

Multnomah County Land Use Planning
1600 SE 190th Ave
Portland, OR 97233
lup-hearings@multco.us

RE: T2-2025-0046 Applicant's Final Written Argument – Carpenter Lane Site

Mr. Kearns:

Thank you for your time and consideration of the temporary permit for construction office trailers for the approved Portland Water Bureau Filtration and Pipelines Project during its construction. The construction trailers are critical for the successful and efficient construction of the project.

The proposed findings enclosed with this letter support the approval of the temporary permit for the construction trailers at the main Filtration Facility construction site on Carpenter Lane. As detailed in the proposed findings, there is ample evidence in the record showing that the proposal meets the approval criteria for a temporary permit.

The applicant respectfully requests your approval of the temporary permit for the construction office trailers in Case No. T2-2025-0046.

Sincerely,



Zoee Lynn Powers
Radler White Parks & Alexander

PROPOSED DECISION OF THE HEARINGS OFFICER

35525 SE Carpenter Ln (R342603 & R342619)

T2-2025-0046

THRESHOLD LEGAL DETERMINATIONS:

Counsel for the Cottrell Community Planning Organization (“**CCPO**”) submitted a letter dated March 13, 2026, which was entered into the record as Exhibit I.9. In the letter, the CCPO asserts that the temporary construction trailers approved at the SE Carpenter Lane property (T2-2025-0046) and the SE Lusted Road property (T2-2025-0048) are not “temporary.” Specifically, the CCPO contends that the plain language of MCC 39.8750(A) limits temporary uses to a maximum duration of one year. The argument rests on an incorrect reading of the code that equates the length of time a temporary *permit* remains valid with the permissible duration of the temporary *use* itself and fails to consider the broader regulatory context for inherently temporary construction uses.

Under the familiar methodology of *Portland General Electric Co. v. Bureau of Labor & Industries*, 317 Or 606, 610–12, 859 P2d 1143 (1993), as clarified in *State v. Gaines*, 346 Or 160, 171–72, 206 P3d 1042 (2009) (“**PGE/Gaines**”) the interpretation of a local code provision focuses on the text and context, which are the best evidence of the enacting body’s intent. Interpretation of a local code is a question of law governed by the same *PGE/Gaines* framework that applies to state statutes. *Waste Not of Yamhill County v. Yamhill County*, 305 Or App 436, 457, 471 P3d 769 (2020).

MCC 39.8750(A) limits permit validity, not the duration of the temporary use.

MCC 39.8750(A) states:

“Notwithstanding the limitations of use as established by this Chapter in each of the several base zones, the Planning Director may issue temporary permits, valid for a period of not more than one year after issuance, for structures, or uses which are of a temporary nature, such as:”

CCPPO’s attorney emphasizes and focuses exclusively on the phrase “valid for a period of not more than one year after issuance” to argue that no temporary use could ever extend for more than one year. That clause, however, exclusively addresses the term of the permit, not the ultimate length of time a qualifying temporary structure or use may exist.

Nothing in the plain language of MCC 39.8750 establishes a one-year cap on the temporary use itself. As staff correctly noted in their March 20, 2026 memorandum (Exhibit J.1), MCC 39.8750 neither prohibits nor discourages the issuance of sequential temporary permits for the same temporary use or structure, provided the use continues to qualify as “of a temporary nature.” This interpretation is consistent with and further reinforced by the 2024 temporary permit condition of approvals that required removal of the trailers “unless a new Temporary Permit” was granted, thereby confirming the County’s interpretation that new temporary permits are both permissible and anticipated. (Exhibit H.1, “T2-2024-0060 NOD 08232024.pdf”, Condition 5).

Sequential temporary permits do not render the term “temporary” meaningless.

The CCPO contends that authorizing sequential temporary use permits deprives the term “temporary” of meaning by permitting a temporary use to exist indefinitely. The concern ignores (1) the context provided by the list of temporary uses in MCC 39.8750(A), and (2) the safeguard inherent in the annual permitting requirement.

