

Minutes of the Thursday, July 14, 2011 Carus CPO Meeting held at Grand View Baptist Church, 14855 S Leland Rd., Beavercreek, OR 97004:

The meeting was brought to order by Co-Chairman, Bruce Powell at 7:02pm. The CPO Board members present were introduced: Co-Chairmen: Bruce Powell and Angie Sundholm, Vice Co-Chairmen: Tom Farr and Ellen Sands, and Secretary: Kathy Lerum.

There were 38 people in attendance with 6 voting members. A voting member is one that has attended at least one meeting in the calendar year and that one of the attended meetings directly preceded the present meeting. The list of voting members for the evening was read: Bruce Powell, Angie Sundholm, Tom Farr, Ellen Sands, Kathy Lerum and Jim Smith.

Chairman Powell explained how the CPO meeting would run and the correct procedure for having a question on the floor. He also explained the purpose of the CPO is to let folks in the community know how the county process works and what is happening with land usage. The Carus CPO was formed in 1991 by Clackamas County as a venue for citizen participation. The Chairman taught how to properly articulate a testimony for land use effectively to the county. An outline was distributed to all in attendance. The best forum is to take any testimonies to the Planning Dep't. at Kane Rd. and get involved with the CPO so warning signs can be seen before a major change is made.

The question was asked as to how someone could access minutes of former meetings and the answer was that they are posted on the county website. As the CPO is only allowed \$150 a year for printing, etc. mailings are not always sent.

The people in attendance unanimously said they would like their names and phone numbers shared with those present so communication could be better established between neighbors. A list was copied and will be e-mailed to those who gave e-mail addresses. All present were reminded that Carus CPO meetings are held once a month on the 2nd Thursday of each month at Grand View Baptist Church at 7pm.

The question was asked as to what types of issues are voted on at a meeting: Co-Chairs Powell and Sundholm said, "county wide programs, proposals and land usage issues. Such as composting, water sheds, etc." Bruce also explained that when a land owner does something that requires more approval; the county has 15 days to process the initial application; CPO and land owners get notice of its application being processed; CPO can discuss land use action at the meeting and vote to give comments or recommendations to county within 15 days. A copy of the vote goes to the county planner wh then gives a yea or nay to the application. Must be within 120 days for administrative or 180 days for judicial decisions otherwise, if deadlines are missed the application will automatically be approved.

Business before the CPO:

William DeMills was introduced to present his application#Z0225-11

Mr. DeMills is applying for 2 dwellings to be built in the center of property next to the old barn. One dwelling is for the dairy family to inhabit and one is for the farm workers to indwell. The application

is for Novelty farming requiring Irrigation and someone on site 24/7. Operation started 1 year ago with a big garden. Will have a maximum of 50 dairy cows, 100 swine, 300 fryer chickens, 4,000 free range chickens, and turkeys.

Question from floor: "Novelty farming? We are concerned about the number of chickens making noise, the waste and not to mention, the odor!"

Mention was made of the land use application being viewable at the county website by listing the permit number.

Question: "4,000 free range chickens? How can the land support all of these animals when it has been recorded that the soil is already depleted in certain minerals, etc.?"

Answer from Mr.DeMills: "Our study shows that we can have a sustainable farm for 100 acres with the animals mentioned. So many chickens are necessary to spread the manure from the cows throughout the grounds so that larvae and parasites, flies, etc. will not accumulate. The cattle will be moved throughout the acreage every 30 days to avoid any problems with parasites, etc. Noted that nitrogen and a few other nutrients are deficient in the soil."

Angie Sundholm read a personal e-mail response to Bruce Powell from Mr. Hewitt that stated the size of the dwelling currently being built at 25,478 sq.ft. with 1,463 sq.ft. garage and a very large deck as well. In this communication it was stated that \$80,000 income over 2-3 out of 5 years seemed to have been met.

