

WWTP Site Selection Committee

Current Scoring Matrix Categories

As reflected in the June 2, 2026 meeting transcript

The June 2, 2026 Site Selection Committee meeting confirms the matrix in use remains a **five-category preliminary screening tool** intended to narrow the candidate list before deeper, more detailed evaluation of the shortlisted sites. The five categories, with what was said about each on June 2, are documented below.

1. Community Impact

The city engineer described this category (loosely) as a count of homes within a general area around each site, with fewer than 50 homes characterized as low impact and 250 or more characterized as higher impact. The committee discussed this category at some length — references to Gladeville, neighboring subdivisions, amenities, business, residential properties — without arriving at a written rubric. **Anchoring of score levels remains informal.**

2. Environmental Impact (and Permitting)

Includes endangered species concerns, floodplain percentage, storm-water infrastructure requirements, and the Phase I and Phase II site assessments — which the committee acknowledged have not been completed for any candidate site. One member explicitly noted on the record:

"A lot of the environmental endangered species stuff there's no way to know that before we short list."

By design, then, this category is being scored on incomplete information at the preliminary screening stage.

3. Existing Infrastructure

The engineer characterized this category as *"a big one."* It includes water, gas, and three-phase power availability; road width and capacity; and proximity to the existing force main, with cost of connection estimated at approximately \$1,000 per linear foot, doubled to roughly \$4,000 per foot when over-and-back connections to both F1 and F2 are required. In practice this is the cost-driver category.

4. Size of Property

The engineer's stated minimum is **60 buildable acres** including buffer. Candidate sites under that threshold (notably Sites 4, 11, 13, 14, and 15) are effectively penalized regardless of merit on the other categories. The 60-acre minimum is technology-dependent — a conventional

activated sludge plant requires materially more land than a membrane bioreactor plant — and the committee has not disclosed which treatment technology is planned. (This disclosure gap is addressed in Appendix F of the Public Record Statement.)

5. Service Efficiency (proposed for renaming)

This category is in active flux. Early in the June 2 meeting, a committee member proposed renaming it:

"That last one that said service efficiency. I think there might have been some confusion over that and I'd like to propose that we replace that with something has to do with how far the site is from the force main."

A follow-up suggestion of **"force main proximity"** appears to have been offered. No formal vote on the rename was taken during the June 2 meeting.

The engineer's response to the rename proposal broadened the original *"service efficiency"* definition to include two distinct considerations:

- Proximity to the existing effluent line and the associated cost of running new pipe;
- Potential to serve other areas — specifically, *"north of or out in the county or wherever this is... county residents with failing septic systems and things like that."*

The second piece — regional-hub service to failing-septic county areas — is the future-state operational scope addressed in Appendix D of the Public Record Statement.

Observations from the June 2 Meeting

The matrix is explicitly preliminary.

A committee member stated on the record:

"The thought is once we get it narrowed down... there are going to be additional criteria that are added to that where we dig deeper into the process. So this is just high level."

This confirms the existence of **deferred criteria** — substantive matters that will not be evaluated at the screening stage. Appendix G of the Public Record Statement addresses the procedural safeguards required to make a preliminary screening defensible under these conditions.

The matrix is being characterized as non-binding.

Committee members repeatedly described the matrix as a tool rather than an authority. One member stated:

"The matrix is not... an absolute, it's a tool we have."

Another suggested that a site should stay on the list *"regardless of what the matrix says"* if there were strong reasons. The matrix therefore carries procedural weight (it is the basis for elimination) and simultaneous rhetorical disclaim (committee members are already publicly hedging its authority). This dual stance is itself a procedural concern: a tool that drives elimination decisions should not be one its users disclaim in advance.

No anchored scoring rubric was adopted.

The five categories are agreed upon. Their meanings are loosely sketched in transcript discussion. The anchored definitions of what distinguishes a score of 5 from a 4, or a 3 from a 2, **do not exist on the public record** as of the close of the June 2 meeting. The procedural critique in Appendix G of the Public Record Statement remains accurate.

Note for the Next Revision

If category 5 is formally renamed at the June 15 meeting (from "Service Efficiency" to "Force Main Proximity" or similar), the footnote in Appendix G of the Public Record Statement that lists the five matrix criteria should be updated to reflect the adopted name. The substantive arguments in Appendix G do not depend on the category name; only the reference list does.

Prepared from the June 2, 2026 Wastewater Treatment Plant Site Selection Committee meeting transcript (City of Lebanon, TN). Page or minute references available on request.