Volume 3: Technical Appendices





Project Sponsors

Business Oregon — Metro — NAIOP Oregon Chapter Port of Portland — Portland Business Alliance

Project Management Team and Sponsors:

Business Oregon - Mike Williams Metro - John Williams and Ted Reid NAIOP Oregon Chapter - Kirk Olsen and Mike Wells Port of Portland - Keith Leavitt, Lise Glancy, and Susie Lahsene Portland Business Alliance - Bernie Bottomly











Consultant Team:

Group Mackenzie – Mark Clemons, Project Manager Gabriela Frask, Brent Nielsen, Chris Clemow, Bob Thompson Ash Creek Associates, Inc. – Chris Breemer Johnson Reid – Chris Blakney







Agency Review: Business Oregon – Karen Homolac Oregon Department of State Lands – Kirk Jarvie Oregon Department of Transportation – Kelly Scannell Brooks

Project Funders:

Commercial Real Estate Economic Coalition (CREEC) Clackamas County City of Gresham City of Hillsboro City of Portland City of Sherwood City of Sherwood City of Wilsonville Howard S. Wright National Electrical Contractors Association – Oregon-Columbia Chapter Oregon State Building & Construction Trades Council Portland General Electric Plumbing & Mechanical Contractors Association Sheet Metal & Air Conditioning Contractors National Association Three Oaks Development Company Westside Economic Alliance

The Project is being funded in part through funds provided by the State of Oregon, acting by and through the Business Oregon (an Oregon state agency).

The site information contained in this report is based on publicly available data sources and is not intended to replace independent due diligence for transaction purposes. Prospective purchasers, tenants, and others shall perform and rely solely upon, their own independent due diligence with respect to the Property.



Volume 3 is one of four documents for the Regional Industrial Site Readiness Project. This volume presents the technical appendices that support Volumes 1 and 2. Volume 1 presents the complete Project analysis and findings. Volume 2 presents site specific details and results of the Project. The Project Executive Summary is the fourth document.

VOLUME 3: APPENDECIES

TABLE OF CONENTS

- A. PHASE 1 SITE MATRIX
- B. PHASE 1 SITE MAPS
- C. PHASE 1 TIERING CRITERIA
- D. PHASE 1 GUIDE TO INFRASTRUCTURE RATING METHODOLOGY
- E. BUSINESS OREGON INDUSTRY PROFILES MATRIX
- F. JOHNSON REID REDEVELOPMENT MEMO
- G. GROUP MACKENZIE INFRASTRUCTURE REPORT
- H. GROUP MACKENZIE TRANSPORTATION REPORT
- I. OREGON DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS WETLANDS REPORT
- J. PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC UTILITY REPORT
- K. ASH CREEK ASSOCIATES REPORT
- L. JOHNSON REID ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

