RESOLUTION NO. 573

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE CITY OF WILSONVILLE LANDFILL SITING REPORT EVALUATION AND APPROVAL, OF SUBMITTAL OF SAID REPORT AND FINDINGS, TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY - PUBLIC HEARINGS.

WHEREAS, the Department of Environmental Quality, hereinafter referred to as the D.E.Q., has been given the legislative authority to select solid waste disposal sites for the Portland, Metropolitan area for final selection scheduled in November of 1986; and

WHEREAS, the D.E.Q. developed siting criteria for establishing a rating system for the acceptability of the potential sites to accept solid waste for disposal. The rating criteria identifies the D.E.Q.'s methodology and basis for selecting a specific site; and

WHEREAS, the D.E.Q. selected one hundred and forty-two (142) sites, based on the pass/fail criteria portion of the landfill siting process, designating a potential nineteen (19) sites for the final selection process; and

WHEREAS, the City of Wilsonville City Council, at its regularly scheduled City Council Meeting, held July 7, 1986, commencing at 7:30 o'clock p.m., Pacific Daylight Savings Time, in the City Hall Council Chambers, 30000 S.W. Town Center Loop East, did approve the policy statement quote.

"The Wilsonville City Council is aware of five (5) potential landfill sites in the Wilsonville area.

The City Council has directed staff to research the sites and prepare a report to the City Council outlining the impact of each site on the City of Wilsonville. This report will be considered at the August 4, 1986 City Council Meeting. Once adopted, the report will be the official position of the City of Wilsonville to be presented at D.E.Q. public hearings which will be held during the month of August."; and

WHEREAS, staff has met with the committee(s) for each site and prepared a staff report, attached hereto as EXHIBIT "A" and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein; which once adopted by the City Council will become the official statement of the City of Wilsonville.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City of Wilsonville that:

1. EXHIBIT "A", attached hereto, or as may be amended from time to time, be adopted as the official position of the City of Wilsonville for the potential landfill sites C-2, C-3-D, C-4, C-5, and C-6-D for submittal at the D.E.Q. public hearings.
2. Authorization is hereby given to the Mayor or his appointees to provide public testimony at the public hearing regarding these potential landfill sites as may be necessary to state the City's official position.

ADOPTED by the City Council of Wilsonville at a regular meeting thereof this 4th day of August, 1986, and filed with Wilsonville City Recorder this same date.

A.G. MEYER, Mayor

ATTEST:

VERA A. ROJAS, City Recorder

EXHIBIT "A"
CITY OF WILSONVILLE
LANDFILL SITE SUMMARY

SITES: C-2, C-3-D, C-4, C-5, C-6-D

Attached with Exhibit "A" is the SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA - RATE COMPARISON. Staff has had the opportunity, to review the criteria, comparing the information gathered with the rating D.E.Q. established for each site. By using information from reliable sources such as:

Well Logs	- Water Resources Department
Airport Regulations	- Federal Aviation Administration Oregon Department of Transportation Aeronautical Division
Floodway Requirement	- Federal Emergency Management Agency
Greenway Use	- Land Conservation and Development Commission
Land Use	- Comprehensive Plans - City and County
Land Development	- Soils Information - Clackamas County Topography Maps U.S.G.S.

The City is able to review each criteria, case by case, and establish a comparison of the D.E.Q.'s rating vs. the City's. In many instances the City's evaluation of each criteria is lower than D.E.Q.'s rating.

It is apparent that there are two key issues regarding the five property sites located in the Wilsonville vicinity. Each site is affected differently by these two issues.

The issues I am referring to were discussed primarily in the pass/fail criterion.

Pass/Fail Criterion:

Let us first discuss the pass/fail criterion prior to analyzing the two key issues. The pass/fail criterion was the first review of numerous sites in Washington, Clackamas and Multnomah Counties. If any one of the twelve (12) pass/fail criterion failed the D.E.Q. requirements, then the site was eliminated from further consideration. The City of Wilsonville has an astounding five sites, within less than a mile of the city limits, and four other sites within three miles.

The two key issues which relate to the pass/fail criteria are: 1) Site Capacity; and 2) Proximity to Airports.

1. Site Capacity:
The D.E.Q. established a minimum 15-year site life, explaining that "as specified"; sites are evaluated, the preliminary design concepts should be formulated, and the site should be eliminated if it does not have a 15-year capacity. In February 1986, the site evaluation criterion for site capacity was rated differently than the site evaluation criteria used in the final analysis in June 1986. It is apparent that the D.E.Q. realized very few sites had a 15-year site life; therefore modified the criterion.

If the D.E.Q. follows its procedures properly, it would eliminate any site, based on the pass/fail criterion for site capacity, if that site has less than a 15-year capacity. The only site in the Wilsonville area which has a site capacity of 15-years or greater is C-2, Corral Creek.

Site capacity also refers to acreage, however; usable landfill area must be the determining factor. Much of the needed 200-acre landfill area for a minimum 15-year site life is not available due to slopes 10% or greater, and perennial or intermittent stream interference. Multiple site development is not only costly, it is the least efficient way to operate a landfill program. Although each separate site can be developed independently, many sites only have less than a 5-year capacity, and therefore require immediate development.

