

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROCEEDING ) RESOLUTION NO. 82-336  
WITH THE SITING AND )  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WEST ) Introduced by  
TRANSFER STATION ) Councilors Deines, Oleson,  
and Rhodes

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Service District has the responsibility for solid waste planning and implementation within the region; and

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Service District, under ORS 268.317, has authorization to construct, lease, improve, and operate landfills, transfer stations, resource recovery plants and other facilities needed for solid waste disposal; and

WHEREAS, Transfer stations are part of the Solid Waste Management Plan and provide service, improve hauling efficiencies, and control the flow of material to the proper facilities; and

WHEREAS, The Regional Services Committee approved the summary and recommendations in the Proposed Solid Waste Transfer Plan which included giving priority to the implementation of a west transfer station when implementing transfer stations; and

WHEREAS, The Board of County Commissioners for Washington County, Oregon, the City of Hillsboro, City of Beaverton, City of Forest Grove, City of Tigard, City of Cornelius, and City of Tualatin passed a resolution requesting the Metropolitan Service District to site a solid waste transfer station within Washington County; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Council supports the implementation of the west transfer station to service the western portion of the region which includes Washington County, Beaverton, Hillsboro, Forest Grove, Cornelius, Tigard, King City, Durham, Sherwood, Tualatin, and a portion of the City of Portland.

2. The Council directs the solid waste staff to develop and implement a public process which involves local agencies in Washington County for siting and implementing a west transfer station for the purpose of providing service, improving hauling efficiencies, and controlling the flow of material to the proper facilities.

3. The Council directs the staff to meet with local officials in order to set up a committee composed of representatives from local agencies which will be served by the west station to establish selection criteria for the RFP process. The committee will review proposals and recommend a firm to proceed with the land use permit process.

4. The Council directs the staff to draft criteria for the selection process that are consistent with Metro's solid waste goals. Final criteria and weighting factors will be approved by the selection committee.

5. The Council directs the staff to prepare a draft of a Request for Proposals (RFP) that will be consistent with Metro goals and will be reviewed and approved by the selection committee. The RFP will contain the process and provision for siting, design, construction, and operation of the west transfer station.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District  
this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 1982.

Cindy Ganger  
Presiding Officer

KT:bb  
6341B/309  
7/8/82



**METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT**  
527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OR. 97201, 503/221-1646

## MEMORANDUM

Date: July 9, 1982  
To: Metro Council  
From: Staff  
Regarding: Local Government Review Committee on  
Westside Transfer Station

Membership of the proposed committee would include one representative from each affected jurisdiction, chosen by the governing body of those jurisdictions, including: (1) Forest Grove; (2) Cornelius; (3) Hillsboro; (4) Beaverton; (5) Tigard; (6) Tualatin; (7) Sherwood; (8) Durham; (9) King City; (10) Washington County; (11) Metro Council; and the City of Portland will send a non-voting member.

The committee's charge would be to "advise the Metro Council on the need for; type; cost; constructor/operator, and the level of service to be obtained from a Washington County Solid Waste Transfer Station." The committee would accomplish this by:

- Reviewing the RFP criteria;
- Developing proposal selection criteria;
- Reviewing proposals; ranking them; and suggesting top firms to the Council for formal action.

A future optional charge would be to have this committee function as an oversight body, advising the Council on operations and rates.

Factors which limit the committee's authority would include:

- Metro Council is the ultimate decision-making body;
- The Metro Council will emphasize the importance of cost in selecting a proposal;
- A Westside transfer station must:
  - 'be of adequate size to handle the Washington County service area;
  - 'be open to the public;

Memorandum

July 9, 1982

Page 2

- \*offer recycling facilities;
- \*be subject to Metro flow control;
- \*be compatible with the regional system.

The committee schedule will be determined by the date by which the Council wishes to issue an RFP. Adequate time to hold at least two public hearings should be programmed into the schedule. The jurisdictions to be served by the station should be consulted to determine the date by which they want the station operational.

PF:pp



METRO

**METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT**

527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OR. 97201, 503/221-1646

**MEMORANDUM**

Date: June 29, 1982  
To: Regional Services Committee  
From: Rick Gustafson, Executive Officer  
Regarding: West Transfer Station Update

At the May 11, 1982 and June 8, 1982 Regional Services Committee meetings, the implementation of the West Transfer Station was discussed. The following is a history of this project and a review of the progress staff has made in developing an implementation strategy.

