday night, it is clear to us that there is concern about partnering with the County particularly around trust. Lewes has set up a good system with BPW as a separate board from city council. Those on BPW have skills and talents that are not necessarily found within the city council. We are lucky to have this.

Does Sussex County have such a committee or board or is staff reporting to the council,

which is obviously political in nature????? Sussex County seems to have highly qualified staff but that is different than a governing board. Is it possible to negotiate with the County to develop a group that is parallel in decision making and knowledge to our LBPW?? I think that would create some balance and possible confidence taking it out of the political realm and into the data/facts world.

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Mon 1/30/2023 2:20 PM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Judith English

Address

420 Kings Hwy
Lewes, DE 19958

[Map It](#)

Email

judithenglish007@gmail.com

Phone

(914) 439-7955

Comments

Will BPW have any control over the effluent produced by Options 3a and 3b? Will they test it regularly to ensure that it is within acceptable limits? If it does not remain within acceptable limits what actions can they take and how quickly will they be addressed?

If Option 3a or 3b is chosen, and the current facility demolished, what will that land be used for?

Please explain what the Canal Modeling and Hydrogeological Evaluations entail, what are they for, and how quickly they can be completed?

If Option 3b is chosen is Lewes responsible for providing the wetland site to be sprayed with effluent or could it be nearer the Sussex County WWTF? If the effluent is sprayed, rather than dumped in the canal, does it have any nutritional value for agriculture, or is it harmful to agriculture?

My choice would be for options 3a or 3b as the proposal to make the existing WWTF floodproof is naive, and options 2 are all too expensive.

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Tue 1/31/2023 3:05 PM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Don Thompson

Address

1 CH Mason Way
Lewes, Delaware 19958
United States

[Map It](#)

Email

donthompson@live.com

Phone

(610) 350-9690

Comments

History has shown us that Sussex County's record on Land Planning is abysmal. They obviously have no concern for the negative effects of their lack of planning on the City of Lewes.

Having said that, I am not sure there is a direct correlation between the County's inept planning and its ability to be a decent partner in wastewater management. From what I could see from the public presentation, the advantages of partnering with the County are substantial. I therefore recommend partnering up with them but would find that option even more attractive if there was a different discharge other than the Lewes Rehoboth Canal. That may be the cheapest option, but I am concerned that any mishap in the future would double or triple the discharge from what we've experienced in the past.

Thanks for taking the time to entertain public comment.

Don Thompson

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Wed 2/1/2023 8:17 AM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Bonnie Osler

Address

901 Savannah Road

Lewes, DE 19958

United States

[Map It](#)

Email

bonnieosler@gmail.com

Phone

(202) 577-3962

Comments

Thank you for arranging for the Lewes Board of Public Works' (BPW) contractor to make its January 21, 2023 powerpoint presentation on the future of processing Lewes and Sussex County residents' sewage. The presentation was well-organized. Unfortunately, it raised troubling questions about BPW's preparation for its future needs, its proposed alliance with Sussex County, and water quality in Lewes's canal.

First and foremost:

- How did BPW get itself into a sewage processing situation so dire that BPW President Tom Panetta declared that "the status quo is not viable"?
- Why didn't BPW plan ahead for the relocation of its processing facility before land in our area became so expensive that purchasing a new site would be financially disastrous?
- Since sea level rise has been an obvious issue for decades, why didn't BPW "harden" the current sewage facility when it made effluent quality upgrades to stave off EPA penalties?
- For years, BPW members repeatedly have assured ratepayers that the current facility

was and is “state of the art.” How did the facility go from “state of the art” to “the status quo is not viable”?

Turning to the contractor’s powerpoint, BPW presented to its bewildered ratepayers with six unpleasant choices for the future of sewage processing. In fact, however, all three supposed paths under option 2 are illusory due to their astronomical projected costs. As to option 3(b), it is highly unlikely that an outfall for sewage into the Inland Bays would be allowed, and there was no indication during the presentation that such permission had been or could be obtained. So, option 3(b) also appears not to be viable.

Accordingly, the only viable choices are option one, harden the current facility, or option 3(a), buddy up with the County so the County can use process BPW ratepayers’ waste and use BPW’s outfall into Lewes’s canal for both BPW and County treated sewage. Neither choice is attractive: hardening the current facility is a poor investment for an asset that BPW chose to locate in the flood plain. Aligning with the County means loss of local control and, even worse, doubling the amount and reducing the quality of treated effluent in our canal.

What BPW’s presentation laid bare is BPW has put itself in a helpless corner and the County needs a place to send its ever-increasing volume of effluent. The County first sought to combine its flow with that of Rehoboth and send the whole mess out through Rehoboth’s ocean outfall. Rehoboth understandably refused. BPW, however, faced with no real alternative, is willing to have the millions more gallons of the County’s sewage dumped in Lewes’s canal. And, of course, providing an outfall for the County simply enables the County’s ravenous rate of housing and other development.

BPW apparently will have no control over the quality of the effluent coursing through our canal. BPW’s contractor made clear that the County will own and operate the sewage processing facility – BPW simply pays half of whatever the County declares its maintenance and operating costs to be. While the presentation stated that the County’s effluent will comply with BPW’s permitted concentrations of undesirable chemicals, that simply states the obvious since those limits can’t legally be exceeded. Unfortunately, BPW provided no information at its presentation about the environmental impact of option 3(a). In fact, the BPW consultant stated that although water quality is “critical,” water quality issues haven’t even been “modelled.”

