

No.	Question/Comment	WIP Response
General Questions/Comments		
1	<p>I am concerned that we did not receive written notice for the referenced July 20th meeting as my husband and I certainly would have attended. Q: Would you please clarify why we were not included on the communication as a resident of Seaforth Landing?</p>	<p>We strive to engage all stakeholders. We would definitely have appreciated your participation in the July community input meeting, and the presentation and discussion would have addressed many of your questions. Relevant factors for not providing you an individual invitation include the County’s requirements for the Community Input meeting, your becoming a resident in mid-2023, and the timing to update the County’s address databases.</p> <p>What I have reconstructed today is that you and your husband acquired the property in June 2023. The County’s Land Records Database Chatham County Land Records Viewer (arcgis.com) did not reflect your acquisition of the property when the invitations were mailed out – in short, we had no way of knowing you’d moved into the area.</p> <p>The County requires that only <u>adjacent</u> property owners to be invited to a community meeting prior to submitting an application for rezoning. Invitations to the meeting were mailed out in late June. However, because of our interest in engaging all stakeholders and our April 2023 meeting with Seaforth Landing residents, we decided to expand the mailing list to non-adjacent Seaforth Landing residents as well as any others who had registered on the WIP website for updates. Finally, since the original public information meeting about the project in January 2023, we have been in regular contact with Diane Donnelly, president of the Seaforth Landing homeowners’ association; we asked her to forward information about the meeting to residents.</p>
2	<p>Mr. Adkins email below implies that this site has been planned since 1989. The WIP Environmental Impact Report indicates that this site is part of an alternative analysis conducted as opposed to utilizing the previously acquired site for a RWTF. Q: Where was the original site? Why has the WIP shifted to an alternative that has significant impact to residents, habitat and requires deforestation of old growth hardwood trees?</p>	<p>The property proposed for rezoning was purchased by Orange Water and Sewer Authority in 1989. The WIP is proposing to build the project at the same location which has been the focus for water supply development since that time. The initial study of the site and a lake intake was conducted in 1990-1991. Representatives of Chatham County, US Army Corps of Engineers, NC Parks, NC Wildlife Resources Commission, and the precursor to the present NC Department of Environmental Quality were included in that study.</p>

No.	Question/Comment	WIP Response
		<p>With respect to the referenced WIP Environmental Impact Assessment included with the rezoning application, the Partners’ consultant Hazen and Sawyer compared this proposed site with seven other properties which have the buildable area, proximity to the lake, topography, undeveloped status, and limited floodplain and streams/wetlands, to feasibly be used for a water treatment facility. This study recommended continuing with the proposed site.</p> <p>Please also note that the site was previously farmland and was more recently planted with pine for silviculture. Based on review of past aerial photographs, the southern third of the site remained in farming until the 1980s, and the trees in the northern site appear to have been harvested between 1964 and 1973, then replanted with the pines present today. Proposed buffers on both sides of streams and around the perimeter of the property will provide protection for trees.</p>
3	<p>Q: Why did the WIP not analyze parcels already zoned appropriately and only looked at residential parcels for alternatives sites? This seems counterintuitive that in an alternative analysis, residents would be negatively impacted in all and would require rezoning.</p>	<p>The consultant performing the site alternatives assessment included all parcels, regardless of zoning classification. They performed a screening assessment of parcels in eastern Chatham County that could feasibly be used for a water treatment facility; that is, they have a minimum buildable area of 60 acres (either a single parcel or assemblage of contiguous parcels) – “buildable area” takes into account favorable topography, outside floodplains and streams/wetlands; near the lake and finished water transmission routes to each Partner; and currently undeveloped.</p>
4	<p>I am hesitant to believe that the Board would have approved the development of Seaforth Landing and other nearby subdivisions if they planned to convert a residential parcel/lot to industrial allowing the installation of 34 structures, 23-50 feet high ranging from 2,600sq ft to 18,000sq ft that will receive, store and utilize hazardous materials, including chemicals in the quantities of 6,000 gallons while producing light and noise pollution in a 24/7 operation. Q: At what point was the Board made aware of this plan and if prior to Seaforth development approval the Boards’</p>	<p>We cannot speak to specifics of informing the Chatham County Board of Commissioners, but we can advise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chatham County (Keith Megginson) was represented in 1991 meetings conducted for the study investigating future use of the site for water supply - Chatham County Public Utilities participated beginning in 2012 in a study investigating the feasibility of the Western Intake Jordan Lake