					SITE CHA	RACTERISTIC	s									IN	FRASTRUC	CTURE	TRANSPO	ORTATION		AVA	ILABILITY	OWNERSH	IIP		
Site ID Preliminary Tier State Certified Traded-Sector Industry	Owner/Site	Location	County	Gross Acres	Wetlands (RLIS) Wetland Acreage (Jurisdictions)*	Flood 96 Acres (RLIS) FEMA Flood AC (RLIS)	Floodplain AC (Jurisdictions)*	Streams AC (RLIS) Stream AC	7-25% Slope Acres (RLIS) 10-25% Slope Acres (Jurisdiction/RLIS)*	All Constraints (RLIS)	Alll Constraints (Jurisdictions)* % Constraints (RLIS)	% Constraints (Jurisdictions)*	Net Developable Acresage (RLIS)	Net Developable Acreage (Market Knowledge)* Use Restriction	Brownfield Annexation Required Number of Taxlots	Number of Owners Sewer Score	Water Score	Storm Score Surrounding System	Quality Access to Interstate Highway	Access to Freight Route (Roadway) Access to Freight	System (All Modes) Currently for Sale/Lease	Willing to Transact	Private Ownership	Investor	Public User	Site I D	Notes
1 1 YES C, D, H	RIVERGATE (PORT)	PORTLAND	Multnomah		0.00	0.21 4	3.20 C	0.00	0.02	0 43.24				43.15	5	A	В	A	A B	A	A L				YES		Lease only
11 1 D, H A, B, D, F,	PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL CENTER - EAST (PORT)	PORTLAND	Multnomah		0.34	0.00	0.00	0.79	1.19	2.02	5.3		41.18		2	A	A	A	A C	A	3 L				YES		Lease only
21 1 H, I	LSI EAST (PORT)	GRESHAM	Multnomah		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.96	0.96	0.8		115.01		6	A	A	A	A B	A	3	YES		Ň	YES		Delineation # 11-0203; no jurisdictional wetlands on site Price constrained: currently not at industrial price; No further wetland investigation
32 1 F	ELLIGSEN RALPH H & SHIRLEY L	WILSONVILLE	Clackamas		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			32.34		1	A	A	A	A C	В	3 S		YES				warranted - per DSL Irregular site shape; can not get square/rectangle net developable 25 acres; No
44 1 D, F	INTEL CORPORATION	HILLSBORO	Washington	31.39	0.00 0.00	0.00	0.00 0	0.00	1.28	0 1.28	0 4.0	0.00%	30.11	31.39	3	В	В	A	A A	A	3 S				YES	6 44	further wetland investigation warranted - per DSL Delineation # 07-0165: valid for 5 years. New delineation required in March 2012;
46 1 YES D, F	DEV. SERVICES OF AMERICA (WESTMARK SITE)	HILLSBORO	Washington	30.02	0.00 0.00	0.00	0.00 C	0.00	1.02	0 1.02	0 3.4	0% 0.00%	6 29.00	30.02	1	A	В	A	A A	A	3 S		YES				No further investigation warranted - per DSL Delineation # 08-0396; Wetland acreage provided by DSL; No further wetland
48 1 YES A, F	WAFFORD DEWAYNE (BAKER/BINDEWALD SITE)	HILLSBORO	Washington	50.78	0.00 1.48	0.00	0.54 0.05	5 0.78	8.86 0.4	7 9.40	3.84 18.5	51% 7.56%	6 41.38	46.94	1	A	В	A	A A	A	A S		YES			48	investigation warranted - per DSL Wetland acreage provided by City of Hillsboro; Wetland delineation expires April
49 1 YES A, F 57 1 YES D, F	NIKE FOUNDATION MERIX CORPORATION	HILLSBORO FOREST GROVE	Washington Washington		0.98 0.98	0.00	6.84 13.75 0.00	5 1.13	0.35 0.0	4 7.16	11.02 0.0		66.72 33.42		1	A	A	A	A A A	B	a s			YES	YES		2012; No further wetland investigation warranted - per DSL Delineation # 06-0248; no further site investigation warrented - per DSL
9 2 DH	NE MARINE DR & 33rd AVE (PORT)	PORTLAND	Multnomah	66.74	4.61 0.60	1.86 1	6.48 18	3 1 56	11.25	0 26.84	4.04 40.2	2% 6.05%	39.89	62 70	1	A	Α	A	с с	Α	3 1				YES	9	Lease only; requires transportation improvements; Located in managed floodplain; Net developable assumes wetland mitigation
			mannonian	00.11	1.01 0.00	1.00	0.10	1.00	11.20	20.01	1.01 10.2		00.00	02.10													Local Wetland Inventory does not exist; Site lacks wetland delineation; 100% hydric soils on site and on site wetlands are expected by DSL; Based on wetland
13 2 D, H	ICDC LLC	PORTLAND	Multnomah	28.11 (0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.24 1.5	9 5.24	1.59 18.6	3% 5.66%	6 22.87	26.52	3	с	A	A	A C	В	3 L			YES	NO	13	Indings site may fall below 25 net developable acces Multi year farming leases on propety require buy out resulting in Tier 2; No longer
																											a brownfield; Net developable acres is only south of sloped hill; Delineation # 11- 0203; Wetland acreage provided by DSL; Per DSL, approximately 1 acre of