Finally, if the only viable option is to transfer sewage processing to the County, it is inefficient and costly to keep have both BPW and the County involved. The sewer service indisputably belongs to the City of Lewes. Perhaps it is time for the City to simply sell the

service to the County or a suitable utility company. Since no information has been provided on this option, however, it is difficult to assess at this juncture.

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Wed 2/1/2023 10:40 AM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Thierry Poirey

Address

19 Harborview Road
Lewes, Delaware 19958
United States

[Map It](#)

Email

tporey@yahoo.com

Comments

I support partnership with Sussex County on the following conditions:

- Sussex County will always pay no less than than 50% of total operating costs (including effluents spreading and/or disposal) for the the new Sussex County WTF and the residual Lewes facility, and BPW will never pay more than 50% of these same total operating costs, even if Sussex county does not submit enough waste to represent 50% of all waste processed at the new SCWTF and/or 50% of effluents piped to the new Lewes effluent transfer station.
- effluents submitted by Sussex County to the new Lewes effluent transfer station will be of a purity/quality no less than that of effluents currently released into the canal by the Lewes processing plant.
- Sussex County will hold BPW and the City of Lewes harmless for any costs, environmental damages and other financial consequences due accidental discharges and/or environmental damages (including consequential damages) at the Sussex County WTF. BPW will hold Sussex County harmless for similar events at the new Lewes effluent transfer station.
- BPW will reduce the footprint of its existing treatment facility to what is needed to accommodate the nominal quantity of effluents to be discharged locally (as per feasibility

study). BPW will clean up the lands freed up after reduction of the Lewes facility's footprint and either sell these lands on the marketplace or transfer them at no cost to the City of Lewes for general use.

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Thu 2/2/2023 10:19 PM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Barbara Curtis

Address

17 Shipcarpenter Sq

Lewes, DE 19958

United States

[Map It](#)

Email

Barbaracurtis65@gmail.com

Phone

(302) 644-4219

Comments

While the fiscally responsible decision would be to select Option 3, I have three major concerns:

First, that the impact on the canal and adjacent wetlands, Roosevelt Inlet area and the nearby shores of the Delaware Bay have not been evaluated. This should be done before a decision is made, looking at maximum flow and worst-case effluent quality. (If option 3B could be assured, such a study would not be necessary - but approval for discharge to a constructed wetland cannot be guaranteed.) A living shoreline project is underway in the canal near Lewes: how will this be affected? What will happen during Nor'easters when the canal floods? Might the decision be deferred until a study is completed?

Second, that Lewes would be an unequal partner with Sussex County both in planning (including negotiating an agreement) and in implementation going forward. If Sussex decides to increase discharges above volumes and below quality levels agreed, will Lewes

have any say? Might we be given at least a seat on their Engineering or Environmental Services department boards (i.e., the BPW equivalent)? If our shorelines are degraded and marine flora and fauna affected, who will bear responsibility to make things right? The Sussex County coffers are orders of magnitude greater than those of Lewes; we would be at a significant disadvantage should we wind up in litigation with the county. Why did Rehoboth Beach turn down the county's request to use their outfall? Will this option enable further irresponsible development in the areas around Lewes? I trust the Lewes BPW; not so the Sussex County politicians.

Third, the disposition of the current WWTF site. Knowing that the site will flood in the future (and American Legion Road sooner), safeguards against future residential or commercial development are needed. If it could become dedicated open space following site decommissioning and cleanup, that would somewhat assuage residents' concerns -- if announced at the same time as the option selection. Better yet, if the City and BPW were to declare the site would remain open space unless it could support a solar farm, a windmill (or three?) and/or an energy storage option, then we could be proud of taking positive steps toward controlling part of our infrastructure's future.

If the above concerns cannot be addressed, I would support a scaled-back Option 1 -- to maintain operation of the existing WWTF for up to 10 years -- while other options are evaluated.

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Fri 2/3/2023 10:02 AM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Anne Colligan

Address

15 Harborview Road

Lewes, DE 19958

United States

[Map It](#)

Email

ajaccp79@gmail.com

Phone

(202) 763-5193

Comments

As a Lewes resident, I would like to know if the stench that regularly comes from the expansive wetlands around the plant will be addressed if the plant remains where it is. I think this is an important issue and I wish to raise it at this time. I will also add that just the other day when I was at the corner of Gills Neck & Savannah, the stench was apparent. I believe it originates from Pump Sta #4 which is located adjacent to that intersection. Thank you.

Anne Colligan

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Fri 2/3/2023 2:08 PM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Christine Besche

Address

500 Dupont Avenue
Lewes, Delaware 19958
United States

[Map It](#)

Email

cbgardens@comcast.net

Phone

(410) 409-8217

Comments

I attended the Jan 23 workshop and found it be very informative. I am not in favor of Concept development option 2c, 3a or 3b. I do not agree with any ocean outfall running through Cape Henlopen State Park and I would assume there would be some strong opposition to this concept. I also do not trust any plans to work with the County.

Thank you for allowing for public comment.