No.	Question/Comment	WIP Response
	<p>rationale for how these two disparate land usages can live in harmony and be consistent with the development goals, rights of citizens and maintaining the rural beauty of Chatham County.</p>	<p>water supply project. I believe the Board received a briefing on the findings of that study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 2017 Chatham County Comprehensive Plan (figure 29, page 139 of 159) includes a call-out of the proposed WTP. - Chatham County entered a Memorandum of Agreement with the other Western Intake Partners in June 2019, to advance the regional water supply project in its current form
5	<p>It appears that the main entrance is the one off of Seaforth Rd., closest to the Seaforth Landing development. Q: Why is that selected as the main entrance rather than further north and closer to Highway 64? How often will this be used daily and for what purposes?</p>	<p>Even at this early stage of project planning and design, our design consultants have coordinated closely with NCDOT on the placement of entry drives. A small stream divides the more-developed southern portion of the property from less developed portions to the north. Locating the main entrance where proposed keeps the development more compact and eliminates impacts to the creek. The project is still in the early planning stage of design, but preliminarily this entrance, more than a quarter mile from the Seaforth/N Pea Ridge intersection, would be used for employees, visitors, and deliveries, perhaps a few dozen times a day when the facility is in operation.</p>
6	<p>Q: How often will the entrance on N. Pea Ridge Road be utilized and for what purposes?</p>	<p>The site has multiple entrances for safety and resiliency reasons; the N Pea Ridge entrance would serve a back-up role. Preliminarily, we expect when in use it would be in lieu of the main entrance by the same people for the same purposes.</p>
7	<p>The report indicates that sediment and sludge will be removed by truck while large volumes of chemicals (6,000 gallons) will be delivered. Q: Will these be diesel 18-wheeler trucks? How often will they be delivering chemicals? How often will waste be picked up? What entrance will they be using? Neither Seaforth Rd or N. Pea Ridge Rd are designed for this type of traffic and the noise and pollution is disruptive to residents.</p>	<p>Concerns about traffic have been raised at prior public meetings, and the WIP partners desire to be a good neighbor. Even at this early stage of project planning and design, our design consultants have coordinated closely with NCDOT on the amount of traffic expected during construction and operation of the facility. The facility will not experience frequent deliveries of chemicals or supply deliveries, or the pick-up and removal of residuals – less than ten times per month on average. These may be by larger tractor-trailers, or by tanker trucks, or by smaller trucks. These deliveries/pick-ups would be expected to use the main entrance (Seaforth Road).</p>

