

From: [Jonathan Tallman](#)
To: [Stephanie Case](#); [Amanda Mickles](#); [Brandon Hammond](#); [Derrin Tallman](#); [randylbaker55@gmail.com](#); [HERT Dawn * DLCD](#); [Sam Diaz](#); [Eve Goldman](#); [DIRECTOR Dlcd * DLCD](#); [Barrett Dash](#)
Subject: Written Testimony and Request to Continue the Record — RVW26-000039
Date: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 6:17:22 AM
Attachments: [Planning city August 20.pdf](#)

Stephanie, Brandon, and Members of the Planning Commission,

Please accept this email and the attached materials as my written testimony for the August 20, 2026 public hearing concerning RVW26-000039, Guna Collaborative/Freehold LLC, Tax Lot 423. Please distribute this submission to every Planning Commissioner and include it in the complete official record.

I am not opposing reasonable development. I am requesting substantial evidence and adequate findings demonstrating that the proposal complies with the Boardman Development Code, the adopted 2025 Transportation System Plan, and all applicable access, public-facility, parking, conditional-use, and notice requirements.

My concerns are as follows:

1. Incomplete public packet

The findings identify a vicinity map, site maps, trip-generation letter, and applicant narrative as attachments, but those materials do not appear in the 19-page public packet available to me.

Without those documents, the public cannot independently evaluate the proposed driveways, access-spacing measurements, 60-foot easement, parking, truck circulation, landscaping, adjoining-property impacts, trip estimates, or TSP compliance.

Please provide the complete application, all listed attachments, the complete trip-generation letter, agency comments, easement documents, and every revised site plan.

2. Public notice of the conditional-use request

The agenda describes an equipment-rental, storage, and service facility but does not clearly disclose that the applicant is also seeking Type III conditional-use approval for three strands of barbed wire. The agenda identifies BDC Chapters 4.2, 2.2.180, and 3, but does not identify Chapter 4.4 among the applicable criteria.

Please provide copies of the mailed and published notices and confirm whether they disclosed:

- The barbed-wire conditional-use request;
- BDC Chapter 4.4;
- The applicable conditional-use criteria; and
- The public's opportunity to address that request.

If the conditional use and applicable criteria were omitted, I request that the City renote the matter and provide a new hearing opportunity.

3. Adopted 2025 TSP and future street connectivity

The adopted 2025 TSP identifies R-18 as a development-driven extension of SE First Street from Oregon Trail Boulevard to Wilson Road at collector standards.

I am not asserting that the expressly described R-18 segment crosses Tax Lot 423, which appears to be located north of Oregon Trail Boulevard. However, this property fronts the northern portion of SE First Street and contains a 60-foot road-and-utility easement.

The TSP identifies preferred future local-street connections and expressly states that their specific alignments and designs will be determined during development review. This proceeding is a development review at which that analysis should occur.

Please identify whether Tax Lot 423 or its 60-foot easement:

- Connects to the northern continuation of SE First Street;
- Is shown as or needed for a future local-street connection;
- Must provide future connectivity to R-18 or another planned street;
- Must preserve cross-access or a street stub to adjoining property;
- Is subject to an applicable collector, neighborhood-collector, or local-street cross-section; or
- Is needed for utilities or other supporting infrastructure identified in the TSP.

Please provide the relevant TSP maps and current Public Works cross-section standards and explain how the proposed development complies.

4. Access-spacing measurements

BDC Table 3.1.200(G) requires private-driveway spacing of:

- 75 feet on a collector;
- 50 feet on a neighborhood collector; and
- 15 feet on a local street.

The findings approve two 30-foot commercial driveways but do not identify SE First Street's functional classification, provide the measured distance between the driveways, provide the measured distance from the nearest driveway to the SE Front Street intersection, or identify the method used to measure compliance.

The findings also do not explain whether the 60-foot easement is treated as a street, driveway, access point, utility corridor, or future transportation connection.

The statement that the closest access to SE Front Street is an existing access easement does not establish compliance without the applicable classification, measurements, methodology, and supporting site plan.

Please provide that information and identify any variance necessary to authorize a deviation.

5. Required improvements and Public Works standards

The 2025 TSP explains that collectors directly serve commercial and industrial land uses and accommodate bicycle and pedestrian movement. It further states that applicable roadway cross-sections are contained in the City's Public Works Standards and recognizes that transportation-project costs may be funded partly through private development.

BDC 3.4.100 requires streets within or adjacent to development to be improved consistently with the TSP.

Please identify the current cross-section and all improvements triggered by this development, including:

- Roadway width;
- Right-of-way;
- Curbs;
- Sidewalks;
- Bicycle facilities;
- Lighting;
- Utilities;
- Cross-access;
- Future street connections; and
- Any improvement guarantee or development agreement.

If the City concludes that any normally applicable improvement is not required, please identify the evidence and Code authority supporting that conclusion.

6. Relevance of the 2022 Loop Road decision

Although the 2022 Loop Road proceeding involved a different property and roadway, it remains relevant to the required analytical process.

LUBA held that the City must identify and justify the applicable functional classification and make adequate findings addressing right-of-way width, paved-roadway width, and required lateral improvements.

I am not asserting that the Loop Road's classification or former dimensional standards automatically govern RVW26-000039. I am requesting that the City conduct the same required analysis for SE First Street and the 60-foot easement under the currently adopted TSP, current Public Works Standards, and Development Code.

The City should not repeat the earlier problem by announcing compliance without identifying the controlling classification, standards, measurements, and supporting evidence.

7. Two commercial access points

BDC 3.1.200 requires commercial access points to be minimized and authorizes or requires shared access, cross-access, driveway consolidation, frontage streets, and stubs to adjoining developable properties when applicable.