Christine Besche

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Sat 2/4/2023 7:45 AM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Gavin Braithwaite

Address

2221 Kings Drive
Lewes, Delaware 19958

[Map It](#)

Email

sparkyncleo@verizon.net

Phone

(302) 645-1539

Comments

Based on all the reasoning I have read and heard publicized, I believe strongly that the "Sussex County" option would be the best way forward for Lewes.

I have no new facts to add to what's already out there.

BPW: Thanks for all you are doing to address this complex strategic decision!

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Sat 2/4/2023 5:46 PM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Jeff Zeller

Address

208 E Market Street

Lewes, De 19958

[Map It](#)

Email

jeffzell61@gmail.com

Phone

(267) 243-1659

Comments

Option 3 to send waste-water to Sussex County Wolf Neck facility sounds like the right choice. In the future, a newer more resilient plant can then be built. Must move out of low lying area.

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Sat 2/4/2023 5:59 PM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Jeff Zeller

Address

208 E Market St

Lewe, De 19958

United States

[Map It](#)

Email

jeffzell61@gmail.com

Phone

(267) 243-1659

Comments

Option 3 sounds like the best option. Send waste-water to Wolfe Neck facility until a new plant at another location can be built. Original wetland site should be preserved for wildlife and trails created for recreation. Adjacent land to Cape Henlopen is not a good area for a wind turbines due to wildlife. Solar panels should be creatively used and let's stay away from solar panel farm layout.

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Sun 2/5/2023 10:29 AM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Jeff Zeller

Address

208 E Market St

Lewe, De 19958

United States

[Map It](#)

Email

jeffzell61@gmail.com

Phone

(267) 243-1659

Comments

Option 3 sounds like the best option. Send waste-water to Wolfe Neck facility until a new plant at another location can be built. Original wetland site should be preserved for wildlife and trails created for recreation. Adjacent land to Cape Henlopen is not a good area for a wind turbines due to wildlife. Solar panels should be creatively used and let's stay away from solar panel farm layout.

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Sun 2/5/2023 6:26 PM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Daphne Fuentevilla

Address

32 Harborview Road

Lewes, DE 19958

United States

[Map It](#)

Email

jnk@cerus.us

Phone

(301) 466-5544

Comments

BPW Board,

Thank you for the professional presentation of the six options for long-range planning of the wastewater treatment facility currently operating in the low marsh lands off American Legion Road in Lewes, DE. I'm concerned that the decisions to be made include not just the quantitative assessment of cost and sufficiency to minimum requirements, as was presented in the recent community meeting, but other considerations consequential to the Lewes community. In particular, qualitative assessments of continued autonomous decision making and cleaner-than-required wastewater effluent to our canals and beaches were not clearly captured in the BPW assessment.

The BPW analysis strongly favors two options that cede wastewater treatment to Sussex County, servicing Lewes through BPW. One limiting assumption strongly supporting the Sussex County advantage is the exclusion of capital costs for Sussex County operation.

Although BPW will not bear these capital costs, it is unreasonable to think that residents and homeowners of Lewes will not pay their share one way or another. Including \$100-\$200 million of construction costs for required Sussex County facilities would level the evaluation of all options and reduce the apparent advantage of Sussex County operation.

Another limiting assumption of the BPW analysis is that the future Lewes wastewater treatment quality standard will meet the requirements of an existing NPDES permit issued by EPA under the Clean Water Act. Currently, Lewes treats its wastewater to a significantly cleaner level than the minimum standards of the existing NPDES permit, while BPW's engineering projections assume effluent quality degrading to the required NPDES minimums. Missing from BPW's analysis is a clear determination of what Lewes wastewater quality standards should be to meet the future needs of the Lewes community. These needs will be shaped by a changing environment and by rapid development in and around Lewes.

The BPW analysis also assumes future waste water capacity requirements and flood risks based on a variety of current projections. These kinds of assumptions are entirely reasonable from an engineering point of view. But the Lewes community may want to consider what will happen when reality confounds current expectations and projections turn out to be wrong. Which options provide Lewes the best protection then? The currently favored options for Sussex County operation may turn out best, after all, but a clear determination recommends itself.

After all, the existing BPW waste treatment facility dates from 2008 and BPW rate payers are still paying off the bonds for its construction. Rising flood risk has exceeded expectations in this very short time. How much additional resiliency should the new facilities include? None of us have a crystal ball. But BPW should clearly describe the level of resiliency it is planning and solicit community input.

BPW should be commended for acting timely and responsibly to address the clear and present risks that increased flooding represents to the existing Lewes waste water treatment plant. A broader range of community interests should inform decisions about what to do next.

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Sun 2/5/2023 7:47 PM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Martin Yerick

Address

140 Kings Hwy
Lewes, DE 19958
United States

[Map It](#)

Email

lewesmartin@hotmail.com

Comments

I write in support of the option to harden the wastewater treatment plant in its current location. Like many others who have commented on the options, I am concerned with the concept of connecting into the wastewater treatment services provided by the County. Sussex County is much larger than the City of Lewes, and its interests generally do not seem to be in line with those of the City. I am concerned that at some point the County could and would ignore the City's views on where and how to dispose of the treated water and waste products that need to be disposed of, all to the City's detriment. If hardening the plant can get us to 2050 at a reasonable cost, that seems like the best option. Significant physical change to the area is expected in the next 27 years, and I think it is likely that new, better methods of treating wastewater will be developed. We do not know the impact climate change will have on the City, and because of that, in my option, the significant cost of constructing a new plant is not warranted at this time. We could do that, only to find out 20 years from now that it was for naught. I recommend that we move forward on the hardening option, and start (continue?) saving money in a capital account for any future construction that may become necessary.

