

# PUBLIC COMMENTS ROSTER

City Council Meeting of November 4, 2025

Citizens wishing to address the City Council during the time set for public comments are requested to sign the roster as provided by the city recorder. Please print your name, address and subject of public concern (as required by Section 4.8.4 of the Council Rules).

The Public Comments period 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 that require a Public Hearing, 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.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Full Address</u>	<u>Subject</u>
<del>Mike Hunter</del>	<del>706 S Main St</del>	<del>Speed</del>
Christine Moffitt	700 Denise Place	EOA
Scott Cooper	575 S MAIN	EOA YA
Dean Lundie	100 Nennank Ave	IGM
Mike & Powter	706 S Main St	Speed
Ashley Audycki	153 N Broadway	EOA
Steve Miller	1536 N. 20 <sup>th</sup> St.	Econ Op Analysis



# Oregon Shores

October 30, 2025

**Re: Land Use Application #187-25-000114-PLNG – Comments on the Proposed 2025 Economic Opportunities Analysis and Associated Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

Dear Chelsea Schnabel, City of Coos Bay Planning Commission, and City Council,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter. Oregon Shores is a statewide nonprofit dedicated to the health and resilience of Oregon's coastal ecosystems and communities. We have long-standing involvement in land use and estuary management planning efforts in Coos Bay, including participation in the Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan Phase 1 process. We submit this letter to express significant concerns with the proposed 2025 Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) and associated comprehensive plan amendments, particularly regarding their mention of the speculative deep-draft channel modification and container terminal project promoted by the Port of Coos Bay.

**The City should refine the plan to support sustainable and community-driven economic development.** Oregon Shores applauds the City's overarching goal to "strengthen and diversify the local economy." However, this vision should be rooted in a regenerative framework, one that builds on existing economic strengths, invests in climate resilience, and supports sectors such as fishing, recreation, and small-scale manufacturing. The Port's strategic planning process has identified strong community support for investment in the Charleston Marina and fishing industry, not for speculative mega-projects. Aligning the EOA and comprehensive plan amendments with these locally grounded priorities would ensure the City is fostering economic growth that is both sustainable and community-driven.

**The EOA overlooks the economic risks and ecological costs of channel modification.** A truly sustainable economic strategy must recognize that healthy estuaries are the foundation of Coos Bay's working waterfront and coastal economy. Commercial and recreational fishing, shellfish harvest, tourism, and other recreational activities all depend on the ecological abundance of the bay. These industries sustain livelihoods while keeping our ecological services intact—services that support biodiversity, buffer our communities from flooding and storm surges, stabilize shorelines, and maintain the water quality essential to both human and ecosystem health. A deep-draft channel would irreversibly alter habitats, increase erosion and dredging, and undermine existing industries and future economic opportunities.

**The EOA's focus on a speculative port expansion violates Goal 9 requirements.** Its reliance on hypothetical channel modifications and the Pacific Coast Intermodal Project (PCIP) is misplaced. The document cites conversations with Port staff to claim the project could generate "upwards of 9,400 regional jobs," yet provides no data, studies, or credible economic analysis to substantiate that figure. This absence of evidence falls short of the City's obligation under Statewide Planning Goal 9 to base land use decisions on substantial evidence and demonstrated economic trends and needs, rather than speculative projections.

**The proposed amendments improperly embed support for a project inconsistent with existing plans.** The EOA and proposed Comprehensive Plan language—specifically Goal 3.9, which states:

**Oregon Coast For All**

mandy@oregonshores.org | oregonshores.org

PO BOX 5626, COOS BAY, OREGON 97420

“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...”—would prematurely signal City endorsement of a project that is inconsistent with the Coos Bay Comprehensive Plan and Estuary Management Plan. Any channel modification of the scale envisioned would require, at minimum, an exception to Statewide Land Use Goal 16, Estuarine Resources—and recent history shows that similar exceptions, such as those sought for the Jordan Cove LNG project, have not withstood legal scrutiny. Embedding this policy language now would inappropriately position the City in support of a proposal that may never meet applicable legal or environmental standards.

For these reasons, **we respectfully request that the City Council remove all language referencing the deep-draft channel and container terminal project (Goal 3.9)**. Although this may seem like a minor amendment, including such language lends undue support to a speculative project that runs counter to the City’s own aspirations for sustainable and community-driven economic growth. The Pacific Coast Intermodal Project (PCIP) does not strengthen existing industries, respect ecological limits, or advance equitable, sustainable prosperity. It threatens the resources that support them. Oregon Shores appreciates the City’s inclusion of regenerative economy principles within the Economic Opportunities Analysis and the vision to “strengthen and diversify the local economy.” By building on these ideas of grounding the plan in resilience, community priorities, and ecological stewardship, the City can chart a course toward economic development that truly benefits the people of Coos Bay.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,



**Mandy Watson**  
**Coastal Conservation Manager**  
Oregon Shores



**Dr. Hannah Epstein**  
**Marine Conservation Manager**  
Oregon Shores

**Oregon Coast For All**

mandy@oregonshores.org | oregonshores.org  
PO BOX 5626, COOS BAY, OREGON 97420



**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

Friday, October 31, 2025

To: Chelsea Schnabel (Community Development Director) and the Coos Bay City Council and Mayor,

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.

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



**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

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.