2. Proximity to Airports:
There are basically four specific segments to eliminating sites in the pass/fail criterion (P/F 3) - Proximity to Airports. It is evident that the D.E.Q. discussed one of those factors, however; there are agencies which govern airport facilities and approaches to airport facilities, which include three additional pass/fail segments.

   a. Oregon Department of Transportation - Aeronautical Division, (ODOT - AD). D.E.Q. recognized the 10,000 foot distance from each side of a runway as an unacceptable area to build a landfill. In consideration of Site C-4, over half of the site is within this area; and C-5 a small portion is within this area.

Proximity to Airports: (cont.)

b. Oregon Department of Transportation -Aeronautical Division, (ODOT - AD). An additional 4,000 feet beyond the 10,000 feet identified in #1. above, is used as an ascending and descending conical zone. ODOT - AD says that building landfills in these areas is normally unacceptable. All of Site C-4 and over half of site C-5 is within this 14,000 foot area.

c. Oregon Department of Transportation - Aeronautical Division, (ODOT - AD). Columbia Helicopter lands turbo-jet aircraft at their landing facility, which is governed by these agencies. By adding this additional distance, Site C-4 is totally within the 10,000 foot distance and the C-5 site is 50% within this area. By adding the 4,000 foot conical zone, the C-5 site would be totally eliminated by the pass/fail criterion.

d. According to the F.A.A. flyway approach information, each of the C-2, C-3-D, C-4, and C-6-D sites is directly under the Willamette Flyway. F.A.A. regulations obviously restrict the height of tower, etc., in the higher elevations, but would also look negatively on a landfill site in these areas. Adjustment of a flyway is not the easiest process, and can take months to achieve approvals. I do not believe the D.E.Q. has procured jurisdictional or judicial constraints over the F.A.A.

Other Considerations:

1. Alternative methods of Disposal - D.E.Q., through the authorization of the State Legislature has developed a "single shot" attitude toward solid waste disposal. This attitude has a dual emphasis combining landfill operations with an aggressive recycling program.

   In most jurisdictions when considering an issue as controversial and important as solid waste disposal, the officials making the decisions normally review multiple disciplines of technology. This case is much different however, and no exploration into the possibilities has been approached.

   The D.E.Q. is willing to invest millions of the tax payer's money and solid waste generator money into developing large quantities of valuable farm, commercial, residential, and open space as waste

Other Considerations: (cont.)

disposal sites. It is highly feasible to reduce the overall property necessary to develop a waste disposal facility, and generate income back to the system.

European countries have developed solid waste burning facilities for years, and the technology capabilities of these systems far out weigh the environmental impact one landfill site distributes. As a governmental entity, it is necessary to provide the most efficient process for the most economic price, which includes continued operations and maintenance. The D.E.Q. must consider alternate methods of solid waste disposal and at least compare them before deciding on a landfill site. Preferably one site could take the place of many if designed and developed properly.

2. Interstate Highway System Impact -
The Oregon Department of Transportation has recently approved its 6-year highway plan for 1987 through 1992. The Interstate Highway System has numerous projects funded to assure that needed expansion occurs prior to impacting service levels of the freeway system.

The City of Wilsonville requested as a part of the FEDERAL AID INTERSTATE (FAI), three projects for interchange improvements.

a. Wilsonville Interchange Improvements -
Project scheduled for construction 1990
b. Stafford Interchange Improvements -
Project scheduled for construction 1990
c. Boeckman Interchange -
Denied due to impact on freeway system

Realizing a landfill site has an enormous effect on the local transportation, it seems that ODOT would need to determine the impact on existing and future interchanges, and the freeway transportation system. It is only appropriate that the D.E.Q. review these concerns with ODOT for an opinion of the impact on the Federal Highway System. Also since Federal funds are involved, the Federal Highway Administration must be involved.

Freeway impacts should be analyzed on I-5, I-205, and Highway 217. Interchange impacts should be analyzed at Charbonneau Interchange, Wilsonville Interchange, and Stafford Interchange.

Other Considerations: (cont.)

3. Local Road Impacts -
City streets in Wilsonville built after 1982 were designed for a minimum 20-6ear life given the volume of traffic and the type of traffic (i.e., percentage of trucks and weight).

Much Much of the route for the trucks transporting solid waste to the five sites within the Wilsonville area will be on arterial streets, which have not been improved to their full standard. According to the City's adopted Capital Improvement Program and finding process, improvements would not occur until such time as development in the area requires such improvement.

The inclusion of any one of the proposed landfill sites within the Wilsonville Community requires these improvements to be made immediately. Also the design of the existing improved arterial streets will not be adequate to handle the additional truck traffic. Maintenance costs will increase drastically within these areas, and the economic impacts are such that the D.E.Q. would have substantial involvement in remedying the situation.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The City of Wilsonville has taken an in-depth look at each site, in order to determine the impact that the site has on the community and the environment. The D.E.Q. has legislatively required that the only method to eliminate a site is through the siting criterion. The City of Wilsonville feels strongly that the following sites need to be eliminated due to the following reasons:

Site C-2 Corral Creek:

1. Does not meet the pass/fail criterion PF/3 - Proximity to Airports.
2. If statement #1. is unacceptable, the site criterion should be reduced in the following areas. (See attached Site Evaluation Criterion Table)

Criteria Number:

10. Flood Plains
11. Site Run-off Source
12. Site Drainage Discharge
13. Down Stream Uses

Criteria Number: (cont.)