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Sun 2/5/2023 9:31 PM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Robert Kennedy

Address

123 Henlopen Shores Circle
Lewes, DE 19958

[Map It](#)

Email

henlopen123@comcast.net

Comments

President and members of the Board of Public Works,

I have attended previous workshops on this matter including the most recent public comment session on January 23 via YouTube.

After listening to the representatives from GHD present their report and answer questions from members of the public, I am still of the opinion that it is in the BPW and its customers' best long term interest to enter into a partnership agreement with Sussex County to construct and operate a joint waste water treatment facility.

I believe that Option 3-a or 3-b are the best options for the following reasons:

- They are the lowest cost option for BPW ratepayers.
- They relocate the WWTP out of the 100 year flood plain and minimize the threat of sea level rise and climate change to WWTP operations for the foreseeable future.
- They don't require the purchase of increasingly limited and expensive land for a new, stand alone, WWTP and related disposal area.
- They provide for trained, local County employees to operate the plant instead of using non-Delaware contract employees.

County employees should be able to operate the plant more efficiently and at less cost than using out-of-state contractual employees,

County employees should be a more stable work force with less turnover giving operators greater knowledge of and experience with plant operations,

County employees should provide for quicker, in-depth responses to any emergencies than contractual workers who do not reside in Sussex County.

- They eliminate past criticisms of having the WWTP remain at its current location on the marsh (Option 1) such as:

WWTP is a form of "visual pollution" on the marsh,

WWTP poses a continued threat for future releases of untreated or partially treated effluent into the marsh,

WWTP at times emits disagreeable odors,

WWTP cannot be accessed during flood events that cover Savannah Road and American Legion Road with water,

Eliminates having to remove a "hardened" WWTP (obtained at considerable expense) and build a new one, at even greater cost, in the future due to unanticipated and unforeseen changes in sea level rise or climate change.

During the public comment session, several members of the public expressed concerns over the wisdom of a joint BPW/Sussex County partnership. I do not believe that the concerns expressed are sufficient to have the BPW reject the potential benefits that the partnership affords the BPW and its customers.

Concerns expressed included:

1. That option 3-a & 3-b increases growth in the county.

Growth in the County is a function of County zoning decisions.

Once land is zoned or rezoned it then becomes the utility's (government or investor owned) responsibility to provide utility services based on permitted uses within the zoning classification.

BPW has no responsibility to provide sewer service in Sussex County unless BPW seeks and is granted permission by either the Delaware Public Service Commission or Sussex County to do so.

Regardless of future growth, in Sussex County, it will be the County's responsibility to provide sewer services to meet current and future demand within the County and not the BPW's responsibility.

2. That growth in the County will increase the cost to BPW and its customers.

Officials for both the County and BPW have stated that the formula for determining the cost of jointly sharing the operation of a new County/BPW treatment facility would be based on the % of untreated influent delivered by each to the total cost to operate the treatment facility. As stated at the public meeting, the plant will be sized based on capacity to serve the BPW service area and a limited, defined area of Sussex County. The design capacity of the facility being based on defined service areas will prevent an increasing % of cost being shifted to BPW and its customers due to increased growth elsewhere in the County. This understanding should be memorialized as a part of any written WWTP agreement between the BPW and Sussex County.

3. Environmental impact of discharging either into the Lewes-Rehoboth Canal or Constructed Wetland.

Option 3-a proposes that treated effluent be discharged into the Lewes-Rehoboth Canal on an outgoing tide while not exceeding the limits established in the current BPW discharge permit.

If Option 3-a is selected, DNREC should be asked to confirm the appropriateness of maintaining current discharge permit limits or establish new limits in light of the additional volume of treated effluent that would be entering the Canal.

Option 3-b would be my preferred discharge method, assuming DNREC would allow it, since it puts treated discharge in or on a section of marsh across from the County treatment plant and would not empty directly into the Canal.

4. Explore obtaining waste water treatment services from other utilities.

I don't think that this would be productive use of time or resources as any other waste water utility would face the same issues and costs as discussed in Option 2 plus they would impose an additional cost on the BPW and its customers in order to collect a return (profit) on their investment.

In addition to the cost for another utility to acquire the land and build the infrastructure, BPW would become a customer of another utility and neither the BPW or its customers would have any control over the operation or the expense associated with the waste water treatment service being provided.

For these reasons I recommend that you select Option 3-a or 3-b as the best long term

solution to the threat posed by sea level rise and climate change to BPW waste water treatment operations.

Please include my comments as a part of this record and consider them before any decisions are made.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J. Kennedy, III

February 3, 2023
Lewes Board of Public Works
City of Lewes

Dear BPW and City Leaders,

After watching the BPW's consultant's detailed presentation online, reading the newspaper articles, and speaking with many BPW customers, I still don't know enough to say which option, if any, is the best option for strengthening the Lewes sewer plant.