First, the list of examples in MCC 39.8750(A) provides critical context. The enumerated structures/uses are either inherently temporary (*e.g.*, a real estate office used for the sale of lots) or expressly designated as “temporary” (*e.g.*, temporary housing). A temporary permit is also authorized for “other uses of a temporary nature when approved by the Planning Director.” Critically, the code does not define the term “temporary.”¹ I find that staff is correct that, as a result, the code grants the Planning Director broad discretion to determine whether, and for how long, a specific use remains temporary based on its purpose and circumstance.

Second, the annual permit requirement provides a mechanism for preserving the meaning and relevancy of “temporary.” The requirement to seek a new permit every year places an annual burden on the applicant to demonstrate that the use remains temporary and authorizes the Planning Director to deny a new temporary permit for a use that is no longer “of a temporary nature.” Contrary to authorizing permanent uses by default, the requirement for annual review ensures continued oversight on the nature of the use.

Finally, MCC 39.8750(A) does not require a temporary use to cease for some period if a new temporary permit is issued. This argument once again conflates the annual permit requirement with the temporary use itself. In this case, there is not a “former use” and a “new temporary use” as suggested by the CCPO. Instead, new temporary permits have been issued for existing and continuing temporary uses.

Construction trailers are inherently temporary.

While the determination of whether a use remains temporary may present close questions in other circumstances, there is no ambiguity in this case. The construction office trailers are inherently and undeniably temporary. They were placed on the properties solely to support construction and will be removed once construction concludes.

Moreover, the MCC expressly identifies the length of time allowed for construction activity to develop a use permitted through a Type III land use decision. Pursuant to MCC 39.1185(B), projects that have commenced construction have four years to complete construction. Under *PGE/Gaines*, MCC 39.1185(B) provides important context that supports the interpretation of the plain language (above), as the CCPO’s interpretation would produce an unreasonable and impractical result by limiting essential construction-support trailers to just one year of a legally authorized multi-year construction period. That result would be in conflict with the *PGE/Gaines* context provided by MCC 39.1185(B). Nothing in MCC 39.8750 suggests an intent to prohibit temporary construction support facilities for the full duration of permitted construction activity.

¹ The plain dictionary definition is “lasting for a time only : existing or continuing for a limited time : impermanent, transitory.” *Merriam-Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary*, <https://unabridged.merriam-webster.com/unabridged/temporary>. Visited March 26, 2026.

Past noncompliance with the 60-day application condition does not justify denial.

Finally, the CCPO contends that a lack of evidence that the applicant will apply for a new permits at least 60 days prior to the expiration of the permits as required by condition 3a justifies denial of the temporary permits. The argument lacks merit and is unsupported by any relevant case law.

The untimely submittal of new temporary permit applications was appropriately addressed through the County's enforcement authority and cured through the current permit process. The fact that the applicant's submittal of the 2025 applications was delayed does not mean that a timely submittal for the new set of temporary permits is infeasible or that the condition of approval requiring the 60-day lead time is inadequate, as suggested by the CCPO. Indeed, LUBA has long held that evidence of past land use violations is not, by itself, a lawful basis to deny a land use application absent express code standards authorizing denial on that ground. See *Stephens v. Multnomah County*, 10 Or LUBA 147, 152 (1984). As explained further in the findings for MCC 39.1250 below, this application is not prohibited by application of that code standard.

STAFF IDENTIFIED APPLICABLE APPROVAL CRITERIA - MULTNOMAH COUNTY CODE (MCC):

- MCC 39.8750 Temporary Permits for Certain Uses
- MCC 39.1250 Code Compliance and Applications
- Lot of Record Criteria:
 - MCC 39.3005 Lot of Record – Generally
 - MCC 39.3080 Lot of Record – MUA-20
- Multiple Use Agriculture – 20 (MUA-20) Zone Criteria:
 - MCC 39.4315(A) Review Uses, Temporary Uses
 - MCC 39.4325 Dimensional Standards and Development Requirements
- MCC 39.6235 Stormwater Drainage Control
- MCC 39.6850 Dark Sky Lighting Standards

§39.8750- TEMPORARY PERMITS FOR CERTAIN USES.

