

Data: 12/1/2006 Time: 2:56 PM To: @ 9,3672808

Town of Cary FAX Svr Page: 003

The memo from Poyner & Spruill is included for your information in the event it may be useful as we discuss next steps for finalizing the EIS.

This information is not intended to be a formal response to your July 27, 2006 or October 2, 2006 letters; rather, it is draft information that we will use in developing that response after we meet with you on December 4. We greatly appreciate your taking the time to meet with us, and look forward to a productive discussion that will address the remaining issues needed to finalize the Draft EIS.

Please call me at 469-4092 or Leila Goodwin at 462-3846 if you have any questions or do not receive the complete attachments.



## **DRAFT TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM**

**PREPARED FOR:** Western Wake Partners

**FROM:** Western Wake Project Consultants

**DATE:** November 29, 2006

**SUBJECT:** Response to NC DENR Information and Data Request  
Western Wake Water Reclamation Facility Site Selection Data  
Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities

---

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of this technical memorandum (TM) is to present supplemental information and data, as requested by the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources (NC DENR), regarding alternative sites that have been considered for the construction of a new water reclamation facility (WRF) that will provide wastewater treatment service for the Towns of Apex, Cary, and Morrisville, as well as the Wake County portion of Research Triangle Park (RTP South).

#### **1.1 BACKGROUND**

In April 2006 the Western Wake Partners (Partners) submitted a preliminary draft environmental impact statement (EIS) to the Construction Grants and Loans Section (CG&L) of the NC DENR Division of Water Quality (DWQ). The purpose of the EIS document is to present a discussion of the expected environmental impacts associated with the proposed Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities project (Project). On June 15, 2006, NC DENR conducted a public hearing to receive comments on the preliminary draft EIS. The public comment period remained open until June 30, 2006.

#### **1.2 HEARING OFFICERS' REPORT AND NCDENR GUIDANCE LETTERS**

NC DENR's Hearing Officers' Report and Recommendations (Hearing Officers' Report) was issued on July 20, 2006. The Hearing Officers' Report summarizes the oral and written comments received during the public comment period and presents recommendations regarding additional information and data that the Partners should consider for incorporation into the EIS in order for the

DRAFT

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

Response to NCDENR Request for Additional Information and Data - WRF Site Selection Data  
Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities

November 29, 2006

Page 2 of 12

document to be considered suitable for submission to the State Clearinghouse as a final draft EIS.

Based on the recommendations of the Hearing Officers' Report, and after consultations with the Hearing Officers and other NC DENR staff, NC DENR has prepared two guidance letters for the Partners. The first letter was issued on July 27, 2006 and the second letter was issued on October 2, 2006. The guidance letters outline the specific information and data items that the Partners must provide to NC DENR staff for review and consideration. Two of the additional information and data items referenced in the NC DENR guidance letters are (a) additional environmental justice analyses, and (b) 20-year present worth cost estimates.

These two additional information and data items are presented in this TM in Section 2.0 and Section 3.0, respectively. Supplemental information prepared by the Western Wake Project Consultants (Consultants) for consideration by NC DENR, and related to the overall WRF site evaluation, is presented in Section 4.0 and Section 5.0.

## 2.0 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE DATA

In accordance with NC DENR guidance letters, the Consultants have conducted an environmental justice (EJ) analysis for each of 13 potential WRF sites. The EJ analyses presented in this TM are intended to supplement the EJ analysis that has already been completed and submitted to NC DENR in the April 2006 edition of the preliminary draft EIS.

As prescribed by NC DENR, the affected area to be analyzed for minority demographics is defined as the areas of census blocks, or portions thereof, encompassed within two concentric circles drawn around the centroid of each potential WRF site. The first circle is drawn with a radius of 0.5 miles around the centroid of each site, and the second circle is drawn with a radius of 1.0 miles around the centroid of each site. For each circle, the Consultants have assumed uniform distribution of total population and minority population within each census-block area and have assigned total population and minority population to the affected area based on the fraction (%) of the census-block area that is encompassed within the circle. For example, if 50-percent of the area of a census block is encompassed within the 1-mile radius, then the Consultants have assigned 50-percent of the total population and 50-percent of the minority population to the affected area being analyzed for environmental justice.

