



# City of Coos Bay PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

RCV'D 10/14/25  
12:00 p.m.

CMS

The City of Coos Bay values our citizen's input and participation in our various councils, boards, and commissions. In an effort to encourage access to participation, we have established a process by which the public can provide written comments in advance which allows for potential timely addition to the agenda topics of interest to the public. Each council meeting provides for a public comment period, as well as when a public hearing is held. Public comment is an opportunity to share information or concern with the council. Public comment is limited to three (3) minutes, per individual.

The Public Comments period is designated for topics not already included on the agenda and is intended for the public to share ideas and concerns; it is not intended for an interactive discussion with Council. There may be opportunities for public comments during specific agenda items, members of the public are requested to confine their remarks to questions or issues under discussion during this time. During ANY designated comment period, individuals shall not engage in personal attacks, shall not impugn the motives of any speaker, and shall at all times, while in session conduct themselves in an appropriate manner. No person shall make personal, impertinent, slanderous or unauthorized remarks or become boisterous while addressing the Council.

If you wish to provide public comment at an upcoming meeting, please fill out this form and submit to [publiccomment@coosbayor.gov](mailto:publiccomment@coosbayor.gov). You may also mail or hand deliver your completed form to 500 Central Avenue, Coos Bay, OR 97420; fax to 541-267-5912; or leave in the drop box at the front doors at City Hall. Completed forms must be received by 1:00 pm the day of the meeting to be added to Public Comment List.

### Public Comment Rules:

- Public Comment Form must be completed before speaking.
- Limited to three (3) minutes per speaker.
- Coos Bay residents and business will be given preference for addressing the council during the time allotted for public comment.
- Speakers may not convey/donate their time to another speaker.
- Council cannot engage in question/answer conversations with the speaker.
- Questions/concerns about operations should be handled by city staff during regular business hours.
- The presiding officer has responsibility of enforcement of these rules, and may alter the order of speakers for efficiency.

Name: Steve Miller  
 Address: 1556 N. 20<sup>th</sup> St. Coos Bay, OR 97420  
 Phone: 541-269-7727 Email: smiller4547@gmail.com

- I wish to speak to the City Council on the following agenda item/issue:  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- I have previously addressed the City Council on this issue.
- In lieu of speaking, I request the City Recorder to include my written comments into the public record (comment area provided on page two).

By signing below, I acknowledge the above public comment rules. Pursuant to ORS 192.420, this document is considered a public record and disclosure may be required upon request.

**SIGNATURE REQUIRED**

**DATE**

Steve Miller

10/14/2025

RCV'D 10/14/25  
12:00 P.M.  
CMS

City of Coos Bay Planning Commission Meeting, Oct. 14, 2025

Public Hearing to Consider repeal and replacement of the 2009 City of Coos Bay Economic Opportunity Analysis with the 2025 City of Coos Bay Economic Opportunities Analysis

Written testimony of Steve Miller, 1556 N. 20<sup>th</sup> St. Coos Bay, Oregon

Note: Please include this written testimony in the record of this hearing

Dear Commissioners,

The 2025 document submitted to replace the 2009 predecessor contains several omissions, misstatements, and problems that seriously diminish the applicability of the economic opportunities analysis of the 2025 replacement as a guiding document for the City of Coos Bay and its residents. These follow below:

- On Pg. 23 of the introduction to Attachment A, Exhibit 1 (second bullet point) it is stated that the Port of Coos Bay's proposed Pacific Coast Intermodal Port container shipping facility recently was approved for a \$100 million *grant* by the Oregon legislature. The legislative record shows that this was not a grant but authorization for issuance and sale of \$100 million in General Obligation bonds. These may possibly go on sale between Spring of 2026 or sometime in 2027, with certain conditions that must be met by the Port and its partner.
- On pg. 34, two paragraphs below, Increases in Automation has its own bullet point. It's the longest text discussion of the 12 bullet points listed under the above overall heading. There is a description of the trend of automation as it may affect jobs locally. It states that: "Coos Bay's mix of industries like healthcare, accommodation and food services, and retail means it likely has roles across the automation risk spectrum. But despite this statement, there is no recognition that at this time a rapidly strengthening global trend to automation of the container terminal industry is a top industrial trend worldwide, and will reasonably threaten thousands of the direct permanent jobs promised for the proposed PCIP.

At a soon to open Saudi container terminal, 12 workers are being trained to remotely operate all the terminal's mechanized lift equipment that unloads, moves, and loads containers. At the more than 80 terminals that are fully automated globally there have been reductions in labor needed ranging from 50-75% or more. After higher initial costs, automated terminals will enjoy a competitive advantage over labor-intensive facilities.

