

August 6.2023

To Multnomah County Land Use Hearing Officer

RE: Site Advisory Group / Good Neighbor Agreement  
File #T3-2022-16220

To Whom It May Concern:

As a participant of the Site Advisory Group, I'd like to submit my testimony on the outcome of the "Good Neighbor Agreement" and the time and energy invested resulting in the lack of an Agreement reached.

Items lacking in the Group meetings:

1. Lack of responses to questions with genuine, timely, detailed information.
2. Reducing input to non-consequential elements of a project vs the relative impact based on the enormity of consequences this project will have on the community.
3. Disingenuous desire to implement a true agree relative to the entire to the entire concept of an agreement. This effort was for public show only and not intended to develop a true agreement.

**A ·gree·ment**

Oxford Language: (Noun) harmony or accordance in opinion or feeling; a position or result of agreeing.

Dictionary.com: an arrangement that is accepted by all parties to a transaction. · a contract or other document delineating such an arrangement. · unanimity of opinion; harmony ...

Cambridge Dictionary: a decision or arrangement, often formal and written, between two or more groups or people: The dispute was settled by an agreement that satisfied both sides.

Merriam-Webster: harmony of opinion, action, or character: concord

Collins Dictionary: 1. the act of agreeing or of coming to a mutual arrangement · 2. the state of being in accord · 3. an arrangement that is accepted by all parties to a transaction.

As one can see by the general accepted understanding and definition of the word agreement, the term reflects the actions of two parties coming to an acceptable arrangement through communication to which all parties participate and relinquish elements of standing enough to form a final opinion that is supported by all parties.

- Some neighbors participated with the Portland Water Bureau's invitation to create a Site Advisory Group in order to have a firsthand understanding of the project that was being forced upon the community. The PWB made a show of creating meetings by which the community could engage and ask questions for almost two years. It was explained to the group that a formal agreement would be prepared based on our participation and the outcome of the engagement. It was always our understanding that we would be presented with that Agreement as a final "contract". We were led to believe that in participating, the PWB would hear our concerns, make adjustments to the project and construction aspects, provide measurable concessions, and be accountable to those.

Our experience was vastly different than what we were told would happen. We found that the our questions were answered with generic responses and platitudes of "we don't know yet".

RE: Site Advisory Group / Good Neighbor Agreement  
File #T3-2022-16220

- The community was offered influence over site and landscape design, colors and lighting options. Offering input to these non-consequential aspects felt disrespectful of the time and energy invested in the meetings. It became apparent the PWB had little understanding of the nature of rural life and commerce as they demonstrated a lack of willingness to accept true reality of the impact the construction project will have on our roads, traffic and the safety of the community.
- Several elements on their “agreement list” are items that are dictated by code, i.e., building height, sound levels and lighting design, though they tout these as results of our Good Neighbor Agreement.
- PWB has stated that they will keep us informed by keeping the website up to date with site activity. This, unacceptably, puts the responsibility on the community to monitor their vast and intricate website for upcoming notices and changes, without any recourse to address needs for change or accommodation should the needs arise.
- The community addressed concerns of the use of hazardous chemicals and asked how it would be protected in the event of a spill or leak. The response was that they will do everything they can to be sure that their staff is adequately trained. They acknowledged that they have no control over chemicals traveling to the site. Asked for a plan of evacuation should/when a spill or accident was to take place, they stated that they were only concerned about spills within the plant. This lack of concern was a direct affront to the safety of the community.

In the end, when the community asked when we would be presented with an Agreement to sign, we were told that no Agreement would be coming forth. The SAG group had prepared a statement denouncing the Good Neighbor Agreement as it was neither reflecting either a Good Neighbor or an Agreement. This statement was submitted to the Portland city council.

In conclusion, there was no by-lateral consensus of opinion, and no agreement was met. I reject the use of the term, as Portland Water Bureau has not acted in good faith in response to the needs of the community.

Sincerely,  
Pat Meyer



---

**File T3-2022-16220**

1 message

---

**Pat Meyer** <neonladyw@gmail.com>  
To: LUP-comments@multco.us

Mon, Aug 7, 2023 at 8:55 AM



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

Please accept my comments on the Good Neighbor Agreement  
Pat Meyer



**Sag Conclusion.pdf**

72K