

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF SELECTING)	RESOLUTION NO. 86-61 9
A SITE FOR THE WASHINGTON)	
TRANSFER & RECYCLING CENTER AND)	Introduced by the
AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER)	Executive Officer
TO ENTER INTO NEGOTIATIONS TO)	
ACQUIRE THE SITE.)	

WHEREAS, The Council of the Metropolitan Service District (Metro) adopted Resolution No. 84-506, a resolution "For the Purpose of Adopting Solid Waste Transfer Station Strategies and Related Policies as a Component of the Solid Waste Management Plan Update 1984"; and

WHEREAS, The report adopted by the resolution as part of the Plan identifies a need for three regional transfer stations in the Portland metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, The resolution states that one of these transfer stations shall be located in Washington County and should be operational in 1986; and

WHEREAS, Based on the recommendations of the WTRC Advisory Group and testimony at public hearings the Council identified four potential sites in Resolution Nos. 85-591 and 86-614, namely Site 56, the Archdiocese and Beaverton Urban Renewal properties at Tualatin Valley Highway and Millikan Way, in Beaverton, Site 56 (south) the Beaverton Urban Renewal property at Tualatin Valley Highway and Millikan Way, in Beaverton, Site 59, the Times-Litho site (now called Cornelius Pass site) at Cornelius Pass Road and Sunset Highway in Washington County, and Site N, the Champion property at Western Avenue in Beaverton; and

WHEREAS, The Council has evaluated the information on each of these sites and has compared them on a variety of bases including proximity to the center of waste, design problems, zoning, traffic impact and compatibility with existing and future uses; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the Council selects the Champion site at Western Avenue in Beaverton as the site for the Washington Transfer & Recycling Center.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this _____ day of _____, 1986.

~~NOT ADOPTED~~

~~Richard Waker, Presiding Officer~~

RW/gl
4908C/445-4
01/13/86

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 86-61~~9~~ FOR THE
PURPOSE OF SELECTING A SITE FOR THE WASHINGTON
TRANSFER & RECYCLING CENTER AND AUTHORIZING THE
EXECUTIVE OFFICER TO ENTER INTO NEGOTIATIONS TO
ACQUIRE THE SITE

Date: January 13, 1986

Presented by: WTRC Advisory Group
Randi Wexler

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

In September 1985, the Advisory Group rated three sites for location of the Washington Transfer & Recycling Center (WTRC) and forwarded their recommendation to the Metro Council. A history of the process is described in Appendix 1. The recommended sites are suitable for a transfer station based on the criteria evaluated by the Advisory Group.

The Advisory Group also examined the support and opposition of various groups interested in the location of WTRC. The Advisory Group did not use the criteria of a willing seller in their final analysis. All sites were assumed to be vacant and/or available on the market. The three sites were rated as follows by the Advisory Group:

1. Site N - Western Avenue and Allen Boulevard
2. Site 56 - T.V. Highway and 160th
3. Site 59 - Cornelius Pass and Sunset Highway

The Group's recommendation stated that if Site N were to continue as an operating business, Metro should not condemn the property.

On September 12 the Council adopted Resolution No. 85-591 and designated three (3) sites for WTRC and authorized the Executive Officer to enter into negotiations to acquire the sites. The sites designated were:

- Site 56 - T.V. Highway and 160th
- Site 56 (south) - T.V. Highway and 160th
- Site 59 - Cornelius Pass and Sunset Highway

Public testimony was not heard on Site N because the owner stated operations at the building were expected to continue.

At the September 12 public hearing the Council asked staff to evaluate any additional sites suggested for location of WTRC. Three additional sites were evaluated by the Advisory Group. Of these one site, Hunziker/Snyder site, was evaluated by the Council. At a public hearing on December 19, Council decided not to add the Hunziker/Snyder site to the list of previously recommended list of sites. (See Staff Report dated December 10.)

At the December 19 public hearing the Council was advised that Site N no longer contained an operating business. Council decided to hold a public hearing on the Champion site to consider placing this site on the list of recommended sites.

On January 9, Council adopted Resolution No. 86- 614 adding Site N to the previously recommended list of sites. (See Staff Report dated December 26.)

