

Attachment B: Comments received on draft Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan January-May, 2023

Date Received	Form	First Name	Last Name	Representing	Topic	Map #	Comment	Response	Status
1/30/2023	letter	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	Citizen Advisory Committee		As we understand, the County's Citizen Advisory Committee has not been invited to participate in this process. Do you know why not? Does the County intend to include the Citizen Advisory Committee in this process before presenting the amendments to the County Planning Commissions?	The County's Citizen Advisory Committee is not currently formed/active.	No action
2/10/2023	email	Jan	Hodder		Citizen Advisory Committee		I would suggest that to ensure a robust public participation in updating the CBEMP the county could convene two committees: 1. an advisory committee with diverse knowledge of the plan's content areas, and 2. a smaller steering committee to direct and oversee the results.	Recommendation included in to modification of Policy #36, Plan Update.	Completed
2/14/2023	email	Donna	Bonetti		Citizen Advisory Committee		As you work to put together a Citizen's Advisory Council within state guidelines, I ask that you include representatives from the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Suislaw Indians and also the Coquille Indian Tribe on the council. Other representatives should include scientists, commercial and recreational fishermen, shellfish aquaculture representatives, conservation/environmental advocates and the community at large. ... The goal of this committee should be to ensure the ecological viability of the bay, address the needs of the bay through climate change, and regulate the bay's natural, cultural and developmental uses for the health, protection and enjoyment of all.	Recommendation included in to modification of Policy #36, Plan Update.	Completed
2/17/2023	letter	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	Citizen Advisory Committee		recommend the CBEMP process emulate the Yaquina Bay EMP (for updating), with a steering committee of representatives of the local government, the port, Tribes and state agencies and a few at-large representatives of the public). The citizen advisory committee should aim to represent the interests of the community, with broad representation from key interest groups.	Phase 2 process may emulate Yaquina Bay EMP's process more closely.	Phase 2

2/17/2023	letter	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	Citizen Advisory Committee		A technical review committee should be established to continue working on the maps, with the goals of fully updating them with current information; assuring transparency as to the sources of the data; improving the clarity and detail of the information they convey; and obtaining peer review. As maps receive this type of review and are deemed fully up to date and accurate, they should substitute for the maps provisionally adopted in the current ("Phase 1") update, where they cover the same material, or be added. This committee should also consider traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) contributed by members of the Tribes whose traditional territories include the estuary.	Recommendation included into modification of Policy #36, Plan Update.	Completed
2/22/2023	feedback form	Jamie	Fereday		Citizen Advisory Committee		For citizen advisory group for GBEMP, provide input by science-based and proficient speakers to address the various aspects of estuarine values: transportation/shipping, fisheries nurseries, flood control/sea level rise management, pollution filtering, carbon sequestration (blue carbon), wildlife habitat, aquaculture, etc.	Recommendation included in to modification of Policy #36, Plan Update.	Phase 2
2/25/2023	email	Bill	Grill		Citizen Advisory Committee		Misguided thinking that somehow a multi-jurisdictional advisory panel can simplify future CBEMP amendment -- may be easier for staff... but not for plan amendment applicants	The intent of the multi-jurisdictional advisory committee is to ensure coordinated maintenance of the plan. This will not necessarily make it "easier" for plan amendment applicants in the short run, but will in the long run.	No action
3/15/2023	email	Ken	Bonetti		Citizen Advisory Committee		Establish a community advisory council that reflects not just government and Port Authority interests, but the broader interests and experiences of the community at large including Tribal citizens, recreation, fishing, aquaculture, conservation, environmental justice advocates, scientists and other community members. The greater community should comprise the bulk of the advisory council.	Recommendation included in to modification of Policy #36, Plan Update.	Phase 2