Question from the floor: A neighboring farm was not approved in the past on speculation; had to have an audit of the property before could proceed. Why is this not being done here?"

Question: "How does this operation show it has met the gross annual income of \$80,000 when it has only been in existence for 1 ½ years with the number of cattle only 5 at present?"

Question: "IRS form F is supposed to be submitted with the application and seems to be missing. What exactly is on the application form that meets the qualifications? An explanation would like to be had as to why the hand written numbers on the application do not seem to add up...\$10 gallon of milk? Every document doe not seem to have been presented."

Question: "Doesn't the Oregon State of Agriculture require a Dairy income licensing?"

Question: "On the application, it is being requested that 2 manufactured homes be put into place. There are already 2 dwellings and a 3rd one being built. (explained that the enormous house being built currently is to replace the old farm house that will be gone once house is finished). Are any of these buildings to be identified as farm operations?"

Answer from Mr. DeMills: "Yes., the new ones.

Question: The CPO would like to address road use. The roads are already being impacted by the construction currently in progress. Road access is of concern to the residents as the only way to the property is through residential that is being converted to farm area. Also, the traffic noise.

Question: Originally the application was for 1 dwelling; why the additional dwelling added?"

Answer from Mr. DeMills: "The county approved for # of workers needed 24/7 and that requires another dwelling."

Chairman Powell explained that the county states that Mr. DeMills must provide evidence of the number of hours worked allowing that 50 hours is the normal work week of dairy farmers, etc.

Question: "Will you be having humane animal practices? Will you be slaughtering on site?"

Answered from DeMills: "Yes, we do humane animal practices. That is why we have free range chickens instead of caged chickens. Caged chickens must be de-beaked so as not to peck each other to death. Cows are out to pasture and not confined to a stall. We will only be killing chickens on property."

Question: Understand that a quick deed was done on June 12th and that John no longer owns land. How does this affect the application? In public record?

Powell explained that deeds submitted but not recorded are not officially recognized as in record".

Question: "Why with a 25,000+ sq.ft. primary residence being built is it necessary for additional dwellings? 10 families could live in that residence alone.

Not answered

Question: "Residency is in question. Not paying Oregon State taxes? Owner using Vancouver address as a mailing address? Doesn't seem right."

Question: "Residential farmers living next door...they go to sleep at night...don't understand why the need for 2 residential homes if just "novelty farming"and not truly a full blown dairy operation.

Question:"How many workers are needed to fully operate?"

Answer from DeMills: "2."

Question: "Will there be any processing on the property?"

Answer from DeMills: "No."

Question:"How do you plan to get the feed to all 1,000's of animals? The trucks are already tearing up the roads. How many loads of feed a week will it take to feed 50 cows, etc. Concerned for impact on road, traffic and road maintenance concerns."

Answer: "Planning to bring in small mini vans."

Question: "Where will your products be sold?"

Answer: "To local families; ordered through the website and delivered 5 days a week."

Question: "Will you be making cheese and butter on site?"

Answer: "Yes, once permits are acquired. Eggs will be processed daily."

Question: "Will there be agricultural times of operations? How early in the morning and how late at night? We don't want to be annoyed by noise all night long."

No answer.

Concerns of crowd: Semis bringing the feed to animals; traffic, transportation studies, multiple dwellings; hours of operation; noise; application for dwelling but concern for dairy operation in future.

Question: "Detailed site map with outlined acreage usage? Where is proposed acreage usage? No certificate of water systems identified? Marketing permits?"

Tom Farr addressed the item of how we deal with problems seen in county that do not seem quite right. He talked about the compliance issue and that unless a neighbor complains to the county, nothing will be done. To address this, contact Scott Caufield at the county.

Discussion was held on how a compliance survey was taken in Feb and the results showed that 60% of the people who participated wanted more action taken.

Chairman Powell brought the discussion back to the DeMills proposal and said that questions can be raised and recommendations made and asked for a proposal from the floor.

