Multnomah County

LUP Hearings <lup-hearings@multco.us>

Oal testimony for the record T3-2026-0012

Carpenter Lane Farm <carpenterlanefarm@gmail.com> Fri, Oct 30, 2026 at 9:27 AM
To: LUP Hearings <lup-hearings@multco.us>, LUP-comments@multco.us, cottrellcpo@gmail.com

This Message Is From an External Sender

External Sender - Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links, and Requests for Payment or Login Information.

Please accept for the record a written transcript of my oral testimony.

Good morning, and thank you for the opportunity to testify.

My name is Tami Wensenk, and I'm speaking on behalf of concerned residents in the Carpenter Lane community as well as the Cottrell CPO.
I urge the County to deny this application unless and until the applicant demonstrates that it meets both applicable conditional use criteria: compatibility with the character of the area under MCC 39.7515(A), and protection of natural resources under MCC 39.7515(B).

Our community is tired. Residents have already sacrificed so much for the Bull Run Filtration Project—our peace and quiet, our rural way of life, and our sense of security in our own homes. We have endured years of construction, disruption, and uncertainty. And now we are being asked to accept an additional disturbance in our rural residential community to serve the City of Sandy, several miles away and in another county.

We understand that infrastructure is necessary. But that does not mean the impacts should simply be imposed on the people who live closest to it, especially when those residents are not the primary beneficiaries.

This application raises serious questions about whether other locations were adequately considered. Why can't the station be located within the existing fenced facility grounds, farther from homes? Why can't the previously approved pump station footprint be used? And why does the application not adequately explain why these alternatives were rejected?

These are not minor questions. A residence is reportedly only about 50 feet from the property line where this station is proposed. The County must carefully consider the effects of siting a mechanical facility so close to nearby homes, including the potential for persistent humming and low-frequency noise. A proposed 50-decibel limit at the property line does not, by itself, resolve whether continuous mechanical noise is compatible with the rural character of this area. It simply is not.

We are also concerned about the changes to the previously approved landscape and habitat plan. The proposed station would occupy an area designated for planting, displacing trees and shrubs and relocating plantings elsewhere. Adding more plants in another location does not automatically replace the habitat function, connectivity, or screening that the original plan was intended to provide. The applicant needs to demonstrate that the revised proposal actually satisfies the County's natural-resource criteria.

This is not simply a question of whether the project can be engineered or whether additional landscaping can be added. It is a question of whether this specific location is appropriate, whether less impactful alternatives have been thoroughly and adequately evaluated, and whether the County has sufficient evidence to approve it.

I would like to add that as I have been listening to the presentations from the consultants & employees of the City of Sandy, that there are more questions raised that deserve and require answers. I will compile and submit those questions and points of concern in writing during the open record period.

Our community has carried a significant burden for a project that does not directly serve us. We should not be expected to absorb every additional impact without a careful, thorough and transparent evaluation of alternatives and local consequences.

We respectfully ask the County to deny this application because it has not adequately demonstrated compliance with the applicable criteria. At a minimum, the County should not approve it until the applicant has fully explained its alternatives analysis and demonstrated that impacts to nearby residents, rural character, and natural resources have been adequately addressed. As such, we also request the record be held open so that all impacted residents have a chance to review and comment.

Thank you.