(A) Notwithstanding the limitations of use as established by this Chapter in each of the several base zones, the Planning Director may issue temporary permits, valid for a period of not more than one year after issuance, for structures, or uses which are of a temporary nature, such as:

- (1) Storage of equipment during the building of roads or developments;*
- (2) Real estate office used for the sale of lots or housing in subdivisions;*
- (3) Temporary storage of structures or equipment;*
- (4) Sheds used in conjunction with the building of a structure;*
- (5) Temporary housing; or*
- (6) Other uses of a temporary nature when approved by the Planning Director.*

Findings:

MCC 39.8750 does not apply.

MCC 39.8750 does not explicitly or implicitly require a temporary use permit for on-site construction office trailers that are located on the same property as, and directly support, an otherwise fully land use–approved project. Therefore, and in the alternative to the detailed findings below addressing compliance, I find that approval under MCC 39.8750 is not required in order to allow construction office trailers at an active construction site for a use that has received full land use approval.

As discussed at the hearing, the applicant is unaware of any instance in the history of Multnomah County land use review in which a temporary use permit was required for construction office trailers located on the same site as active construction for a project that has otherwise received full land use approval. That past practice (while of course not binding on the County) is more consistent with the text and context of MCC 39.8750 under a *PGE/Gaines* analysis than an interpretation that requires such permits.

MCC 39.8750 authorizes the Planning Director to issue temporary permits for “structures, or uses which are of a temporary nature,” and then provides a non-exclusive list of examples, ending with “other uses of a temporary nature.” However, LUBA specifically held that this construction, in this case, is not a “use” under Multnomah County Code. *Cottrell Community Planning Organization v. Multnomah County*, LUBA No 2023-086 (Jan 22, 2025). Consistent with that reasoning, construction activities and the ordinary, on-site facilities necessary to carry out construction are part of the implementation of an approved use, not a separate land use subject to temporary use permitting.

The common feature of the examples listed in MCC 39.8750(A) is that they involve stand-alone structures or activities that would not otherwise be allowed on a site absent temporary authorization. For example, a property used solely for construction equipment storage independent of any approved construction activity on that site, constitutes a temporary use because the site has not otherwise received land use

approval for a permanent use. By contrast, construction occurring on the site of an approved permanent use is simply the construction of that approved use. It is not also a separate temporary use.

The structure of MCC 39.8750 supports this conclusion. The code authorizes temporary permits “notwithstanding the limitations of use as established by this Chapter in each of the several base zones.” That language confirms that the purpose of the section is to allow otherwise prohibited uses to occur temporarily, not to regulate or re-permit construction *already authorized in the base zone* as part of an approved project. To find otherwise would lead to an absurd result, requiring common construction-related structures like cranes to meet standards they inherently cannot meet, such as height limits.

Construction office trailers located on the same site as construction of a permitted use are an ordinary and expected construction activity and are integral to implementing the underlying land use approvals. This interpretation is reinforced by MCC 39.1185(B), which allows up to four years to complete construction once commenced. The code plainly anticipates that construction will occur over a multi-year period and does not impose additional land use review requirements for the routine, temporary facilities necessary to complete that construction.

For these reasons, MCC 39.8750 does not require a temporary use permit for the construction office trailers proposed here. The trailers are part of the implementation of an otherwise fully approved land use project and do not constitute a separate temporary use subject to MCC 39.8750.

This standard is met.

In the alternative, I find that MCC 39.8750 does not contain or point to any approval standards that must be satisfied through findings. Instead, it is an authorizing provision that grants discretion to the Planning Director to issue permits for temporary uses that would not otherwise be allowed. Broad discretion is granted to the Planning Director to issue temporary permits as she deems appropriate. For this reason, there are no applicable approval criteria for a proposed temporary permit other than the approval of the Planning Director – which has been obtained by the issuance of the approval being appealed in this case. That standard is met. Accordingly, findings below are provided in the alternative to this finding that the only applicable approval criterion is the approval of the Planning Director.