No.	Question/Comment	WIP Response
8	<p>A 24/7 operation that has the risk of noise, vibration, hazardous materials and light pollution impacting residents does not seem like a reasonable ask when options that don't impact residents are readily available in Chatham County and the 180 miles of Jordan Lake shoreline. Q: Why has the WIP not identified appropriately zoned locations or location more proximate to Hwy 64? For example, huge swaths of undeveloped land owned by the US government have lake access further north and closer to Hwy 64.</p>	<p>As noted above, the alternatives analysis looked at all types of zoning, and evaluated parcels or collections of parcels that met the project's criteria. The portions of Jordan Lake northwest of the proposed intake (around Bells Landing), as well as north of US 64 are shallower than is the lake further south, and therefore less resilient for water supply when the lake level is lower during drought. In addition, the west side of Jordan Lake north of the proposed site has similar land uses.</p>
9	<p>Q: Does the construction period of three years also include the running of the pipelines down Seaforth Rd and N. Pea Ridge? A construction period of three years with 150 construction workers is a significant disruption to the community and will produce particulate matter, road debris, noise and significant traffic issues that will hinder the ability to enjoy our property. This neighborhood has limited access to enter and leave and the scale and duration of this type of project is an undue burden. Residents would see this everyday coming and going, as well as interested persons in home resale opportunities that could provide a negative perception.</p>	<p>The construction period for the entire project is estimated to be around 3 years, inclusive of the treatment facility, lake intake and transmission pipelines. Please note that only the pipeline along Seaforth Road (to Durham, Chatham County and OWASA distribution systems) is part of the initial construction. The Town of Pittsboro has decided not to construct the transmission pipeline to Pittsboro in the initial project, though it will be constructed in the future.</p> <p>Construction for pipelines occurs for shorter durations at any one location, and will not require active construction over the entire 16-mile route for the entire duration.</p>
10	<p>The speed limit on Seaforth Rd and N. Pea Ridge are already dangerously high, prohibiting cyclists, runners and pedestrians to enjoy the roads. Increased traffic with large trucks delivering chemicals and removing waste put residents at further risk and speed limits should be lowered. What mitigation do you have planned to address this?</p>	<p>Concerns about the speed limit along Seaforth Road and N Pea Ridge Road have been raised in past public meetings, and the WIP partners desire to be a good neighbor. The context of past concerns have been with traffic to and from the Vista Point State Recreation Area, which will certainly remain a larger share of traffic than the water treatment facility. Our consultant has raised residents' concerns about the speed of existing traffic along both roads with the NCDOT District responsible for Chatham County roads, and provided contact information for this group to Seaforth Landing and other residents. NCDOT has several options to address residents' concerns, including speed limits, and traffic signals/signage.</p>

No.	Question/Comment	WIP Response
11	<p>After receiving Mr. Sullivan's email about signs being posted advertising the public hearing, I went out to look for them. I did locate two signs on Seaforth Rd, prior to the N. Pea Ridge intersection. Thank you for pointing this out. I do have some feedback regarding the signs. As the signs are 'generic' and don't inform citizens about "the what and the when" of the public hearing, they may not achieve your desired goal of citizen participation. In addition, the phone number is to the main planning department with no instructions or information related to the public hearing notice, or what prompt to select to learn more. I appreciate this is likely a cost saving measure, so you may use the same signs for all public hearings, however I feel this is self-limiting and am concerned that the true intent of the public notice effort may be being subverted.</p>	<p>This comment is addressed to the County.</p>
Aesthetics		
12	<p>Q: What type of perimeter fencing is proposed? What is the height of the fence? Will the fencing be visible from the road? The Apex/Cary WTF looks like a prison yard is an absolute eye sore, that seems to attract degraded home upkeep and roadway trash. While I feel that the Board should require the WIP to find a more suitable space that does not abut a residential development, at a minimum the entire facility should be out of sight and of enough distance from the road so that the 34 large structures and lighting are not visible. If the fencing is visible from the road, it should be aesthetically pleasing and with the purpose of securing the site <u>and</u> screening the view. A composite wood fence would be one option. The 'screening landscaping' at the Apex/Cary facility is inadequate and does not hide the chain link fence with barbed wire at the top, along with hazardous material signs. All the building are visible and you feel as if you are looking at a chemical plant site off the New</p>	<p>This is another important area where the project is proactively trying to be a good neighbor. The project proposes a vegetated buffer of generally 100-ft around the property to screen the facility from view. We won't rely just on existing vegetation; the proposal includes augmenting the current pine-dominant vegetation nearest the roads with additional plantings to enhance screening in the understory. Fencing would be located inside that 100-ft buffer, so that from the road a passerby or resident would see the trees. The Cary/Apex facility you mention has not taken these measures.</p> <p>Safety requires a metal fence around the developed portions of the facility, rather than a wood fence. This has not yet been designed, but our intent is that the fencing complements the desired screening effect.</p> <p>If you would like to see other examples of operating water treatment facilities incorporating features similar to what is planned for the Western Intake Partnership, the Partners can help you arrange a visit.</p>