For purposes of scoring, and as prescribed by NC DENR, sites with a minority population less than 50% are to be assigned a score of 1.0 and sites with a minority population greater than or equal to 50% are to be assigned a score of 5. Table 1 presents the results of the EJ analyses conducted by

## DRAFT

## TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

Response to NCDENR Request for Additional Information and Data -- WRF Site Selection Data  
Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities

November 29, 2006

Page 3 of 12

the Consultants as prescribed by NC DENR staff in the guidance letters of July 27, 2006 and October 2, 2006. As further prescribed by NC DENR, the Consultants have combined physical feature scores (*Items 1 through 8 in Table 2 and reprinted in this TM from the preliminary draft EIS, April 2006*) for each of the potential WRF sites with EJ scores for each of the potential WRF sites. The results of combining physical feature scores with EJ scores are presented in Table 2. Table 2 is submitted in its current form as directed by NC DENR in the guidance letter of October 2, 2006.

### 3.0 ANALYSIS OF COST DATA

To prepare 20-year present worth cost estimates for each of the 13 sites, the Consultants identified alignment routes for raw wastewater pipelines and treated effluent pipelines to serve each of the potential WRF sites. For each of the potential WRF sites, raw wastewater pipeline alignments were developed based on raw wastewater entering the regional wastewater system at the West Cary Pump Station and treated effluent being discharged at the main stem of the Cape Fear River downstream of Buckhorn Dam. For several sites (Sites 20, 21, 22, 25, 26 and 28) two alternative effluent transmission routes were identified. One alternative alignment was routed around the north and western perimeter of Harris Lake, and one alternative was routed around the south and eastern perimeter of Harris Lake. The pipeline lengths required for each potential WRF site are presented in Table 3.

Using pipeline alignment and length information provided in Table 3, the Consultants then used topographical data to prepare a preliminary hydraulic profile and conduct a preliminary hydraulic analysis for each of the 13 sites. The preliminary hydraulic profile and hydraulic analyses served as the basis for sizing pump stations and pipelines and estimating power consumption for each of the 13 sites.

Once facility sizes and power consumption requirements were determined for each of the 13 sites, the Consultants prepared estimates of construction costs and annual operation and maintenance (O&M) costs for each of the potential WRF sites. Construction costs include estimates for land acquisition; a new water reclamation facility; raw wastewater pump stations, force mains and gravity sewers; a treated effluent pump station and treated effluent transmission mains. Annual O&M costs include estimates for power consumption for pump stations; labor and material costs for pump station and pipeline inspection and maintenance; and chemical consumption costs for nuisance odor control for raw wastewater conveyance.

Date: 12/1/2006 Time: 2:56 PM To: @ 9.3672808

Town of Cary FAX Svr Page: 007

DRAFT  
MEMORANDUM  
Response to NCDENR Request for Additional Information and Data - WRF Site Selection Data  
Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities

November 29, 2006  
Page 4 of 12

DRAFT  
TABLE 1  
Environmental Justice Demographic Comparisons  
Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities

WRF Site	0.5-Mile Radius Analysis		1.0-Mile Radius Analysis		Score to be Used in Evaluation Table (2)
	Minority Population / Total Population (1)	Percent Minority	Minority Population / Total Population (1)	Percent Minority	
Site 3	16 / 152	11%	61 / 595	10%	1
Site 6	3 / 66	5%	10 / 257	4%	1
Site 9	76 / 162	47%	267 / 1,015	26%	1
Site 11/12	1 / 36	3%	5 / 159	3%	1
Site 14	84 / 102	82%	157 / 297	53%	5
Site 16	15 / 92	16%	43 / 330	13%	1
Site 20	3 / 13	23%	39 / 74	53%	5
Site 21	3 / 12	25%	18 / 47	38%	1
Site 22	2 / 9	22%	7 / 30	23%	1
Site 25	3 / 21	14%	3 / 39	8%	1
Site 26	2 / 17	12%	14 / 64	22%	1
Site 28	8 / 12	67%	22 / 55	40%	5
Site 30	6 / 27	22%	48 / 147	33%	1

**Environmental Justice Data for Other Areas**

	Minority Population / Total Population	Percent Minority
Wake County	188,686 / 627,846	30.1%
Project Service Area (1)	30,120 / 149,748	20.1%

**Notes:**

- (1) Total population and minority population are weighted based on census block area within 0.5-mile and 1.0-mile radius  
(2) Sites were assigned a score of "1" if population within the 0.5-mile and 1.0-mile radius was less than 50% minority. Sites were assigned a score of "5" if population within the 0.5-mile or 1.0-mile radius was greater than 50% minority.

