Cottrell CPO

Pleasant Home
Community Association

Cottrell Community Planning Organization
Pleasant Home Community Association
PO Box 1411
Boring OR 97009
October 30, 2026
Cottrell Community Planning Organization (CPO)

RE: Case T3-2026-0012 – City of Sandy Pump Station
Response to Exhibit A.6 – Farm Impact Study, February 6, 2025
Request for Clarification of Prior Approval and Independent Land Use Review

Dear Hearings Officer:

The Cottrell Community Planning Organization (CPO) submits the following comments regarding Exhibit A.6, the February 6, 2025 memorandum prepared by Bruce Prenguber of Globalwise Inc. for Winterbrook Planning, entitled *Design Modification of Bull Run Filtration Facility Project for Sandy Pump Station*.

The CPO objects to the applicant's reliance on this memorandum as evidence that the proposed City of Sandy Pump Station has already been adequately evaluated under the land use approvals for the Bull Run Filtration Facility (Case T3-2022-16220). The memorandum characterizes the proposed Sandy Pump Station as a minor modification of the previously approved Pleasant Home Water District Pump Station without adequately demonstrating that the revised facility satisfies applicable land use criteria or remains consistent with the previously approved plans and conditions.

We request that the Hearings Officer address the following concerns:

1. The Sandy Pump Station Was Not Specifically Evaluated in the Prior Land Use Decision

The February 2025 memorandum evaluates a proposed City of Sandy Pump Station as a modification of the previously approved Pleasant Home Water District Pump Station. However, the original land use application and associated approval contemplated infrastructure serving Pleasant Home Water District, not the revised proposal now intended to serve the City of Sandy.

Although the memorandum was prepared on February 6, 2025, before Hearings Officer Liz Fancher's June 23, 2025 remand decision, the CPO has not identified evidence establishing that

this memorandum was submitted into the remand record or considered in the Hearings Officer's findings.

The distinction is consequential. The previous approval cannot automatically be extended to a subsequently proposed facility merely because the new infrastructure occupies a portion of the same project site.

The CPO requests that the County identify the specific exhibits, approved plans, findings, and conditions that it contends authorized the Sandy Pump Station and explain whether the proposed changes were considered in the 2025 remand decision.

2. Sandy's Participation in the 2025 Remand Did Not Establish Approval of the Proposed Pump Station

The CPO acknowledges that the City of Sandy participated in the April 16, 2025 remand proceedings. In Exhibit R.9, AJ Thorne, Sandy's Public Works Director, submitted testimony supporting the Bull Run Filtration Facility and explaining Sandy's need to connect to Portland's water supply system.

However, Thorne's testimony did not identify the proposed Sandy Pump Station, its location, design, dimensions, or its intended replacement of the previously approved Pleasant Home Water District Pump Station. Nor did it provide an evaluation of the pump station's potential impacts on surrounding properties, agricultural operations, or natural resources.

Rather, the testimony addressed Sandy's general need for water supply infrastructure and the regional benefits of the filtration facility.

This distinction is particularly important because the applicant's February 6, 2025 farm impact memorandum demonstrates that plans for the Sandy Pump Station were already being developed before the remand hearing. Yet the CPO has not identified evidence that the proposed pump station was formally incorporated into the remand application or specifically evaluated in the Hearings Officer's June 23, 2025 decision.

If the Sandy Pump Station was sufficiently developed for a consultant to evaluate its agricultural impacts in February 2025, why was that proposed facility not expressly identified and evaluated in the remand decision issued four months later?

The CPO requests that the County identify where, within the 2025 remand record and approved plans, the proposed Sandy Pump Station was disclosed, evaluated, and authorized. Sandy's

general support for the filtration facility does not establish land use approval of the separate pump station now proposed.

3. The Proposed Changes Require Independent Evaluation

On page 2 of Exhibit A.6, the consultant identifies several modifications, including:

- Replacement of the previously planned pump station with a larger facility;
- Relocation of the pump station approximately 150 feet east;
- Additional impervious surface for access;
- Modification of landscape plantings; and
- Increasing the underground pipeline diameter from 8 inches to 16 inches.

These changes affect the physical configuration, location, and operational characteristics of the facility. Yet the consultant characterizes them as minor without presenting an updated, farm-by-farm analysis demonstrating that the revised facility will not adversely affect surrounding agricultural operations.