No.	Question/Comment	WIP Response
	Jersey Turnpike. This type of compound would not fit in with the rest of the rural area or the entrance of a state recreational site.	
13	The number and size of the structures seem too many for the size of the lot and along with the clearcutting is not consistent with maintaining the rural beauty of Chatham County, let alone the entrance to a subdivision with \$1 million+ homes and the state recreational facility. Q: Why is the administrative building so large for 18-20 staff and what would a 6,000 sq ft expansion of the 2 nd floor look like and what purpose would it achieve? This seems excessive and not appropriate for a rural corner abutting a subdivision and state recreational facility.	The administrative building is typical for this sort of facility and is proposed to be attached to the treatment processes to consolidate construction. The staff to operate and maintain the facility safely would be housed in these areas. In addition, in inclement weather staff may need to stay temporarily in the facility. The provision for future expansion of the facility is a master-planning measure; this may not be needed. The drawings included with the application (accessible on the website) include a rendering of the administration building.
14	The clearcutting of the forest will be inconsistent with the surrounding area and the limited landscaping as outlined in the plan will neither screen the 34 enormous structures that are being constructed or limit the glow from the lighting. While I feel the Board should require the WIP to find a more suitable location that does not impact residents, at a minimum the placement of the structures should be far enough back from the roads so that they are not visible.	As noted above, the Partners desire to be a good neighbor to those who live in the Seaforth Road/N Pea Ridge Road area, and the vegetated buffer and other measures mentioned are to screen the facility from outside view. Further, with regard to lighting, the facility will be designed to limit offsite light by (1) limiting the number of light fixtures, (2) using fixture designs that limit up-lighting into the sky, (3) using energy-efficient, warm-color LED and sodium fixtures, and (4) using motion sensors and timers to limit unnecessary lighting.
15	I believe some areas of the documents indicated a 50ft buffer while others indicate a 100ft of natural vegetation will remain. Q: is it 50 or 100 feet? Are you counting the already cleared land from the road to the tree line? The reality is neither 50 or 100ft is adequate to hide the buildings, tanks, roads and related lights. The trees are pine and there is no low ground cover. A more appropriate site should be selected or, at a minimum, the number of structures and/or size should be decreased so they are set farther back from both roads. Q: How can you further mitigate the plan to ensure the buildings are hidden and related lighting is not visible given the limited number of 'canopy trees' and the limited screening planting planned?	The beginning of the vegetated buffer is the current beginning of vegetation within the site property; the road right of way is not counting road right-of-way. Nearly all the boundary facing N Pea Ridge Road and Seaforth Road will incorporate a 100-ft (or more) vegetated buffer. The existing pine trees do not provide the screening we'd like, which is why we are proposing to augment the trees with significant additional understory vegetation. The instances of 50-ft minimum buffer are where two stormwater management features impinge into the buffer next to the Vista Point Recreation Area (i.e., not along a road).

No.	Question/Comment	WIP Response
Lights		
16	Q: How many pole lights across the facility will be installed? On the diagram I counted at least 40?	The lighting design in the drawing you reviewed from the County's website is preliminary but reflects the general intent. Measures to minimize off-site light were discussed in response to question 14.
17	Q: How many exterior building lights will be installed? The diagram was illegible at that level?	The lighting design in the drawing you reviewed from the County's website is preliminary. Each of the buildings would be expected to have lights at entrances or in parking areas in lieu of additional pole lights. Our intention is to minimize the number of lights required.
18	Q: Will the interior building/structure lights remain on overnight?	The lighting design is preliminary, particularly for buildings and other structures. Conceptually, our intent is to (1) limit the number of light fixtures, (2) use fixture designs that limit up-lighting into the sky, (3) use energy-efficient, warm-color LED and sodium fixtures, and (4) use motion sensors and timers to limit unnecessary lighting. Interior lights would be turned off when not needed or shielded from view outside a building or structure.
19	The light pollution seems significant for both residents and wildlife and not appropriate. Q: Why is this level of lighting required at night when only a limited number of staff will be working and the site is secured by fencing? The lighting plan appears to be designed as if it is an airport or shopping mall. I am unclear how the limited amount of existing vegetation that will remain after clearcutting and is primarily pine trees will block this amount of light.	Same response as above.
20	The documents reference timers for the light which while is good from an energy standpoint, it does not address the glow that will be visible from the surrounding area if this amount of lighting is permitted. Q: How can the lighting plan or placement be changed to avoid negatively impacting the neighborhood.	Same response as above.