To the extent MCC 39.8750 is interpreted to apply as an approval standard, I find that the construction office trailers are inherently temporary (as explained above in the “Threshold Legal Determinations” section), as they are used solely for the duration of construction and will be removed upon completion. The Planning Director has exercised her discretion to approve the permit under appeal. Accordingly, to the extent that MCC 39.8750 provides an approval criterion, I find that it is met.

CODE COMPLIANCE AND APPLICATIONS CRITERIA:

39.1250 CODE COMPLIANCE AND APPLICATIONS.

Except as provided in subsection (A), the County shall not make a land use decision approving development, including land divisions and property line adjustments, or issue a building permit or zoning review approval of development or any other approvals authorized by this code for any property that is not in full compliance with all applicable provisions of the Multnomah County Zoning Code and/or any permit approvals previously issued by the County.

(A) A permit or other approval, including building permit applications, may be authorized if:

(1) It results in the property coming into full compliance with all applicable provisions of the Multnomah County Zoning Code. This includes sequencing of permits or other approvals as part of a voluntary compliance agreement; or

(2)

Findings: As the Staff Report (Exhibit A.0, page 6), explains:

“The County received a code compliance complaint related to the use of construction trailers on the site after the expiration of casefiles T2-2024-0060 and T2-2024-0062, which were administered under code compliance case numbers CCINT-2025-0052 and CCINT-2025-0053. The County’s code compliance process for violations, such as this, is to first request the applicant apply for and obtain permits for the use, and then to require the removal of the trailers if no application is made or the subsequent applications are not approved. This casefile, T2-2025-0046 will remedy a portion of the code complaint issue.

“The temporary construction office trailers under review through T2-2025-0046 were originally sited through a 2024 land use review (T2-2024-0060), and finalized in Zoning Plan Review (BP2024-0093), which was approved after prior to PWB obtaining building permits from the City of Gresham. The applicant has not moved the trailers since their initial placement.

“T2-2024-0060 expired on September 7, 2025. The application for T2-2025-0046 was submitted on September 2, 2025. The original decision for T2-2025-0046 was issued on November 25, 2025.”

T2-2025-0046, if approved, will address the entirety of issues reported in code complaint CCINT-2025-0052 and remedy violations subsequently identified in code case CC-2025-0004 related to this Property, as noted by staff at Exhibit I.2, page 1. There are no other open code compliance cases for this Property, other than CC-2025-0004. Exhibit I.2, page 1. If T2-2025-0046 is approved, the County would consider the Property to be in full compliance with all applicable provisions of the Multnomah County Zoning Code and any permit approvals previously issued by the County, under the County’s interpretation of MCC 39.1250. Exhibit I.2, page 1.

Because this casefile, T2-2025-0046, will remedy the portion of the code complaint related to this property, this standard is met at the time of issuance of this decision. Additionally, the code provides at MCC 39.1250(A)(1) that permits may be authorized even if an open code compliance case exists where the application moves the property into compliance with the code. That is the situation that exists here.

As explained above, this application brings the property into full compliance, this is the only open case on the property, and this application will remedy the portion of the code complaint that is relevant to this property.

Accordingly, this standard is met.

LOT OF RECORD CRITERIA:

§ 39.3005- LOT OF RECORD – GENERALLY.

(A) An area of land is a “Lot of Record” if it meets the standards in Subsection (B) of this Section and meets the standards set forth in this Part for the Zoning District in which the area of land is located.

§ 39.3080 LOT OF RECORD – MULTIPLE USE AGRICULTURE-20 (MUA20).

(B) In addition to the standards in MCC 39.3005, for the purposes of the MUA-20 district the significant dates and ordinances for verifying zoning compliance may include, but are not limited to, the following: [....].