Here are some thoughts to consider:

1. Solving this situation needs more publicity and time. Put a written explanation in the mail with our bills. Have public workshops when more folks are in town. Have members of BPW discuss it with members of homeowners' associations and neighborhood groups.
2. In order to have public confidence and consensus in the sewer decision it is important that ratepayers understand and are convinced that the ultimate plan is needed, what it entails, how long it will take, how it will be financed, and that all options have been considered.
3. What were the criteria given to the consultants prior to their evaluation?
4. If the land under the current treatment plant belongs to the City of Lewes and is vacated if the county option is chosen, shouldn't the City of Lewes be involved in making this decision and deciding together with BPW what ultimately happens to that property?
5. Why didn't Rehoboth choose to go with Sussex County?
6. Have you discussed it with DNREC, EPA, the University of Delaware?
7. Once the five members of the BPW are unanimous in their decision, they should come to the ratepayers and explain it to us. How much more will it cost the ratepayers each month?

I admire the individual members of the Lewes BPW and realize that this is a complex matter, but none of us knows when the "BIG" emergency might come. Because Lewes is not directly on the ocean and have breakwaters to help protect us, I believe BPW has enough time to be thorough and receive new suggestions a little while longer.

Sincerely,
Elaine Simmerman
418 W. Fourth St.
Lewes, DE 19958
302 841 4383

Comments on BPW Wastewater treatment plant options.

I read the GMB report thoroughly making notes to be clear about the options.

I had a concern about the analysis GMB included regarding soft factors such as approvals from other political bodies biasing the results towards ease of implementation. It seems to me that when making a strategic decision, soft factors should be largely ignored in favor of a desirable long-range solution. I then reread the report ignoring those soft factors.

LEWES

- Lewes BPW made investment in 2008 to upgrade the Howard H. Seymour WWTP to a state of the art facility, capable of handling 1.5 million gallons a day. It is now 14 years later approximately half-way through the design life of the facility. The plant currently operates at 0.9 million gallons per day which is largely local customers in the vacation season. During the shoulder and winter seasons for reasons of process stability BPW takes/imports up to 0.6mgd from Sussex County Wolfe Point facility. This benefits BPW with stable operations and Sussex County with a way to process during seasons where their spray irrigation is less effective.
- BPW estimates that if every lot in Lewes and the BPW service area were built out, needed capacity would be 1.75 million gallons per day in 2050. Current demand is far below that figure if it is ever reached in the next 25 years.
 - The plant is not currently constrained by capacity.
 - Lewes wastewater treatment plant has capacity for years into the future.
 - Lewes wastewater treatment plant is still considered state of the art, in process design and operation.
- In the GMB report Option 1, a large portion of the cost is to build a seawall around the plant and then build a raised roadway for large trucks to get in and out with dried sludge and supplies. It seems that an upgrade to automated dewatering would allow faster processing with less sludge on site. A barrier seawall around the entire site should be considered for the next 15 years. The roadway, which is a major expense could probably be delayed.

Sussex

- The immediate discussion of options for the Lewes WWTP came about because Sussex County has plans to make major upgrades to its Wolfe Point facility and has approached Lewes with an offer, requiring a near term decision, that would allow Sussex to use BPW's canal outfall.
- The offer is to pay for the upgrades to Wolfe Point in exchange for allowing Sussex to use the permitted outfall to the Lewes Canal.

- When Rehoboth Beach upgraded to an ocean outfall Sussex County offered to share Rehoboth's Ocean outfall for \$7.6 million for the permission to use 40% of Rehoboth's permit.
- Rehoboth Beach turned them down. Four years later a new outfall is worth more than \$7 million to Sussex County.
- Many things in life, government, and science are built on trust between interested parties. Certainly, our capitalist system is built on trust. Lack of trust is a serious consideration and disqualifier in many transactions.
- People at the operating level of BPW seem to trust engineers at Sussex County. However, these engineers will move on, retire, take other assignments, and Lewes in the long term will be at the mercy of the Sussex County Commissioners.
- The replacements and management of the trusted engineers will eventually be decided by Sussex County Council a group to which Lewes has at most one vote. That councilperson also represents county residents outside of Lewes. He/she is not answering to a Lewes focused constituency. Even with a dynamic council person in the past, IG Burton found it nearly impossible to get anything done through the county council. Lewes cannot rely on Sussex County Council to have its best interests at heart. They have a demonstrated track record in other directions.
- In the long term BPW customers will have to pay for the Wolfe Point operating cost and future Wolfe Point capital cost. An offer of "no immediate capital cost" but a portion of operating cost is not a "DEAL"(assumed in the report to be 50% with no supporting data) . Sussex County will be allocating the operating cost. Sussex County will be determining when the next investment is needed. Lewes BPW will be an onlooker.
- The offer from Sussex County gives no authority for management or ongoing involvement to Lewes BPW in the future. The board should not agree to anything that allows Sussex County to ignore Lewes BPW now or in the future. The offer should be rejected and the options 3a. and 3b. removed from consideration by BPW board.

- A decision to join with Sussex County at this time is a mistake.
 - Lewes has no "need" to do this at this time.
 - The current plant has years of life.
 - Signing on with Sussex adds cost before the existing investment is amortized.
 - Signing with Sussex gives responsibility for service to Sussex County which has shown little regard for Lewes resident's concerns.

The Board should continue to study.

