
Re: Testimony in opposition to plan for Water Filtration Plant

1 message

les poole <elpee5440@gmail.com>
To: "lup-comments@multco.us" <lup-comments@multco.us>
Cc: les poole <elpee5440@gmail.com>

Mon, Aug 7, 2023 at 11:33 AM

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

Supplemental testimony from Les Poole:

I submitted written testimony and testified during the recent public hearing. I was pleased the Hearings Officer extended the comment period on this far reaching decision. I opened my verbal comments that morning by pointing out that all affected public and private entities firmly oppose the location. Testimony from private individuals followed that pattern. Only 2 spoke in favor of the project. One of them gave reasons for why the plant should be built, but didn't address any of the criteria for a land use decision.

Public Safety cannot be compromised in order to build and operate the filtration plant, yet that is what's been proposed. I am optimistic the Hearings Officer will deny the application due to the constrained transportation system and lack of compatibility with the neighborhood. Excavation is a major aspect of the project. The calculation of the number of truck trips focuses on deliveries, but fails to adequately address the volume of material that will be removed from the site. The analysis also fails to specify how many of the trucks will be pulling trailers. The length and weight of trucks with that configuration increases the likelihood of accidents, especially at the intersection of Cottrell Road and Dodge Park Blvd. The applicant proposes minor improvements of the sight distance, but that will not alleviate the safety concerns. Other roads affected by the project are inadequate, and will suffer tremendous damage.

During the hearing one of the officials promoting the project provided an ambiguous response to a question about why other locations were eliminated. She replied that the initial (unnamed) location was met with large public opposition. Was the opposition supported with the type and volume the response Cottrell location has attracted? Was the location dropped prematurely? It's difficult to imagine there was a stronger case for rejection than what has occurred in Cottrell.

Again, I request the approval be denied.
Les Poole

On Thu, Jun 29, 2023 at 1:54 PM les poole <elpee5440@gmail.com> wrote:

I have over 30 years experience in land use and transportation experience in Oregon. I lived in east Multnomah County for over 30 years, and currently reside in Clackamas County. I have family members who live on Dodge Park Blvd. I'm not opposed to

Exhibit I.44

building the plant, however the location is problematic. Some of the obstacles and challenges have been addressed in the application. Others remain unresolved.

While convenient, previous ownership of a proposed site is not a high consideration when choosing a location. Furthermore, the rural location has a constrained road system that is already suffering from increased traffic and decay. There will be trucks lined up on many occasions. The traffic study assumes they will be equally spread out during the day.

The information in the reports fails to adequately consider the sight distance impacts on Bluff and other roads. Trucks will be entering roads very slowly, creating a high probability of accidents. An approval of the site would be in error because safe access for the project cannot be guaranteed.

A final, unmitigable aspect of the location is the agricultural zoning. There isn't sufficient evidence that the project and its impacts are compatible with the neighborhood. Removing farmland at this location isn't justified. Please do not approve the plant.

Thank You,
Les Poole
PO Box 805
Oregon City, Or. 97045