Findings: The County has previously determined that this property comprises two Lots of Record meeting all code requirements for lots of record generally and in the MUA-20 zone. A full analysis of this issue was performed in the main land use case for the filtration facility project, as shown in Exhibit I.4. The text of the analysis of these code sections in the Staff Report (Exhibit A.0) and Exhibit I.4 are hereby incorporated in their entirety into these findings. These standards are met.

MULTIPLE USE AGRICULTURE – 20 CRITERIA:

§ 39.4315 REVIEW USES.

The following uses may be permitted when found by the approval authority to satisfy the applicable standards of this Chapter.

(A) Temporary uses when approved pursuant to MCC 39.8700 and 39.8750.

Findings: The Applicant is requesting the approval of construction trailers as a temporary use during construction of the approved Filtration Facility, if such approval is needed. The findings for MCC 39.8750 are under the *Temporary Permits For Certain Uses* section above. This standard is met.

§39.4325 DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS.

All development proposed in this base zone shall comply with the applicable provisions of this section.

(A) Except as provided in MCC 39.3080, 39.4330, 39.4335 and 39.5300 through 39.5350, the minimum lot size for new parcels or lots shall be 20 acres.

(B) That portion of a street which would accrue to an adjacent lot if the street were vacated shall be included in calculating the area of such lot.

Findings: These sections (A) and (B) are not applicable as no new parcels or lots are proposed with this application.

(C) Minimum Yard Dimensions – Feet

Front	Side	Street Side	Rear
30	10	30	30

Findings: The proposed location of the construction office trailers complies with the above yard dimensions, as shown on the site plans at Exhibit A.3 and Exhibit A.4. The analysis of this code section in the Staff Report (Exhibit A.0) is hereby incorporated in its entirety into these findings. This standard is met.

Maximum Structure Height – 35 feet

Findings: Exhibit A.5 shows that the construction office trailers are 16 feet in height. Accordingly, the proposed construction office trailers will not exceed the 35-foot maximum structure height. This standard is met.

Minimum Front Lot Line Length – 50 feet.

Findings: This standard is not applicable as no new parcels or lots are proposed with this application.

- (1) Notwithstanding the Minimum Yard Dimensions, but subject to all other applicable Code provisions, a fence or retaining wall may be located in a Yard....*
- (2) An Accessory Structure may encroach ...*
- (3) A Variance is required for any Accessory Structure that ...*

Findings: These standards are not applicable as no fences, retaining walls, or Accessory Structures are proposed with this application.

(D) The minimum yard requirement shall be increased ...

(E) ... may exceed the height requirement ...

(F) ... may have a reduced minimum rear yard ...

Findings: These standards are not applicable as the proposed construction office trailers do not exceed the height requirement nor require a reduced yard requirement.

(G) On-site sewage disposal, storm water/drainage control, water systems unless these services are provided by public or community source, required parking, and yard areas shall be provided on the lot.

(1) [N/A].

Findings: Findings are provided below on each topic of this code section.

Sewage Disposal. As explained in the Staff Report (Exhibit A.0):

“In its decision previously approving a Temporary Use Permit for the construction office trailers via T2-2024-0060[²]...Multnomah County determined that the sanitary stations associated with an approved development constitute normal construction activity and therefore do not require separate review under a Temporary Use Permit. The sanitary stations are serviced by a licensed professional pumper. As reflected in the findings of that prior approval, the County Sanitarian also reviewed the proposal and found it acceptable.

“The proposed office trailers do not require sewer connection, and no expansion, intensification, or relocation of the previously approved temporary construction office trailers is proposed with this application.”

In addition, the applicant has confirmed that it continues to provide temporary on-site sanitary stations served by a DEQ-licensed pumper in a manner that has been approved by the County Sanitarian. Exhibit I.3 (Septic Review Certification); Exhibit I.6 (evidence that the sanitary contractor continues to be DEQ-licensed). As explained in the Staff Report, the County interprets its code to provide that permanent septic systems are not required for temporary construction activities. Therefore, this standard is inapplicable, or, if applicable, it is met.