DRAFT  
MEMORANDUM  
Response to NC DENR Request for Additional Information - WRF Site Selection Data  
Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities

November 29, 2006  
Page 5 of 12

DRAFT  
TABLE 2  
Combined WRF Site Data - Physical Features and Social Demographics  
Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities Project

EVALUATION CRITERIA	POTENTIAL WRF SITES												
	3	6	9	11 & 12	14	30	16	20	21	22	25	26	28
1 PROPERTY OWNERS	7.50	6.10	6.30	3.50	2.30	2.10	3.50	1.50	1.90	1.90	2.50	2.10	2.90
2 EXISTING LAND USE	7.50	6.36	3.79	4.07	1.50	1.50	3.50	1.50	1.50	1.79	1.50	1.79	2.64
3 ADJACENT LAND USE	5.00	3.25	3.10	2.29	3.75	1.00	3.00	1.51	1.64	1.73	2.00	2.04	2.31
4 COUNTY LOCATION	1.00	3.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
5 IMPACT ON PROJ. COSTS	1.86	1.22	1.21	0.81	1.28	2.50	1.57	1.76	1.24	1.12	0.50	2.50	1.04
6 ENVIRONMENTAL	5.00	3.56	1.34	2.27	3.61	4.39	1.78	1.00	1.00	3.45	1.00	2.70	1.00
7 OTHER/MISC.	5.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
8 AREA RATIO	1.50	1.50	7.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	4.95	5.21	4.44	1.50	4.56	4.44	1.50
<b>SUBTOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE</b>	<b>34.4</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>25.2</b>	<b>20.4</b>	<b>15.8</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>17.7</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>14.1</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>13.4</b>
9 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE <sup>(1)</sup>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	5.00
<b>TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE (with EJ)</b>	<b>35.4</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>26.2</b>	<b>21.4</b>	<b>20.9</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>18.7</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>15.1</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>18.4</b>

Notes:

(1) The scores presented in this table include the scores for environmental justice demographic data (item 8) and physical feature data (items 1 through 8) for each of 13 possible WRF sites. The table has been prepared in its current form as directed by the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources (NC DENR). Given the nature and source of each data set, the Project Partners recommend that EJ demographic data and physical feature data be evaluated separately for each potential WRF site. The presentation of separate EJ demographic data and physical feature data are presented in Table 6 of Section 5.0 of this TM. Table 2 is presented in this TM in its current form as directed by NC DENR in the guidance letter of October 2, 2006.

(2) Sites were assigned a score of "1" if population within the 0.5-mile and 1.0-mile radius was less than 50% minority. Sites were assigned a score of "5" if population within the 0.5-mile or 1.0-mile radius was greater than 50% minority.

Date: 12/1/2006 Time: 2:56 PM To: @ 9,3672808

Town of Cary FAX Svr Page: 009

DRAFT  
MEMORANDUMResponse to NCDENR Request for Additional Information and Data - WRF Site Selection Data  
Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities ProjectNovember 29, 2006  
Page 6 of 12DRAFT  
TABLE 3  
Influent and Effluent Pipeline Length Comparisons  
Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities

WRF Site	Route Length (miles)		
	Influent Pipe	Effluent Pipe	Total Length
Site 3	10.8	19.2	30.0
Site 6	13.2	17.1	30.3
Site 9	8.9	16.0	24.9
Site 11/12	10.0	15.8	25.8
Site 14	9.7	11.7	21.5
Site 16	9.9	14.0	23.9
Site 20 (NW Route)	11.9	14.8	26.7
Site 20 (SE Route)		14.0	25.9
Site 21 (NW Route)	12.1	14.9	27.0
Site 21 (SE Route)		14.0	26.1
Site 22 (NW Route)	12.3	15.6	27.9
Site 22 (SE Route)		14.5	26.9
Site 25 (NW Route)	13.1	15.3	28.4
Site 25 (SE Route)		15.4	28.5
Site 26 (NW Route)	13.3	15.6	28.9
Site 26 (SE Route)		15.7	29.0
Site 28 (NW Route)	15.2	17.0	32.2
Site 28 (SE Route)		12.2	27.4
Site 30	11.2	11.0	22.2

