

EXHIBIT A

Charles E. Daye

**Brandis Professor of Law
UNC School of Law
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3380
(919) 962-7004**

email: cdaye@email.unc.edu

**Counselor at Law
3400 Cambridge Road
Durham, NC 27707
(919) 489-9415**

February 3, 2005

Mr. Mark Ahrendsen
Chair, Technical Coordination Committee

Via Email: Mark.Ahrendsen@durhamnc.gov

Re: Southwest Corridor Alignment

Dear Mr. Ahrendsen ,

This letter comes to you in your capacity as a Chair, Technical Coordination Committee (TCC) that I am told advises the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). I write to bring to your attention the destructive impact the proposed alignment of the "Southwest Corridor" is having on my family's property, that my family has owned and occupied and on which my family has paid taxes for well over a hundred years. My request is simple. Please do not propose Option B1 for the preservation of a "Southwest Transit Corridor."

There is a long background to this matter, but I will abbreviate it here.

The mistreatment of my family deepens with every step certain public bodies take in the Southwest area of Durham County. When getting sewer to the new Creekside School, the Durham Public School Board permitted its staff to conclude secret deals with private parties that foreclosed access for my family's homes and property to sewer service connected to the City of Durham's lines. The City of Durham's staff, in turn, waived requirements for sewer lines on public thoroughfares and committed other questionable acts that denied sewer service to my family. The County of Durham financed this bypassing sewer installation notwithstanding that it excluded my family's property.

Rather than file a lawsuit for what we are convinced was illegal and discriminatory, my family and I attempted another strategy to get sewer to at least part of our property. The solution was to sell a small portion of our land to a private developer who would bring sewer access for the remaining part of my family's homes and property. We were combining a portion of my family's property (about 6 acres) with adjacent property (the Tilley property of about 33 acres). The combination would then give a developer 39 acres to absorb the cost of pulling sewer down Trenton road, across Interstate 40, and effectively to our remaining property, as well as to their proposed development.

Now the TAC has a proposal before it for location of the southwest transit corridor – especially Option B1 – that, if adopted, will destroy our effort to get sewer to our homes and property. Option B1 bisects the Tilley property and makes the developer's proposal unfeasible. The developer is already insecure about the very consideration of Option B1 and some parties are talking about being forced to back out. The reason is that my family's property and the Tilley property are inextricably linked from a sewer standpoint because developers have to combine our properties to have the scale in size to absorb the cost of pulling sewer from the pump station behind the office park near the Leigh Farm Historic Park. This is very costly, around \$500,000. The only way this can be done by a private actor is to create a development on part of my

family's property and the Tilley property to amass enough acreage to absorb the cost of the sewer line.

I want to emphasize that when considered in light of the previous denial of access to sewer by the governmental actors, the proposed Option B1 adds insult to the injury my family and I have already suffered by now threatening to scuttle our efforts to get sewer to our property through private means without any help of governmental actors.

What makes the situation all the more awful is that Option B1 is a shift of the corridor off the property owned by some of these very same governmental authorities that denied my family sewer access in the first place. And this never mind that my family's property is being taxed to help pay the very bond funds used to purchase that property the governmental actors now own. So, my family and I are being subjected to this imposition by public authorities who are attempting to shift the transit corridor off their own property and onto the taxpaying, private property of my family. And let me recall that these governmental actors ran sewer lines to their school and left my family to fend for itself as best we can. That is incomparably wrong.

Yet, still the matter gets even worse: I have mentioned that parties are now talking about being forced to abandon the transaction that will bring sewer to my family. The very consideration of imposing Option B1 is having a direct and immediate impact on shutting off my family's access to sewer. This is the case even though the proposed corridor is just that – a "proposed corridor project" that might be built, if ever, at some indeterminate and unknown time in the future. This situation cries out as greater injury piled onto an injury already inflicted and already twice compounded!

A decision to reserve the County's or School Board's property by shifting the corridor off of publicly-owned property and onto the private property of taxpaying citizens strikes me as simply wrong and possibly an illegal taking or unconstitutional abridgment of my rights.

It is my fervent plea that the TCC and TAC regard the plight my family has been forced to face. I implore you not to take away my family's only present opportunity to get sewer to our property. If this corridor remains on my family's property or if it dissects the Tilley tract as proposed Option B1 now does, it will destroy our ability to secure sewer. I believe we deserve better than that. Also, I have studied the Constitution and laws of the land enough to believe that, if all reason otherwise fails, we can seek by litigation to protect my family's home and property rights and our citizenship rights under the Constitution and laws of this State and the United States.

I understand there may be some questions about wetlands preservation and other legal issues. None of these issues should preclude finding other alternatives to Option B1. I stand ready to attempt to address any such issues that might arise or that you would find helpful

In sum, I renew my plea: Please do not propose that the TAC adopt Option B1 for the "preservation" of a Southwest Transit Corridor. If you have any questions, I will be happy to discuss this matter at your convenience. I may be contacted at the home or at the office telephone numbers listed at the head of this note.

With great appreciation, I am,

Yours sincerely,

Charles E. Daye /S/
Charles E. Daye
Brandis Professor of Law and
Member in good standing of the North Carolina State Bar