

**Summary and Staff Response to 10/14/25 Public Testimony  
(187-25-000114-PLNG, EOA)**

[ - ] comments | [ \_\_ ] staff response

- Comments suggest the EOA contains omissions, misstatements, and problems.
- (p 2, EOA) Comments provide that reference to \$100 million “grant” from the Oregon legislature should be a reference to \$100 million in “general obligation bonds”.

**Response:** It is understood that the State has funded an investment in the PCIP project. Terms used to describe this funding include “grant”, “investment”, “bonding”, “GO bonds”, etc. The purpose of this information is to identify that the State is supporting the project.

- (p 13, EOA) Comments provide that the paragraph on “increases in automation” does not identify implications to the shipping container industry.

**Response:** This section presents a summary of national, state, and regional economic trends on the City’s economic growth. The discussion on increases in automation do not expressly discuss implications to the shipping container industry because it is meant to provide broader discussion on impacts to all businesses across industrial and commercial sectors, which, as applicable, are assumed to apply to the shipping container industry.

- (p 26, EOA) Comments state that reference to the proposed shipping container terminal lying “at the center of a major West Coast logistics corridor (that) creates new opportunities for long-term economic growth” is questionable due to the constraints of the existing rail and road transportation facilities.

**Response:** This section presents a summary of the City’s competitive advantages, of which an expanded Port is only one of many advantages identified. It is understood that improvements to the existing transportation systems are a likely component of any future Port expansion project; the Executive Summary as well as the Summary of Effect of National, State, and Regional Trends on Economic Development in Coos Bay point out that Port expansion is contingent on infrastructure investment, including but not limited to channel modifications and rail line upgrades. Regardless, Port expansion remains an advantage due to the additional local services needed to support the industry and its employees, some of which are presumed will locate in the City.

- (p 32, EOA) Comments point out that expansion of the Port would impact the City’s employment projections, and emphasizes this is problematic.

**Response:** This section sets forth the expected employment growth and land demand needs for the City. It identifies expansion of the Port has the potential to cause a major change in employment forecasting during the planning period and factors this into the

City's expected employment growth and land demand needs with the intent of preparing the City for all potential employment growth as is the point of an EOA.

- Comments suggest the EOA relies heavily on potential Port expansion and does not adequately address environmental impact concerns.

**Response:** The purpose of the EOA is not to complete a comprehensive analysis of any one industry or project. As such, potential environmental impacts of a potential project will not be contemplated in an EOA. The EOA clearly identifies that a potential Port expansion, if completed, will have significant impacts on the amount and types of employment opportunities for Coos Bay and that is all that the EOA will or should consider in this case.

- Comments suggest that some proposed text amendments can be construed to be unqualified endorsements and active support for the proposed PCIP project and that references to supporting development of a deep-draft channel should be removed; further, it would be irresponsible to approve proposed Policy 3.9 as-is because the EOA conflicts with the Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan. Example, proposed *Policy 3.9 – Support the Port of Coos Bay in its development efforts for transportation linkage and to develop a deep-draft channel to accommodate large cargo vessels and increase shipping activities and water-dependent uses.*

**Response:** This is an existing policy (refer to Policy 6.2) that has simply been reorganized and renumbered to fit within revised goals. Further, the EOA does not by itself authorize a Port project nor does it allow the Council to authorize a Port project outside of all other permits, processes, rules, and regulations that would, otherwise, apply. It is simply a guidance document based on a snapshot of the best available data at the time. It is understood that the Port expansion will necessitate other plan updates and permit approvals, all of which stand separate from the EOA.

*Existing Policy 6.2 - Support the Port of Coos Bay in its development efforts for transportation linkage and to develop a deep-draft channel to accommodate large cargo vessels and increase shipping activities and water-dependent uses.*

*Proposed Policy 3.9 – Support the Port of Coos Bay in its development efforts for transportation linkage and to develop a deep-draft channel to accommodate large cargo vessels and increase shipping activities and water-dependent uses.*

- Comments suggest that robust Tribal consultation and further study is needed to understand the full impact of the PCIP project on the local economy and request the EOA support existing industries such as fishing, tourism, and healthcare.

**Response:** Representatives of the local Coquille Indian Tribe and the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians were included on the Project Advisory Committee for the EOA update project. The EOA identifies tourism, the recreational, cultural, and healthcare economies as assets and sets forth policies in support of those assets (refer to proposed Policies 1.4, 1.5, and 2.8).

*Proposed Policy 1.4 - Continue to facilitate efforts to enhance Coos Bay as a medical center for the surrounding area.*

*Proposed Policy 1.5 – Promote eco-tourism activities and the exploration and enjoyment of our natural surroundings.*

*Proposed Policy 2.8 - Encourage expansion of recreational, cultural and eco-tourism industries by supporting, enhancing and expanding amenities and infrastructure from waterfront development to lodging options, including shopping, arts and entertainment.*

- (p iii, EOA) Comments ask that there be no statements about leveraging the potential expansion of the Port.

**Response:** The intent of an EOA is to forecast economic growth and land needs based on the best available data at the time. It is reasonable that the City plan leverage, not rely on, potential opportunities including but not limited to Port expansion.

*Potential Expansion of the Port: While the city should not rely on the potential Port of Coos Bay's Pacific Coast Intermodal Port expansion for its economic future, it should plan to leverage the expansion and the potential employment as a key opportunity. The Port expansion would likely result in local jobs related to logistics, support services, and related commercial and industrial uses. (p iii, EOA)*

- (p 24-25, EOA) Comments suggest projected job numbers (9,400), development cost numbers (\$2.3 billion), and funding numbers (\$100 million) are inaccurate.

**Response:** Staff and Consultant worked with the Port and State economic agencies to identify this data; it is based on a snapshot of time and is assumed will likely change as the project evolves. Not all project jobs, rather 600 to 1,200 jobs, are attributed to Coos County and it is assumed the City of Coos Bay may realize only a portion of those projected jobs. Still, any increase in jobs/employment has an impact to the City that should be considered in the City's EOA. Project cost numbers and funding numbers have no actual impact on the EOA other than to identify the scope of and support for a project contemplated in the analysis.

- Comments suggest that existing Goals 5 and 6 should not be removed.

Existing Goal 5 - *Recruit sustainable industries and industries that provide “green-collar” jobs.*

Existing Goal 6 - *Maximize use of Coos Bay’s unique geographic and recreational assets and cultural heritage.*

**Response:** Many of the existing goals and policies have been reorganized and renumbered into the updated goals and policies, they are intended to be broader moving forward and less narrowly focused which creates a more streamlined document and affords the greatest amount of flexibility for use and ensures all areas of the City benefit as opposed to a select few. Examples of existing policies that remain include: existing Policy 5.1 is now proposed Policy 4.2.; existing Policy 6.3 is now proposed Policy 2.5; existing Policy 6.4 is now proposed Policy 2.6; etc.

- Comments suggest the EOA is not consistent with ORS and Oregon Statewide Planning Goals.

**Response:** ECONorthwest prepared the updated EOA as a consultant experienced in preparation of EOAs. Staff has zero concerns it is inconsistent with the regulations governing EOAs.

*Chelsea Schnabel*

Chelsea Schnabel, AICP, CFM | Community Development Director

October 17, 2025

Date