20. Recharge Discharge Areas
23. Depth to Aquifer
28. Downgradient Non-Drinking Wells
40. Zoning

41. Current Site Use
71. Scenic Views
73. Access Routes
80 Site Life

82. Surface Water Control
83. Ground Water Drainage
84. Leachate Treatment
85. Slopes

88. Groundwater Monitoring
91. Traffic
92. Waste Transport Distance
94. Road Construction

Site C-3-D - Dammasch Hospital Property:

1. Does not meet the pass/fail criterion PF/10 - Buffer Area. There are more than five homes, less than 1,000 feet from the site.
2. Does not meet pass/fail criterion PF/3 - Proximity to Airports.
3. Does not meet the original pass/fail criterion, which established the 142 sites for site capacity, PF/12.
4. If statement #1., #2., and #3 are found to be unacceptable by the D.E.Q., the site criterion evaluation should be reduced in the following areas. (See attached Site Evaluation Criterion Table)

Criteria Number:

11. Site Run-off Sources
13. Downstream Uses
20. Recharge/Discharge Areas
28. Downgradient Non-drinking
73. Access Routes
81. Landfill Gas

Criteria Number: (cont.)

82. Surface Water Control
83. Groundwater Control
84. Leachate Treatment
88. Groundwater Monitoring
91. Traffic
92. Waste Transport Distance
94. Road Construction

Site C-4 - Butteville:

1. Does not meet the pass/fail criterion PF/10 - Buffer Area. There are more than five homes, less than 1,000 feet from the site.
2. Does not meet pass/fail criterion PF/3 - Proximity to Airports.
3. Does not meet the original pass/fail criterion, which established the 142 sites for site capacity, PF/12.
4. If statement #1., #2., and #3 are found to be unacceptable by the D.E.Q., the site criterion evaluation should be reduced in the following areas. (See attached Site Evaluation Criterion Table)

Criteria Number:

11. Site Run-off Sources
13. Downstream Uses
23. Depth to Groundwater
28. Downgradient non-drinking wells
40. Zoning
71. Scenic Views
81. Landfill Gas

82. Surface Water Control
83. Ground Water Drainage
84. Leachate Treatment
86. Groundwater Monitoring
91. Traffic
92. Waste Transport Distance
94. Road Construction

Site C-5 - East of Charbonneau Site:

1. Does not meet the pass/fail criterion PF/10 - Buffer Area. There are more than five homes, less than 1,000 feet from the site.
2. Does not meet pass/fail criterion PF/3 - Proximity to Airports.
3. Does not meet the original pass/fail criterion, which established the 142 sites for site capacity, PF/12.
4. If statement #1., #2., and #3 are found to be unacceptable by the D.E.Q., the site criterion evaluation should be reduced in the following areas. (See attached Site Evaluation Criterion Table)

Criteria Number:

10. Flood Plains
13. Down Stream Uses
20. Recharge Discharge Areas
21. Natural Protection
23. Depth to Groundwater
25. Downgradient Users
26. Groundwater Quality
40. Zoning

71. Scenic Views
73. Access Routes
81. Landfill Gas
82. Surface Water Control
83. Groundwater Drainage
84. Leachate Treatment
92. Waste Transport Distance
94. Road Construction

Site C-6-D - Advance Road Site:

1. Does not meet the pass/fail criterion PF/10 - Buffer Area. There are more than five homes, less than 1,000 feet from the site.
2. Does not meet pass/fail criterion PF/3 - Proximity to Airports.
3. Does not meet the original pass/fail criterion, which established the 142 sites for site capacity, PF/12.

4. If statement #1., #2., and #3 are found to be unacceptable by the D.E.Q., the site criterion evaluation should be reduced in the following areas. (See attached Site Evaluation Criterion Table)

Criteria Number:

10. Flood Plains
13. Downstream Users
23. Depth To Groundwater
28. Downgradient Non-Drinking Wells
40. Zoning
71. Scenic Views

81. Landfill Gas
84. Leachate Treatment
85. Slopes
91. Traffic
92. Waste Transport Distance
94. Road Construction

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 10

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Surface Water

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Flood Plains

WEIGHTING: 6

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATI	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOT
10	60	5	30	10	60	8	48	1	6	1	6	10	60	8	48	10	60	10	60

Recommended Change in rating comments.

C - 5 -- A portion of Site C-5 is located within the 100 - 500 year flood plain of the Pudding and Molalla Rivers.

C - 6 - D -- A perennial creek travises site C-6-D which indicates a minor river or creek within the 100 - 500 year flood plain.

C - 2 -- A perennial creek travises site C-2 which indicates a minor river or creek within the 100 - 500 year flood plain.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 11

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Surface Water

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Site Runoff Sources

WEIGHTING: 4

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATI	
TS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOT
0	40	10	40	1	4	1	4	10	40	6	24	6	24	1	4	10	40	6	24

C - 4 -- A intermittent stream crosses this piece of property and increases the impact of the site on surface runoff. Therefore, the rating should be reduced.

C - 2 -- A perennial drainage ditch crosses this piece of property which, according to definition, should reduce this rating.

