

May 23, 2025

VIA EMAIL ONLY

Liz Fancher, Hearings Officer  
c/o Multnomah County Land Use Planning Division  
Email: [lup-hearings@multco.us](mailto:lup-hearings@multco.us)

Re: T3-2022-16220 Oregon Association of Nurseries' Final Argument

Dear Madam Hearings Officer:

Thank you for hosting the remand hearing and allowing the open record period. This letter is to provide final argument for the Oregon Association of Nurseries (OAN). Please include it in the record and acknowledge receipt.

This application was remanded by LUBA because the prior county decision “misconstrued the community use natural resources criterion [MCC 39.7515(B)] and, based on that misconception, failed to adopt adequate findings supported by substantial evidence.” *Cottrell Community Planning Organization et al v. Multnomah County*, \_\_\_ Or LUBA \_\_\_ (2025) (LUBA No. 2023-086, January 22, 2025, slip op at 130). As a result, this remand decision must address both the meaning and application of MCC 39.7515(B).

LUBA also ruled that construction impacts are not part of the scope of the use to be evaluated under MCC 39.7515(B). Slip op at 130 (“The hearings officer did not misconstrue the applicable law in concluding that the county was not required to consider construction impacts under the community use criteria.”). The current question is whether the operation of the water treatment facility and pipelines will adversely affect natural resources. The answer is yes.

The applicant argues that all the natural resource impacts are due to construction, but the logical extension of the applicant’s argument is that the construction of the water treatment facility and pipeline could permanently degrade or destroy any natural resource it found inconvenient to preserve without violating MCC 39.7515(B). The argument is inconsistent with the express language of that code which requires no adverse impact, is inconsistent with the purposes of the comprehensive plan and zoning code which are to preserve natural resources, is inconsistent with the underlying county and state policies to preserve agricultural resources, and is contrary to ORS 215.243(1) and Goal 3 which the comprehensive plan and MCC 33.7515(B) implement.

At LUBA, the parties debated the meaning of the term “natural resources” in MCC 39.7515(B). OAN understands that LUBA concluded, as a matter of law, that the “hearings officer misconstrued the code when they concluded that ‘natural resources’ in MCC 39.7515(B) includes only those significant resources included in SEC overlays.” Slip op at 121. LUBA also concluded “The MCCP glossary explains that within the context of the MCCP, ‘natural resource’ is defined as: ‘Generally, a functioning natural system, such as a wetland or a stream, wildlife habitat or material in the environment used or capable of being used for some purpose, also including minerals and fuels, agricultural resources and forests[.]’ MCCP App 2 B, at 7.” Slip op at 121–122.

May 23, 2025  
Page 2

Three terms require interpretation: “natural resource”, “agricultural resource”, and “adversely affect”. The definition of the term “natural resource” is set forth in the Glossary of the MCCP is the correct definition of that term for purposes of MCC 39.7515(B). Accordingly, the “natural resources” to be considered under MCC 39.7515(B) are functioning natural systems, including wetlands or streams, wildlife habitat, material in the environment used or capable of being used for some purpose, including minerals, fuels, agricultural resources, and forests.

The applicant testified on April 16, 2025, that the original meaning of “natural resources” as written in the original comprehensive plan did not include “agricultural resources” in the enumerated list of natural resources, and, therefore, that agricultural resources need not be considered. The applicant contends that this prior list of natural resources controls, because when MCC 39.7515(B) was first enacted, the prior list was in effect.

OAN disagrees for two reasons. First, although it is inherently difficult to determine the meaning of terms drafted a half century earlier, there is a timely analysis from LUBA of the same approval criterion, that the community service use will not adversely affect natural resources. In the case of *West Hill and Island Neighbors, Inc. v. Multnomah County*, Metro applied for a community service approval to develop a solid waste landfill. The application was approved by the County, and then appealed to LUBA. LUBA No. 83-018, June 29, 1983 (Unpublished). Petitioner complained the fill would reduce the soil capability for timber production. LUBA remanded and ruled that the community service standards protecting forest resources:

“are stated in absolutes; and, together, they require any proposed community service use to meet very stringent standards. Whether or not the land will be returned to forest production [when the site is returned to timber production after the fill is completed] begs the question of the impact of the use now.” Slip op at 18.