5/25/2023	email	Beverly	Segner		Citizen Advisory Committee		Commitment to expand Citizen Involvement: Creation of a Citizen Advisory Committee made up of citizens who are not representing government entities and agencies. There are "regular" folks interested in how we care for our coastal resources and can contribute to the CBEMP. We need and want to have seats at the table. Seeking representation from a broad base of the community will assure a well-developed plan.	No response at this time.	Phase 2
5/25/2023	email	Beverly	Segner		Citizen Advisory Committee		Creation of a Technical Advisory Committee so we can draw on the incredible expertise of our scientific community. I stand in awe of their knowledge, wisdom, and dedication to educating people like me who care about land use planning and its intent, but without them would know nothing about, for example, how dredging can impact a fishery.	No response at this time.	Phase 2
5/26/2023		Jan	Hodder		Citizen Advisory Committee		The joint CBEMP advisory committee, which will look at and make recommendations related to proposed plan amendments, is missing representation from a significant part of the Coos estuary and therefore should include a representative of the South Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve. The inclusion of a Port Authority member is unclear. This should be a member of the Port Commission, not a port staff member, reflecting the membership of all other government commissions suggested for this committee.	Change was made to recognize the Port Commission (vs. Authority). The Steering Committee is made up of governmental representatives, hence it is not appropriate to place a SSNERR representative on the committee (although appointed representatives may serve on the SSNERR).	Change made
5/26/2023	email	Rick	Eichstaedt		Citizen Advisory Committee		Any additional citizen, governance, or technical committees developed must include a Tribal representative.	Tribes have been included in the Steering Committee. The inclusion of the tribes during Phase 2 is recommended.	Change made

5/26/2023	email	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	Citizen Advisory Committee	<p>We understand that one of the core update elements of public engagement during this current phase is setting the stage for a comprehensive update is the structure of a Citizens Advisory committee as well as the creation of Technical Advisory Committee and Ad-Hoc Steering Committee. We strongly advocate for the makeup of these various committees to be reflective of the communities that depend on the livelihood of a healthy bay, rather than stakeholders who are already a part of the update process as participating jurisdictional decision makers.</p> <p>There are many local community members who have an expertise in relevant industries, including maritime, fishing (commercial and sport), recreation, conservation, tourism, aquaculture and many more. These are the types of expertise and lived experiences that need to be prioritized on this committee over the positions such as elected and appointed officials who are ultimate decision makers on the plan. Those decision-making entities should be included in the process via an Ad-Hoc Steering Committee with representatives from Tribal governments, planning commissions, city councils, and the Port of Coos Bay, not as participants on the Citizens Advisory Committee. The Citizens Advisory Committee should reflect the expertise and lived-experience of the community.</p>	This recommendation may be considered during the Public Engagement Plan design for Phase 2.	Phase 2
-----------	-------	--------	---------	---------------	----------------------------	---	---	---------

5/26/2023	email	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate			Our recommendation for the makeup of a Citizens Advisory Committee include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1- Community member at large representative appointed by Coos County Board of Commissioners, • 1- Community member at large representative appointed by Coos Bay City Council • 1 - Community member at large representative appointed by North Bend City Council • • 1- Tribal community member at large representative appointed by the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians • 1- Tribal community member at large representative appointed by the Coquille Indian Tribe • 1 - Commercial or sport fishing industry representative • 1 - Aquaculture or seafood processing representative • 1- Public health or social services representative • 1- Recreation or tourism representative Representatives from rural communities, lower-income communities, communities of color, and youth should be prioritized.	This recommendation may be considered during the Public Engagement Plan design for Phase 2.	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate			Our recommendation for the makeup of a Technical Advisory Group include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1- representative from the South Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve • 1- representative from the Coos Watershed Association • 1- representative from the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians Natural Resources staff • 1- Tribal government representative appointed by the Coquille Indian Tribe Natural Resource Staff Representatives from other academic institutions including Oregon Institute of Marine Biology and Southwestern Oregon Community College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representatives from other conservation organizations including the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds, Wild Rivers Land Trust, and Coast Range Forest Watch • Representatives from fishing and aquaculture industry 	This recommendation may be considered during the Public Engagement Plan design for Phase 2.	Phase 2

5/26/2023	email	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate			<p>Our recommendation for the makeup of an Ad Hoc Steering Committee include: ● 1- Tribal government representative appointed by the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians ● 1- Tribal government representative appointed by the Coquille Indian Tribe ● 1- Coos Bay City Council representative ● 1- Coos Bay Planning Commission representative ● 1- North Bend City Council representative ● 1- North Bend Planning Commission representative ● 1- Coos County Board of Commissioners representative ● 1 - Coos County Planning Commission representative ● 1- Port of Coos Bay representative</p>	<p>The name of the Advisory committee was changed to "steering committee" for clarity. The makeup of this committee includes representatives from all three jurisdictions, both tribes, and the port (hence all applicable governing bodies).</p>	Change made
-----------	-------	--------	---------	---------------	--	--	---	---	-------------