Four sites are on the list of recommended sites for location of the WTRC:

- Archdiocese/BURA site (Beaverton)
- BURA site (Beaverton)
- Champion building (Beaverton)
- Cornelius Pass site (Washington County)

All four sites are suitable for development of a transfer center and meet the criteria evaluated by the Advisory Group. All four sites have these characteristics:

- are located within one-half mile from a highway;
- have minimal impact on residents;
- are more compatible with adjacent land use than other sites;
- have full utilities, including rail;
- are a minimum of four acres; have no major geotechnical concerns; and
- are within seven miles from the center of waste.

Site Descriptions

Archdiocese/BURA site (Map 1) on T.V. Highway and 160th in the city of Beaverton provides access from T.V. Highway and is less than two miles from the center of waste generation. The site is comprised of two parcels that are separated by T.V. Highway. The north parcel is more than 500 ft. from a residential neighborhood located across T.V. Highway, and is at the edge of a developing campus industrial area (Beaverton Creek Tech Center). The northern parcel is owned by the Archdiocese of Portland and is zoned "Campus Industrial." A comprehensive plan change and a zone map change from "Campus" to "Light" Industrial would be necessary. The south parcel is four acres owned by the city of Beaverton and zoned "Light Industrial." It is separated from residential area by a rail line and storage business. This parcel would possibly be used for the gatehouse operation and ancillary operations such as a truck wash

area. To provide for the transfer building, additional land would be used on the north side of T.V. Highway.

Access from one parcel to the other is provided by the T.V. Highway overpass of the B&N Railroad. Use of land beneath the overpass would require either two at-grade crossings of the B&N Railroad or relocation of one of the two tracks. Both properties are bisected by the BPA and PGE power corridors. This factor severely limits the buildable portion of the properties. In conclusion, based on preliminary layouts, the site is workable but will be difficult to develop.

The BURA site (Map 1) is located on T.V. Highway and 160th in the city of Beaverton. The parcel is four acres and is currently zoned "Light Industrial." Access is provided off of T.V. Highway. The site is bisected by both BPA and PGE power corridors and rights-of-way. This factor severely limits the buildable portion of the property. In conclusion, based on preliminary layout, the site is workable but will be difficult to develop.

The Champion building (Map 2) at Western and Allen Boulevard is an eight-acre parcel located in the city of Beaverton. The site is two miles from the center of waste. The Champion Wood Products site was evaluated by the Advisory Group and staff in response to the Alternative Siting Report prepared by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Sunset Corridor. It is zoned "Industrial Park" with surrounding uses being predominantly warehouse, distribution, and processing of wood products. The existing 40,000 sq. ft. warehouse building could be used to support part of the transfer operation. Most vehicles would use Highway 217 to Allen Boulevard and travel to Western Avenue. Both Allen and Western are four-lane fully improved roads. Site N is more than 1,000 ft. from a residential area located further east on Allen Boulevard. The residential area is separated from Site N by other industrial development and a large tract (75 acres) of vacant industrial land.

The Cornelius Pass Road site (Map 3) in Washington County, is a 10-acre parcel with access from Sunset Highway. The site is more than 1,000 ft. from a residential development which is across Cornelius Pass Road to the east. The site is on the edge of the Sunset Corridor area and on the edge of a large vacant Special Industrial District zone for land development. The parcel is buffered from adjacent industrial property by a 100 ft. BPA right-of-way for power lines. Site 59 has a significant natural resource designation (wetland) through the center of the parcel. The area under the power corridor is also designated as Open Space. These items will require special consideration during the design phase. The site was originally offered to Metro for sale by the previous owner. The offer has since been rescinded and the property was sold to another party. Although this site is farther from the center of waste than the other two sites (six and one-half miles from the center of waste), access from Sunset Highway provides a good transportation corridor for collection vehicles, transfer trucks, and public haulers. Under the current transportation plan,

access would be from Croeni Road. The long-term access would probably be on a new road farther north after the Cornelius Pass Interchange is completed. The site is zoned industrial. Because it is in a Special Industrial District (SID), it must be developed under the SID Master Plan for all land in the District. At this time, the Master Plan does not include this parcel and it must be added to the Plan.