C - 3 - D -- A intermittent stream crosses the site C-3-D, therefore, this rating should be reduced.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 12

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Surface Water

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Site Drainage Discharge

WEIGHTING: 4

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATI	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOL
1	4	1	4	1	4	1	4	1	4	1	4	10	40	1	4	1	4	1	4

C - 2 -- In review of the topography maps, and the sites relationship to Corral Creek, the majority of the site drains to either a stream with less than 40 cfs, or an intermittent drainage channel.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 13

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Surface Water

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Downstream Uses

WEIGHTING: 7

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATI	
IS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOT
7	49	5	35	9	63	5	35	9	63	5	35	10	70	1	7	7	49	1	7

The criteria indicates that if either recreational facilities or water supply intakes exist downstream of the site(s) on other streams than the Willamette River or the Columbia River, then the rating can be reduced. It is very important to understand the relationship between the high and low flow in the Willamette River, and during low flow it may be very difficult to meet the guidelines set by D.E.Q. regarding discharge into the river. There are numerous affects that can be determined by allowing this type of discharge into the Willamette River at these locations. C-5, C6D, and C-4 are upstream from highly used recreational facilities. C-5 Molalla State Park; C-6-D Molalla State Park; C-4 Boones Ferry Park, Clackamas County Boatramp, Wilsonville Memorial Park. C-2 and C-3-D are upstream of a Willamette River Appropriation Permit No. 46314 from the Water Resources Department.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 20

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Ground Water

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Recharge/Discharge Areas

WEIGHTING: 8

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
9	72	6	48	9	72	9	72	9	72	9	72	9	72	6	48	9	72	6	48

C-2, C-3-D, C - 5 -- Numerous local wells are located in this area, and by review of well logs information it is apparent that these areas are local recharge areas.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 21

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental Groundwater

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Natural Protection

WEIGHTING: 8

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
9	72	7	56	8	64	8	64	7	56	7	56	3	24	3	4	7	56	7	56

C - 5 -- Has many of the same soil characteristics as the C-4 area. In review of this information, C-5 should have a similiar rating.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 22

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental Groundwater

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Aquifer Characteristics

WEIGHTING: 8

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
TS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
	40	5	40	2	16	2	16	5	40	5	40	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8

No changes.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 23

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Groundwater

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Depth to Groundwater

WEIGHTING: 4

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
9	36	1	4	9	36	7	28	4	16	1	4	9	36	5	20	5	20	5	20

C - 5/C - 4 -- Well logs taken in these areas are known to produce water at elevations less than 25 ft., and in many instances have artesian flow. These should have a reduced rating.

C - 2 -- Well logs in these areas are known to produce water in this area between 25 - 50 ft. below ground level.

C 6 D -- Well logs indicate many water levels above 50 feet, however a few wells in the vicinity of the landfill area are between 25 and 50 feet.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 24

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental Groundwater

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Hydrological Boundaries

WEIGHTING: 4

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ PTS	RATING TOTAL	CITY PTS	RATING TOTAL	DEQ PTS	RATING TOTAL	CITY PTS	RATING TOTAL	DEQ PTS	RATING TOTAL	CITY PTS	RATING TOTAL	DEQ PTS	RATING TOTAL	CITY PTS	RATING TOTAL	DEQ PTS	RATING TOTAL	CITY PTS	RATING TOTAL
10	40	10	40	6	24	6	24	9	36	9	36	8	32	8	32	9	36	9	36

No information provided to dispute these numbers.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 25

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Groundwater

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Downgradient Users

WEIGHTING: 10

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
4	40	1	10	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	40	1	10	1	10

C - 5 -- It is evident that there are approximately 1000 downgradient homes or approximately 3000 users. This site rating should be reduced.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 26

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Groundwater

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Groundwater Quality

WEIGHTING: 4

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
2	8	1	4	2	8	2	8	2	8	2	8	2	8	2	8	2	8	2	8

C - 5 -- Municipal supply of excellent quality within the downgradient of the proposed landfill site.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 27

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Groundwater

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Evidence of Vaulting

WEIGHTING: 3

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	1	3	1	3	10	30	10	30

No additional evidence to dispute these ratings.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 28

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Groundwater

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Downgradient Non-Drinking Water Wells

WEIGHTING: 2

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
5	10	5	10	8	16	5	10	8	16	5	10	8	16	5	10	8	16	5	10

Well logs indicate the presence of numerous no-drinking water wells within the landfill site areas.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 30

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Natural Habitat

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Threatened or Endangered Species

WEIGHTING: 8

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
10	80			10	80			10	80			10	80			10	80		

No information to dispute the D.E.Q.'s rating of these sites.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 31

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Natural Habitat

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Land Habitat

WEIGHTING: 4

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
4	16			6	24			5	20			4	16			6	24		

No information to dispute the D.E.Q.'s rating of these sites.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 32

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Natural Habitat

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Aquatic Habitat

WEIGHTING: 4

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
1	4			5	20			1	4			10	40			1	4		

No information to dispute the D.E.Q.'s rating of these sites.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 33

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Natural Habitat

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Current Habitat Disturbance

WEIGHTING: 4

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
6	24			7	28			8	32			8	32			8	32		

No information to dispute the D.E.Q.'s rating of these sites.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 40

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Land Use

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Zoning

WEIGHTING: 3

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
6	18	4	12	6	18	4	12	6	18	4	12	6	18	4	12	1	3	1	3

C - 5, C 6 D, C - 4, & C - 2 -- Each site is a farm use, but in many instances has rural residential applications. For example, two to five acre parcels with a residence on each. The ratings are established for farm use or light industrial, and parcel residential and commercial. Since the point structure is six to two respectively, the actual rating should be four.