The Solid Waste Management Plan (COR-MET) was adopted by the MSD Board (Ordinance No. 9) in May, 1974. The adopted plan recommended four transfer/processing stations. One of these stations was located in Washington County. An environmental assessment of the milling stations was completed in September 1974, and a site in Beaverton was selected as the top site. Due to public opposition, this site was rejected.

In November 1974, an RFP was issued for construction of four transfer/processing facilities. A public committee appointed by the MSD Board evaluated the proposals. As a result of a revised cost estimate of the COR-MET estimate for the four transfer/processing stations which indicated the COR-MET estimate was low and a request for a \$20 million grant/loan from the State of Oregon Pollution Control Bond Fund, which was subsequently denied, the evaluation committee recommended a reduction in the number of stations. In August 1975, MSD modified the solid waste plan to two transfer/processing stations (one in north Portland and one in close proximity to Rossman's Landfill) and one transfer station to be located in Washington County (Ordinance No. 31).

Three proposals had been submitted in the RFP process and were rejected due to a legal opinion which recommended that a contract not be awarded under the bidding process since the number of facilities were reduced. Since the Beaverton site was rejected, an environmental assessment of a site on Merlo Road was conducted. In December 1975, MSD signed a contract with Parker Northwest for the design, construction, management and operation of Rossman's processing station and the Merlo Road transfer station. This contract became invalid due to Parker's inability to obtain private financing of approximately



Memorandum  
June 29, 1982  
Page 2

\$4 million to purchase the short-term equipment. Because of the lack of financing for the project and the defeat of a Washington County Comprehensive Plan change for the site, the station on Merlo Road was not constructed.

In September 1978, the Disposal Siting Alternatives Report was released and recommended that a transfer station be implemented to correspond with the Oregon City processing plant or a system of landfills. Since this report, SCS Engineers reviewed, in 1980, 21 options for transporting waste to the Energy Recovery Facility (ERF). As a result of this report, Metro staff further evaluated the recommendation presented in the SCS report, a three-transfer station system, as well as the two-station alternative. The proposed Solid Waste Transfer Plan, which analyzed the two- and three-station options, recommended the implementation of a two-station system.

The Regional Services Committee approved in January 1981 the summary and recommendations in the proposed Solid Waste Transfer Plan which included giving priority to the implementation of a West Transfer Station when implementing transfer stations. The proposed Solid Waste Transfer Plan and a Transfer Station Siting Procedures Report was sent to all local jurisdictions within the region in May 1981. Due to limited response to these reports, Metro did not proceed with implementation. Metro staff did continue to update the cost effectiveness of the two-station system.

In December 1981, the Solid Waste Facilities Implementation Plan (FIP) was presented to the Metro Council. The FIP compared the cost of alternative solid waste disposal systems and their impacts. Results of the FIP indicated that one central transfer station provided the necessary flow control. However, construction of two transfer stations (i.e., two stations and the Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center) would not result in additional cost to the total system cost. The cost savings with the two-station system is in the collection haul cost.

The existing landfills which currently serve the Washington County commercial haulers and the public are St. Johns, Rossman's, Newberg, Hillsboro and Grabhorn. By the end of this year, Rossman's and Hillsboro Landfills are expected to close. The Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center (CTRC), which will open when Rossman's Landfill closes, will not provide service to Washington County. Newberg Landfill is estimated to close by early 1984.

In Washington County, commercial haulers travel to Newberg, St. Johns or Rossman's Landfills. With the closure of Rossman's, Washington County haulers will travel to either Newberg or St. Johns. However, the major impact to the haulers in Washington County will not be when Rossman's closes, but when Newberg closes. Once Newberg closes, Washington County haulers would then either travel to St. Johns or McMinnville Landfills. The impact of Hillsboro Landfill closing will have its greatest affect on the public who currently use it.

The Washington County Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) discussed siting a landfill in Washington County at its November 4, 1981 and December 2, 1981 meetings. On December 16, 1981, I spoke to the Advisory Committee and three Washington County Commissioners about the landfill siting process and Metro's plans to implement a West Transfer Station. This led to a series of meetings with Metro staff and SWAC. Table 1 includes a summary of these meetings.