22 2 A, B, D, F,	H LSI WEST (PORT)	GRESHAM	Multnomah	87.69	0.00 3.70	0.00	0.00	0.67 0.6	7 23.77 15.4	5 24.40	19.85 27.8	2% 22.64%	63.29	67.84	3	A	A	A	АВ	A	3	YES **		,	YES	22	wetland exists in net developable area on south portion of the site; No further site investigation warranted - per DSL
29 2 C, D, H	CLACKAMAS COUNTY DEVELOPMENT	CLACKAMAS	Clackamas	61.93	0.00		6.71	3.82	26.47	32.32				40.00	A 11	В	В	BI	B B	В	<u>c s/L</u>				YES	29	Can mitigate brownfield within 6 months (completed phase 2 assessment); Development Agency estimates net developable 40 acres; Tier 2 because wellands analysis and mitigation plan requires more than 180 days and not shovel ready within 180; No further welland investigation warranted - per DSL
38 2 D	BILES FAMILY LLC	SHERWOOD	Washington	39.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.72	8.72	22.0		30.89		YES 1	C	A	В	ВВ	В	3 5		YES				No further wetland investigation warranted - per DSL Needs intersection improvements. Permit timing > 6 months; No further wetland
40 2 D	PACIFIC REALTY ASSOCIATES LP	TUALATIN	Washington	26.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.95	0 3.04	0 11.3	4% 0.00%	6 23.76	26.80	1	A	A	A	B B	A	A S/L			YES		40	investigation warranted - per DSL
50 2 YES A, F	KEITH BERGER / HERBERT MOORE / BOYLES TRUST	HILLSBORO	Washington	72.40	0.00 0.07	0.00	7.16 5.78	3 0.00 1.8	8 0.86	0 8.02	6.26 11.0	8% 8.65%	64.38	66.14	5	3 В	В	A	вв	в	3 S		YES			50	Known SNRO on site; Required extension of Huffman Rd for site access is greater than 6 month timeline; Wetland delineation reconcurred 11/09; Wetland acreage provided by DSL; No further wetland investigation warrented - per DSL; North portion of Moore parcel is included as part of this site; 2 property owners
																											Gross acreage includes area designated for Huffman Rd extension and net developable acresage does not; Required extension of Huffman Rd for site access is greater than 6 month timeline; Southern portion of Moore parcel is
52 2 YES A, F 54 2 D, F	BERGER PROPERTIES / HERBERT MOORE 5305 NW 253RD AVENUE LLC	HILLSBORO	Washington Washington	52.00 (38.49 (0.00 0.00		0.00 0 8.34 7.25	0 0.00 5 0.00	0.00	0.00		0% 0.00%			YES 1	2 A	B	B (<u>в с</u> с с	B	3 S 3	N/A	YES				included as part of this site; 3 property owners Willingness to transact is unknown
55 2 B, D, F	SPOKANE HUMANE SOCIETY	HILLSBORO	Washington	45.49 (0.00 0.00	0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.0	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.0	0.00%	45.49	45.49	YES 1	с	А	С	сс	в	3	YES	YES				Known SNRO on site; Multiple owners own this parcel but listed as 1 LLC; could be aggregated with site 56 for a 116 acre site
56 2 A, F	EAST EVERGREEN SITE	HILLSBORO	Washington	71.11	0.00 5.16	0.88	0.00 0.00	0.00	0.44	0 1.32	7.26 1.8	6% 10.21%	69.79	71.11	YES 9	7 C	A	в	A C	в	c s	YES	YES				Floodplain and SNRO on site; Net developable acres assumes mitigated floodplain and SNRO; 9 parcels/7 property owners; 6 parcels/4 owners currently for sale; Remaining owners have in past expressed willingness to transact; could be aggregate with site 55 for a 116 acre site
62 2 D, F	ROCK CREEK SITE	HAPPY VALLEY	Claskamas	40.83 (0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.65	6.65	16.2	10%	34.18		5	2 0	в	в	вс	в		VES	VES			62	2 property owners and 5 parcels; 2 parcels currently for sale; according to broker
62 2 D, F 63 2 D	WOODBURN INDUSTRIAL CAPITAL	FOREST GROVE					0.75	0.00	0.00	0.98	3.9		24.12		1		A		A C		A S/L	163	YES				contact, adjacent parcel owners are willing to transact to aggregate a larger site Net developable acres assumes floodplain and wetland mitigation
66 2 D, F, H		TUALATIN	Washington		0.00 0.00		0.00 0.00%		1.5	8 1.58	3.4		44.67	,	YES 2	A	A	в	с в	в		YES					Desginated as Manufacturing Business Park; falls under commercial services overlay in SW Concept plan
67 2 Aviation 68 2 Aviation	PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL CENTER - WEST (PORT) HILLSBORO AIRPORT (PORT)	PORTLAND	Multnomah Washington	69.45 (39.22 (0.00 5.95	5 2.74 0.0 0.00	0 18.16 0.7	4 21.16 0.00		7% 15.10%			5	A	A	A A	A C	A	3 L A L	YES			YES YES		Lease only; Aviation use only Lease only; Aviation use only