C - 2 -- Current site use is more applicable to SCS Agricultural Class I & II soil. I believe that by using a percentage of agricultural crop production versus SCS Agricultural soils the latter will prevail.

C -4, & C - 5 -- Both these sites are located with the 10,000 foot landing approach zone, and 4,000 feet ascending-descending conical zone for turbo jet air craft. This 14,000 foot area makes the C-5 area reduced by 75% of the area it once had. The C-4 site is eliminated due to the fact that the site is completely within the 14,000 foot area. The Oregon Department of Transportation Aeoronautical Division indicated that the building of a landfill site in these areas is normally unacceptable.

Also, all sites are within the flyway approval to the Aurora Airport and according to FAA regulation landfill applications should be prohibited.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 41

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Land Use

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Current Site Use

WEIGHTING: 7

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
1	7	1	7	2	14	2	14	1	7	1	7	4	28	2	14	2	14	2	14

C - 5, C 6 D, C - 4, & C - 2 -- Each site is a farm use, but in many instances has rural residential applications. For example, two to five acre parcels with a residence on each. The ratings are established for farm use or light industrial, and parcel residential and commercial. Since the point structure is six to two respectively, the actual rating should be four.

C - 2 -- Current site use is more applicable to SCS Agricultural Class I & II soil. I believe that by using a percentage of agricultural crop production versus SCS Agricultural soils the latter will prevail.

C -4, & C - 5 -- Both these sites are located with the 10,000 foot landing approach zone, and 4,000 feet ascending-descending conical zone for turbo jet air craft. This 14,000 foot area makes the C-5 area reduced by 75% of the area it once had. The C-4 site is eliminated due to the fact that the site is completely within the 14,000 foot area. The Oregon Department of Transportation Aeoronautical Division indicated that the building of a landfill site in these areas is normally unacceptable.

Also, all sites are within the flyway approval to the Aurora Airport and according to FAA regulation landfill applications should be prohibited.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 42

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Land Use

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Adjacent Land Use

WEIGHTING: 8

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
1	8	1	8	2	16	2	16	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8

C - 5, C 6 D, C - 4, & C - 2 -- Each site is a farm use, but in many instances has rural residential applications. For example, two to five acre parcels with a residence on each. The ratings are established for farm use or light industrial, and parcel residential and commercial. Since the point structure is six to two respectively, the actual rating should be four.

C - 2 -- Current site use is more applicable to SCS Agricultural Class I & II soil. I believe that by using a percentage of agricultural crop production versus SCS Agricultural soils the latter will prevail.

C -4, & C - 5 -- Both these sites are located with the 10,000 foot landing approach zone, and 4,000 feet ascending-descending conical zone for turbo jet air craft. This 14,000 foot area makes the C-5 area reduced by 75% of the area it once had. The C-4 site is eliminated due to the fact that the site is completely within the 14,000 foot area. The Oregon Department of Transportation Aeoronautical Division indicated that the building of a landfill site in these areas is normally unacceptable.

Also, all sites are within the flyway approval to the Aurora Airport and according to FAA regulation landfill applications should be prohibited.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 50

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Air Quality

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Air Quality

WEIGHTING: 2

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
EQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
TS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
10	20			6	12			10	20			6	12			6	12		

No substantial information to dispute these ratings.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 60

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Cultural Resources

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Cultural Resources

WEIGHTING: 4

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
10	40			10	40			10	40			10	40			10	40		

No substantial information to dispute these ratings.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 70

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Aesthetic

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Site Visibility

WEIGHTING: 3

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3

C - 5, C 6 D, C - 4, & C -2 -- All are adjacent to or within acknowledged Greenways and according to LCDC do have scenic importance. This rating category should be looked at very carefully to provide an accurate assessment of the Scenic View Category.

C - 5 -- Access for this site is definitely through high density, residential, and should be treated as such in the rating.

C - 2 -- Majority of access is or will be through high density residential development. It is important that D.E.Q. utilize future zoning and uses to determine a final rating.

C 3 D -- Majority of access is or will be through high density residential development. It is important that D.E.Q. utilize future zoning and uses to determine a final rating.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 71

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Aesthetic

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Scenic Views

WEIGHTING: 2

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
10	20	1	2	10	20	1	2	10	20	5	10	10	20	1	2	10	20	10	20

C - 5, C 6 D, C - 4, & C -2 -- All are adjacent to or within acknowledged Greenways and according to LCDC do have scenic importance. This rating category should be looked at very carefully to provide an accurate assessment of the Scenic View Category.

C - 5 -- Access for this site is definitely through high density, residential, and should be treated as such in the rating.

C - 2 -- Majority of access is or will be through high density residential development. It is important that D.E.Q. utilize future zoning and uses to determine a final rating.

C 3 D -- Majority of access is or will be through high density residential development. It is important that D.E.Q. utilize future zoning and uses to determine a final rating.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 72

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Aesthetic

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Buffer Area

WEIGHTING: 10

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ PTS	RATING TOTAL	CITY PTS	RATING TOTAL	DEQ PTS	RATING TOTAL	CITY PTS	RATING TOTAL	DEQ PTS	RATING TOTAL	CITY PTS	RATING TOTAL	DEQ PTS	RATING TOTAL	CITY PTS	RATING TOTAL	DEQ PTS	RATING TOTAL	CITY PTS	RATING TOTAL
1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10

C - 5, C 6 D, C - 4, & C -2 -- All are adjacent to or within acknowledged Greenways and according to LCDC do have scenic importance. This rating category should be looked at very carefully to provide an accurate assessment of the Scenic View Category.