LUBA also opined that the code:

“may indeed be unnecessarily strict when applied to community service uses, but the policy nonetheless exists and is part of the approval criteria \*\*\*\* The county might wish to consider amending the policy or exempting certain community service uses from it.” *Id.*, at 33 (footnote omitted).

*West Hill and Island Neighbors, Inc.* is a contemporaneous LUBA opinion which indicates the not adversely affect natural resources criterion must be applied strictly, and if the proposed community service use (the land fill) displaces a natural resource use (growing timber), the natural resource is adversely affected. On April 16, 2025, OAN testified that a strict interpretation and application of MCC 39.7515(B) consistent with that case does not preclude a community service use in this rural zone because a community service use can be approved on a property that was previously developed with a non-farm use without adversely affecting natural resources. Moreover, the City’s own engineer found the Powell Butte site within the UGB was feasible. Rec. 2746-48. Denial of this application does not mean the use cannot be suitable sited. The strict application of MCC 39.7515(B) does not preclude development of either this water treatment facility or another community service use.

OAN listened to the applicant’s argument at the April 16, 2025, hearing that the current LUBA remand was inconsistent with prior interpretations of the natural resource standard. However, *West Hill and Island Neighbors, Inc.* and the current remand order are consistent because both require strict

May 23, 2025  
Page 3

protection of natural resources; displaced forest resources in *West Hill and Island Neighbors, Inc.* and displaced agricultural resources here. As quoted above, in *West Hill and Island Neighbors, Inc.* LUBA invited the County to consider exempting certain community service uses, but the County has not exempted the water treatment facility or the associated pipelines in any way. *West Hill and Island Neighbors, Inc.* applies, and that there is nothing in the intervening years, or in the text or context of MCC 39.7515(B), that suggests a less than strict interpretation is correct. The very large size of the water treatment facility does not compel a different interpretation of the MCC 39.7515(B) criterion, and the applicant's argument for a looser interpretation is unpersuasive.

Second, the MCCP has been updated since MCC 39.7515(B) was enacted, and now expressly includes agricultural resources on the enumerated list of natural resources. The current MCC 39.7515(B) must be interpreted consistently with the current comprehensive plan—not the comprehensive plan in effect in 1977 as the applicant argues. The Oregon Supreme Court requires that zoning code provisions must be interpreted consistently with the *current* comprehensive plan.

“If [a comprehensive] plan is to have any efficacy as the basic planning tool for the City of Milwaukie, it must be given preference over conflicting prior zoning ordinances. To hold otherwise would allow a city to go through the motions and expense of formulating a comprehensive plan and then relegating that document to oblivion through continued reliance on the older zoning ordinances.”

*Baker v. City of Milwaukie*, 271 Or 500, 509, 533 P2d 773 (1975).

The current comprehensive plan definition of natural resources controls, and that plan defines agricultural resources as natural resources which are protected under MCC 39.7515(B).

OAN notes that, in the alternative, that even if the 1977 version of the comprehensive plan was relevant to interpretation of MCC 39.7515(B), in the MUA zone that plan restricts uses that are similar to the proposed community service uses.

“The Zoning Article: should include a Multiple Use Farm Zone with: b. the following examples of uses:

1. permitted as primary uses; agriculture and forestry practices and single family dwellings on legal lots;
2. the sale of agricultural products on the premises, dwellings for farm help, and mobile homes, should be allowed under prescribed conditions;
3. on lands which are not predominantly Agricultural Capability Class I, II, or III, rural planned developments, cottage industries, limited rural service commercial, and tourist commercial should be allowed as conditional uses upon the showing that the conditional use standards can be met[.]”

Ex S.7 Comprehensive Framework Plan 1977, page 206 (emphasis original).

These MUA provisions demonstrate the 1977 comprehensive plan classifies uses in the MUA area by soil type, and that non-resource uses were discouraged from locating on Class II soils. The only soils evidence in the record is that the water treatment facility property and pipeline properties are Class II soils and thus high-value farmland under Oregon law. Rec. 3659-3560; Ex N43, page 63. See, e.g. ORS 215.710(1) (defining high-value farmland). No party has provided contrary evidence. The applicant's post-rebuttal report attempting to explain why the agricultural soils on the subject properties are not natural resources does not challenge the assertion the soils are Class II and thus high-value farmland under Oregon law. Ex S.36. OAN concludes that the 1977 comprehensive plan discouraged non-resource uses in the MUA zone on Class II agricultural soils, and, therefore, that the applicant's argument that the 1977 version of the plan supports approval of the conditional use permits for the proposed water treatment facility and pipelines is unpersuasive.

