

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT

January 13, 2026

Jonathan Tallman has, as of the writing of this response, submitted 5 emails that could be construed as comment to the Parks Master Plan (PMP) adoption public record. Staff will address those submittals here.

Email #1: The first email indicates that it is submitted “solely to preserve the administrative record and to request procedural clarity prior to any final action.” It goes on to list the following five headings with additional text.

1. Landowner Record Preservation
2. Relationship to Other Active Proceedings
3. Request for Clarification and Procedural Safeguards
4. Reservation of Rights
5. Prior Acquisition Discussions (Record Context)

Staff Response: The City of Boardman maintains records of public hearings and other proceedings as required by Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR). No other procedure is required, and it is unclear what Mr. Tallman is requesting. Under item #1 if he wishes to maintain his own records for this action that is entirely up to him and is not governed by any ORS or OAR. As to any relationship of the Parks Master Plan (PMP) to other documents it would not impact the adoption process for the PMP. The public hearing in this matter is pertinent to only the PMP and would not impact the TSP. Nor would it have any impact on adoptions by Morrow County for the Heritage Trail. For the third bullet Mr. Tallman needs to understand that the PMP is a planning level document. It does not authorize the City of Boardman to purchase property or build a park or trail facility. Those future actions may be based on recommendations of the PMP but will have specific approval processes that will need to be followed at that time. Item 4 appears to state that Mr. Tallman would not like to see any park improvements on his property. It should be made clear that none are planned. For item 5 he is requesting correspondence prior to any acquisition of his property which would be required should the City of Boardman pursue any park development on said property.

Email #2: This email was in response to the City of Boardman updating the Public Hearing meeting packet to address changes to the PMP and its appendix. He is asking if the amended version “will supersede the previously posted” document and if it is “the version intended to be relied upon by the Board” and if the “document will be clearly posted and accessible to the public in advance of the meeting.”

Staff Response: Staff would respond “YES” to all three of those questions. It was posted last Friday, January 9, at about 1:00 p.m. and will be the document to be adopted unless the City Council identifies any further amendments.

Email #3: This email seems to address the Morrow County Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) with direct comment to the Heritage Trail.

Staff Response: This is not a process that the City of Boardman has any say in, nor does the adoption of Morrow County's CIP affect the PMP. He also sends this email to the City of Boardman but consistently addresses the Boardman Park and Recreation District's process and adoption of the PMP. He requests inclusion of the Intergovernmental Agreement relied upon for the collaboration of the City and District in the development of the PMP. Should he want to review that document he can submit a Public Records Request, but it is not a document that would be presented as part of an adoption process for the resulting document, in this case the PMP. He also attached a Land Use Board of Appeals Final Opinion in LUBA No. 2022-062. It is unclear the intent of this inclusion, but the City responded to this remand in late 2023 with a final decision issued in early 2024 with public notice provided to Mr. Tallman at the time. The last item in this email is a request for a redline version and a request to allow for the record to remain open using a 7-7-7 procedure. The City Council does not need to require either of these items to be accomplished. A document was also provided as part of the January 9 posting that outlines the changes; the request, and the type of request for a 7-7-7 procedure, for the record to remain open is applicable to quasi-judicial proceedings (the application of the law) with this being a legislative procedure (the adoption of the law).

Email #4: This email appears to restate the items identified in Email #2 and #3.

Staff Response: See previous responses to Email #2 and #3. Staff emphasize again that the PMP is a planning level document. It does not authorize acquisition of land nor the development of park or trail facilities.

Email #5: This email addresses Mr. Tallman's perspective concerning changes made to the PMP posted on January 6 and the amended version posted on January 9. He then restates much of the same information from Emails #2, #3, and #4.

Staff Response: There are no unresolved issues with the record. There was an amended version of the PMP, and its appendices uploaded on Friday, January 9, which included a separate document that outlined the changes. Clearly the version for adoption is the Amended version posted on January 9. Mr. Tallman also includes a reference to a Records Request that he submitted in 2025 to which Ms. Mickels has responded with an estimated cost. If Mr. Tallman wants the City to move forward assembling the requested documents, he needs to pay the invoiced amount of over \$16,000. This does not have any applicability to the PMP adoption which is the action that is before the City Council as part of the Public Hearing and meeting on January 13, 2026.