C, D, H, 2 3 stc. marine	TIME OIL CO	PORTLAND	Multnomah	43.50 (0.00	35.32	2.21	0.24	4.47	37.62	86.4	.8%	5.88	25.00	C 2	Α	Δ	в	ва	Α	A S				YES		Net developable is less than 25AC but assumes cut/fill balance can be achieved
4 3 C, D, H	ESCO CORP	PORTLAND	Multnomah	37.62	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.78 4.2	9 5.10	4.29 13.5	7% 11.40%	6 23.13	33.33	C 6	3 A	A	A	A A	A	A	NO				6 4	3 property owners; 6 parcels
5 3 C, D, H 6 3 D	ATOFINA CHEMICALS INC MC CORMICK & BAXTER CREOSOTING	PORTLAND PORTLAND	Multnomah Multnomah	59.76 (42.39 (5.49 4.57	8.87 13 2.24 8	3 0.49 3 1.10	13.78 6.97	11.05 8.27		9% 21.76% 0% 21.23%			C 6	C	A C	B	A A B A	A	3	NO	YES			5	Poor truck access because of severe slope
																											Marine use only; Gross and net development acres are taken from Metro's Large Lot Inventory. Data is not available to explain the net development acreage from
7 3 C, Marine	WEST HAYDEN ISLAND (PORT)	PORTLAND	Multnomah	472.00										404.00 YES	YES 2	B	В	B	c c	A	3	YES		```	YES		this source. This site is entirely constrained by floodplain. Lease only; Aviation use only; Net developable acres assumes floodplain
10 3 Aviation	SW QUAD (PORT)	PORTLAND	Multnomah	212.56	0.50 0.00	0.07 10	6.63 53	3 0.99	28.35 5.1	1 118.82	59.10 55.9	0% 27.80%	6 93.74	206.47 YES	5	В	A	A I	вс	A	3	YES		,	YES	10	mitigation. 10% slope and streams acreage is subtracted from net dev acreage; Located in managed floodplain
																											In managed floodplain; net developable acres assumes complete mitigation strategy (> 6 month timeline); drainage ditches (2 acres) to remain; On site
15 3 D, H	BT PROPERTY LLC (UPS)	GRESHAM	Multnomah		0.00 0.00				5.36	0 9.10					4	A	A	A	A B	A	4	NO			YES		investigation warranted by DSL; No delineation on site and 100% hydric soil
16 3 D, F, H 17 3 D, H	CEREGHINO MICHAEL TRIP - PHASE 3 (PORT)	GRESHAM FAIRVIEW	Multnomah Multnomah		1.28 0.00 0.13 4.14	0.00	6.80 C	0.92	3.49 4.47	0 41.05 0 4.60					5	A	A	A I	B A B A	A B	A B S	NO	YES		YES	16 17	In managed floodplain; net developable AC assumes complete mitigation strategy; On site wetland investigation is warranted - per DSL
18 3 A, D, H 19 3 A, D, H, I	TRIP - PHASE 2 (PORT) TRIP - PHASE 2 (PORT)	TROUTDALE	Multnomah Multnomah		14.94 12.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.38		12.07 45.0 19.64 49.2				2		A		A B	В	c s				YES YES	18	Net developping appropriate militation statemet
19 3 A, D, H, I	TRIP - PHASE 2 (PORT) MT HOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE	TROUTDALE	Multnomah		0.00		0.00	0.00	12.72	1 12.72					x 2	A	B	B	A C	B	3	NO			YES		Net developable acres assumes complete mitigation strategy Mt Hood Community College will retain ownership; Future use is undetermined - Per conversation with VP of Administration; Potentially an environmental cleanup site (per Metro database) and level of clean up unknown
24 3 D, F	JOHNSON E JEAN	GRESHAM	Multnomah	37.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.34	3.34	9.0	10%	33.82	2	YES 1		C	В	A C	В	3	YES	YES			24	No interchange near site
25 3 D 26 3 D	JONAK LESTER JR DANNAR CHARLES	GRESHAM GRESHAM	Multnomah Multnomah	34.22 (27.93 (0.00 0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.70 7.1 5.90	5 12.70 0 6.26		2% 20.89% 3% 0.00%			YES 1 YES 1		c c	B I	B C A C		3	N/A N/A					No interchange near site No interchange near site
28 3 D	SIRI JAMES F & MOLLIE	HAPPY VALLEY	Clackamas		0.00		0.00	0.00	1.13	1.13			25.26		2		A	A	вс	A	4	NO					Owner is not willing to transact
33 3 C, D, F, H,	COFFEE CREEK INDUSTRIAL AREA - site 1	WILSONVILLE	Washington	85.23	0.30 1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.64	1.94	4.89 2.2	.8% 5.74%	6 83.29	80.34	YES 2'	17 A	A	A	B A	A	A	NO	YES			33	
34 3 C, D, H	VAN'S INVESTMENT LTD	WILSONVILLE	Washington	52.79	4.50 N/A	16.48 1	6.48	0.00	16.17 6.0	5 29.35	24.85 55.5	9% 47.07%	6 18.56	25.50	1	с	С	В	СВ	А	A	N/A	YES			34	Area does not have slope and wetlands data available from City of Wilsonville; Net developable acreage is challenged because of slope.