The next definitional requirement is to define "agricultural resources". The term "agricultural resources" is not defined in the County zoning code or comprehensive plan, so we look to other sources for relevant context and guidance, in the context of the listing of agricultural resources in the comprehensive plan as a natural resource. The Oregon legislature declared, as a matter of policy, that: "Open land used for agricultural use is an efficient means of conserving natural resources." ORS 215.243(1). This legislative declaration is relevant context for defining agricultural resources because, analogous to the comprehensive plan, it indicates "open land used for agricultural use" is a "natural resource". Conversely, there is no authority for the proposition that "open land used for agricultural use" is not a "natural resource"; indeed, such an argument would conflict with the legislative policy. Therefore, "open land used for agricultural use" is "agricultural resources" and constitutes "natural resources" within the meaning of MCC 39.7515(B).

The applicant debates this definition. In support of their argument that agricultural soils are agricultural resources and functioning natural systems and thus natural resources within the meaning of MCC 39.7515(B), Oregon Association of Nurseries and 1000 Friends have provided information from the Natural Resources Conservation Service, which is part of the US Department of Agriculture. For example, Chapter 9 of the US Soil Survey Manual, written by the Soil Science Division Staff of the United States Department of Agriculture, explains how agricultural soils function as a natural system.

"Soil function is a way of describing the role of soil in the environment and has been used to define the concept of soil quality and soil health. Essential soil functions include nutrient cycling, water storage and release, biodiversity and habitat, filtering and buffering, and physical stability and support (simplified from Mausbach and Seybold, 1998). Soil stores and moderates the cycling of nutrients and other elements. It regulates the drainage, flow, and storage of water and solutes (N, P, and pesticides). It supports biodiversity and habitat and promotes the growth of plants, animals, and microorganisms. It serves as a filter and buffer for toxic compounds and excessive nutrients and protects the quality of water, air, and other resources. It provides physical stability and support, allowing the passage of air and water through its porous structure, serving as a medium for plant roots, and providing an anchoring support for human structures." Ex. U-24, page 65.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Assessing Dynamic Soil Properties and Soil Change*, by Skye Wills, Candiss Williams, and Cathy Seybold, USDA-NRCS, from the US Soil Survey Manual, page 482, by Soil Science Division Staff of United States Department of Agriculture, February 2018.

The Hearings Officer finds that these federal reports are credible expert testimony, because they were written by scientists employed by the Soil Science Division Staff of the United States Department of Agriculture. Indeed, the name of the soils science agency—Natural Resources Conservation Service—demonstrates that the federal government classifies agricultural soils as natural resources and strives to conserve them. While the County comprehensive plan and zoning code need not be interpreted and applied consistently with reports provided by the US Department of Agriculture or its Natural Resources Conservation Service, these reports detailing how agricultural soils function as a natural system are credible expert evidence which supports the conclusion that the open land used for growing nursery crops on the water treatment facility property and the pipeline route properties is a functioning natural system and therefore a natural resource within the meaning of MCC 39.7515(B). The support from federal scientists indicates this conclusion is not only plausible, it is entirely consistent with both the federal government’s scientific work and the Oregon legislature’s declaration of policy.

In response, the applicant relies on a report from Globalwise, dated May 5, 2025, to support its preferred definition of “agricultural resources”. Ex S-36. The Globalwise logo at the top of the report indicates that it provides “marketing and economic services”. The report was written by Mr. Prengruber, whose signature block indicates that he is an Agricultural Economist. The report explains:

“Farmland, particularly ornamental nurseries, dominate the lands surrounding the proposed filtration facility site. \*\*\*\* These farms do not follow organic or typical sustainable cultural practices. Significant human intervention with large amounts of inputs are employed. \*\*\*\* The added materials to the soil are fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, rodenticides, soil amendments, and seeds/seedlings in order to be utilized for crop or livestock production. \*\*\*\* Agricultural land is managed for crop production, not for natural conditions such as wildlife habitat, wetland functions, or stream management.”

