

Town of Hillsborough  
**Waste Transfer Station Advisory Committee**

**DRAFT Future Meeting Discussion Points**

**Economy/Economic Development**

Negative impact on current and upcoming investment in the Waterstone Development and I-40 interchange area; Lost Town and County Tax Base (lost to tax rolls and negative impact on tax value for nearby property); impact is magnified by being in EDD, job creation potential, and quality of life from lost development in the planned Economic Development District, lower property values; [Points of interchange. Two undeveloped interchanges in OC.] Hillsborough has relied on this EDD for our future, and we've started delivering it. We rely on balance of non-residential/residential. The county should be more concerned about the balance. EDC strategic plan goals of 5000 jobs by 2010 will be impacted.

**Cost**

Vehicle-miles traveled for collection trucks.

Land acquisition cost.

Meeting EDD requirements

Initial versus long term (long term costs will outrun initial costs at some point)

Infrastructure costs: water and waste water treatment, capacity, intersection improvements, old 86 improvements (shoulder widening)

Firefighting

Duplicating costs already handled at Eubanks or additional costs to citizens having to go multiple places.

Cost-benefit analysis needed of proposed sites to current sites and needed infrastructure compared to existing County-owned land and infrastructure; analysis of transporting waste to other locations (in and out of Orange); Cost to Chapel Hill and Carrboro to travel north of current landfill;

Cost to taxpayers at Town and County levels for investment in new land, infrastructure, and compliance with Economic Development District guidelines; Lower property values, Lost Town and County tax base/development opportunities; Land costs for proposed sites

## **Environment**

Impact on ground water.

EIS and permit costs will be considered only after the site has been chosen, and could be prohibitive.

Impervious surface impacts.

Flood plain issues, seasonal streams (not on map?). [OC reexamined these sites on 10/6 – still not a problem.]

As Triangle was in non-compliance for ozone levels, but is on probation.

Water and Sewer Availability-impact on Town's overall capacity; Disposal of "Washout" matter; Impact on nearby waterways (ex. Cates Creek, Neuse River); Tree loss due to development; Wind impacts; Noise pollution; Odor control; Air pollution and potential health risks; Proximity to schools; Lost opportunity to reuse County-owned land and infrastructure; Negative impact on aesthetics of entryway to historic town; Include carbon footprint statistics (for example, comparison of site #10 to #56)

Vector control could have large negative impact.

Surface water runoff to adjacent sites.

## **Traffic**

Additional traffic volume on Old NC 86, I-40 Interchange and neighboring roadways leading to Hillsborough and Waterstone; Increased truck traffic; Provision of truck traffic count for existing and proposed facilities; Costs of needed infrastructure improvements and identification of funding sources  
Include carbon footprint statistics (for example, comparison of site #10 to #56)

Two-lane roads (Old-86 and OGR) are inadequate. LOS at the I85 bridge.

Bridge capacity and maintenance costs.

## **Process**

Not sufficient time to give a thoughtful response to the site-specific proposal.

The EIS is to be done after the decision rather than before.

The Strategic Growth Plan phase two consultants identified these areas to be in Hillsborough's planning jurisdiction. (The Interlocal Agreement Committee). The county and Hillsborough are working together on this with the consultants.

Analysis is performed on a comparative basis rather than absolute basis.

Concern about cost is not captured until after the selection is made.

### **Social Impact**

Consider “central to population center”

Entrance/gateway to county seat; also a gateway to Orange County (from the interstate)

Concentration of schools (including DTCC).

Tourism

### **Recommendations**

Develop a meaningful and transparent way for public participation in the decision process.

Perform EIS and economic analysis before site selection.

Slow down.

Create an industrial zone for this kind of use.

Look at county-owned sites

Ensure the top level concerns are factored into the selection process

### **Waste Transfer Station Advisory Committee DRAFT Questions for Orange County/Consultants**

What is the anticipated size of the proposed transfer station? A: About 27-36 thousand SF. Probably similar to Durham (though it’s currently undersized).

Confirm the number of days the solid waste transfer facility would operate each week.