Site ID	Preliminary Tier	Traded-Sector Industry	Owner/Site	Location	County	Gross Acres	Wetlands (RLIS)	Wetland Acreage (Jurisdictions)*	FEMA Flood AC (RLIS)	Floodplain AC (Jurisdictions)*	Streams AC (RLIS) Stream AC (Jurisdictions)*	7-25% Slope Acres (RLIS) 10-25% Slope Acres (Jurisdiction/RLIS)*	All Constraints (RLIS) All Constraints	(<i>Jurisdictions</i>)* % Constraints (RLIS)	% Constraints (Jurisdictions)*	Net Developable Acresage (RLIS) Net Developable Acreage	(Market Knowledge) Use Restriction	Brownfield Annexation Required	Number of Taxlots	Sewer Score	Water Score	Storm Score	Surrounding System Quality	Access to Interstate Highway Access to Freicht	Route (Roadway) Access to Freight System (All Modes)	Currently for Sale/Lease	Willing to Transact	Private Ownership	Investor Public	User	Site I D	N
35	3	C. D	TONQUIN INDUSTRIAL AREA	TUALATIN	Washington	49.70	0.83	0.50	0.00 C	00	0.15	9.18	9.73	9.40 19.58%	18.91%	39.97 40.	30	YES	8 7	7 В	C	в	в	в	Δ Δ		YES			YES	35	Property owners have expressed willingness to aggregate - per City of Tualatin
36		-, -	TIGARD SAND & GRAVEL SITE	TUALATIN		296.88					1.02	163.71	168.78	56.85%	10.0170	128.10		YES	15 3		C	P	C	P			NO					Tigard Sand & Gravel ownes 12 parcels; active gravel operation
37			ORR FAMILY FARM LLC	SHERWOOD	Washington	96.26			0.00 0		0.00	49.60	53.42	55.50%		42.84		YES	1		A	D	с С	D				YES		120		Annexation required; Owner not willing to transact
47	Ŭ		CRANFORD JULIAN F & SHARON D	HILLSBORO	Washington	28.51								1.22 27.82%	4.28%		.29	1123	1	c	в	в	A	A	A A			YES				Combination of hydric and partially hydric soils present; On site wetland investigation warranted - per DSL
59	3	C, D, H	COFFEE CREEK INDUSTRIAL AREA - site 2	WILSONVILLE	Washington	46.37	0.00	0.00	0.00 C	0.00 0.00	0.00	0.10	0.10	0 0.22%		46.27		YES	12 8	в	в	А	в	в	с в		NO	YES			59	8 property owners; ability to aggregate has not been discussed
60	3	C, D, H	COFFEE CREEK INDUSTRIAL AREA - site 3	WILSONVILLE	Washington	29.65	0.00	0.00	0.00 0	0.00	0.00	2.60	2.60	0 8.77%		27.05		X YES	10 7	7 В	A	A	в	в	c c		NO	YES			60	7 property owners; No expressed willingness to aggregate; Site includes parcels that are split by County lines; Potential underground storage tank on site but exact location is unclear (Metro database); UST could be also located in parcel 61 to the north
61	3	C, D, H	COFFEE CREEK INDUSTRIAL AREA - site 4	WILSONVILLE	Washington	48.56	0.00	0.00	0.00 C	0.00 0.00	0.00		0.00	0 0.00%		48.56		YES	12 8	з в	А	А	в	в	в с		NO	YES			61	8 property owners; No expressed willingness to aggregate
64	3	D	WOODFOLD-MARCO MFG INC (East Oak St)	FOREST GROVE	Washington	25.46	0.00		0.00 0	.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%		25.46			2 2	2 В	в	в	А	с	A C		NO	YES				2 parcels; 2 property owners
65			WOODFOLD-MARCO MFG INC (West Oak St)	FOREST GROVE		53.93	0.02		0.00	00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.04%		53.91			5	в	в	C	А	с	A C		NO	YES			65	
100	3		HOLZMEYER RICHARD HENRY ET AL	FOREST GROVE		111.37	0.00		0.00 0		0.00	11.63	11.25	10.10%		100.12		YES	1	C	-	в	A	с	с в			YES			100	Outside UGB; Water service information was not available at the time of this analysis
101	3	A, B, F	VANROSE FARMS and VANDERZANDEN	HILLSBORO	Washington	270.5	18.45		9.08 27	.34 22.8	i 12.14	29.99 23.4	35.77 4	5.67 13.22%	16.88%	234.73 224.	.83	YES	2 2	2 C	в	в	в	с	в в		YES	YES			101	Outside UGB; Parcels were aggregated into1 site per City of Hillsboro; On site wetland investigation is warranted per DSL
104	3	A, B, F	HILLSBORO URBAN RESERVES (Aggregate)	HILLSBORO	Washington	320	0.00	0.00	0.00 14	.96 9.24	0.00	4.54 1.36	i 19.50 1	0.60 6.09%	3.31%	300.50 309.	.40	YES	9 8	з с	в	В	с	с	в в		YES	YES			104	Outside UGB; Property owners have expressed willingness to aggregate and transact - per City of Hillsboro; On site wetland investigation is warranted - per DSL
109	3	A, D, H	MORSE BROS INC	TUALATIN	Washington	85.31	3.98		0.00 0	.00	0.00	21.26	23.59	27.65%		61.73		C YES	7	с	С	В	с	с	с в		NO			YES	109	Outside UGB