As a result of this interest in a Washington County transfer station, I presented the impacts of a West Station on Washington County at the Washington County Public Official Caucus meeting on January 21, 1982. Since this meeting, Metro has received resolutions of support for a West Station from the following local jurisdictions:

Washington County  
Hillsboro  
Beaverton  
Tigard

Forest Grove  
Tualatin  
Cornelius

Table 2 is a summary of the contents of these resolutions.

At the Regional Services Committee meeting in April 1982, a resolution was introduced to support the development of a solid waste transfer station in Washington County. No action was taken on this resolution. However, a subcommittee consisting of Councilor Oleson and Councilor Burton was set up to assist staff in the development of options for implementation of the West Station. Three options were developed. These options are:

1. Siting conducted by a private firm which would apply for a franchise for a transfer station once it had a site with land use approval. The franchise would be awarded to the first firm which would submit its application and meet Metro's minimum requirements for a transfer station.
2. Siting conducted by a private firm which is selected through an RFP process. Two suboptions are:



- a. Issue an RFQ for siting, design, construction and operation. Qualified firms would then receive an RFP.
  - b. Issue an RFP for design, construction and operation.
3. Siting through a public process. Metro would:
- a. Issue an RFP for design, construction and operation (full service); or
  - b. Issue an RFP for design and construction and bid operation; or
  - c. Issue an RFP for design, bid construction and bid operation.

Upon meeting with the local officials from the Washington County jurisdictions and discussing the process for siting and constructing the West Station, the following conclusions were made:

- Local support for public, competitive process to select a firm to build and operate a West Transfer Station.
- Process should optimize participation of private firms.
- Process should reduce role of Metro resources in implementation.

Based on these conclusions, staff recommended at the June 8, 1982 Regional Services Committee meeting Option 2b for the implementation of the West Station. Under option 2b, a committee composed of a representative from each of the local jurisdictions which will be served by the West Transfer Station would be formed in order to review proposals and rank firms. Metro would propose selection criteria and the committee would weigh the individual criteria. After the committee ranked the proposals, the top ranked firm would begin the land use permit process. The top firm would have to secure a site within a defined period of time. In the event that the top firm did not secure a site within the specified time frame, the second ranked firm would then be selected to proceed. The selected firm which secured a site would be awarded an exclusive franchise which would contain as franchise conditions Metro's minimum requirements.

Memorandum  
June 29, 1982  
Page 5

A process schedule was also presented to the Regional Services Committee on June 8. Since the Committee did not approve the Resolution at this meeting because there still was not a legal opinion on franchise authority from Washington County, this schedule has been revised and is also attached.

It is recommended that the Regional Services Committee adopt Resolution No. 82-336 for the purpose of proceeding with the siting and implementation of the West Station. Adoption of this Resolution by the Metro Council would allow staff to proceed with the setting up of the selection committee and with the development of the evaluation criteria and RFP. The decision to construct the West Transfer Station will be based on the costs received in the proposals. An estimated cost of the West Station is presented in Table 3.

KT/gl  
6247B/309

TABLE 1

## SUMMARY OF MEETINGS ON THE WEST TRANSFER STATION

| Date     | Meeting   | Description  |
|----------|---|--|
| 12/02/81 | Washington County Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) | Discussed siting of landfill in Washington County. Commissioners Dagg, Gardner and Warren were present at this meeting.  |
| 12/16/81 | Washington County SWAC                                  | Rick Gustafson discussed the landfill siting process and a west transfer station. Commissioners Dagg, Hays and Warren attended the meeting.  |
| 01/13/82 | Washington County SWAC                                  | Presentation of the FIP and impact of transfer stations on Washington County.  |
| 01/21/82 | Washington County Public Officials Caucus               | Presentation by Rick Gustafson on the impact of transfer stations on Washington County. Representatives from Washington County, Tualatin, Forest Grove, Beaverton, Hillsboro, Sherwood, King City, Tigard and Durham attended the meeting.   |
| 01/25/82 | SWPAC   | Presentation of the impact of transfer stations on Washington County.  |
| 02/03/82 | Washington County SWAC                                  | Discussion on transfer stations including costs.   |
| 03/03/82 | Washington County SWAC                                  | SWAC members signed recommendation to Washington County Board to approve funding and authority for the County to proceed with a feasibility study for a transfer station and general use landfill. The recommendation stated that there was a possibility that Metro was unable to provide Washington County with a facility within a timeframe that would meet the needs of the County residents. |
| 03/31/82 | SWAC  | Presentation on computer model Metro developed to evaluate haul costs for transfer stations.   |