- Hardening the existing plant (option 1 in the GMB report) in due time.
- Relocation and utilization of existing WWTP (Option 2-b in the GMB report)
- Relocation and a new Ocean Outfall (Option 2-c in the GMB report)
- It is likely that improvements in membrane technology will extend the life of the Howard Seymour plant.

Bob Heffernan

February 5, 2023

Lewes resident and BPW customer

Fw: Wastewater Treatment Plant and GHD Report

Austin Calaman <ACalaman@LewesBPWDE.gov>

Mon 2/6/2023 12:21 PM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>; Robin Davis
<RDavis@LewesBPWDE.gov>

Cc: Preston Lee <dpreslee@gmail.com>; Tom Panetta
<Thomas.Panetta@lewesadventure.com>

[INTERNAL EMAIL]

Additional comments for the WWTP.

Thanks,

Austin Calaman

General Manager

Lewes Board of Public Works

302.645.6228

<https://www.facebook.com/lewesbpw>



From: Stephanie Tsantes <stsantes@comcast.net>

Sent: Sunday, February 5, 2023 3:08 PM

To: Austin Calaman <ACalaman@LewesBPWDE.gov>

Cc: Preston Lee <dpreslee@gmail.com>

Subject: Fwd: Wastewater Treatment Plant and GHD Report

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Let me try sending this again with Austin's correct email address.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Stephanie Tsantes <stsantes@comcast.net>

Subject: Wastewater Treatment Plant and GHD Report

Date: February 5, 2023 at 2:59:22 PM EST

To: acalamam@lewesbpw.com

Cc: Preston Lee <dpreslee@gmail.com>

Dear Austin and BPW Board Members,

While I was unable to attend the meeting where GHD presented their report, I have watched the video of that presentation a few times and also tried to read their detailed report. At the outset, I want to say that the quality of the report compared to past engineering reports I have read from other contractors with the City was an excellent product. Having said that, I am always a little skeptical of any report if the funding of that report is compromised by funding from an outside interested party—in this case the County. For that reason, I do not necessarily think that this is an independent report.

From a starting base, the County has previously approached Rehoboth Beach to try and join on their wastewater project that gave the City of Rehoboth permission to use Ocean Outfalls as a way of discharging treated wastewater. Rehoboth Beach turned the County down. In researching that old request amongst other items discussed, there is discussion in a Cape Gazette article dated 11/19/21 where in the County spokesperson at that meeting says that "county facility features land application system which does not require nutrient removal" and their spokesperson balked that if nutrient removal was added onto any plan they would not continue as it would cost the county too much money to include it.

I have lived in the City limits for close to 30 years. I have seen the general view from County Council that they approve every rezoning and redevelopment of land in favor of developers and there is little regard for open space, the environment, and infrastructure and so I see this attempt to join forces with the City of Rehoboth who turned them down and now with Lewes as nothing more than having our citizens continue to just look the other way with the overdevelopment and lack of planning in the County. We need to look at nothing more than Donovan Smith MHP to know that the County has neglected their civic duty to some of their residents over time and clearly neglected the environment. In addition, the pressured timing of when the County would like to have an answer

from the City is troubling in terms of any due diligence I think that still needs to be conducted.

I admit I do not understand every nuance of the detailed GHD report but I do have several questions:

2050 planning

(1) the various options seem to only really plan until 2050, is this correct? If so, this seems incredibly short visioned and with the millions of dollars being proposed to be spent it seems that you need a 20 year, 40 year and 60 year general plan before you commit to any of these options. Or in the alternative, if all of these plans are to get you to the year 2050, then i think the best option for Lewes is Option 1.

Can we talk about smell, noise and other potential impact from relocation of the outfalls to the town side of the canal

(1) is there a difference in what we will smell in town with activated sludge treatment vs. membrane bioreaction (2) will there be any increase in smell with any of the proposed projects (3) does the smell decline if the flow rates were just the city vs. adding in twice the capacity with the county proposals. (4) what is the impact to the residents of Gills Neck Road does the change in the location of the outfalls from one side of the canal to the town side which property or properties will that impact the most on Gills Neck Road. (5) the proposed "new odor control structure" can you discuss this generally. Have you discussed this proposed change in outfalls with any of the impacted residents—especially along Gills Neck or near the proposed improved pump station. (6) the new generator figure 23 can you talk about the noise that this generator or other the pieces of these options from 2 a, b, and c.

Environmental questions

(1) if you go with option 3a wherein everything gets treated by the county and then transferred to the City's existing location, does the City have any control if the county is not treating the effluent to the same degree of the City currently does. What is the proposed difference in that discharge of nutrients number. I think the BPW should be proud that we are generally not close to the permit levels

in terms of discharging bad stuff back into the canal. What assurances do we have from the County that they will treat even close to the same level that we are currently treating and also what is the long term impact when twice as much is being discharged into the canal. (2) Under option 3-b what is the environmental impact of this "constructed wetland".

I hope that some of these questions make sense and I look forward to hearing answers going forward. I do not think that the City should enter into a joint project with the County and give away control over what we discharge into the canal, how much we discharge into the canal, and the best possible treatment of what we discharge into the canal. As I said above, if all of these are projects that just take us to 2050, then i think hardening the existing WWTP in Lewes is the best option for our residents. I would also suggest that in the long range planning that in the next 20 years, the BPW look to acquire suitable property to build an upland new WWTP. I generally do not support Ocean Outfalls as a method of disposing of our treated effluent, but might be persuaded in that direction if it was a joint project with Cape Henlopen State Park. The BPW discussing options with the park was mentioned just as an aside but i think is something that should be meted out before there is any final decision here.