**DRAFT****TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM**

Response to NCDENR Request for Additional Information and Data – WRF Site Selection Data  
Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities

November 29, 2006

Page 7 of 12

Construction costs, O&M costs and salvage values for each of the 13 sites have been converted to 20-year present worth values to allow for direct comparison of total project costs for each potential WRF site. The summary of construction costs, O&M costs, salvage values and 20-year present worth costs for each of the 13 sites is presented in Table 4.

#### **4.0 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCE DATA**

Section 2.0 and Section 3.0 provide information and data as requested by NC DENR staff in the guidance letters of July 27, 2006 and October 2, 2006. However, consistent with applicable federal and state regulatory requirements for the preparation of environmental documentation, the Consultants have prepared Section 4.0 to present information and data regarding the estimated environmental impacts associated with the raw wastewater pipelines and treated effluent pipelines required to serve each of the 13 potential WRF sites. The Consultants have conducted a review and analysis of environmental resource information and data to estimate environmental impacts for streams, wetlands, game lands, archaeological and cultural resources and property parcels. The estimated environmental impacts associated with the pipelines required to serve each of the potential WRF sites are presented in Table 5.

#### **5.0 PRESENTATION OF TOTAL PROJECT IMPACTS**

The purpose of this TM is to present the results of the data collection and analyses that have been conducted to review and evaluate alternative sites for the construction of a new water reclamation facility that will provide wastewater treatment service for the Towns of Apex, Cary and Morrisville, as well as the Wake County portion of Research Triangle Park (RTP South).

Because the individual components (pumps stations, pipelines, treatment facilities, etc.) of the proposed Project are functionally interdependent – thereby constituting a single and connected action – the evaluation of alternative WRF sites should consider the total costs and total environmental impacts for the entire Project. Accordingly, the Consultants have prepared information and data that allows for a direct comparison of total costs and total environmental impacts for each of the 13 potential WRF sites. The available information and data is summarized in Table 6.

Data: 12/1/2006 Time: 2:56 PM To: @ 9,3672808

Town of Cary FAX SVr Page: 011

**DRAFT  
MEMORANDUM**

Response to NCDENR Request for Additional Information and Data - WRF Site Selection Data  
Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities

November 29, 2006

Page 8 of 12

**DRAFT  
TABLE 4  
Construction, O&M, and 20-Year Present Worth Cost Comparisons  
Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities**