C - 5 -- Access for this site is definitely through high density, residential, and should be treated as such in the rating.

C - 2 -- Majority of access is or will be through high density residential development. It is important that D.E.Q. utilize future zoning and uses to determine a final rating.

C 3 D -- Majority of access is or will be through high density residential development. It is important that D.E.Q. utilize future zoning and uses to determine a final rating.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 73

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Environmental - Aesthetic

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Access Routes

WEIGHTING: 5

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
7	35	5	25	6	30	6	30	5	25	5	25	4	20	2	10	4	20	2	10

C - 5, C 6 D, C - 4, & C -2 -- All are adjacent to or within acknowledged Greenways and according to LCDC do have scenic importance. This rating category should be looked at very carefully to provide an accurate assessment of the Scenic View Category.

C - 5 -- Access for this site is definitely through high density, residential, and should be treated as such in the rating.

C - 2 -- Majority of access is or will be through high density residential development. It is important that D.E.Q. utilize future zoning and uses to determine a final rating.

C 3 D -- Majority of access is or will be through high density residential development. It is important that D.E.Q. utilize future zoning and uses to determine a final rating.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 80

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Technical

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Site Life

WEIGHTING: 5

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
TS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
:	10	2	10	3	15	3	15	2	10	2	10	10	50	6	30	1	5	1	5

According to the Department of Environmental Quality, a site or a combination of sites with a projected site life of less than fifteen years was eliminated by the pass/fail criterion. It is apparent that if Site C-3-D, Site C-4, and C-5 were chosen they may not in combination equal a fifteen year life. Of the five Wilsonville sites only the C-2 site has a greater than fifteen year life.

Site C-5, C 6 D, C-4, and C-3D should not have been placed on the site list due to the fact that they did not pass the pass/fail criteria of site life. D.E.Q. developed the pass/fail criterion which indicates a site would be eliminated if it did not pass any one of the pass/fail criterion. The criteria identifies a minimum 200 acres is necessary to develop a suitable site with a fifteen year capacity. Is the 200 acres landfill area or total site area?

These sites have between 75 and 150 acres of landfill area and are under the minimum 200 acres necessary for development of a landfill site. Development cost for sites less than 200 acres are proportionately greater than larger sites.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 81,82,83,84

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Technical

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Landfill Gas, Surface Water Control, Ground Water Drainage; Leachate Treatment

WEIGHTING: 4, 2, 2, 7

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
EQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
TS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
10	40	7	28	10	40	7	28	10	40	7	28	1	4	1	4	10	40	7	28
10	20	3	6	1	2	1	2	9	18	3	6	3	6	1	2	7	14	3	6
5	10	3	6	5	10	5	10	5	10	3	6	5	10	3	6	5	10	3	6
10	70	5	35	10	70	5	35	10	70	5	35	10	70	5	35	10	70	5	35

Site C-5, C-6D, C4, C-3D -- all have structures within 500-feet of the site, therefore; their rating should be 7 instead of 10. Although soils may have low potential for gas mitigation, the presence of the structure increases the hazard.

Site C-5, C-6D, C-4, C-3D, C-2 -- each have either an intermittent stream or perennial stream travising the property.

Site C-5, C-4, C-2, and C-5 -- have perched water due to soils

According to LCDC Goal 14, the City is to provide sewer service for those businesses/residences, within the City limits or Urban Growth Boundary. By allowing a connection to said landfill site, we would be reducing the overall capacity of the City's treatment plant to tax payers within the LCDC Goal 14 criteria. Obviously the cost and acceptability of building a treatment plant on-site is quite costly.

The type of discharge in most cases will need some form of pretreatment prior to acceptance. A careful analysis would be performed prior to allowing such discharge. However, according to Section 3 of the Wilsonville Code, the State cannot mandate the City to allow said connection when it may be detrimental to allowing future economic development.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 85, 86, 87, 88

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Technical

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Slopes, Landslide Potential, Site Soils, Groundwater Monitoring

WEIGHTING: 2, 5, 6, 3

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
TS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
7	14	7	14	10	20	7	14	7	14	7	14	10	20	7	14	7	14	7	14
10	50	10	50	5	25	5	25	10	50	10	50	7	35	7	35	10	50	10	50
5	30	5	30	5	30	5	30	4	24	4	24	3	18	3	18	5	30	5	30
1	3	1	3	2	6	2	6	7	21	4	12	7	21	4	12	7	21	4	12

85 -- In review of the rating for slopes and in review of the topography maps, it seems many of these sites have slope in excess of 15%.

Site C 6 D, Active Landfill Area, would be located in the areas of slopes 0-5% and should be rated.

C-2 - Although the active area of the landfill would be located predominately on slopes of 5 to 10%, some of the active landfill area would be located on 0 to 5%. However, much of the area does have slope in the 10 to 15% range. The rating for this site should be reduced to accommodate the average slope within a siting area large enough to accommodate a 15 year life.

86 -- A full geotechnical investigation will be necessary in order to determine the actual landslide potential of each site.

87 -- Again, a full geotechnical investigation will be necessary in order to determine the actual cover soils for each site.