Jim Smith moved to have the CPO submit the questions raised to the county with no recommendations at this time until more information is made available to the CPO. And that with this information given, discussion to be tabled until the next meeting on August 11th.

It was seconded by Kathy Lerum. Call for discussion: The people present want to delay the applications approval due to incomplete information and seemingly flaws in application.

Vote was 5 in favor and 1 abstention.

The question was asked "what happens if denied?"

Chairman answered by saying that the next step was the planner would render a decision and that can either be accepted or put up for appeal.

Question: "If I am just a resident hearing of acceptance for the first time, can I appeal?"

Answer: "No, not unless you had put input or comments to said application beforehand. Make sure that when you do apply for appeal, etc. that all correspondence has name, address, etc. listed."

OLD BUSINESS concluded.

NEW BUSINESS:

Procedural items were noted by Angie Sundholm: Prop Owners petition dated July 6th to divid acreage into 2 plots.

Note: the Traffic Safety Commission is looking for volunteers.

Clackamas Fire District Newsletter available for looking over;'Rules for burning, etc.

Clackamas County Open House Thursday, July 21st at County Development Bldng.

With no more New Business, Tom Farr motioned we adjourn the meeting and Angie Sundholm seconded. Unanimous in favor!

Meeting Adjourned at 8:45pm

Minutes of the Carus CPO meeting held August 11, 2011 at Grand View Baptist Church:

The meeting was called to order at 7:05pm by CPO chairman, Angie Sundholm with 20 people in attendance. The minutes of the previous meeting were read and as no additions or corrections were noted, it was moved to accept and was unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

Chairman Sundholm announced that land use application #Z0225-11 for John and Chauncy Childs, which was discussed at length at the previous meeting, had been approved by the county and that all information regarding said application can be viewed at the county website. It was noted that the county did acknowledge receipt of the CPO's comments but that no further response had been given. Ms. Sundholm answered the question of how to file appeals to the county. A \$250 appeal fee and formal letter of appeal would need to be filed; also, contact Gary Hewitt who is in charge of applications and get a hearing set up. Much discussion was had over the approval. Many of the surrounding neighbors expressed alarm at the way row crops were planted on the property which would result in massive flooding on neighbor's property when the rains begin. Those present voiced concern over the fact that the county did not seem to follow proper procedures and there seemed to be an issue of inconsistency. It was moved by Mr. Mark Hillyard that the Carus CPO file a request of findings and specifications for applications approval and the justifications for said approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Art Bridge. Vote was 19 in favor, 1 abstention. Mr. Bridge also said he would like to see evidence of the \$80,000 criteria having been met and an audit of the records.

The question was asked as to how effective the CPO can be in affecting change if the Clackamas County does not respond to concerns. Discussion was heard with personal testimonies of applications that had previously been denied and accepted.

No further Old Business.

NEW BUSINESS:

Land Use #Z0354-11

This is a Measure 37/49 property now applying for the 23-acre parcel to be divided into 3 parcels (3 home sites) with access. The neighbors had previously okayed easement for 1 dwelling but not three. It was mentioned that there seems to be legal documents that would take issue with the application. Mr. Bridge stated that the concern of the members present was that the amounts of time neighbors have to be notified of CPO meetings and land usage items did not seem to be enough. It was stated that online access to applications need to be available sooner as the notification was just received this afternoon. Chairman Sundholm did note that the notification from the county did seem to be in order but did not allow for much time.

It was moved by Kathryn Sorenson and seconded by Dennis Hoffman to have the CPO request that the planning staff address in their findings the effect that both the covenants and restrictions document and easement documents have on the application. 18 in favor, 1 abstention and 1 not voting.

With no more discussion, the chairman presented the monthly Fire District newsletter for reading and announced the next meeting as Thursday, September 8, 2011. With no more New Business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:16pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Mrs. Kathy Lerum, Carus CPO Secretary