In addition to these comments that have been raised to the Planning Commission above, we would also like to highlight:

- The last EOA was approved in 2009, so in terms of time, there is no rush to meet the 20-year deadline in 2029. With the questions and considerations to discuss, the City Council should not feel the pressure to pass this right away.
- During the Planning Commission hearing, Community Development Director Chelsea Schnabel noted that the inclusion of the PCIP project information was intended to provide a snapshot of what is possible for economic development. If that is the intention of EOA's, then the 2009 plan was missing a big snapshot that, for me, feels awkward to say was more of a realistic, economically viable project for the community. Back in 2009, the Jordan Cove LNG Project had navigated the environmental impact statement process, received approvals from the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) process, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (2009). This was when Jordan Cove LNG was an import project and seemed more doable at the time of that EOA. Why was that proposal not included? Why should the PCIP be included if there are no permits and designs?
- The inclusion of PCIP information was also discussed at the Planning Commission meeting, which was due to the Port's involvement in the EOA process. As I understand that remark, organizations such as Rogue Climate were not included in the EOA process. There may have been opportunities to incorporate suggestions, ideas, and collaborative work, especially given the substantial amount of climate information included in the EOA. Rogue Climate focuses a significant portion of our framework on the [Principles of a Just Transition](#). A Just Transition is defined as:
  - "Just Transition is a vision-led, unifying and place-based set of principles, processes, and practices that build economic and political power to shift from an extractive economy to a regenerative economy. This means approaching production and consumption cycles holistically and waste-free. The transition itself must be just and equitable; redressing past harms and creating new relationships of power for the future through reparations. If the process of transition is not just, the outcome will never be. Just Transition describes both where we are going and how we get there."<sup>2</sup>

---

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

<sup>2</sup> Climate Justice Alliance. *What Do We Mean By Just Transition?* <https://climatejusticealliance.org/just-transition-2/>



**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

- All in all, Rogue Climate does not oppose all development. We want to see the City of Coos Bay lead our region in what is possible, while protecting what most of us know and love about the region.
- When we think of the word economy, let's focus on the meaning of the root word "eco". In Greek etymology, "eco" means home. What makes this region feel like home? For many, it is the ecology and the ecosystems that support them. When we return to think about the meaning of economy, we're really talking about the management of our home. So, when thinking about what this EOA suggests regarding goal 3.9 and the "snapshot" info of the PCIP - is that how we want the management of our home to be reflected to the generations to come?

We request that the City of Coos Bay issue a continuance on the EOA and have a worksession 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)

**Date:** 31 October 2025

**To:** City Council, City of Coos Bay

**Re:** Economic Opportunities Analysis, August 2025 report, and comments regarding revised Text Amendments to the Coos Bay Comprehensive Plan.

Public Hearing to Consider Type IV Land Use Application #187-25

000114-PLNG (Economic Outlook Analysis

**From:** Christine M. Moffitt, PhD 700 Denise Place, Coos Bay

---

I write to you with my comments regarding the proposed revisions and adoption of the Economic Opportunities Analysis Report of August 2025 and the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan.

I have followed the work of the consultants that conducted the survey and meetings. I attended the September 2 meeting when the EDSP was adopted. I attended the Planning Commission meeting on October 14 and presented testimony with reference to the complete report that accompanied the strategy document adopted on September 2. In October, I pointed out errors in the report. I include with this submission a copy of my remarks from the October 14 meeting.

In addition to those remarks from October, I want to highlight the changes that I see in **Goal 3** that I found concerning. This entire goal was substantially changed. Previously it read: **Recruit Service Oriented Businesses**. Now it reads: ***Align land use and infrastructure with economic priorities.***

The new **3.2** removes an element of high importance to all of us: *Continue to facilitate efforts to enhance Coos Bay as a medical center for the surrounding area.* And replaces it with *Align the City's economic development opportunities and planning for infrastructure needs, including water, broadband, and transportation, with a focus on developing infrastructure for priority development sites.*

We know that the medical center and associated medical care infrastructure is an important economic driver, and important to the wellbeing of our community. Is removing this a good idea for aligning us for the future.

The other statement added to this section to me is a violation of our planning process for a project that has no final plans provided, no permits filed or even in review. It reads: *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.*

I strongly object to the statement inserted to be part of this planning document.

In my October 14 Testimony, I pointed out the errors and inconsistencies with reference to the PCIP and in the consultant's report dated August 2025. The incorrect statement that I particularly objected to is on document Page 2 of Attachment A, exhibit 1 and I 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, and this statement has been repeated in various press releases.

The correct information is that 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

With that error, a Comprehensive Plan should not make such a goal to support the Ports effort to develop deep draft channel to accommodate large cargo vessels and increase shipping activities.... To me and also to regulators, this implies that this project has been submitted and approved. Clearly zoning and environmental assessment have not been submitted or approved. It has not received endorsement from the regulatory process, and there are concerns regarding the feasibility.

I am also concerned that with the omission of previous Goals 5 and 6 from 2009 sets a different tone in the document. Having those as Goals in previous plans was important in the tone of the document. I will reiterate these again for you.

Goal 5 was “**Recruit sustainable industries and industries that provide “green collar” jobs**”. Nowhere in this new plan is the word sustainable or reference to green collar.

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

To me the cultural heritage of our Indigenous peoples is important. You recognized this importance with proclamation of Indigenous Peoples' Heritage Month. The Empire and the Hollering place on the Spit and in Empire are important cultural heritage assets.

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 (submitted at October 14 Hearing)

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.