* These columns indicate that environmental constraint information was provided by jurisdictions, Port of Portland, or Group Mackenzie knowledge and are not from Metro RLIS data. These columns. Net developable acreage (market knowledge) supplements the net developable acreage (RLIS) column.

** Indicates a seller is willing to transact but not within in tier 1 timeframe of 180 days.

TRADED-SECTOR INDUSTRY:

A: Regionally to nationally scaled clean-tech manufacturer

B: Globally scaled clean technology campus

C: Heavy industrial/manufacturing

D: General manufacturing

E: Food processing

- F: High-tech manufacturing or campus industrial
- G: Regional (multi-state) distribution center
- H: Warehouse/distribution
- I. Portland regional distribution center

J: Call center/business services

K. Data centers

L: Rural/frontier industrial

































				Phase 1 Tieri	ing Matrix				
	25 net developable acres	Use Restriction	Brownfield Remediation	Annexation Required	Sewer, Water, & Storm	System Mobility	Currently for Sale or Lease		Willingness to Transact
Tier 1	Within 6 months	No	No or Within 6 months (Score of A)	No	A or B	A or B	Yes	OR	Yes
Tier 2	Within 7-30 months	Yes or No	Within 7-30 months (Score of B)	Yes	A, B or C	A, B or C	Yes	OR	Yes or Unknown
Tier 3	>30 months	Yes or No	>30 months (Score of C)	Yes	A, B or C	A, B or C	Yes or No	OR	Yes or No or Unknown

Site readiness and time to market are the determining factors used to develop tiers of sites.

Tier 1 sites are shovel ready, or can be shovel ready within 180 days (6 months) and require minimal to no additional costs or time to deliver a site. It is anticipated that no or minimimal infrastucture or remediation is necessary along with due diligence and entitlements, could be provided/obtained within this time period. The site has no use restriction, and is currently on the market for sale or lease or the ownership is willing to transact.

Tier 2 sites require additional time, between 7-30 months, and costs to deliver a shovel ready site. These sites may have a use restriction e.g. marine or aviation only as determined by the Port of Portland. They may have deficiency issues with regards to infrastructure, may require brownfield remediation and may also require annexation and additional entitlements that are assumed to take beyond 6 months time. These sites are currently on the market for sale or lease, or the ownership is willing to transact or this information is not available.

Tier 3 sites require the most time, over 30 months, and costs to deliver a shovel ready site. In addition to the criterion for Tier 2, these sites may or may not be currently for sale or lease or willingness to transact could be yes or no, or is not available.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION RATING METHODOLOGY

INFRASTRUCTURE

L	А	≥ 8" main located adjacent to or stubbed to site or within ~200ft of site. No downstream pipe/treatment capacity issues.
Ň	В	≥ 6-8" main located within ~ 1000ft, with no downstream deficiencies. Possible pump station needed.
Š	С	No nearby pipe and/or significant lift station and force main needed. Downstream deficiencies may be present.