Stormwater / drainage control. Addressed below under MCC 39.4325(G) subsection (2).

Water systems. The construction trailers have only piped cold water. The water is provided by Pleasant Home Water District (PHWD). Exhibit I.7 (“construction trailers only have piped cold water”); Exhibit I.5 (Pleasant Home Water District Certification of Water Service for construction of project). This standard is met.

Required parking. There is no parking required for a temporary use under MCC 39.6505, as there is no new building or change in use proposed, only a temporary use. This standard is met.

Yard areas. See the analysis above of MCC 39.4325. This standard is met.

All the standards in MCC 39.4325(G) are met.

(2) *Stormwater/drainage control systems are required for new impervious surfaces. The system shall be adequate to ensure that the rate of runoff from the lot for the 10 year 24-hour storm event is no greater than that before the development.*

Findings: No new impervious surfaces are proposed with this application compared to the previously approved application. Exhibit H.1. Topics related to ground disturbance are separately handled by the Erosion and Sediment Control Permit for the site (T1-2023-16751) and are outside the scope of this case.

² The record for the prior decision, as well as the prior decision itself, are provided in this record at Exhibit H.1.

However, staff notes that the plans for T1-2023-16751 included all ground disturbance required to site the construction trailers and showed the location of construction trailers. Exhibit A.0, page 5.

The applicant provided two Stormwater Drainage Control Certificates (signed by a Registered Professional Engineer licensed in Oregon) corresponding to the two construction trailer locations. Exhibit H.1 (“Storm Water Certificate_ ...”). Each of those Certificates specifically provides that the “rate of stormwater runoff attributed to the [trailers] for a 10-year/24-hour storm event will be no greater than that which existed prior to any development[.]” *Id.* Therefore, compliance with stormwater requirements remains fully addressed. This standard is met.

(H) New, replacement, or expansion of existing dwellings ...

Findings: These standards are not applicable as no dwellings are proposed.

(I) Required parking, and yard areas shall be provided on the same Lot of Record as the development being served.

Findings: As explained above, there is no required parking for this temporary use and all yard areas are being provided on site. This standard is met.

(J) All exterior lighting shall comply with MCC 39.6850.

Findings: As discussed in the Dark Sky Lighting Standards section below, the proposed lighting complies with MCC 39.6850. This standard is met.

STORMWATER CRITERIA

§ 39.6235 STORMWATER DRAINAGE CONTROL.

(A) Persons creating new or replacing existing impervious surfaces exceeding 500 square feet shall install a stormwater drainage system as provided in this section. This subsection (A) does not apply to shingle or roof replacement on lawful structures.

Findings: Addressed above under MCC 39.4325(G) subsection (2). This standard is met.

(B) The provisions of this section are in addition to and not in lieu of any other provision of the code regulating stormwater or its drainage and other impacts and effects, including but not limited to regulation thereof in the SEC overlay.

Findings: There are no other code sections regulating stormwater (or its drainage and other impacts and effects) that are applicable to this proposed temporary use. The proposed construction trailers are not located in any SEC overlay. This standard is not applicable.

(C) The provisions of this section are in addition to and not in lieu of stormwater and drainage requirements in the Multnomah County Road Rules and Design and Construction Manual, including those requirements relating to impervious surfaces and proposals to discharge stormwater onto a county right-of-way.

Findings: There are no stormwater or drainage requirements in the Multnomah County Road Rules or Design and Construction Manual applicable to this proposed temporary use. The proposed construction trailers do not discharge stormwater onto a county right-of-way. This standard is not applicable.

(D) The stormwater drainage system required in subsection (A) shall be designed to ensure that the rate of runoff for the 10-year 24- hour storm event is no greater than that which existed prior to development at the property line or point of discharge into a water body.

Findings: Addressed above under MCC 39.4325(G) subsection (2). This standard is met.

(E) At a minimum, to establish satisfaction of the standards in this section and all other applicable stormwater-related regulations in this code, the following information must be provided to the planning director:

(1) [...]