5/26/2023	email	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	Citizen Advisory Committee	<p>...It is essential to the success of comprehensive Phase 2 planning that there be a true citizen advisory committee, and a critical feature of a true CAC is that it does <u>not</u> include official representatives of government entities. It should include representatives of various stakeholders and components of the community, to assure that all values and resources important to diverse groups within the community be considered. We therefore strongly urge that in addition to recommending a steering committee, the Phase 1 plan stipulate that a true CAC be organized to go forward with Phase 2 (and that this same approach be recommended for future major revisions). We recommend that its composition be as follows—at least one member each unless otherwise indicated: The fishing industry, both recreational and commercial; The seafood industry, including aquaculture and seafood processing; General local businesses; Tourism industry or commercial recreation businesses; Recreational interests; The scientific community (at least one, but ideally several with different areas of expertise, such as estuarine ecology, wildlife biology, and water quality/chemistry); The conservation/environmental community (at least one, but preferably one from a local organization and one from a statewide group); At least two tribal members, one from each of the tribes whose territory includes the Coos Bay watershed—but as individuals, not as official representatives of the tribal government (which would be represented on the steering committee); One Spanish-speaking member of the Hispanic/Latino community; Three citizens at large, one each appointed from the county and the two cities, but not employed by or otherwise with formal ties to the local governments.</p>	<p>For comprehensive plan updates, a Citizens Advisory Committee will be formed as per Policy #36. The recommendations herein for advisory committee representation can be part of the development of the Phase 2 Public Engagement Plan.</p>	Phase 2
-----------	-------	---------	---------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------	--	---	---------

5/26/2023	email	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	Citizen Advisory Committee		We further recommend that a third, technical advisory committee be organized immediately, as part of a transition to Phase 2. This committee would advise on the data underlying the maps (which need both improvement and continuous updating), and on other scientific, policy, and technical considerations. Section #36, Plan Update, speaks to the future need for “studies and projects” and “necessary research”—a technical committee, consisting of scientific experts (drawn from OIMB, SWOCC, SSNERR, OSU, the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds, etc., as well as Tribes) along with the relevant resource agencies) and people with land use planning experience, would help to guide the fulfillment of these needs.	The recommendations herein for advisory committee representation can be part of the development of the Phase 2 Public Engagement Plan.	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	Citizen Advisory Committee		An explicit statement about the composition of a CAC—and a technical committee—should be set forth in the CBEMP as it will exist after adoption of the Phase 1 draft.	Specific planning project parameters are not normally included into regulatory documents.	No action
5/26/2023	email	Nolan & Janice	Lloyd		Citizen Advisory Committee		Create a Citizen Advisory Committee. One of the most important things to me is to have the public involved in the process. The best way to ensure that we (the public) get a seat at the table is to create a citizen advisory committee with diverse representation from the community. This committee should include members from a broad reach of local people.	The recommendations herein for advisory committee representation can be part of the development of the Phase 2 Public Engagement Plan.	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Nolan & Janice	Lloyd		Citizen Advisory Committee		Include a Technical Advisory Committee to guide technical, scientific policy changes to the plan. This could include local experts such as scientists from OIMB, State Agencies, and members of the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds, for example.	The recommendations herein for technical advisory committee representation can be part of the development of the Phase 2 Public Engagement Plan.	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Steve	Miller		Citizen Advisory Committee		An advisory committee or committees fully representative of our diverse local interests associated with our estuary should be a strong feature of our EMP update. I also look forward to completion of the Phase 2 portion of the update as well, which will provide Coos County and its citizens a fully updated CBEMP that will enable us to confidently plan, with good information and guidance, the future use and protection of our Coos Bay estuary by the people who live by, enjoy, and benefit from it.	The recommendations herein for advisory committee representation can be part of the development of the Phase 2 Public Engagement Plan.	Phase 2