So i would rate my options:

1. Option 1 Hardening the existing WWTF —and long term looking at purchasing property for long term project
2. Option 2-B relocation and use existing WWTF
3. Option 2-C New WWTF with Ocean outfall (but only in joint project with Cape Henlopen

Thank you for taking the time to read this and since I do not have all of your board members email addresses please circulate this to all of the board members.

Regards,
Stephanie Tsantes

New Submission WWTF Long-Range Planning

production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Mon 2/6/2023 3:58 PM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

David Ennis

Address

50 Harborview Rd
Lewes, DE us, 19958
United States

[Map It](#)

Email

Davidhennisllc@aol.com

Phone

(302) 249-0750

Comments

I would like to reenforce my previous comments at the BPW workshop that the policies, practices, & regulations that Sussex County has been following in recent years, does not appear to have the City of Lewes's best interests at heart in reference to the increased housing stock vs. infrastructure planning and funding.

Prior to any contract being finalized with Sussex County or any private entity for handling/ treating the City's wastewater, a cooperative understanding should be negotiated through Lewes Planning and Zoning, legal council and along with Mayor & Council. Conditions should be placed into any agreement so that Lewes taxpayers do not end up without some control. Lewes should not be handing over full control or decision making ability to any entity.

As to not end up in a similar internal legal battle, I suggest any agreement must include a clear path to a non-court based dispute resolution.

As the planner, Janelle should also be tapped as an incredible City resource and she should be conferred with extensively.

There may need to be some review of the document called The Cost of Sprawl, produced in approx 1990, by The State of Delaware.

Thank you for your consideration,

David Ennis

50 Harborview Rd

Lewes

302-249-0750

Fw: New submission from Contact Form

Kristina Keller <KKeller@LewesBPWDE.gov>

Tue 2/7/2023 8:16 AM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[INTERNAL EMAIL]

From: production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Sent: Monday, February 6, 2023 4:19 PM

To: Kristina Keller <KKeller@LewesBPWDE.gov>

Subject: New submission from Contact Form

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Alan Roth

Email

alanjroth@dblrs.net

Message

The time is now 4:16 pm. I worked all day on these comments about the WWTF project planning - I hope you'll consider them even though I thought your closing time was 5 pm, not 4 pm. Thank you.

Thank you for giving the community the opportunity on January 23rd to hear your consultant's explanation of its long-range planning study of options for wastewater treatment within the Lewes BPW service area.

For purposes of my comments below, I begin with the premise that the Lewes BPW will not select Option 2a, 2b, or 2c. I do not believe that an elected body will choose a path that imposes on ratepayers upfront capital costs anywhere from 5 to 9 times higher than the costs of the other choices presented, nor project lifecycle costs that are anywhere from 57 to 300 percent higher. Accordingly, my comments below focus on Option 1 and Options 3a and 3b.

Assuming the consultant's preliminary capital cost estimates are realistic, the \$3 million difference for ratepayers between Option 1 and Options 3a/3b is rather minimal if the bulk of those costs is financed with long-term debt. At the public meeting, I believe the General Manager made reference to 20-year financing, but as of last week, the inverted yield curve offered the opportunity to borrow at lower rates for 30 years.

<https://www.currentmarketvaluation.com/models/yield-curve.php>

I have less confidence in the consultant's projection of net present value Operations and Maintenance costs over the next 27 years. The direction of the overall economy is simply unknowable over such an extended period. Moreover, technological developments (including labor-saving technology) are sure to confound even the best economic predictions. In 1996, 27 years ago, how many among us would have predicted that we would be walking around with powerful computers in our hands or be talking on our wristwatches the way Maxwell Smart did on a 1960s television sitcom?

But even assuming the O&M costs of Option 1 between now and 2050 will be significantly higher than those of Option 3a or 3b, these numbers alone cannot address the most fundamental problem faced by the Lewes BPW, which is:

How do you choose between (1) preserving our independence and controlling own destiny by spending money to harden, maintain, and operate an existing plant in a suboptimal location, or (2) avoiding the long-range threat to that plant posed by climate change and rising sea levels but surrendering our fate to a political body that your constituents largely don't trust – and whose own development decisions, by the way, actually necessitate additional plant and outfall capacity?

As my question above presupposes, I accept the premise that the existing WWTF is situated in a suboptimal location and that a new plant, in a new location, will eventually become inevitable. Even assuming we are fortunate enough not to be overwhelmed by rising seas or more frequent Hurricane Sandy-like storms within the next two decades, it will take years to plan for, finance, and build in a new, safer location. And given current development patterns, it's not clear where such a new plant could be built within or even near Lewes city limits.

However, the consultant has presented in Option 1 a plan that appears viable for at least those two-plus decades, during which such further long-term strategic planning can take place. Accordingly, there is no need at this moment to leap into a "deal" with Sussex County unless it's on terms that place the Lewes BPW and Lewes ratepayers on terms that

put meat on the bones of the term “partnership,” which is the word used in the consultant’s report to describe Options 3a and 3b. There are many different forms of partnership, but being treated as a mere customer by a service provider, or being made subject to the whims of another political body, is not a true partnership. The Lewes BPW should not accept such subservient status in search of hypothetical or speculative O&M savings extending over nearly three decades.