No.	Question/Comment	WIP Response
Noise		
21	The report acknowledges that currently noise levels are exceedingly low in the location as it is undeveloped and the adjacent properties are also quiet.	Statement, not a question.
22	The report further acknowledges that the facility will generate noise 24/7 but a 'noise study' will occur during the design phase and that they will abide by the county noise ordinance. Q: What is the purpose of the noise study? What is the expected dBA? What is the maximum dBA they will abide by, per the noise ordinance? Does the WIP feel the maximum dBA is appropriate at all times of operation? What additional mitigation can be utilized to ensure noise is not heard in the Seaforth Landing subdivision?	<p>Noise studies are commonly used to understand existing noises in the project area, and to model how noise is attenuated by the project's design measures. The study provides assurance of meeting the desired standard before facilities are constructed.</p> <p>Noise regulation is covered in Chapter 92 of the Chatham County ordinances. The county's maximum permissible daily standard shall not exceed 60 decibels (dBA), though a permit can be issued for up to 80 dBA (the project does not plan to request such a permit and plans to design facilities to remain under the County's standard). This is a maximum limit, and we would expect at most times the facility would be under this standard. Mitigation approaches include (1) the vegetated buffers, which also mean facilities will be more than 100 ft from the property line; (2) design equipment (like pumps and motors) to meet the standard, or be located within buildings designed with sound attenuation.</p>
23	The Apex/Cary WTF facility emits a constant humming noise and like it the planned facility will reverberate noise in this quiet community. It is not reasonable to ask the community to live with 24/7 noise levels from an industrial facility next door, when the zoning was originally established to protect residents from this type of burden. The WIP should be required to seek a parcel that is zoned appropriately and not adjacent to residential properties. At a minimum, the WIP should be required to conduct the noise study and prove they have buildings and technology in place that will not create noise burden to the neighborhood, PRIOR to a rezoning being approved.	Statement, not a question.

No.	Question/Comment	WIP Response
24	<p>The report mentions the potential for vibrations to residents but offers no mitigation other than to ‘notify residents and measure them.’ Q: Are residents expected to just live with 24/7 vibrations and noise from an industrial site? The WIP should be required to prove that they have buildings and technology to prevent vibration along with the noise PRIOR to a rezoning being approved.</p>	<p>The WIP facility desires to be a good neighbor to the surrounding community. Though we have not yet reached the stage of design to quantify the specific noise, lighting and vibration associated with the operation of the water treatment facility, water treatment facilities are <u>not</u> expected to have regular vibration which would be detectable off-site by residents. Page 9 of the Five Findings statement refers to contractor obligations to comply with the County’s regulations during construction. Measures to remove rock <u>may</u> cause detectable vibrations when the foundations and other facilities are constructed (such as the untreated water pump station from the water intake). Design specifications for this work will include appropriate measures for the Contractor to manage and minimize off-site vibration, and to be a good neighbor if issues are observed.</p>
25	<p>It is unreasonable to ask this community to live with the noise and disruption from 3 years of construction, including clearcutting, filling, building, etc. The WIP should be required to seek a parcel that is zoned appropriately, not adjacent to residential properties and perhaps already cleared of trees, rather than deforestation of old hardwood trees.</p>	<p>Statement, not a question. Note that the site is predominantly pine, due to its prior farming use.</p>
Hazard		
26	<p>The chemical storage facility is located on the side of the lot nearer to Seaforth Landing. The report offers no information on the risks to our health or safety if a chemical spill or fire were to take place. Transporting into the site, transferring them to storage and then utilizing the chemicals in the treatment all offer unique risks of an accident. Q: Was a health analysis conducted and, if so, where are the findings. If not, why? What is the environmental impact if a spill or fire were to occur? How would that impact wildlife and the lake? How would such an occurrence impact our land value?</p>	<p>Chemicals used for today’s water treatment are selected to avoid more hazardous materials. Chemical storage will typically be in liquid form, as well as some quantity of polymer that is stored as a dry powder. Even the chlorine used to disinfect the water will be stored in liquid form, at a strength like the Chlorox bleach one uses at home. The Chatham County Water Treatment Plant and Cary/Apex Water Treatment Facility on the other side of the lake and many other similar water treatment facilities already have these same chemicals and they are regulated for containment, fire prevention, and safety. These chemicals have to be NSF certified to go into drinking water, so they are not hazardous to neighbors. Spills are regulated to be contained and NC Fire Prevention Code requires fire protection wherever needed.</p>