5/26/2023	email	Donna	Bonetti		Citizen Advisory Committee	<p>Please increase stakeholder and citizen participation in guiding the comprehensive Phase 2 update of the CBEMP by creating a citizen advisory committee and technical advisory committee for this short-term update process. A much more diverse citizen advisory committee is necessary to ensure the needs of the community are broadly represented. This would also expand citizen involvement in the update process. Importantly, representatives of government entities should not be on the citizen advisory committee. This includes the port authority, a governmental body with development interests that often conflict with the interests of the citizens. Port representation on the citizen advisory committee would be a conflict of interest. Government bodies should instead form a steering committee, separate from the advisory committee. The citizens' advisory committee should include the following stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The fishing industry, both recreational and commercial o The seafood industry, including aquaculture and seafood processing o Local businesses broadly o Tourism industry or commercial recreation businesses o Recreational interests o The scientific community o The conservation/environmental community o At least 2 tribal members, one from of each of the tribes whose territory includes the Coos Bay watershed—not as official representatives of the tribal government o Individual citizens from the cities of Coos Bay and North Bend, and the unincorporated county—these would not be government employees or representatives of the governing bodies, but citizens at large, especially those with experience or expertise in water issues. 	<p>The recommendations herein for advisory committee resrepresentation can be part of the development of the Phase 2 Public Engagement Plan.</p>	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Donna	Bonetti		Citizen Advisory Committee	<p>To guide technical scientific and policy changes to the plan during the Phase 2 update, a technical advisory committee composed of local experts is needed. This might include scientists from OIMB, state agencies, and members of the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds, NOAA and state agencies.</p>	<p>The recommendations herein for technical advisory committee resrepresentation can be part of the development of the Phase 2 Public Engagement Plan.</p>	Phase 2

5/26/2023	email	Larry	Basch		Citizen Advisory Committee		The county is mandated to increase stakeholder and citizen participation in guiding the comprehensive Phase 2 update of the CBEMP by creating a technical advisory committee and citizen advisory committee for this short-term update process. These committees would be outlined in part 1, section 2 of the plan: Citizen Involvement.	No response needed at this time.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	stickies on map				mapping	3.1	Dark green "agricultural" should be forest surrounding SSNERR.	Fixed. Lands marked F are now denoted as "Forested," lands marked EFU are denoted as "Agricultural."	Completed
3/14/2023	stickies on map				mapping	3.1	Jetty area -- "recreation" is not primary zone.	The data we have shows the areas south and north of the Jetty as recreation including the ocean side of the North Spit.	No action
3/14/2023	stickies on map				mapping	3.1	"Employment" is an odd category.	"Employment" correlates to statewide planning goal definitions.	No action
2/27/2023	feedback form		(blank)		mapping	3.1-3.3, 4.1-4.3	Always fun comparing neighborhoods I'm familiar with, like home and work, to see how they show up in mapping.	No change requested.	No action
2/19/2023	letter	Beverly	Segner		mapping	3.2	Difficult to discern areas designated as conservation, development or natural.	Changed legend to differentiate conservation, natural, development by color and shoreland by stippled overlay.	Completed
3/14/2023	stickies on map				mapping	3.2	Probably on a legend somewhere, but categories should be defined for the public on the map, to avoid future confusion.	no change made to map at this point. Definitions are in the CBEMP itself.	No action
3/14/2023	stickies on map				mapping	3.3	Why is this called "resource"? It's a residential area (Pidgeon Point).	The parcels in question are tidelands and forested parcels that have PCLS codes of 6 (Tidelands) and 640 (Forest) (from tax assessor PCLS designation).	No action