The Washington County Planning staff is unclear as to the process to amend the Master Plan to include Site 59 in the Master Plan. Because of this situation, additional time (two to six months) would be required to determine how to amend the Master Plan before the required development permits could be obtained.

Choosing an adjacent parcel to Site 59 (Map 3) within the Master Plan would eliminate these concerns. Within the Master Plan there is a small lot development area (Tier 1) located on the north side of Croeni Road. The zoning on lots already in the Master Plan would allow a transfer station as a permitted use. The property in Tier 1 is in the same ownership as Site 59. By selecting an adjacent parcel the site will be closer to a neighborhood located across Cornelius Pass Road.

Staff Recommendation

To formulate a staff recommendation for selecting a site, the staff analyzed the land use process and land acquisition process for the remaining four sites. Staff also performed a comparative technical analysis of the remaining sites. Four categories were evaluated to decide upon the preferred site. The categories reviewed included: solid waste technical aspects (center of waste and transportation), flexibility for development, land use, and acquisition of land. Center of waste is a measure of convenience for the public and collection industry and a measure of cost for the region in operating a transfer station. Transportation issues are an important technical criteria as well as a major concern expressed by the public. Flexibility for development is a measure of usable acreage for both transfer operations and additional recycling. Land use is a measure of the difficulty in acquiring the necessary permits. Acquisition of land is a measure of whether or not condemnation is required and whether condemnation is possible. A qualitative rating was given for each category of the decision matrix. The qualitative rating included: poor, fair, good or best. Each site presents different issues with regard to land use and acquisition of land. The qualitative ratings of technical issues are based on information reviewed by the Advisory Group and professional judgement on behalf of the Staff. An explanation of each rating for the four sites is provided.

DECISION MATRIX

<u>Site</u>	<u>Center of Waste</u>	<u>Trans- porta- tion</u>	<u>Flexibility For Development</u>	<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Acquisition</u>
Archdiocese/BURA					
56	Best	Fair	Poor	Poor	Cannot Condemn State Land
BURA					
56 (S)	Best	Fair	Poor	Good	Cannot Condemn State Land
Champion					
N	Best	Good	Best	Good	Can Condemn
Cornelius Pass					
59	Fair	Best	Fair/ (Best)*	Poor/ (Best)**	Can Condemn

()*adjacent parcel within Master Plan without drainage hazard area.
 ()**adjacent parcel within Master Plan type II process.

Site 56 -- Archdiocese/BURA Property

A "best" rating was given for the center of waste criterion because the site is located one and a half miles from the center of waste.

A "fair" rating was given for transportation criterion because access is predominately from T.V. Highway which is not a controlled access highway and is mostly stop and go traffic due to numerous traffic signals.

A "poor" rating was given for flexibility for development criterion because of several utility corridors and right of way areas, difficulty in connecting the north and south sections of the parcel, and in general the confined nature of buildable land.

A "poor" rating for the land use criterion was given because the north parcel would require a zone change from campus industrial to light industrial or industrial park.

Condemnation of the entire parcel is not possible or if condemnation were possible, the process would be very complicated due to multiple landowners. Current ownership includes PGE, BPA, Burlington Northern Railroad, and the State. We cannot condemn from BPA or the State. Metro could possibly obtain a lease from BPA.

Site 56 South -- BURA Site

All ratings are the same as Archdiocese/BURA Site except for the land use criterion. A rating of "good" was given for the land use criterion because the parcel is zoned light industrial and a transfer station is an allowed use under a planning director's interpretation of public utility.

Site N -- Champion Building

A rating of "best" was given for the center of waste criterion because the parcel is located two miles from the center of waste.

A rating of "good" was given for the transportation criterion because access is predominately from Highway 217, a controlled access highway.

A "best" rating was given for the flexibility for development criterion because the existing warehouse could be used, three vacant acres are available, and there are no special development constraints due to utilities.

A "good" rating was given for the land use criterion because the parcel is zoned industrial park and a transfer station is an allowed use according to a planning director's interpretation.