WRF Site	Capital Costs <sup>(1)</sup>	O&M Costs <sup>(1)</sup>	Salvage Value <sup>(1)</sup>	20-Year PW Costs
Site 3	\$ 280,617,000	\$ 68,207,000	\$ (44,497,000)	\$ 304,327,000
Site 6	\$ 298,160,000	\$ 68,620,000	\$ (48,922,000)	\$ 317,858,000
Site 9	\$ 285,406,000	\$ 70,855,000	\$ (39,603,000)	\$ 296,658,000
Site 11/12	\$ 281,781,000	\$ 70,489,000	\$ (44,422,000)	\$ 307,848,000
Site 14	\$ 260,253,500	\$ 68,090,000	\$ (38,665,000)	\$ 289,678,500
Site 16	\$ 259,679,000	\$ 69,672,000	\$ (38,304,000)	\$ 291,047,000
Site 20 (NW Route)	\$ 278,723,000	\$ 70,294,000	\$ (42,592,000)	\$ 306,425,000
Site 20 (SE Route)	\$ 273,224,000	\$ 72,680,000	\$ (41,594,000)	\$ 304,310,000
Site 21 (NW Route)	\$ 278,285,000	\$ 69,487,000	\$ (42,614,000)	\$ 305,158,000
Site 21 (SE Route)	\$ 277,271,000	\$ 72,068,000	\$ (42,173,000)	\$ 307,166,000
Site 22 (NW Route)	\$ 284,179,000	\$ 71,335,000	\$ (44,023,000)	\$ 311,491,000
Site 22 (SE Route)	\$ 281,676,000	\$ 73,921,000	\$ (43,173,000)	\$ 312,424,000
Site 25 (NW Route)	\$ 272,285,000	\$ 69,806,000	\$ (41,382,000)	\$ 300,689,000
Site 25 (SE Route)	\$ 275,481,000	\$ 72,578,000	\$ (41,776,000)	\$ 306,283,000
Site 26 (NW Route)	\$ 276,556,000	\$ 71,383,000	\$ (41,984,000)	\$ 305,955,000
Site 26 (SE Route)	\$ 278,671,000	\$ 74,040,000	\$ (42,294,000)	\$ 310,417,000
Site 28 (NW Route)	\$ 290,146,000	\$ 71,361,000	\$ (45,516,000)	\$ 315,991,000
Site 28 (SE Route)	\$ 274,154,000	\$ 73,131,000	\$ (41,611,000)	\$ 305,674,000
Site 30	\$ 268,532,000	\$ 69,369,000	\$ (40,272,000)	\$ 295,629,000

Note:

(1) All costs are present worth costs, 2006 dollars

Date: 12/1/2006 Time: 2:56 PM To: @ 9,3672809

Town of Cary FAX Svr Page: 012

DRAFT  
MEMORANDUM  
Response to NCDENR Request for Additional Information and Data - WRF Site Selection Data  
Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities Project

November 29, 2006  
Page 9 of 12

DRAFT  
TABLE 5  
Environmental Impact Comparisons  
Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities

WRF Site	Stream Impacts (No. of Crossings) <sup>(1)</sup>	Wetland Impacts (acres) <sup>(1)</sup>	Property Impacts (Total Parcels / Unique Property Owners) <sup>(1)</sup>	Game Land Impacts (acres) <sup>(1)</sup>	Number of Historic Sites or Districts within 0.5 mile <sup>(1)(2)</sup>
Site 3	81	25.6	214 / 162	37.0	7
Site 6	64	12.6	241 / 190	42.8	11
Site 9	58	12.4	205 / 162	36.2	7
Site 11/12	54	12.0	195 / 164	40.4	7
Site 14	40	13.1	143 / 116	36.2	7
Site 16	51	12.1	176 / 130	36.2	7
Site 20 (NW Route)	58	14.8	151 / 135	45.7	5
Site 20 (SE Route)	71	16.1	141 / 134	49.9	4
Site 21 (NW Route)	60	14.1	157 / 140	47.2	7
Site 21 (SE Route)	73	16.1	144 / 137	49.9	6
Site 22 (NW Route)	66	14.0	159 / 147	47.2	7
Site 22 (SE Route)	70	16.0	141 / 138	49.9	6
Site 25 (NW Route)	53	13.2	223 / 173	36.7	7
Site 25 (SE Route)	68	14.0	195 / 173	48.8	6
Site 26 (NW Route)	59	13.1	228 / 175	36.7	7
Site 26 (SE Route)	74	14.0	200 / 175	50.5	6
Site 28 (NW Route)	53	15.0	239 / 191	41.4	7
Site 28 (SE Route)	64	13.8	202 / 170	49.4	6
Site 30	40	13.1	134 / 115	40.1	7

## Notes:

(1) Includes impacts for influent/effluent pipeline easements but not WRF site.

(2) Includes number of historic districts or sites for which pipelines will be installed within 0.5-mile of the district or site.