Ex S-36. The report concludes: “Agricultural land, considered as either farmland or farmed soil, is not a functioning natural system.” Ex S-36. As a starting point, the report is not provided by a professional with apparent training or knowledge of agricultural resources as natural resources, such as a soils scientist. Expertise regarding marketing, economics, and agricultural economics is not relevant to the question of how to define “agricultural resource” within the context of the County comprehensive plan, zoning code, and the state laws and goals that the County provisions implement. The Globalwise report is not expert evidence on whether the soils on the water treatment facility and pipeline properties are functioning natural systems or natural resources.

Substantively, the crux of the Globalwise report is that the historic use of customary farm practices such as the application of fertilizers, pesticides, soil amendments, and seeds for the production of nursery crops means the water treatment facility property and surrounding properties are not a functioning natural system, and thus not an agricultural resource or a natural resource. This is a legal argument which conflicts with the plain text of the comprehensive plan glossary definition of natural resources. The applicant admits the subject property was open land used for agricultural use and



produced nursery crops. The employment of customary farm practices on the water treatment facility property and pipeline route properties including the application of fertilizers, pesticides, and soil amendments, and the planting of seeds, does not mean those properties are not a functioning natural system. Partially inorganic perhaps, but still functioning. Globalwise wrongly attempts to insert the qualifier “organic” into the glossary definition, as if the terms were “functioning organic natural systems” and “organic agricultural resources”. That interpretation would mean that only a certified organic farm where no artificial inputs were provided—not even seeds—would qualify as a functioning natural system and thus an agricultural resource. This argument violates ORS 174.010 by inserting the “organic” qualifier that the County omitted. The Globalwise interpretation of “agricultural resources” is inconsistent with the text of the comprehensive plan and the purposes of both the comprehensive plan and MCC 39.7515(B) which are to protect natural resources, expressly including agricultural resources.

The next interpretive question is the meaning of “adversely affect”. The term “adversely affect” is not specifically defined in the MCCP or the Code. However, the MCCP does provide relevant context. MCCP Community Service Policy 2.45 identifies the importance of requiring community facilities like the water treatment facility to avoid adverse impacts on farm practices, which rely on native soils and related agricultural natural resources.

“Support the siting and development of community facilities and services appropriate to the needs of rural areas while avoiding adverse impacts on farm and forest practices, wildlife, and natural and environmental resources including views of important natural landscape features.”

Another comprehensive plan provision explains that the County’s primary concern with respect to protection of natural resources is avoiding “environmental degradation.” MCCP 1-3 (explaining that the County has embraced land use planning as a necessary means “to protect natural resources from environmental degradation.”). The dictionary definition of “degradation” is helpful in this context. Webster’s indicates that degradation means “5: impairment in respect to some physical property: a: damage by weakening or loss of some property, quality, or capability.” *Webster’s Third New International Dictionary* 594 (unabridged ed 2002). Therefore, when taken together with the meaning of the term “natural resources,” the legal question under the adversely affect natural resources standard is whether the water treatment facility use, including the pipelines, weakens or impairs some property (as in characteristic), quality, or capability of the enumerated natural resources, including wetlands or streams, wildlife habitat, material in the environment used or capable of being used for some purpose, including minerals, fuels, agricultural resources, and forests.

With those interpretative questions resolved, the substantive question under MCC 39.7515(B) is whether the operation of the water treatment facility and pipelines adversely affect natural resources, including agricultural resources. The answer is yes, for the following reasons.

Factually, the applicant previously testified that “The filtration facility site was previously leased to neighboring farmers and was used for nursery crop production with crop rows generally oriented in a north/south direction[.]” Rec 236. There is no contrary evidence in the record or other dispute on this point. Factually, the water treatment facility property is open land used for agricultural use, most recently for the production of nursery crops.

May 23, 2025  
Page 7

The record also indicates that operation of the water treatment facility would displace, cover and convert nearly 95 acres of agricultural natural resources to an urban water treatment facility. As the Oregon Dept. of Agriculture testified,

“The proposed facilities would be located amongst and upon lands that are highly suitable for agriculture and have been in agricultural production for decades. Most of the soils contain prime or other high-value agricultural soils. Much of the immediate area contains Class II soils, some of the best agricultural soils in the United States. It is important to note that these capability ratings are regardless of irrigation. The area soils are high quality with or without irrigation.” Rec 3624.