There is a third way. In the metropolitan Washington area, the Blue Plains Advanced Wastewater Treatment Plant has for nearly 40 years handled wastewater treatment for the District of Columbia, Fairfax County (VA), and Montgomery and Prince George’s County (MD). While Fairfax has its own wastewater treatment plant, and the two Maryland counties are partners in the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, which operates its own wastewater facilities, the Blue Plains plant, which is owned by the DC Water and Sewer Authority (DC Water) takes a significant quantity of excess flows that those counties’ systems cannot handle. Pursuant to an Intermunicipal Agreement (IMA) first signed in 1985 and periodically updated since then, the suburban counties are guaranteed seats on the DC Water Board of Directors for purposes of considering and voting on matters pertaining to the joint interests of the parties – capacity at Blue Plains, management of facilities for wastewater transmission and treatment, and biosolids management. The IMA also resolved flow and capacity allocation issues while providing for a regional water quality program and biosolids management plan. <https://www.dewater.com/intermunicipal-agreement>

It might be possible to create a similar arrangement here involving the Wolfe Neck plant. Certainly, the Lewes BPW has authority under sections 4.1 and 4.2 of its own Charter to enter into a contractual arrangement with Sussex County on such terms as it deems fair and appropriate. And 9 DE Code § 6702 provides that “[i]n addition to the other powers which it has [relating to sewers and sewer districts], the County may, under this chapter: . . . (7) Enter into a contract or contracts with any city or town situated within the County providing for the disposal of sewage collected by any sewerage system either for a specified or an unlimited time and for the charge to be made for such service by or to any such city or town; . . . and (10) Enter into and perform contracts, whether long term or short term, with any person, organization, association or other entity, public or private, profit or nonprofit, for the study, design, construction, operation, or maintenance of a sanitary sewerage system, which may be in or outside of a sanitary sewer district.

If such a contract can be entered into by both parties, it seems evident that the contract terms can include governance provisions for the Wolfe Neck plant, including fair representation for the Lewes BPW on a governing body to protect the interests of Lewes

customers and ratepayers. By proposing own IMA between the City and the County, the Lewes BPW can perhaps take the first step toward testing whether the County is interested in a real partnership, rather than a relationship of subservience.

FN/ The consultant's so-called "Multi-Criteria Analysis" (MCA) analysis is interesting, but I place little stock in it for evaluation purposes. These criteria, and the weightings placed on them, are entirely subjective. A different consultant might have come up with additional or different criteria, or placed different weights on the list before you. An audience of Lewes residents, including some with great expertise, would likely have done the same.

Fw: New submission from Contact Form

Kristina Keller <KKeller@LewesBPWDE.gov>

Tue 2/7/2023 2:59 PM

To: Sharon Sexton <SSexton@LewesBPWDE.gov>

[INTERNAL EMAIL]

From: production@inclind.com <production@inclind.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 7, 2023 11:05 AM

To: Kristina Keller <KKeller@LewesBPWDE.gov>

Subject: New submission from Contact Form

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Name

Robert Doordan

Email

albred1@outlook.com

Message

Your comment page for the GHD study long range plans returns "page not found".
<https://www.lewesbpwde.gov/2023/01/wastewater-treatment-facility-comments/>

My comment is to revisit the cost of option 2.

Option 1 is not feasible given expected flooding. Option 3 requires faith in trust in Sussex County. I will likely result in the canal becoming a sewer.

1-9-2023

Dear Lewis BOW,

I want to give you what I would like see happen to the sewage plant. I feel it should be turned over to Sussex County to manage.

I think this is the most cost effective way to handle the sewage treatment + disposal problem -

Smyra went with Kent County to handle their sewer issues and have been very happy with the result.

Thank you for listening to my comment.

Dwight H. Gln
8 Delmar Ave

Lewis, DE 19958

302-645-1672

and

21 Vandant Rd

Newark, DE 19711

302-738-9481

Cell - 302-547-2931

Dear BPC

2-1-2023

I wrote you a note before and put the note in my bill payment. However after reading Tuesday's Cape Gazette I feel compelled to write again.

The best most cost effective way to go is with Sussex County taking over Lewis Waste Treatment. Rehoboth turned the county down and thus beaches are closed frequently and for up to a week because of E. coli in the ocean. As this solution was not great!

Staying the course is not an option. It is a costly BAND AID with no guarantees that beaches will not happen. We have had 2 canal contaminations and we do not need more.

Asking tax payers in this economy to pay 420% more on their sewer bill will cause for sale signs to go up everywhere. This increase is unbelievable to me and should not be even on the table.

We live at 8 Delmas Ave in Lewis and 21 Vansant Road in Newark (Pike Creek). In Newark New Castle County handles our sewers and there are no problems. I just paid my yearly bill which was \$94. Kent County also handles Smyrna sewers. We have friends that live in Lewis and Smyrna and Kent County does fine in Smyrna.

Legal in the county is the way to
go - Why re-invent the wheel.
And if for some reason the county
does NOT hold up its end and back
them out to the jury legally.

Thank you for listening

Deirdre H Taylor

302-549-2931

dehtaylor@verizon.net