- On pg. 47 The statement that the proposed container terminal would lie "at the center of a major West Coast logistics corridor and creates new opportunities for long-term economic growth is clearly questionable. This seems to imply that a Coos Bay container terminal could serve as an extraordinarily capable rail and road pathway onto the US supply chain. However, the realities of both rail and road transport are seriously impaired by route constraints and the distance from Class 1 rail service, which will also require hundreds of miles of travel north or south by rail before turning east toward the central US transport hubs populations. The roads turning inland from our coast are slow, mountainous routes that already experience congested traffic, late Spring through Fall, which will not support potentially thousands of additional tractor trailer trips daily transporting shipping containers from the PCIP.
- On pg. 53, anticipating the PCIP project, the Analysis rightly points out that employment that could result from constructing a Pacific Coast Intermodal Port... "would exceed the growth anticipated by the City's current employment forecast..." placing strain on land available for businesses, housing, parks, and other uses. This has remained a persistent problem for decades.

#### A Need for Due Diligence by City officials and Elected Representatives

Throughout the 2025 Economic Opportunities Analysis, there are at least seven (7) direct and indirect references to the proposed PCIP container terminal project, more than any other potential or existing business expansion described in the document. The business opportunities described in the report appear to bank very heavily on the proposed container terminal and the promises project supporters and employees have made for the economic opportunities and benefits it could bring.

However, there has been almost no public recognition or discussion by our Port of Coos Bay and its private partner of the industrial and economic environment container terminals worldwide operate in today---its highly competitive and very uncertain future. There has also been very little information presented by the Port and its partner of the problems they face in development and operation of a successful container terminal project and the specific conditions residents of the area would be expected to accept where they live, work, and recreate.

There has been no apparent reflection by preparers of this Analysis and some local officials, on the negative economic consequences for the valuable recreation and tourism sector of our economy by dredging the most highly productive lower 8-miles of the Bay supporting that economic sector. Thousands of local residents also highly prize that area for the wealth of historic, cultural, recreational, and foods it produces.

Some proposed text amendments to the Coos Bay Comprehensive Plan

Some proposed text amendments to the Coos Bay Comprehensive Plan presented as an agenda item for the same Oct. 14<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting contain language for text amendments that can be construed to be unqualified endorsements and active support for the proposed PCIP project. There is no evidence that review of details of the proposed project, studies done for permits, or review of issued permits has been completed by the City of Coos Bay to indicate it has done the due diligence expected of public officials and representatives to justify making those text amendments.

Thank you for receiving my comments for the record of the Oct. 14, 2025 meeting of the Coos Bay Planning Commission.

Sincerely,

Steve Miller  
1556 N. 20<sup>th</sup> St.  
Coos Bay, OR 97420  
541-269-7727



**Rogue  
Climate**

[www.rogueclimate.org](http://www.rogueclimate.org) || PO BOX 1980, Phoenix OR, 97535  
South Coast Office: 153 N. Broadway, Coos Bay, 97420 ||  
541-816-0758  
Rogue Valley Office: 205 N. Phoenix Rd, Suite G || 541-301-9204

Tuesday, October 14, 2025

To: Chelsea Schnabel (Community Development Director) and the City of Coos Bay Planning Commission

Subject: Land Use Application #187-25-000114-PLNG

Thank you for the opportunity to comment this evening on the land use application that seeks to replace the 2009 Economic Opportunity Analysis (EOA) with the recently conducted 2025 version. We applaud the City of Coos Bay for taking the time to host a committee, conduct surveys, and more to develop an economic analysis that is meant to reflect the future of growth for the region.

While we agree with general goals that include “strengthen and diversify the local economy”, we must ask for a continuance due to the **goal 3.9** that lists:

“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.”

Listing this within the Comprehensive Plan goal and associated policies may have implications for how to effectively evaluate permit applications. This expresses bias for projects that are listed in the EOA, such as the Pacific Coast Intermodal Project (PCIP). We request that the City of Coos Bay exclude this specific language from the policies in the EOA document, as developing a deep-draft channel may impact goals such as “strengthen and diversify the local economy.” The EOA lists language to suggest that there could be “upwards of 9,400 regional jobs” from the PCIP that appears to be speculative without any citations to support this number. As Statewide Planning Goal 9 suggests, EOAs are meant to focus on concise needs and trends for economic development. As the PCIP currently stands, the project has not been fully designed nor started the permit process. The PCIP is expected to apply for goal exceptions in future permit processes regarding statewide planning Goal 16 because the PCIP is at odds with the Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan. It would be irresponsible for the City of Coos Bay to approve Goal 3.9 as currently stands.