Condemnation powers would need to be exercised because the owner is unwilling to discuss an option agreement.

Site 59 -- Cornelius Pass Site

A rating of "fair" was given for the center of waste criterion because the parcel is located 6-1/2 miles from the center of waste.

A rating of "best" was given for the transportation criterion because access is from Highway 26 and traffic is minimized on the local access street system within business districts due to location outside of a high activity business district.

A "fair/best" rating was given for the flexibility for development criterion because of sewer easements, a drainage area, and a power corridor. These three items limit the amount of buildable space. Choosing a site within the Master Plan will eliminate most of these development issues. A "best" rating for the flexibility for development criterion was given if an adjacent parcel is selected.

A "poor/best" rating was given for the land use criterion because the site is not now included in the Master Plan for a Special Industrial District zone and the amendment process is time-consuming. If a parcel within the Master Plan was selected the land use rating would improve to "best" because a transfer station is listed as an allowed use (Type II process).

The owner is unwilling to discuss an option agreement and condemnation powers would need to be exercised. Only one owner is involved and there appear to be no problems with the title.

In summary, Sites 56, 56 south, and N are located close to the center of waste. Site 59 is further from the center of waste. The most desirable highway access is from Sunset Highway or 217 (Sites 59 and N). T.V. Highway is less desirable (Sites 56 and 56 south). Sites 56 and 56 south present the most difficult development constraints. Sites 59 poses fewer development issues, while Site N is the easiest site to develop. None of the sites are guaranteed land use permits based on the controversial nature of this development. Legal issues are anticipated to surface. All sites at this time require condemnation. Pieces of Site 56 and 56 south cannot be condemned by Metro. Evaluating all these factors, the Champion Building is the preferred site.

One outstanding issue of a non-technical nature is the appropriate amount and type of development near a transfer station. All sites are located within the UGB and have different levels of development adjacent to or in close proximity to the sites. Transfer stations operate well in a variety of development environments.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends adoption of Resolution
No. 86-615.

RW/gl
4860C/445-7
01/13/86

APPENDIX I

A transfer and recycling center serving Washington County has been a recommended element of the Solid Waste Management Plan since its adoption in 1975. A 1984 update of the original Plan recommended that a total of three transfer stations serve the metropolitan region. The Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center (CTRC) began operation in April of 1983. The station serving the western portion of the region was given next priority.

The closure of landfills serving Washington County prompted a renewed effort to begin implementation of the west station in the spring of 1982. Staff began holding discussions with local jurisdictions and members of the collection industry in Washington County regarding their need/desire for a transfer station. Resolutions of support for a facility were received from Washington County, and the cities of Hillsboro, Beaverton, Tigard, Forest Grove, Tualatin and Cornelius.

In July 1982, the Metro Council directed staff to initiate a process for implementing a transfer station in Washington County. A committee was established and directed to consider various implementation alternatives. The Committee urged Metro to proceed with building the transfer station as soon as possible. After receiving the Committee's suggestions, the Metro Council decided that the Washington Transfer & Recycling Center (WTRC) be publicly owned and privately operated by contract. Resolution No. 83-439, passed in December 1983, authorized staff to proceed with siting of WTRC. Between December 1983 and June 1984, prior to beginning the actual siting effort, several public meetings were held to inform the community about the solid waste problem and the need to proceed with a transfer station. (See "Meetings List," Attachment "A.")

Site Selection Process

In June 1984 a site selection Advisory Group was formed to assist staff in choosing the location for WTRC. The Advisory Group is composed of citizens, members of the recycling and collection industries, and local government staff. The Advisory Group has worked for over a year and one-half to locate a suitable site for WTRC.

The Advisory Group worked with staff to develop criteria for evaluating sites. The original criteria consisted of a three-stage evaluation and screening process which examined transportation issues, environmental impacts, development constraints and compatibility issues.

