

SD1'S B.2 PACKET: ONE-PAGE SUMMARY

What SD1 says - and what the response shows is still missing

SD1'S POSITION

SD1 says Route B.2 is the best long-term system for Central Boone County. It argues that B.2 uses a lower-elevation gravity alignment, has greater hydraulic reach, can potentially serve more land by gravity, and reduces reliance on the Bullittsville Pump Station, force mains, and equalization tanks.

SD1 acknowledges that B.2 has greater construction, terrain, environmental, property, easement, and cost-overflow risks than B.3. It says those risks have been managed through design, permits, easements, bids, and restoration requirements.

SD1 also says the project is projected to cost about \$39.5 million, with approximately \$10.6 million in ARPA funds reducing SD1's stated net cost to under \$30 million.

THE COMMUNITY'S RESPONSE

The need to address sewer overflows is not disputed. The question is whether B.2 is necessary. Hazen found A.3, B.2, and B.3 could solve the wastewater problem, identified B.2 as carrying the greatest environmental, construction, property, terrain, access, and cost-overflow risks, and recommended eliminating B.2 from further consideration. B.3 had the least environmental impact.

SD1 has not identified the additional acres, parcels, homes, businesses, customers, or actual planned development that B.2 alone would serve. Potential shaded areas on a map do not establish a public need. Court testimony indicated Gayle Pille's property was the only land B.2 opens that the alternatives would not.

B.3 includes gravity sewer after its pumped section, and B.2 still uses the Central Boone County Pump Station. The real question is whether B.2's claimed extra gravity reach is worth its substantially greater damage and risk.

SD1 also has not released the specific post-Hazen analysis, lifecycle-cost comparison, growth forecast, or decision record showing why B.2's claimed benefits outweigh its documented harms.

BOTTOM LINE: SD1 has explained why it prefers B.2. It has not shown the evidence necessary to prove that B.2 is the only reasonable choice - or that its claimed benefits outweigh the harm.

OUR RESPONSE PAGE 6

This page presents SD1's conclusion as if B.2's risks are behind it. They are not.

A court order does not make the controversy disappear

SD1 says the needed easements were obtained through negotiation or court order. But taking an easement through eminent domain is not the same as reaching agreement with a landowner, and it does not mean the taking was fair, necessary, or free from challenge. Gayle's condemnation case remains contested. SD1 should not use the fact that it obtained a court order as proof that the route is justified or that residents' concerns have been resolved.

"No cost overruns" is not a final result

SD1 says potential cost overruns "did not occur" and calls the project's estimated \$39.5 million cost "final." But **Phase 4 has not started construction**. The B.2 route still faces stream crossings, wooded and steep terrain, construction access, excavation, restoration requirements, and impacts to private property. Those are precisely the kinds of issues that can cause added costs during construction. A favorable bid is not the same as a completed project within budget.

The report should identify exactly what the \$39.5 million includes: which phases; design; easements; legal costs; environmental mitigation; restoration; construction management; and contingency. It should also explain what changed from the earlier planning estimates and what contingency remains if costs rise.

ARPA money is not proof that B.2 costs less

SD1 points to approximately \$10.6 million in ARPA funding and says its net cost will be under \$30 million. That is public funding that reduces what SD1 expects to pay. It does not make the actual project cost disappear, and it does not prove B.2 is the least expensive or best route. The total cost still matters to taxpayers and the public.

"You can still donate the property later" minimizes the harm

SD1 says Gayle may still be able to donate her property after the sewer is built and disturbed areas are restored. Gayle is not simply trying to preserve whatever remains after a sewer corridor is forced through the property. She is trying to protect the intact wooded land, restored habitat, and Woolper Creek watershed she has spent decades caring for. Whether a land conservancy might accept the property after construction, subject to its requirements and SD1's easements, is not proof that the taking causes no meaningful harm. It is an acknowledgment that the property will be permanently burdened by an easement.

SD1 repeats claims without proving them

SD1 again says B.2 has greater hydraulic reach, reduces pumping, and serves currently unserved areas. But it still does not show how much additional land B.2 uniquely serves; how many future customers would benefit; whether the claimed service area is actual planned development or speculation; how B.2's total pumping, force-main, energy, maintenance, and replacement costs compare with B.3; how much B.2's greater environmental and property damage costs; or why B.2's added benefits outweigh those harms.

Calling B.2 "the only alternative that eliminated the Bullittsville Pump Station" does not end the analysis. **B.2 still uses the Central Boone County Pump Station, and B.3 also transitions to gravity sewer.** The question is whether avoiding the Bullittsville facilities justifies choosing the route SD1 itself acknowledges has greater environmental, construction, and property impacts.

Finally, SD1 says project performance "has exceeded expectations." But the report provides no metrics, no completed Phase 4 construction, no final restoration results, and no final cost accounting to support that statement. Before calling B.2 the "greatest long-term value," SD1 should release the full **post-Hazen route-by-route comparison** and give the public the actual numbers behind its conclusion.

QUESTIONS NOT ANSWERED BY SD1

Addendum to the Central Boone County Conveyance packet

SD1's packet explains its current position, but it does not fully answer most of the evidence-based questions submitted about Route B.2. The central issue remains unresolved: SD1 repeatedly states that B.2 was "carefully evaluated," provides "greater flexibility," and offers the "greatest long-term value," but does not provide the specific analyses, calculations, comparisons, or decision records requested to support those conclusions.

Post-Hazen justification

The packet does not identify a specific post-Hazen engineering study, cost analysis, memorandum, or decision document showing why B.2 was selected after Hazen documented major disadvantages and recommended that B.2 be eliminated from further consideration.

Gravity sewer

The packet gives a general explanation of why gravity sewer can be preferable to pumping. It does not identify the requested study showing why a gravity-sewer solution was preferable to the other feasible alternatives. It also fails to clearly acknowledge that B.3 includes gravity sewer and that B.2 still uses the Central Boone County Pump Station.

Future growth

SD1 claims B.2 provides greater hydraulic reach and future service potential, but does not identify the acreage, parcels, planned developments, projected customers, or sewage demand that B.2 would uniquely serve. Shaded maps showing potential service areas are not an answer to what actual growth B.2 accommodates beyond the alternatives. The packet also does not reconcile this claim with testimony that Gayle Pille's property was the only land opened by B.2 that the other alternatives would not open.

Development considerations

The question of whether anticipated development, large undeveloped properties, or developers' future infrastructure needs played a role in selecting B.2 is not answered. References to economic vitality and future service do not explain whether those considerations influenced the route-selection process or how they were weighed.

B.2's known risks

SD1 acknowledges that B.2 created greater construction, terrain, environmental, property, easement, and cost-overrun risks than B.3. But the packet supplies no decision matrix, lifecycle-cost analysis, quantified environmental comparison, or other record showing how those serious risks were weighed against B.2's claimed advantages. A statement that the risks were "carefully evaluated" is not the requested explanation.

Changing the alignment

The packet does not answer what would be required to change Phase 4's alignment before construction begins. A timeline showing contracts, permits, design work, and easement acquisition is not a description of the engineering, contractual, permitting, financial, and scheduling steps required now - or which specific obstacles would make a route change difficult or infeasible.

The packet also does not identify any factual errors, omissions, or missing context in the fact-check submitted with the questions. Nor does it provide the underlying documents, testimony, data, or analyses needed for the public to independently evaluate SD1's disagreement.

SD1 has stated why it still prefers B.2. It has not shown the specific records, calculations, comparisons, and decision process that justified choosing B.2 after Hazen recommended against it.