This testimony is credible and persuasive, in part because no party has challenged the asserted fact that the soils on the water treatment facility property are high-value agricultural soils as defined in state law.

Regarding adverse impacts, the application stated: “the Water Bureau prioritized placement of the pipelines within the right-of-way where possible to preserve surrounding farmland and natural resources *where feasible*.” Rec 346 (emphasis added). But where the applicant deemed that preservation of agricultural natural resources was not feasible, such as on the water treatment facility property, those resources are not preserved, agricultural resources are adversely impacted, and MCC 39.7515(B) is not satisfied.

Regarding the specific agricultural resources on the water treatment facility property, the record indicates “According to the United States Department of Agriculture, over 95% of the proposed site contains Class 2 soil. The State of Oregon considers Class 2 soil ‘High-Value Farmland’ and Farmland of Statewide Importance” (OAR§660-033-0020 (8)(a)). Prior to construction, the City estimates approximately 1,225,000 cubic yards of soil to be removed, of which it is estimated 245,200 cubic yards of High-Value Class 2 topsoil will be removed across 75 to 80 acres.” Rec. 3659. No party disputes the soil removal. Instead, the applicant explains that the topsoil has been relocated to a nearby property where it can be used for agricultural production. There is no evidence in the record that the relocated topsoil is actually being used for agricultural production, or that the receiving property is not already agricultural so that depositing the relocated topsoil will maintain the same number of acres of agricultural resources as before. Nor is there evidence that the receiving property has other attributes of the water treatment facility property to support a conclusion the relocated topsoil will be part of a functioning natural system that is similar to the functioning natural system that produced nursery crops on the water treatment facility property. The relocation of topsoil is a degradation of the agricultural resources caused by the operation of the water treatment facility which permanently removes the topsoil from its natural environment and prevents the replanting of nursery stock or other crops, and concludes the operation therefore adversely affects natural resources such that MCC 39.7515(B) is not satisfied. Moreover, unlike in *West Hill and Island Neighbors, Inc. v. Multnomah County*, the applicant does not contend that most of the water treatment facility property can later be replanted and used for agriculture including the growing of nursery crops. The inability to replant the formerly open agricultural land with new crops due to ongoing operation of the facility adversely affects agricultural resources, and is not a construction impact, such that MCC 39.7515(B) is not satisfied.

May 23, 2025  
Page 8

Similarly, approximately four miles of proposed pipeline traverses high value soils of existing farmland. The record indicates that local farmers and soil scientists with the Oregon Department of Agriculture agree that the valuable topsoil will be permanently degraded by the operation of 7-9 foot diameter pipes. As a result, the operation of the pipeline alone will degrade approximately 10-15 acres of valuable soil across two counties. Rec 3659. This is credible expert evidence that operation of the pipeline adversely affects natural resources such that MCC 39.7515(B) is not satisfied.

OAN also notes record testimony that “Degradation of natural resources, including increased soil compaction, soil horizon mixing, and decreased crop yields have been common outcomes of underground pipeline installation.” Rec 1261; 2911. Again, unlike in *West Hill and Island Neighbors, Inc. v. Multnomah County*, following construction, the pipeline properties cannot later be replanted due to permanent easement restrictions. OAN concludes the operation of the pipeline degrades agricultural resources and is an adverse impact to natural resources where the underground pipeline traverses agricultural land such that MCC 39.7515(B) is not satisfied.

Consider this testimony from Rec. 3659.

“According to the United States Department of Agriculture, over 95% of the proposed site contains Class 2 soil. The State of Oregon considers Class 2 soil ‘High-Value Farmland’ and Farmland of Statewide Importance” (OAR§660-033-0020 (8)(a)). Prior to construction, the City estimates approximately 1,225,000 cubic yards of soil to be removed, of which it is estimated 245,200 cubic yards of High-Value Class 2 topsoil will be removed across 75 to 80 acres. Similarly, approximately 4 miles of proposed pipeline routes for both the raw and treated water spans through high value soils of existing farmland. Furthermore, it will negatively impact and permanently destroy future farmland production in these areas. Local farmers and soil scientists with the Oregon Department of Agriculture agree that the valuable topsoil will not recover from the dredging of trenches, construction, and heavy equipment needed to establish the connectivity of redundant 7-9 foot diameter pipes. As a result, the raw and treated water pipeline alone will destroy approximately 10-15 acres of valuable soil across two counties. Maps provided in Figure 5 and Figure 6 illustrate the spatial extent of high value farmland within the agricultural community which the City wishes to build the facility and its pipeline network.”