5	Α	≥ 12" main adjacent or within ~200ft, preferred loop system existing. No low-pressure issues.
/ato	В	≥ 8" adjacent, or ≥ 12" main within ~ 1000ft. No pump station or pressure/treatment deficiencies.
\$	С	No nearby pipe and/or system deficiencies present.
٤	Α	\geq 12" public main adjacent or within ~200ft, or ability to discharge to managed surface waters. No capacity issues.

8	A	2 12 public main adjacent of within ~2001, of ability to discharge to managed surface waters. No capacity issues.
to	В	≥ 12" main within ~ 500ft; possible outfall to nearby regulated surface channel or wetland.
۵.	С	No adjacent public storm or no available discharge point to surface water.

TRANSPORTATION

ding Ty	А	Local Access and Transportation System Mobility are Good
Surrounding System Quality	В	Local Access is Good and Transportation System Mobility is Poor -OR- Local Access is Poor and Transportation System Mobility is Good
Sul	С	Local Access and Transportation System Mobility are Poor
	Local Direct Exten Value Trans and ir	Poor – Property does not have a direct connection and/or significant improvements are necessary to gain local access. portation System Mobility – Defined as the mobility on the existing freight transportation system. This includes mobility on the adjacent higher-order roadways intersections. This does not include mobility on the mainline interstate highways as it is assumed all motor vehicle freight generally has to traverse these rays and is not critical to individual property valuation.
s to ate 'ay	А	< 1.0 Miles to Interstate Highway
Access to Interstate Highway	В	1.0 - 5.0 Miles to Interstate Highway
Ac Int Hi	С	> 5.0 Miles to Interstate Highway
nt to e ay)	А	< 0.5 Miles to Freight Route
Access to Freight Route (Roadway)	В	0.5 - 2.0 Miles to Freight Route
Ac F F Ro	С	> 2.0 Miles to Freight Route
o tem	А	Reasonable Access to 3 Freight Modes
Access to Freight System (All Modes)	В	Reasonable Access to 2 Freight Modes
Acce eight All M	С	Reasonable Access to 1 Freight Modes
Fre /		