The findings merely conclude that two separate 30-foot driveways are appropriate. Please explain:

- Why two driveways are necessary;
- Why one consolidated access would not be adequate;
- Why shared access or cross-access is not feasible;
- Whether the driveways comply with the applicable spacing standard;
- Whether they interfere with the 60-foot easement; and

- Whether access must be stubbed or preserved for adjoining developable property.

8. Traffic and heavy-truck circulation

The applicant reportedly estimates 66 daily trips, including 18 heavy-truck trips. Even if those numbers fall below the threshold for a full traffic-impact study, that does not independently establish compliance with BDC Chapters 3.1 and 3.4, the TSP, or the Main Street IAMP.

The findings should address:

- Safe truck ingress and egress;
- Truck turning movements and driveway storage;
- On-site maneuvering and loading;
- Whether trucks can exit without backing onto a public street;
- Effects on the SE First/SE Front intersection;
- Cumulative development and traffic;
- The project's relationship to the Main Street interchange; and
- Whether the trip estimate remains accurate if the required parking, use classification, or operational intensity changes.

Please identify the methodology, data, proposed operating hours, fleet size, and operational assumptions used in the trip-generation letter.

9. Unresolved parking requirement

The applicant proposes 14 parking spaces, but the findings indicate that either 25 or 51 spaces may be required. The packet also contains unresolved internal comments stating, "Multi use, is it auto retail? Or general business" and "Come back."

The Commission cannot determine compliance until the City:

- Identifies the correct use classification;
- Determines the applicable parking formula;
- Calculates the required number of spaces;
- Receives a revised site plan; and
- Determines whether additional parking changes landscaping, stormwater, driveway spacing, circulation, or trip generation.

10. Application completeness and later review

BDC 4.2.600 requires a finding that the application is complete. Staff instead describes it as only "generally complete."

Condition 1 also requires the applicant to submit a future Development Review application even though this proceeding is presented as a development and site-design review.

Please explain:

- Whether the present application is complete;
- Exactly what is being approved now;
- What material issues are being postponed;
- Whether a revised site plan will receive public review;

- Whether the later review will be ministerial; and
- How the Commission can presently find compliance when parking, access, and other design matters remain unresolved.

11. Permitted-use determination

The findings state that machinery or heavy-equipment sales and service are permitted and that this equipment-rental, storage, repair, wash-bay, and outdoor-yard proposal is “similar in nature.”

Please identify the Code provision authorizing that similarity determination and explain why the complete operation—including rental, repair, washing, outdoor storage, heavy-truck activity, and barbed-wire security—is consistent with the Tourist Commercial Subdistrict.

12. Conditional-use findings for barbed wire

The findings should separately address all applicable BDC 4.4.400 criteria, including:

- Site adequacy;
- Traffic and public safety;
- Noise and vibration;
- Dust and emissions;
- Lighting and glare;
- Impacts on adjacent properties;
- Compatibility with the Tourist Commercial Subdistrict;
- Public-facility capacity; and
- Conditions necessary to minimize negative impacts.

The present findings do not appear to provide a complete conditional-use analysis.

13. Wash-bay wastewater and stormwater

The proposal includes a wash bay, but the findings do not adequately explain how wash water, oil, grease, sediment, detergents, or other contaminants will be managed.

Please identify:

- Whether wash water will enter the sanitary-sewer system;
- Whether pretreatment or an oil-water separator is required;
- Whether the wastewater system has adequate capacity;
- Whether a discharge permit is required;
- How contaminated water will be prevented from entering the stormwater system; and
- Which agencies reviewed the proposed system.

14. Public-facility capacity

The findings state generally that the project will connect to existing water, sewer, and utilities but do not identify the supporting capacity evidence.

Please provide documentation establishing adequate:

- Domestic water service;

- Fire flow;
- Wastewater capacity;
- Stormwater management;
- Street capacity;
- Utility capacity; and
- Emergency access.

15. Agency review

The packet states that agencies were notified on August 13, only seven days before the hearing.

Please identify all responding agencies and provide their written comments, including comments from Public Works, the City Engineer, Fire Marshal, utility providers, and wastewater and stormwater reviewers. The public should have a meaningful opportunity to review and respond to any materials submitted after publication of the packet.

16. Sign standards

The findings quote a sign provision containing an unfilled blank for the Development Code adoption date.

Please identify which sign regulations are currently effective and explain how the Commission can rely on an unfinished provision as an approval criterion.

17. Consistent application of access and development standards

As a Boardman landowner, I have been required to address restrictive access conditions based substantially on future transportation planning and future roadway implementation.

The City should explain the objective standards permitting two commercial access points for this development and how those standards are applied consistently to similarly situated Boardman properties.

I am not asking the Commission to decide another property's application in this proceeding. I am requesting a transparent and consistent explanation of the standards applied to RVW26-000039.

Requested action

I respectfully request that the Planning Commission not approve RVW26-000039 on the present record.

If the City or applicant cannot provide the complete application, missing attachments, notice documents, easement information, agency comments, applicable TSP classification, Public Works standards, driveway measurements, revised parking plan, wastewater analysis, and complete findings before or during the hearing, I request that:

1. The hearing and written record remain open;
2. All new materials be made publicly available;
3. The public receive a meaningful opportunity to review and respond;
4. The Commission deliberate only after that response period; and

5. The matter be renoticed if the conditional-use request or applicable criteria were omitted from the original public notice.

Please confirm receipt of this testimony, its distribution to every Planning Commissioner, and its inclusion in the complete official record for RVW26-000039.

Respectfully,

Jonathan Tallman
Boardman landowner