88 -- C-4, C-2, C-3-D have numerous well logs which indicate water retrieval at shallow depth, however, many of the aquifers are at depths over 100 ft. in monohomogenous and unconsolidated aquifer materials. These ratings should be reduced based on this information.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 89, 90, 91

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Technical

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Precipitation, Climatic Extreme, Traffic

WEIGHTING: 3, 2, 6

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
EQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
TS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30
10	20	10	20	10	20	10	20	10	20	10	20	10	20	10	20	10	20	10	20
5	30	5	30	6	36	3	18	6	36	5	30	4	24	3	18	6	36	3	18

91 -- Site C-4 has the same traffic impact as site C-5 in regards to its direct access to and from I-5. Streets in the C-4 area are of less quality regarding width and structure. This in fact, impacts the streets ability to transport truck traffic, and requires substantial investment to provide said truck transportation system.

Site C-6-D, C-2, and C-3-D will predominately utilize the Wilsonville Interchange in Wilsonville. This interchange has been identified by the Oregon Department of Transportation (O.D.O.T.) as being reconstructed under the 1987-1992 Six Year Plan for the 1990 construction season. The Wilsonville Interchange is presently at a D level service, however is rapidly entering an "E" level. O.D.O.T. will have to re-evaluate their design to compensate for the increased truck traffic. The City was denied a new I-5 access at Boeckman Road designated for truck traffic due to the states ability to make the Wilsonville Interchange work. I feel the Wilsonville Road area will more than likely approach E level before any improvements are made.

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

RATE COMPARISON

Criteria No. 92, 93, 94

CRITERIA CATEGORY: Economic

CRITERIA STATEMENT: Waste Transport Distance, Cover Soils, Road Construction

WEIGHTING: 5, 3, 4

C - 5				C 6 D				C - 4				C - 2				C - 3 D			
EQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING		DEQ RATING		CITY RATING	
TS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL	PTS	TOTAL
4	20	2	10	6	30	2	10	4	20	2	10	4	20	2	10	6	30	2	10
8	24	8	24	8	24	8	24	6	18	6	18	5	15	5	15	8	24	8	24
8	32	7	28	7	28	3	12	8	32	7	28	6	24			5	20		

92. If transfer stations are utilized in Washington, Clackamas and Multnomah Counties, in most cases, the average haul distance will be 20 to 25 miles to each site. Therefore, a rating of 2 is the best possible rating that could be accomplished from the average distance.

93. Assuming the site does not have adequate cover, which rating item 87 addresses; can the DEQ identify where cover soil will come from which is adequate to meet DEQ specifications. Again a complete geotechnical investigation of the site would reveal the effects of taking soil from, or adding to it.

95. All roads in Wilsonville are built for existing and future traffic volumes. The City did not build any of the streets to handle the anticipated additional truck traffic. Widening and improvements to the structural capabilities of the streets must be completed. Streets in Wilsonville are not a standard section; streets are designed according to its anticipated volumes, and traffic weight impact. According to the map, the following improvement to City streets must be completed.

C-5	Miley Road 1 mile of Public Street	- $633,600
	1 mile access	- $216,800
C-6-D	5 miles Wilsonville Road - Advance	- $1,584,000
	1 mile access road	- $216,800
C-4	Butteville Road 1 mile	- $316,800
	1 mile access road	- $216,800
C-2	4½-miles of Wilsonville	- $1,425,600
	1 miles access road	- $216,800
C-3-D	1 mile Wilsonville Road	- $316,800
	1 mile Brown Road	- $316,800
	½ mile access road	$79,200