A list of 54 potential sites was compiled by using the Washington County and city of Beaverton industrial land inventories, and by advertising and by soliciting for sites from local real estate firms and developers. The Advisory Group narrowed the 54 sites to three potential sites in the area of S. W. 158th and Jenkins Road in

Washington County. On March 5, 1985, a county-wide public meeting was held to assist the Advisory Group in determining which of these three sites was most appropriate for a transfer station. Generally all three sites were considered inappropriate for a transfer station by the public attending the meeting. Their reasons included: close proximity to a residential neighborhood; the perceived impacts on existing and future economic development in the region, specifically, impacts to Sunset Corridor developments and NIKE corporate headquarters; and potential impacts on a food processing plant from any potential odors, birds or rodents at the transfer station. Transportation concerns centered on minimizing the impact of trucks driving past existing businesses or future hi-tech development.

Following the March public meeting the Advisory Group decided to reconsider the criteria in light of the public testimony and input from local governments. An Ad Hoc Committee of the Sunset Corridor Association, a regional economic development group, developed an Alternative Siting Report that reviewed and expanded the site evaluation process performed by the Advisory Group. Due to concern raised by the business community, several meetings were held by the Advisory Group to examine and revise the criteria for site selection. The Ad Hoc Committee, as well as others, played an active role in streamlining the evaluation process, adding additional criteria, and recommending additional sites for evaluation. The revised criteria focused on the same major factors as the original criteria, except that a Campus Environment Zone was segregated from other industrial uses, and vacant industrial land was treated differently than developed industrial land. Also the Advisory Group gave added weight to sites located near principal highways (Sunset, Highway 217, and T.V. Highway). These criteria changes reflect a variety of opinions held by the general public on the issue of compatibility. (See "Criteria," Attachment "B.")

With criteria set, staff then evaluated a list of 79 potential sites (original 54, plus new sites identified by the Ad Hoc Committee and others). The Advisory Group narrowed the list of 79 sites to 10 potential sites located in five areas throughout Washington County. With a list of 10 sites, staff and Advisory Group members conducted area meetings to talk with residents and businesses around the 10 potential sites. Landowners within 500 ft. of the sites were notified and encouraged to attend. Other people possibly impacted and those interest groups already involved in the process were also notified.

These area meetings were an education process to continue to inform the public about why a transfer station is needed and to provide an opportunity for residents and businesses to discuss questions and concerns about specific sites. A question and answer period followed the staff presentation. At the conclusion of the five area meetings, a second county-wide public meeting was held on July 16, 1985. The Advisory Group presided over this public meeting to listen to concerns of the nearby businesses and residents. At the meeting, staff reviewed and answered questions from the five area

meetings which related to general concerns about transfer stations (noise, odor, litter, etc.) and site specific concerns such as impacts to certain roadways. Public comment was taken following the staff presentation. In general, the same comments voiced at the area meetings were repeated at the county-wide public meeting. No new technical information was presented that would have bearing on the use of individual sites for a transfer station. With comment from both the county-wide public meeting and the area meetings and additional technical work (availability of a parcel, special permits required, a schematic drawing and additional traffic information), the Advisory Group narrowed the list of 10 to 3 sites. These sites are depicted on a set of maps included in the Staff Report to the Advisory Group, Attachment "C." The Advisory Group considered the group of 10 sites technically suitable for development of a transfer station. The numerical screening process was used to assist in screening the list of 79 sites. The numerical screening process was not used to narrow the list of 10 sites to 3 sites.

RW/gl
4860C/445-5
01/08/86

WASHINGTON TRANSFER & RECYCLING CENTER
PUBLIC MEETINGS 1983 - 1984 - 1985 - 1986

1986

1/9/86

PUBLIC HEARING, site at Western/ Allen Blvd.
Beaverton (Champion)

1/16

METRO COUNCIL MEETING for final decision on a
site.