No.	Question/Comment	WIP Response
27	We are dependent on well water. I did not see any impact analysis to our own drinking water in the event of a chemical spill or overflow of the waste from the treatment facility. Q: Has this analysis been conducted? If so, where are the findings? If not, why not?	This is a drinking water treatment facility and has no discharge into the ground that might affect area wells. Chemicals used for today’s water treatment are selected to minimize use of hazardous materials. As noted in the previous response, design standards will include containment of chemical off-loading and storage areas, so that they are not allowed to reach either surface streams or into the ground. The designs must pass review by state and local agencies, to assure that nearby well users are protected.
28	I don’t see any information that would indicate that water service would be extended to Seaforth Landing, yet we would bear the burden of the treatment facility for other counties and other areas of Chatham County. The benefits of this site will accrue to developers like Chatham Park at the expense of nearby residents and the environment. Q: What consideration has been made to extend water service to this neighborhood if the Board moves forward with approving the rezoning, regardless of resident objection?	In prior meetings with the public regarding this project, Chatham County representatives have advised they are not planning to provide water service to the areas immediately surrounding the proposed facility. The County has expressed its intention to serve current areas, but to rely on the municipal and private utilities operating within the County to serve developing areas outside the County’s existing service area.
29	One of the documents mentions posting of caution signs for hazardous materials. Q: Where will these be posted and what is the size of them?	Signage would be designed in a later phase of the project. The statement in the Five Findings Report is a reference to general practice for water treatment facilities and in conformance with required codes such as the NC Fire Prevention Code, to place identification labels and signage on storage tanks themselves as required by state and local codes and ordinances. Commonly, these signs would be similar but smaller than roadway signs, intended to be read by those working at the storage tank.
Land Value		
30	The report states that land value will not be impacted but offer no evidence to support this assertion. Q: What comparator data or analysis has been completed to support the findings that land values will not be impacted. It appears that this may be required, but I did not see any evidence of a land value report.	The statement in the Five Findings Report is “This project is not expected to impact surrounding land values. Based on the mitigative measures proposed at this facility, the project will not have a significant effect on surrounding properties.” Considerations supporting that expectation in the specific case of the Western Intake Partnership facilities include (1) the Partners have

No.	Question/Comment	WIP Response
		<p>committed to construct a fire hydrant at the facility, near the intersection of Seaforth Road and N Pea Ridge Road, to enhance Fire Department access to water for fire protection for area residents; (2) improvements to utilities to serve the treatment facility could improve these services for others in the surrounding area; (3) the Partners propose extensive vegetation preservation and enhancement measures to screen the facility from view of neighboring residents; (4) a subdivision of 50-100 homes, with their accompanying traffic, noise and light impacts, would otherwise be located on a property of this size. The site should be expected to be developed in some manner.</p>
31	<p>Homeowners bought into this subdivision with the expectation and good faith of a quiet rural setting and understood surrounding parcels to be residentially zoned. Q: Does the planning department and Board feel it is appropriate to change this rather than requiring the WIP to seek a parcel that is already zoned appropriately without residential neighbors, or use the acres of land near the high school and not squeeze this oversized “factory” into this small wedge of land, after permitting large lot luxury homes to be built? Many of the residents are near retirement or retired, looking for a peaceful neighborhood. A decision to allow this facility to be built, here, would be ruinous and am dismayed that the proposal has progressed this far with very limited consideration of the impact to the subdivisions.</p>	<p>Question posed to the County.</p>