There is no credible contrary evidence in the record to indicate that soil will not be removed, or that the pipeline route could later be replanted with trees. Therefore, the operation of the pipeline routes across high-value agricultural land degrade agricultural resources and the application does not satisfy MCC 39.7515(B).

The applicant argues that degradation of agricultural resources on the water treatment facility property and the pipeline properties is a construction impact that is outside the scope of MCC 39.7515(B). But the prior occupant of the water quality treatment facility property was Surface Nursery which grew nursery crops. Rec. 236. Surface Nursery vacated the property in approximately 2019 when the applicant began site preparations for construction of the water treatment facility. Therefore, 2018 is the base line condition for measurement of the natural resources on the water treatment facility property and pipeline properties, and for consideration of adverse effects to natural resources. Ex. S-27.



May 23, 2025  
Page 9

Because these adverse impacts to agricultural resources are permanent and are not being mitigated, they are not construction impacts that are exempt from review. To provide just one example, new nursery stock cannot be planted on most of the water treatment facility property, and, therefore, the operation of the facility adversely impacts agricultural resources. Similarly, trees cannot be planted along the pipeline route due to permanent easement restrictions, even to replace trees that were removed for construction, and, therefore, operation of the pipeline adversely impacts natural resources. As in *West Hill and Island Neighbors, Inc.*, this inability to replant the subject property once the proposed use is operational is an adverse impact to natural resources and MCC 39.7515(B) is not satisfied.

In summary, this application presents a straight forward question regarding a very strict criterion. The applicant failed to persuade LUBA that the text of MCC 39.7515(B) does not mean what it says. The Hearings Officer must follow LUBA's lead in *West Hill and Island Neighbors, Inc.* and this case, and apply the code strictly, because that is how it is written. The inability to replant trees for timber production during operation of the landfill in *West Hill and Island Neighbors, Inc.* led to a rejection of that County approval. Now, under the same test, the inability to replant seedlings for nursery crop production during operation of the water treatment facility compels rejection of this application for the same reasons. The County, in its legislative capacity, declined LUBA's invitation to exempt certain community services from the natural resource standard.

OAN urges the Hearings Officer to respect that legislative choice, apply MCC 39.7515(B) as written, and deny the application.

Finally, as per the Hearings Officer's instruction at the April 16, 2025 remand hearing, OAN is providing draft findings in Word by separate document for the Hearings Officer's consideration.

Thank you for your assistance and we look forward to the decision.

Sincerely,

JORDAN RAMIS PC



Jamie D. Howsley  
Admitted in Oregon and Washington



LUP Hearings &lt;lup-hearings@multco.us&gt;

---

## #T3-2022-16220 OAN's Final Argument and Draft Hearings Officer Decision

---

**Joseph Schaefer** <joseph.schaefer@jordanramis.com>  
To: LUP Hearings <lup-hearings@multco.us>

Fri, May 23, 2025 at 2:58 PM



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

Good afternoon. Attached are the Oregon Association of Nurseries' final argument letter from Jamie Howsley of Jordan Ramis, in pdf, and its Draft Hearings Officer Decision, in Word as requested by the hearings officer.

Please file these in the record and confirm receipt.

Thanks and have a good holiday.

Joseph

**Joseph Schaefer** | Paralegal/Land Use Specialist

Direct: (503) 598-5584

**JORDAN**  **RAMIS**

1211 SW Fifth Ave, Suite 2700

Portland OR 97204

[jordanramis.com](http://jordanramis.com) | (888) 598-7070

Portland | Bend | Vancouver WA



**The Oregonian**

Jordan Ramis PC is a 2024 Top  
Workplace!  
3 Years Running

**DISCLAIMER:** This e-mail is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). It contains information that is confidential and/or legally privileged. If you believe that it has been sent to you in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this information by someone other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

---

**2 attachments****Draft Hearings Officer Decision.docx**

47K

**Ltr to HO-T3-2022-16220 OAN's Final Argument.pdf**

623K