1986

1985

9/12/85 PUBLIC HEARING, BEAVERTON
10/4 Tigard City Council Briefing
11/4 Beaverton City Council
11/20 Advisory Group
11/20 Tigard Neighborhood Planning Organizations
12/3 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING, Tigard
12/6 Advisory Group
12/9 160th/TV Hwy. Neighborhood group
12/19 PUBLIC HEARING, Tigard site

1985

1985

1/9/85 Beaverton Chamber of Commerce Transportation Committee
1/14 Royal Woodlands Neighborhood Assn.
1/21 Northwest District Neighborhood Assn.
1/24 Metro Council Briefing
2/6 WTRC Advisory Group
2/7 CPO # 6
2/13 CPO # 7
3/5 WTRC PUBLIC MEETING
3/12 Oak Hills Neighborhood Assn.
4/8 CTRC tour
4/11 Meeting with Sunset Ad Hoc Committee
4/15 Beaverton City Council
4/16 Washington County Commissioners
4/24 Advisory Group
5/1 Advisory Group
5/8 Advisory Group
5/29 Advisory Group
6/17 Area A (Royal Woodlands neighborhood)
6/18 Area A (Rollingwood neighborhood)
7/1 Area E (TV Hwy/Hillsboro) Businesses/residents
7/9 Beaverton Chamber of Commerce, Government Affairs Comm.
7/10 Area D (Sunset Hwy/Cornelius Pass Rd.) Residents/businesses
 CPO #7
7/11 Area B/C (TV Hwy./158th) Residents/ businesses)
 CPO #6
7/16 PUBLIC MEETING, Countywide
8/20 Beaverton Chamber Government Affairs Committee
8/28 Advisory Group

1985

1984

1/3/84 CPO # 1
1/13 Hillsboro Chamber of Commerce
2/2 CPO # 6
5/9 CPO # 7
5/17 CPO Leaders Group
6/18 CTRC Tour for elected officials and community leaders
6/26 SERTOMA, Beaverton
6/27 WTRC Advisory Group
6/27 Beaverton Chamber of Commerce
7/10 Beaverton CCI
7/25 CTRC Tour for elected officials, community leaders
and the WTRC Advisory Group.
8/2 Beaverton Optimist Group
8/8 WTRC Advisory Group
9/5 League of Women Voters
10/10 WTRC Advisory Group
11/6 Beaverton Lions Club
11/14 WTRC Advisory Group
11/26 Beaverton Planning Dept. Briefing
11/27 Washington County Planning, Briefing
12/19 WTRC Advisory Group

1984

1983

MEETING SCHEDULE

WTRC

- 7/22/83 Elected Officials Group; Public meeting
at the Regional Services Committee.
- 9/13 Regional Services Committee, public meeting
- 12/7 Special meeting of the Regional Services Committee
Rock Creek Campus. Public meeting for the purposes
of implementing a transfer station in Washington
County.
- 12/20/83 Metro resolution adopted declaring Metro's intent
to proceed with a transfer station in Washington
County.

1983

EVALUATION PROCESS FOR SITING
WASHINGTON TRANSFER & RECYCLING CENTER

REVISED CRITERIA

- Step 1 Fatal Flaw Analysis
Step 2 Cumulative Analysis of Eight Criteria
Step 3 Additional Information for Most Promising Sites

Step 1 Fatal Flaw Analysis

For sites to be considered in the cumulative phase of site evaluation, sites must meet the following minimum criteria. A site must be:

- a. No more than seven miles from the center of waste
- b. Four acres or greater
- c. No smaller than 300' for one dimension

Step 2 Cumulative Analysis of Eight Criteria

Criteria	Point System	Weight Factor
1. Size of Site	5 Greater than 5 acres	1
	3 4-5 acres	
2. Geotechnical Considerations	5 Moderate slope, moderate soil, no floodplain	1
	4 No slope, moderate soil, no floodplain	
	3 Slight slope, severe soil high groundwater table	
	1 No slope, severe soil, high groundwater table	
3. Availability of Utilities (within 1000' of property line)	5 All utilities	1
	4 All except rail	
	3 Power, water only	
	2 Sewer only	
	1 No utilities	

Criteria	Point System	Weight Factor
4. Zoning	5 Permit	2
	4 Type II process	
	3 Type III process	
	1 Plan amendment/zone change	
5. Distance from Center of Waste	5 Less than 2 miles	2
	4 2-4 miles	
	3 4-6 miles	
	2 6-7 miles	
6. Transportation Access (Transfer Trucks)	5 $\frac{1}{4}$ mile or less from highway serviced by arterial	2
	4 $\frac{1}{2}$ mile or less from highway serviced by arterial	
	3 1 mile or less from highway serviced by arterial	
	2 More than 1 mile from highway serviced by arterial	
	1 Greater than 2 miles from highway serviced by arterial	
7. Transportation Access (Collection Vehicles)	5 Predominantly direct access from highway	2
	4 Mixed highway/arterial use with four access points	
	3 Predominantly arterial use with three access points	
	2 Mixed arterial/collector with two access points	
	1 Predominantly local streets or central business district	