Findings: This code section provides submittal requirements, which are not approval criteria. This standard does not apply.

DARK SKY CRITERIA

§ 39.6850 DARK SKY LIGHTING STANDARDS.

(A) The purpose of the Dark Sky Lighting Standards in this Section is [...].

Findings: This section provides a purpose statement, which is not an approval criterion. This standard is not applicable.

(B) The following exterior lighting is exempt from the requirements of paragraph (C) of this section:

....

(8) Lighting used by a public agency in service of a temporary public need, when such lighting cannot both serve the public need and comply with the standards in paragraph (C) of this section.

Findings: The proposed lighting complies with the standards in paragraph (C), as explained further below and in the Dark Sky Lighting Compliance Inventory at Exhibit I.10. This standard does not apply.

(C) The following standards apply to all new exterior lighting supporting a new, modified, altered, expanded, or replaced use approved through a development permit and to all existing exterior lighting on property that is the subject of a development permit approval for enlargement of a building by more than 400 square feet of ground coverage.

Findings: This standard does not apply to temporary permits, as there is no “use approved through a development permit.” MCC 39.6850(C). LUBA specifically held that this construction is not a “use” under Multnomah County Code. *Cottrell Community Planning Organization v. Multnomah County*, LUBA No 2023-086 (Jan 22, 2025). Accordingly, the Dark Sky Lighting Standards do not apply as an approval criterion

for this construction temporary use. In the alternative, I find that the standards for Dark Sky Lighting are met, as explained immediately below.

(1) The light source (bulbs, lamps, etc.) must be fully shielded with opaque materials and directed downwards. "Fully shielded" means no light is emitted above the horizontal plane located at the lowest point of the fixture's shielding. Shielding must be permanently attached.

(2) The lighting must be contained within the boundaries of the Lot of Record on which it is located. To satisfy this standard, shielding in addition to the shielding required in paragraph (C)(1) of this section may be required.

Findings: The proposed lighting meets these standards. In Exhibit I.10, the applicant provided a comprehensive Dark Sky Lighting Compliance Inventory with photographic evidence of all styles of lighting used on every temporary office trailer at the site. The photos in Exhibit I.10 show that the lighting is fully shielded and directed downwards with shielding permanently attached and done with opaque materials. In addition, all lighting supporting the construction trailers are contained within the boundary of the site. Exhibit I.10, page 1. These standards are met.

Several members of the public expressed concerns about lighting at night coming from the filtration facility property and provided photos. *See, e.g.,* Exhibit I.1 (Culver); Exhibit I.11 (CCPO). The testimony expresses that "lights from this site are visible" at surrounding properties. Exhibit I.13 (Wensenk). However, light from the construction "site" as a whole is outside the scope of these proceedings, which concern only the lights that support the temporary construction trailers. The applicant provided evidence, and I now find, that the lighting depicted in public testimony photographs is not associated with external lighting supporting the temporary construction office trailers under review in this case. Exhibit J.2, page 1. The minimal lighting shown immediately adjacent to the tall, green Pleasant Home Water District (PHWD) tanks (identified with a down arrow on page 4 of Exhibit I.11) relates to one of the construction trailer sites. However, in response to this public testimony, the contractor found in its night-time assessment that some of the construction trailer interior lights were left on overnight. While the dark sky standards only apply to exterior light fixtures, and therefore interior lights are not relevant to these proceedings, the contractor has now made it mandatory that all interior lights are turned off when the last site personnel are gone. Exhibit J.2, page 2. The contractor confirmed that all exterior lighting serving the construction trailer area are compliant with dark sky requirements. Exhibit J.2, page 2.

Overall, I find that the Dark Sky Lighting Standards in MCC 39.6850 do not apply to this proposed temporary use, and, in the alternative, I find that all Dark Sky Lighting Standards in MCC 39.6850 are met.

As the application complies with all applicable approval criteria, the appeal is denied and the approval is upheld.