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA TABLE

CRITERIA #	TEXT / WEIGHTING	C - 5 DEQ RATING PTS	C - 5 DEQ RATING TOTAL	C - 5 CITY RATING PTS	C - 5 CITY RATING TOTAL	C 6 D DEQ RATING PTS	C 6 D DEQ RATING TOTAL	C 6 D CITY RATING PTS	C 6 D CITY RATING TOTAL	C - 4 DEQ RATING PTS	C - 4 DEQ RATING TOTAL	C - 4 CITY RATING PTS	C - 4 CITY RATING TOTAL	C - 2 DEQ RATING PTS	C - 2 DEQ RATING TOTAL	C - 2 CITY RATING PTS	C - 2 CITY RATING TOTAL	C - 3 D DEQ RATING PTS	C - 3 D DEQ RATING TOTAL	C - 3 D CITY RATI PTS	C - 3 D CITY RATI TOTA
10	Flood Plains/6	10	60	5	30	10	60	8	48	1	6	1	6	10	60	8	48	10	60	10	60
11	Site Runoff Sources/4	10	40	10	40	1	4	1	4	10	40	6	24	6	24	1	4	10	40	6	24
12	Site Drainage Discharge/4	1	4	1	4	1	4	1	4	1	4	1	4	10	40	1	4	1	4	1	4
13	Downstream Uses/7	7	49	5	35	9	63	5	35	9	63	5	35	10	70	1	7	7	49	1	7
20	Recharge/Discharge Areas/8	9	72	6	48	9	72	9	72	9	72	9	72	9	72	6	48	9	72	6	48
21	Natural Protection/8	9	72	7	56	8	64	8	64	7	56	7	56	3	24	3	24	7	56	7	56
22	Aquifer Characteristics/8	5	40	5	40	2	16	2	16	5	40	5	40	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8
23	Depth to Groundwater/4	9	36	1	4	9	36	7	28	4	16	1	4	9	36	5	20	5	20	5	20
24	Hydrological Boundaries/4	10	40	10	40	6	24	6	24	9	36	9	36	8	32	8	32	9	36	9	36
25	Downgradient Users/10	4	40	1	10	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	40	1	10	1	10
26	Groundwater Quality/4	2	8	1	4	2	8	2	8	2	8	2	8	2	8	2	8	2	8	[illegible]	8
27	Evidence of Vaulting/3	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	1	3	1	3	10	30	1[illegible]	30
28	Downgradient Non-Drinking Wells/2	5	10	5	10	8	16	5	10	8	16	5	10	8	16	5	10	8	16	5	10
30	Threatened/Endangered Species/8	10	80	10	80	10	80	10	80	10	80	10	80	10	80	10	80	10	80	10	80
31	Land Habitat/4	4	16	4	16	6	24	6	24	5	20	5	20	4	16	4	16	6	24	6	24
32	Aquatic Habitat/4	1	4	1	4	5	20	5	20	1	4	1	4	10	40	10	40	1	4	1	4
33	Current Habitat Disturbance/4	6	24	6	24	7	28	7	28	8	32	8	32	8	32	8	32	8	32	8	32
40	Zoning/3	6	18	4	12	6	18	4	12	6	18	4	12	6	18	4	12	1	3	1	3
41	Current Site Use/7	1	7	1	7	2	14	2	14	1	7	1	7	4	28	2	14	2	14	2	14
42	Adjacent Land Use/8	1	8	1	8	2	16	2	16	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8
50	Air Quality/2	10	20	10	20	6	12	6	12	10	20	10	20	6	12	6	12	6	12	6	12
60	Cultural Resources/4	10	40	10	40	10	40	10	40	10	40	10	40	10	40	10	40	10	40	10	40
70	Site Visibility/3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3
71	Scenic Views/2	10	20	1	2	10	20	1	2	10	20	5	10	10	20	1	2	10	20	10	20
72	Buffer Area/10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10
73	Access Routes/5	7	35	5	25	6	30	6	30	5	25	5	25	4	20	2	10	4	20	2	10
80	Site Life/5	2	10	2	10	3	15	3	15	2	10	2	10	10	50	6	30	1	5	[illegible]	5
81	Landfill Gas/4	10	40	7	28	10	40	7	28	10	40	7	28	1	4	1	4	10	40	7	28
82	Surface Water Control/2	10	20	3	6	1	2	1	2	9	18	3	6	3	6	1	2	7	14	3	6
83	Ground Water Drainage/2	5	10	3	6	5	10	5	10	5	10	3	6	5	10	3	6	5	10	3	6
84	Leachate Treatment/7	10	70	5	35	10	70	5	35	10	70	5	35	10	70	5	35	10	70	5	35
85	Slopes/2	7	14	7	14	10	20	7	14	7	14	7	14	10	20	7	14	7	14	7	14
86	Landslide Potential/5	10	50	10	50	5	25	5	25	10	50	10	50	7	35	7	35	10	50	10	50
87	Site Soils/6	5	30	5	30	5	30	5	30	4	24	4	24	3	18	3	18	5	30	5	30
88	Groundwater Monitoring/3	1	3	1	3	2	6	2	6	7	21	4	12	7	21	4	12	7	21	4	12
89	Precipitation/3	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30	10	30
90	Climatic Extreme/2	10	20	10	20	10	20	10	20	10	20	10	20	10	20	10	20	10	20	10	20
91	Traffic/6	5	30	5	30	6	36	3	18	6	36	5	30	4	24	3	18	6	36	3	18
92	Waste Transport Distance/5	4	20	2	10	6	30	2	10	4	20	2	10	4	20	2	10	6	30	2	10
93	Cover Soils/3	8	24	8	24	8	24	8	24	6	18	6	18	5	15	5	15	8	24	8	24
94	Road Construction/4	8	32	7	28	7	28	3	12	8	32	7	28	6	24	4	16	5	20	4	16
	SUMMARY:	264	1199	207	926	249	1138	205	953	256	1127	212	957	251	1127	177	800	248	1093	205	885

FEBRUARY 1986 LANDFILL SITING CRITERIA

SITE EVALUATION CRITERION

Criteria Category: Technical

Criterion Statement: Site Capacity

Recommended criterion weighting (1 to 10): 8

Ranges of Acceptability

Description	Recommended Rating (1 to 10)
Projected site life greater than 40 years.	10
Site life between 30 and 40 years.	8
Site life between 25 and 30 years.	6
Site life between 20 and 25 years.	4
Site life between 15 and 20 years.	2

Criterion Discussion:

A landfill with a long life is desirable because the cost of site identification, development, and closure are high. Sites with a projected life less than 15 years have been eliminated by a pass/fail criterion.

JUNE 1986 LANDFILL SITING CRITERIA

No. 80

SITE EVALUATION CRITERION

Criteria Category: Technical

Criterion Statement: Site Life

Recommended criterion weighting (1 to 10): 5

Ranges of Acceptability

Description	Recommended Rating (1 to 10)
Projected site life greater than 30 years.	10
Site life between 20 and 30 years.	7
Site life between 10 and 20 years.	4
Site life less than 10 years.	2

Criterion Discussion:

A landfill with a long life is desirable because the costs of site identification, development, and closure are high. Sites or a combination of sites with a projected life less than 15 years have been eliminated by a pass/fail criterion.

Individual sites with a life of less than 15 years are rated because they may provide an acceptable alternative in combination with the other sites.