| Date     | Meeting                                | Description  |
|----------|--|--|
| 04/06/82 | Regional Services Committee            | Introduced Resolution No. 82-316 for west transfer station. No action taken. Set up Services Subcommittee to work with staff.  |
| 05/05/82 | SWAC                                   | Transfer station update. The Committee recommended to the Board to request a legal opinion from County Counsel on rate setting for the transfer station.   |
| 05/05/82 | Washington County Hauler's Association | Reviewed options for implementing a west transfer station.   |
| 05/11/82 | Regional Services Committee            | Introduced Resolution No. 82-330 for west transfer station. Reviewed options for implementing the west stations. Statements made by representatives from Tigard, Washington County, Forest Grove, SWAC and the Haulers. No action taken.           |
| 06/08/82 | Regional Services Committee            | Staff recommended option 2B for implementation of the west station. Review of process schedule for this option. Representative of Washington County Haulers requested no decision be made until legal question on franchise authority is answered. |

6247B/309



TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF RESOLUTIONS  
WEST TRANSFER STATION

| Jurisdiction                                | Date of Resolution | Description  |
|---|--------------------|--|
| Washington County<br>Board of Commissioners | 02/23/82           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metro requested to site a solid waste transfer station within Washington County.</li> <li>• Metro requested to begin siting process as soon as possible and work with Washington County.</li> <li>• Metro requested to assist Washington County in siting its own disposal facility if Metro is unable to site a facility within the near future.</li> <li>• Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) and County staff work with Metro and advise the Board of the progress towards completion.</li> </ul> |
| City of Hillsboro                           | 03/02/82           | City encouraged Metro to implement a solid waste transfer station system.  |
| City of Cornelius                           | 03/03/82           | Letter to Washington County expressing Council support for the Washington County Resolution.   |
| City of Tualatin                            | 03/08/82           | City encouraged Metro to implement a solid waste transfer station system.  |
| City of Beaverton                           | 03/08/82           | City encouraged Metro to site and construct a solid waste transfer station.  |
| City of Forest Grove                        | 03/22/82           | City supports concept of locating a solid waste transfer station in Washington County.   |
| City of Tigard                              | 05/10/82           | City encourages Metro to implement a solid waste transfer station system.  |

6247B/309

TABLE 3

## ESTIMATED COST IMPACT OF WEST STATION

| <u>Facility</u>           | <u>System<br/>Volume<br/>TPY</u> | <u>COST OF SERVICE</u>              |                                     |                                  | <u>Uniform<br/>Rate<br/>\$/Ton</u> |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
|                           |                                  | <u>Landfill<br/>Cost<br/>\$/Ton</u> | <u>Transfer<br/>Cost<br/>\$/Ton</u> | <u>Total<br/>Cost<br/>\$/Ton</u> |                                    |
| Current                   |                                  |                                     |                                     |                                  |                                    |
| St. Johns                 | 410,000                          | 11.85                               |                                     |                                  |                                    |
| CTRC                      | 410,000                          | 11.85                               | 7.65                                | 19.50                            | 13.95                              |
| 1985 Costs                |                                  |                                     |                                     |                                  |                                    |
| CTRC                      | 666,000                          | 11.85 <sup>1</sup>                  | 7.65                                | 19.50                            | 13.15 <sup>2</sup>                 |
| West Station <sup>3</sup> | 666,000                          | 11.85                               | 9.95                                | 21.80                            | 16.70                              |
| East Station <sup>3</sup> | 666,000                          | 11.85                               | 9.10                                | 20.95                            | 19.90                              |

<sup>1</sup>Assumes landfill cost/ton does not change.

<sup>2</sup>CTRC costs are the same as current costs. Cost/ton decreases because of increase in system volume.

<sup>3</sup>Transfer is to St. Johns Landfill.

6247B/309

**OPTION 2B  
PROCESS SCHEDULE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF WEST STATION**