The memorandum relies heavily on studies prepared for the original filtration facility and associated infrastructure. It does not provide updated farm-specific measurements, operational cost estimates, or a detailed comparison demonstrating that the revised pump station will not force significant changes in accepted farm practices or significantly increase their costs.

The CPO questions whether the original agricultural compatibility analysis, prepared for a different pump station design and service arrangement, adequately evaluates the current proposal.

4. Compliance With Noise Standards Does Not Establish Agricultural Compatibility

On page 3 of Exhibit A.6, the consultant relies on a December 17, 2024 Stantec noise memorandum and concludes that the proposed pump station will comply with county noise standards. He further concludes that there is no potential for increased noise impacts on surrounding farm uses.

However, the statutory farm impacts test is not limited to compliance with general noise regulations. The relevant question is whether the proposed use will force a significant change in accepted farm practices or significantly increase the cost of those practices.

The memorandum does not independently establish how continuous mechanical noise from the relocated pump station may affect nearby agricultural activities, nor does it provide updated farm-specific information supporting its conclusion.

The CPO requests that the applicant demonstrate compliance with the applicable agricultural compatibility criteria using evidence specific to the Sandy Pump Station rather than relying solely on prior findings and general noise-code compliance.

5. The Previous Remand Approval Does Not Authorize Unlimited Modifications

In her June 23, 2025 remand decision, Hearings Officer Fancher evaluated the Bull Run Filtration Facility and associated infrastructure under MCC 39.7515(B), including the requirement that the proposed community service use will not adversely affect natural resources.

The decision established conditions of approval tied to specific project plans and documents. On page 275, the Hearings Officer clarified that references to updated plans apply to the versions relied upon by Portland Water Bureau in 2025 to obtain approval of the remanded applications.

This limitation is particularly relevant where the proposed Sandy Pump Station may alter areas previously designated for landscaping, screening, or habitat mitigation.

The CPO requests that the County identify the specific approved plans and conditions applicable to the proposed pump station and demonstrate that the revised facility will not compromise previously approved natural resource protections.

The fact that the filtration facility received final land use approval does not exempt subsequent modifications from applicable land use review. If the proposed Sandy Pump Station changes the physical footprint, location, or mitigation commitments upon which the original approval relied, the County must determine whether those changes require reconsideration of relevant findings and conditions of approval.

6. Request Regarding Admission and Evidentiary Weight of Exhibit A.6

The CPO requests that the Hearings Officer determine when the February 6, 2025 memorandum was first submitted to Multnomah County, whether it was included in the record for Case T3-2022-16220, and whether the Sandy Pump Station was specifically included in the plans approved through that proceeding.

If the applicant represents that the memorandum formed part of the prior approval, but it was not timely admitted into that record, the CPO requests that it not be treated as evidence supporting the earlier decision.

Further, if the memorandum was introduced into the current proceeding without complying with applicable evidentiary deadlines or without providing an adequate opportunity for public response, the CPO requests that the Hearings Officer consider striking it from the record, subject to the applicable procedural requirements.

Alternatively, the CPO requests that Exhibit A.6 be assigned limited evidentiary weight because it relies primarily on previously prepared analyses rather than providing a sufficiently detailed evaluation of the revised Sandy Pump Station.

The CPO emphasizes that the inclusion of this memorandum in the current record cannot retroactively establish that the Sandy Pump Station was evaluated or approved in the earlier proceeding.

Multnomah County previously approved the Bull Run Filtration Facility does not establish that every subsequent modification to the facility satisfies the County's land use requirements.

The proposed City of Sandy Pump Station represents a changed facility serving a different water provider, with a revised location, increased pipeline capacity, and modifications to the previously approved site configuration.

The CPO respectfully requests that the Hearings Officer:

Require the County and applicant to identify where the Sandy Pump Station was specifically disclosed, evaluated, and approved in the prior land use proceedings;

Require an independent demonstration that the proposed changes satisfy applicable agricultural compatibility and other land use criteria;

Determine whether the revised pump station remains consistent with previously approved landscaping, screening, habitat mitigation, and natural resource protections; and

Clarify the procedural status of Exhibit A.6 and refrain from treating the memorandum as evidence of prior approval unless the record affirmatively establishes that fact.

The CPO further requests that the Hearings Officer not rely on the prior approval of the Bull Run Filtration Facility as a substitute for evaluating the specific land use impacts of the proposed Sandy Pump Station.

Cottrell Community Planning Organization and Pleasant Home Community Association