<				_	-	_	_	_				
		PROFILE	A Regionally to	В	С	D	E	F	G	н	1	J
	CRITERIA		Nationally Scaled Clean-Tech Manufacturer	Globally Scaled Clean Technology Campus	Heavy Industrial / Manufacturing	General Manufacturing	Food Processing	High-Tech Manufacturing or Campus Industrial	Regional (multi- state) Distribution Center	Warehouse / Distribution	Call Center / Business Services	Rural / Frontier Industrial
				d outright looot	ad in LICP or on	uivelent and au	toido flood ploin	u and aita (NCDA	dooo not conto	in contaminant	a watlanda nr	
1	GENERAL REQUIRI	EMENTS	Ose is permitte	d outright, locat			•	; and site (NCDA) that can be imp			s, wettands, pro	
2	PHYSICAL SITE Total Site** (Acres)	<u>Competitive</u> Acreage*	50	100	25	10	20	25	200	25	3	5
3	Competitive Slope: WORKFORCE	Maximum Slope	0 to 5%	0 to 5%	0 to 5%	0 to 5%	0 to 5%	0 to 7%	0 to 5%	0 to 5%	0 to 12%	0 to 5%
4	Available workforce population in 50 mile radius	People	150,000	750,000	30,000	30,000	20,000	60,000	75,000	20,000	25,000	1,000
5	TRANSPORTATION TRIP GENERATION:	ADT/Acre	50 to 75 (per acre)	50 to 75 (per acre)	42 to 58 (per acre)	76 to 106 (per acre)	75 to 100 (per acre)	50 to 75 (per acre)	64 to 86 (per acre)	65 to 86 (per acre)	144 to 192 (per acre)	5 to 10 (per acre)
6	MILES TO INTERSTATE OR OTHER PRINCIPLE ARTERIAL:	Miles	w/ in 10	w/ in 10	w/ in 10	w/ in 20	w/ in 30	w/ in 15	w/ in 5 (only interstate or equivalent)	w/ in 5 (only interstate or equivalent)	N/A	N/A
7	RAILROAD ACCESS:	Dependency	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Not Required	Preferred	Preferred	Not Required	N/A
8	PROXIMITY TO MARINE Port:	Dependency	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Not Required	Preferred	Preferred	Not Required	N/A
9	PROXIMITY TO AIRPORT- REGIONAL(Commercial)):	Dependency	Competitive	Required	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Competitive	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	N/A
_		Distance (Miles)	w/ in 60	w/ in 30	w/ in 60	w/ in 60	w/ in 60	w/ in 30	w/ in 60	w/ in 60	w/ in 60	N/A
10	PROXIMITY TO AIRPORT- INTERNATIONAL:	Dependency	Preferred	Competitive	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	N/A
	UTILITIES	Distance (Miles)	w/ in 100	w/ in 100	w/ in 300	w/ in 300	w/ in 300	w/ in 100	w/ in 300	w/ in 300	w/ in 300	N/A
1	WATER:	Min. Line Size (Inches/Dmtr)	10	10	8"	8"	10"	10"	4"	4"	4"	4"
		Min. Fire Line Size (Inches/Dmtr)	10"	10"	10"	10"	10"	10"	10"	10"	8"	6" (or alternative source)
		High Pressure Water Demand Dependency	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Not Required	Preferred	Preferred	Not Required	Not Required	Not Required	Not Required
		Flow (GPD)	250,000	1 MGD	36,100	17,000	24,900	65,300	11,700	11,700	4,600	750
2	SEWER:	Min. Service Line Size (Inches/Dmtr)	10"	10"	8"	8"	10"	10"	4"	4"	4"	4' (or on-site source)
		Flow (GPD)	250,000	1 MGD	32,500	15,300	100,000	58,800	11,700	11,700	4,600	750
3	NATURAL GAS:	Preferred Min. Service Line Size (Inches/Dmtr)	6"	6"	6"	4"	6"	6"	2"	2"	2"	N/A
		On Site	Competitive	Competitive	Competitive	Competitive	Preferred	Competitive	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred
4	ELECTRICITY:	Minimum Service Demand	2 MW	10 MW	1 MW	.25 MW	.25 MW	.25 MW	1 MW	.25 MW	0.15 MW	.1 MW
		Close Proximity to Substation	Competitive	Competitive	Competitive	Preferred	Not Required	Competitive	Not Required	Not Required	Preferred	Not Required
		Secondary System Dependency	Preferred	Competitive	Required	Not Required	Not Required	Required	Not Required	Not Required	Required	Not Required
15	TELECOMMUNICATIONS:	Major Communi- cations Dependency	Required	Required	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Required	Preferred	Preferred	Required	Preferred
		Route Diversity Dependency	Preferred	Preferred	Not Required	Not Required	Not Required	Required	Not Required	Not Required	Required	Not Required
Ī		Fiber Optic Dependency	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred	Required	Preferred	Preferred	Required	Not Required
16	SPECIAL CONSIDER		Acreage allotment includes expansion space (often an exercisable option). Very high utility volumes in one or more areas common. Sensitive to nearby uses.	Demanding criteria-driven site selection. High material and visitor throughput. Major Commercial Airport a must. Redundency in trip routes and utilities vital. Surrounding Environmentals (vibration, noise, etc). Buffering and expansion space necessary. Sensitive to encroachment activities of nearby uses (residential, institutional, commercial).	Adequate distance from sensitive land uses (residential, parks, large retail centers) necessary. High throughput of materials. Large yard spaces and/or buffering required. Often transportation related requiring marine/rail links.	(residential,		Surrounding environment of great concern (vibration, noise, air quality, etc.). Increased setbacks may be required and/or on-site utility service areas. Avoid sites close to wastewater treatment plants, landfills, sewage lagoons, and other such land uses. May require high volume/supply of water and sanitary sewer treatment.	Transportation routing and proximity to/from major highways is crucial. Expansion options required. Truck Staging required. Truck Staging required. Truck Staging required. Truck staging required. Truck staging required. Truck staging required. Truck staging requires not like to site or have routing issues between site and interstate that have rail crossings, school zones, airport runways, or drawbridges.	and bridges to/from major	Relatively higher parking ratios may be necessary. Will be very sensitive to labor force considerations and the location of other similar centers in the region.	Located in mor remote location in the state. Usually withou direct access (within 50 miles of Interstate on City of more than 50,000 people.
			I	[1	ĺ	1	1		up Mackenzie	I	L

Group Mackenzie; Business Oregon

Т	е	n	m	s	2
1	е	П	П	s	i

'Required' factors are seen as mandatory in a vast majority of cases and have become industry standards
'Competitive' significantly increases marketability and is <u>highly recommended by OBD</u> . May also be linked to financing in order to enhance the potential reuse of the asset in case of default.
'Preferred' increases the feasibility of the subject property and its future reuse. Other factors may, however, prove more
critical
* Competitive Acreage: Acreage that would meet the site selection requirements of the majority of industries in this sector.
**Total Site: Building footprint, including buffers, setbacks, parking, mitigation, and expansion space