DRAFT  
TABLE 6  
Summary of Data Analysis  
Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities

WRF Site	Summary		WRF Site Data		Pipes Alignment Length Data			Cost Data		Total Project Data			
	No. of Buildings in Tract	No. of Top Buildings	Payroll Fraction Data	Environmental Justice Site (Percent Minority within 1/4 mile Radius)	Row	Webster	Total Length	25-Year PW Costs	Stream Impacts (No. of Crossings) <sup>(1)</sup>	Wetland Impacts (Acres) <sup>(2)</sup>	Property Impacts (Total Property / Unique Property Owners) <sup>(3)</sup>	Gross Land Impacts (Acres) <sup>(4)</sup>	Number of Historic Sites or Districts within 0.5-mile <sup>(5)</sup>
Site 3	2	0	34.4	11%	10.8		30.0	\$304,327,000	81	25.6	214 / 162	37.0	7
Site 6	2	0	25.0	5%	13.2		30.3	\$317,858,000	64	12.6	241 / 190	42.8	11
Site 9	5	2	35.2	47%	<b>8.9</b>		24.9	\$286,668,000	53	12.4	305 / 162	<b>38.2</b>	7
Site 14/12	4	2	20.4	3%	10.0		25.8	\$307,848,000	54	<b>12.0</b>	195 / 184	40.4	7
Site 14	7	4	15.9	82%	8.7		<b>21.5</b>	<b>\$289,871,508</b>	<b>48</b>	13.1	143 / 116	<b>38.2</b>	7
Site 18	6	1	20.3	16%	9.9		23.9	\$291,047,000	51	12.1	178 / 130	<b>36.2</b>	7
Site 20 (NW Route)	3	1	14.5	23%	11.9		28.7	\$308,425,000	58	14.8	151 / 135	45.7	5
Site 20 (SE Route)							25.9	\$304,310,000	71	16.1	141 / 134	48.9	4
Site 21 (NW Route)	1	0	17.7	25%	12.1		27.0	\$305,158,000	60	14.1	157 / 140	47.2	7
Site 23 (SE Route)							26.1	\$307,188,000	73	16.1	144 / 137	48.9	6
Site 22 (NW Route)	3	0	13.5	22%	12.3		27.9	\$311,491,000	86	14.0	159 / 147	47.2	7
Site 22 (SE Route)							26.9	\$312,424,000	70	16.0	141 / 138	48.9	6
Site 25 (NW Route)	6	0	14.1	14%	13.1		28.4	\$300,889,000	53	13.2	223 / 173	36.7	7
Site 25 (SE Route)							28.5	\$306,283,000	66	14.0	193 / 173	48.9	6
Site 26 (NW Route)	4	0	17.6	12%	13.3		28.9	\$305,065,000	59	13.1	228 / 175	36.7	7
Site 26 (SE Route)							29.0	\$310,417,000	74	14.0	200 / 175	50.5	6
Site 28 (NW Route)	3	1	<b>13.4</b>	67%	15.2		32.2	\$375,881,000	53	15.0	239 / 191	41.4	7
Site 28 (SE Route)							27.4	\$305,874,000	64	13.8	202 / 170	48.4	6
Site 30	8	2	15.0	22%	11.2		32.2	\$295,528,000	<b>48</b>	13.1	<b>134 / 115</b>	40.1	7

Notes:  
 (1) Includes impacts for all tributary pipelines assessments but not WRF site  
 (2) Rankings for parcels based on number of unique property owners  
 (3) Includes number of historic districts or sites for which pipelines will be installed within 0.5-miles of the district or site  
 (4) Denotes five highest-ranking sites for each category  
 (5) Denotes highest-ranking site for each category

Date: 12/1/2006 Time: 2:56 PM To: @ 9,3672808

Town of Cary FAX 5yr Page: 014

DRAFT  
TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM  
Response to NCDENR Request for Additional Information and Data – WRF Site Selection Data  
Western Wake Regional Wastewater Management Facilities

November 29, 2006  
Page 11 of 12

## 6.0 RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information and data presented in Table 6, the consultants find that Site 14 offers the least impacts at the lowest cost. This finding is consistent with the information and data presented in the April 2006 edition of the preliminary draft EIS. Accordingly, the Consultants recommend that the Partners proceed with the preparation of the final draft EIS for submittal to the State Clearinghouse with Site 14 presented as the preferred WRF site for the proposed Project. In addition, as requested in the NC DENR guidance letters, it is recommended that the Partners proceed with the implementation of a public participation program for the affected community located adjacent to Site 14. The results of the public participation program will be presented to NC DENR and included in the Final EIS as agreed upon by NC DENR. The recommended public participation program is presented in Appendix A of this TM.