Criteria	Point System	Weight Factor
8. Compatibility to Adjacent Sites* (500' radius)		3

Developed Land

Vacant Land

5 Heavy industry
exclusive farm use

5 No existing
development
plans

4 Warehouse/distribution

3 Mixed use, auto
commercial,
food processing

3 Developer has
development
plan or master
plan

2 Campus environment/
corporate office

2 User has develop-
ment plan or
or master plan

1 Residential/school

Step 3 Additional Information From Public Meeting and Discussions with Landowners for Most Promising Sites

1. Availability of Site
2. Cost of Land
3. Compatibility

*Sites adjacent to a variety of uses (either developed or vacant) will be determined by using an average figure of adjacent uses.

RW/srs
3560C/412-3
05/20/85

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO.85-614 FOR THE
PURPOSE OF DESIGNATING AN ADDITIONAL SITE FOR THE
WASHINGTON TRANSFER & RECYCLING CENTER

Date: December 10, 1985

Presented by: WTRC Advisory Group
Randi WexlerFACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

At a September 12 public hearing, the Metro Council authorized staff to negotiate for the purchase of two potential sites for the Washington Transfer & Recycling Center (WTRC). (See attached Staff Report dated August 30, 1985.) The Metro Council also asked staff to examine any new sites suggested for location of the transfer station. Three additional sites have been reviewed by the WTRC Advisory Group against their adopted criteria. The Advisory Group requests that the Council review one of these three additional sites. New information regarding the Champion site in Beaverton has been obtained and reviewed by the Advisory Group. This additional information should be forwarded to the Metro Council.

New Site Selection Process

Owners of new potential sites were asked to supply Metro with a letter indicating they understood the type of development proposed for the property and were willing to enter into an option agreement for sale of the property. Owners were also asked to consult with their neighbors and to consider their neighbors' responses before considering an option agreement.

Once a letter of commitment was received from a landowner, staff evaluated the parcel using the technical selection criteria (Attachment B of August 30, 1985, Staff Report). If the technical evaluation appeared favorable, staff initiated option agreement negotiations with the landowners. An option was obtained on one site (Hunziker/Snyder) and had not been completed on the other two sites: Knez and the GE building. The Advisory Group reviewed the parcels against the technical criteria and determined that the Hunziker/Snyder site, and the Knez site, warranted discussion by nearby residents and businesses. Both of these sites are located on Hunziker Street between 72nd and Hall in Tigard (see attached map). The Advisory Group asked that option negotiations continue on the Knez site.

The public process began with a briefing of the Tigard City Council on October 14. The briefing outlined the need for a

transfer station, the site selection criteria, the role of the Advisory Group, and the anticipated public process in Tigard.

A meeting of neighborhood planning organizations in Tigard followed on November 20. This meeting was similar to the five area meetings held in other parts of Washington County.

On December 3 a public meeting was held to elicit comments on the proposed sites in Tigard. Two members of the Advisory Group and staff attended this public meeting to listen to concerns and answer questions from nearby business representatives and residents. Public comment at these meetings centered primarily on traffic considerations (turning movements at the intersection of Hunziker and 72nd, road capacity, impact of added traffic volume and future traffic volume from other developments), potential impacts to school children walking to Phil Lewis School (due to budget constraints children living within 1/2 mile of the school are not bused and walk to school), and potential impacts to the Tigard Civic Center currently under construction on Hall Street near Fanno Creek.

With comments from the meetings in Tigard and additional technical work (traffic study and schematic drawing), the full Advisory Group voted on whether to include these parcels in the group of sites to be reviewed by the Metro Council. The Knez parcel, on the north side of Hunziker street, was less desirable than the Hunziker/Snyder parcel due to a floodplain consideration, so the Advisory Group did not consider this site further. The Advisory Group on a 4-4 vote failed to recommend the Hunziker/Snyder site to the Council for placement on the list of approved sites. However, the Advisory Group did recommend that the Council decide whether to add this site to its current list.