**Rogue  
Climate**

[www.rogueclimate.org](http://www.rogueclimate.org) || PO BOX 1980, Phoenix OR, 97535  
South Coast Office: 153 N. Broadway, Coos Bay, 97420 ||  
541-816-0758  
Rogue Valley Office: 205 N. Phoenix Rd, Suite G || 541-301-9204

Existing industries such as commercial and recreational fishing, tourism, conservation, and more depend on a healthy estuary. The Coos Estuary is considered to be the nursery bed for fish and shellfish industries and acts as a carbon sink. A healthy estuary protects our coastline and nearby communities from the impacts of flooding and extreme storms, making this region a climate refuge for people seeking relief from wildfire and smoke that were highlighted in the analysis. Developing a deep-draft channel would have irreversible impacts on essential habitats, cultural resources, and nearby communities. Robust Tribal consultation and further study is needed to understand the full scope of these impacts to the local economy. This draft EOA fails to address the economic harm that this development could bring to generations of coastal industries like fishing, shellfishing and tourism. The EOA should be consistent with the Port of Coos Bay's strategic planning process, which so far has identified significant support for investments in the Charleston Marina and fishing industry.<sup>1</sup> We encourage that the City of Coos Bay to align economic development goals with the Port's strategic planning process.

We request that the City of Coos Bay issue a continuance to refine goal 3.9, which explicitly lists the development of a deep-draft channel. We support the plan to "strengthen and diversify the local economy", but encourage the City to promote solutions that reflect a regenerative economic structure. By supporting existing industries (such as fishing and tourism) and welcoming new businesses that support community needs, such as healthcare, there are opportunities to work in alignment with other industries. We encourage the City of Coos Bay to refine goal 3.9 language to not list "develop a deep-draft channel" in order to adopt the 2025 EOA.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Ashley Audycki  
South Coast Coordinator  
[ashley@rogueclimate.org](mailto:ashley@rogueclimate.org)

---

<sup>1</sup> Port of Coos Bay Board of Commissioner Meeting. 09-18-2025. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9PtAtOsilW8>

RCV'D 10/14/25

CMS

planning  
To: City Council, City of Coos Bay  
Re: Attachment and Text of City of Coos Bay Comprehensive Plan 2000, Volume 1, Chapter 7.  
From: Christine Moffitt, PhD. 700 Denise Place, Coos Bay

I have followed the draft report and want to comment on the final economic report.

The general information is well presented but there are points of omission and also points with incorrect details. Some of the incorrect details are important to the outcome of the focus areas in the revised plan.

The PCIP project is mentioned as various places in the document as if this development is fully fleshed out and on the way to creation. It is not. There has been no economic assessment of the proposal and various job numbers are placed into portions of the report. The are numbers provided in this document that are different from those provided in the documents that are available as part of submissions to the USACE. Page 2 of Attachment A, exhibit 1 quote

The Port of Coos Bay has plans for the development of a 2.3 billion shipping container facility project, supported by the Governor's Office with a recently approved \$100 million grant from the Oregon legislature.

This is not correct.

*HB 5006 included authorization to issue \$100 million of general obligation bonds for the Coos Bay Channel Modification project. The accompanying SB 5505 outlined specific requirements to be met before bonds could be issued. Listed were completion of the environmental impact statement for the project and the issuance of the final record of decision through the National Environmental Policy Act. Additionally, it requires that the Oregon International Port of Coos Bay, or a private entity engaged in a public private partnership with the port, has closed on a Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing loan through the Build America Bureau within the United States Department of Transportation in the amount of at least \$1 billion or has secured equivalent levels of alternative funding through other federal grants or loans*

In page iii of the Attachment A, the potential expansion of the Port PCIP project is addressed, indicating that the city should plan to leverage the expansion and potential employment as a key opportunity. This is an endorsement of the concept before the entire plan is provided. There was a recent strategic planning exercise conducted and there was a lot of push back about this project. The community in Empire has expressed concerns. The environmental permit applications have not been submitted for processing.

Putting this endorsement directly into the planning document is putting the cart ahead of the horse. A note of careful assessment should be part of the assessment, but not a statement of leveraging the expansion.

This project appears in other areas throughout the assessment.

Page 24.

Port officials estimate the expansion will generate approximately 9400 jobs: This includes 2,500 terminal workers, 6,900 indirect jobs, and 2,600 construction jobs.

The 2.3 billion is mentioned as the cost, but 4.3 estimate is provided in the documents provided to the USAC that are available on the Port Web.

The \$100 million comes again on page 25.

In the proposed wording of the changes to the comprehensive plan, there are various places that this project is mentioned.

The omission of Goals 5 and 6 from the 2009 plan is an issue of concern. Having those points as recognized priority may distort future focus.

Goal 5 was "recruit sustainable industries and industries that provide "green collar" jobs. Goal 6, that is also removed was Maximize use of Coos Bay's unique geographic and recreational assets and cultural heritage.

To me the cultural heritage of our native tribes is important. You heard me in earlier meetings addressing the Empire area and the Hollering place.

New point Policy: 1.3. Support new and existing industrial businesses, considering opportunities to leverage development at the Port of Coos Bay.

Loss of reference to Empire District in 2.2 revision

2.5.Promote the waterfront as key to a recreational center and opportunity to increase awareness of Coos Bay's rich maritime and logging history. Are there other elements of history to be increased, particularly the cultural history of native people? The History Museum has done a magnificent job and that museum is new since the last documents.

These are some of the areas that I find of concern in the proposed changes to the planning document.