A: M-F, 7am-4pm, Sat 7:30-Noon = 5.5 days/week

Confirm the amount of land to be acquired at each site and what happens to the remainder of the property not used for the transfer station. A: Each site has a specific configuration and criteria, e.g. min 25 acres. Some sites require more, e.g. wetlands. Why is site 573 split? 60-65 acres proposed to be used. Why so much land needed for 30k sf? A: traffic, parking, etc. What would be a min size? A: No way to know now. 25 acres for buffering, but does not include future growth. Impervious surface? A: Don’t know yet. Have not

considered EDD guidelines requirement. Consideration of guidelines are post-decision, so costs for EDD compliance are not considered. Ballpark construction \$5.7M.

What additional solid waste facilities could be built at the proposed locations? A: No discussions with the BOCC. Possible considerations: drop-off area. "One-stop shopping": could include tires, brush, scrap metal, garbage truck parking. Composting possible. It is not only a WTS that will be sited. Olver made assumptions about how much of property would have to be acquired to allow rest of property to be used for something else. Would Eubanks still be used for some things? C&D, maintenance, household wastes, landfill maint, recyclable processing, yard waste, compost sales.

Please confirm the anticipated truck traffic. A: Transfer trucks – 8 or 9 up to 15. Other trucks 45-50 per day from pickup truck size to garbage truck. Prohibiting traffic on Churton Street

Confirm the types of trucks anticipated.

What is the current volume of trucks at the existing landfill? A: Municipal solid waste ave 45-50 per day. Does not include extra trucks needed to reach distant sites.

Conduct a cost-benefit analysis of the proposed Hillsborough sites compared to the continued use of the property near the existing landfill. This should include infrastructure such as water, sewer, roads, and additional staff, and transportation costs to the Towns. A: Not at any stage in the current decision process. Cost criteria in community specific list (development costs for site, estimate acquisition costs).

Conduct a cost-benefit analysis of the proposed sites given such factors as economic impact of including property values, property tax base, economic development, traffic, and environmental issues. A: Not at any stage in the current decision process.

Conduct a cost-benefit analysis, similar to those outlined above, of the project comparing the costs associated with the new facility and shipping the County's waste to another community.

Confirm the estimated water and sewer service required to support this facility, including daily gallons for "wash down". A: Depends on sewer service and its adequacy. If not available, need holding facility. Holding facility would be contained. What about neighboring fish farm?

Confirm the method of disposal of "wash down" materials- for example, the use of sanitary sewer or a holding tank.

Confirm any laws regarding cleaning waste transfer stations, as well as the method and frequency of cleaning at the proposed facility. A: State regulations require removal of wastes, vector control plan.

Confirm the environmental requirements that the County would need to meet in order to site this facility, for example air quality permits. A: Solid waste management permit, erosion control, stormwater mgmt, etc. EIS required? Not before the decision. State has a requirement (after the fact). TIA? No. But CH and Carrboro agreements will be needed to divert traffic around secondary roads. Schools on new 86 and Orange Grove Road.

Confirm the additional costs to the Towns of Chapel Hill and Carrboro to transport waste north of the current landfill (or to other potential sites identified).

Consider establishment of an industrial district as a more suitable site to meet community needs. A: Should be a recommendation we make to the BOCC.

Further detail the calculation of each technical criteria scoring, particularly parcel size, land availability and usability (for example, the ranking of site # 857 as more available than site #10); also include carbon footprint statistics (for example, comparison of site #10 to #56), and zoning designations and requirements. Provide additional clarification on how 10 of about 200 sites met the established criteria. Confirm that criteria should consider not “central collection location” but “central to population”. A: Population and employment statistics.

Discuss the consistency of the selection of the proposed Hillsborough sites with the current and past Town and County’s Joint Strategic Growth Planning efforts and discussion regarding Town oversight of activities in the proposed project area near I-40.

Consider removal of governmental solid waste facilities within Economic Development Districts.

Make criteria related to environmental impact prominent in site analysis, including reuse of existing County-owned land and infrastructure. Discuss the impact of the proposed project on impervious surfaces and run off, flooding on site #573;

Discuss tree loss, wind impact, the presence of waterways such as Cates Creek and Neuse River, noise pollution, air pollution, and traffic congestion. Address the potential impact health impact of air pollution from diesel trucks given the proximity to neighborhoods and schools (California health statistics for children with asthma and cancer cited by Cornwallis Hills HOA). A: Addressed in various criteria.

How should we give input now since the forms are not being used? Public input method TBD; staff making a proposal to BOCC next week.