Members voting against including the Tigard site were primarily concerned with the location of the site in relation to the Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center (CTRC) in Oregon City. These members felt the amount of overlap in service area between the two locations would not provide the high level of service desired for the western portion of the District. One member cited a negative perception on behalf of Tigard residents about the site selection process as the reason for not including additional sites for presentation to Metro Council.

Members voting for inclusion of the Hunziker/Snyder site concluded that the site is workable from a technical analysis, overlap of service areas does exist but a high level of service is still provided, and the process of site selection was similar to the process in other parts of Washington County.

Advisory Group Recommendation

The Advisory Group recommends that the Metro Council review the Hunziker/Snyder site and decide whether to include this site with the other sites previously recommended to Council. The Advisory Group did not rate the Tigard site nor did they wish to re-rate the sites previously recommended to Council.

The Advisory Group discussed the Champion Wood Products building on Western Avenue in Beaverton and decided it was no longer an operating business. The Advisory Group recommends that the Council decide whether to consider a public hearing on the Champion site. The Advisory Group also recommends that the site selection process be closed and no additional sites be evaluated.

Site Description

The Hunziker/Snyder site on Hunziker Street in Tigard is composed of two adjacent tax lots. The two tax lots used together comprise a 6.24 acre site. The parcel is 4 to 4-1/2 miles from the center of waste generation. The surrounding land uses include a foundry, a roofing company, a wood products distribution company, two office buildings, a parts distribution center, and a small residential area (Knoll Street). One tax lot is zoned Industrial Park and the other tax lot is zoned Light Industrial. Option agreements have been completed for both the Snyder parcel and the Hunziker parcel. The Hunziker/Snyder site would serve 79 percent of the population within a 20 minute service area. Thirteen percent of this population is already served by the CTRC, leaving 66 percent of the population in the study area served by the Tigard location. For comparison, the Cornelius Pass Road site would serve 70 percent of the population within the study area. On a regional basis, a Tigard location and the CTRC would provide service for 52 percent of the region's population, while the Cornelius Pass Road site and the CTRC would provide service for 53 percent of the region's population. Both locations provide a high level of service. Sites closer to the center of waste generation would provide service for even a greater share of the regional population. The Hunziker/Snyder site duplicates service to a heavily populated area while the Cornelius Pass Road site provides service to an area anticipated to grow as a population and employment center. Both sites provide service to the bulk of the population to the year 2000.

Status of Acquisition Negotiations

Council asked staff to negotiate the purchase of the properties previously recommended by the Advisory Group on September 12. The status of those negotiations are as follows: the owner (Sunset Highway Association) of the site at Cornelius Pass Road is unwilling to sell to Metro; the owner (Archdiocese of Portland) of the northern parcel of the site at 160th and T.V. Highway is unwilling to sell to Metro; and the future owner (Beaverton Urban Renewal Agency) of the southern parcel of the site at 160th and T.V. Highway has scheduled a public information meeting to discuss sale of the property to Metro.

Since the public hearing of September 12, the Champion Wood Products building located on Western Avenue in Beaverton has been vacated. The current owner of the building, U.S. Plywood Inc., is unwilling to enter into an option agreement with Metro for sale of the property. U.S. Plywood is still considering what alternative to pursue with regard to the Champion building. The Advisory Group's concern about an operating business is no longer operative.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends adoption of Resolution No. 85-614 which adds the Hunziker/Snyder site to the list of sites to be considered for the WTRC.

The Executive Officer further recommends that the Council hold a public hearing on the Champion site to determine whether or not to include this site on the approved list of sites, and that on December 19 the Council adopt a motion to close the site selection process with the exception of the Champion site. The following time table is suggested for completion of this process:

Public Hearing on the Champion site -- January 9

Decision on Selection of a Site -- January 16
(Special Council Meeting)

RW/gl
4833C/445-4
12/12/85