2/19/2023	letter	Beverly	Segner		mapping	4.1, 5.6, 5.11, 5.12, 5.14	Color schemes are too similar in color, making it near-impossible to distinguish key resources or features on the landscape.	4.1 There are two categories. No change made. 5.6 No change made. 5.11-14 Need more information on concerns colors. An online viewer will allow user to hover over specific designations to learn more about them.	Refer to on-line viewer
3/14/2023	stickies on map				mapping	4.3	Not South Slough (ask Jenni).	Not enough information.	No action
2/27/2023	feedback form		(blank)		mapping	4.5	I did not realize how much of the North Spit is federal. Interesting mix with private and port facilities, including HazMat storage.	No response needed.	No action
2/27/2023	feedback form		(blank)		mapping	4.8	Employment density has oddly circular shapes -- artifacts of density/radius?	Yes, the employment density is intentionally obscured do to the nature of the data.	No action
3/14/2023	stickies on map				mapping	4.8	Does the North Spit have <100 including the railroad area?	Yes, according to the data the North Spit has fewer than 100 employees per Square Mile.	No action
3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	5.1a	In addition to eelgrass, this map should also designate herring spawning regions of the bay. Known occurrences are in the Fossil Point and Pidgeon Point areas but there may be other locations that I am not familiar with.	Will need data if it is to be included. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
2/27/2023	feedback form		(blank)		mapping	5.1a, 5.1b	Eelgrass is good -- would like to see seagrass too (critical for crab populations).	Will need data if it is to be included. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.1a, 5.1b	The seagrass extent at the Fossil Point/Barview area is substantially under represented. This is a very low intertidal and mostly shallow subtidal bed which is likely underrepresented by remote sensing.	No other data source exists. May want to include a message on the map identifying that the eelgrass/sea grass beds are not static.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.1a, 5.1b	Given the dynamic nature of seagrasses, it is advisable to include a date on the legend of the map.	A date is included for the map. Have revised the data credits to indicate the date of the data.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.1a, 5.1b	The seagrass bed to the east of the dredge spoils islands in the upper bay has a very linear boundary, suggesting a stitching error.	No response needed.	No action

3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.1a, 5.1b	The seagrass beds in the Barview area contain multiple species of seagrasses. At least 3 species are present in areas of rocky substrate.	No response needed.	No action
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.1a, 5.1b	The rock substrate in the lower bay is a very unusual habitat type in this estuary. For example, it is the only intertidal area of the estuary that supports rock drilling species such as Piddock clams.	No response needed.	No action.
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.1a, 5.1b	The legend identifies snowy plover habitat. The area mapped is the current area occupied/managed for snowy plovers. This area is a fragment of the historic area/habitat used by this species. The map should/could identify other areas historically used by this species before it was pushed to the current endangered species status. It may be of value to consult with the Snowy Plover Recovery Plan to include a data layer more reflective of how this species may reoccupy former habitat during the next 40 years.	Will need data source if it is to be included. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.1b	EDNA information that S. Slough has compiled indicates there are additional lamprey species in the Coos system.	Will need data source if it is to be included. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.1b	There is an additional harbor seal haul-out in the oyster lease area north and east of the dredge spoil islands in the upper bay.	Will need data source if it is to be included. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.1b	Are the lines indicative of the adult phase of the fish or do they include juvenile rearing areas?	Will need to review data to answer authoritatively. Will provide a link to the dataset.	
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.1b	Should unique estuarine species be included in this type of map? E.g., bay pipe, starry flounder? Orca use of the estuary on a seasonal basis up to the Marshfield Channel?	Will need data source if it is to be included. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
2/20/2023	email	Michelle	McMullin	NOAA Federal	mapping	5.1b	Designated critical habitat for the southern distinct population segment of green sturgeon extends further than what is depicted on Map 5.1b. Refer to 74 FR 52300. Consider depicting areas of designated critical habitat for ESA-listed species on the Species maps or on separate maps. Another natural resources related law applicable to the Coos Bay area is the Magnuson-Stevens Conservation and Management Act that details Essential Fish Habitat for managed fisheries.	Will need data source if it is to be included. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2

3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.2	North Slough, Haynes Inlet, and the tide flats in the upper main body of the estuary support softshell and bent nose clams.	Will need data source if it is to be included. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.2	Dungeness crabs are harvested by recreational fishers in the North Bend portion of the bay near Roseburg terminal.	Will need data source if it is to be included. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.2	The area of rock bottom in the Barview district includes very high densities of rock boring clams, which do not appear in the map.	Will need data source if it is to be included. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.2	I understand that the tide flats to the east of the dredge spoil islands in the upper bay have commercial oyster lease areas. The Coos Bay Geographic Response Plan indicates the presence of shellfish beds in this portion of the bay. DEQ supports the Geographic Response Plan for this estuary.	Will need data source if it is to be included. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.2	The subtidal portion of the South Slough inlet in the vicinity of the Charleston Bridge has been an area used by commercial clam divers. I'm told the substrate in the bottom of that portion of the inlet south of the Charleston Bridge is a shell bottom. This may be the only shell bottom habitat in the entire estuary.	Will need data source if it is to be included. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.3, 5.6	The shapefile for the CBEMP boundary does not correspond with the western shoreline of the North Spit.	Map modification made.	Completed
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.3, 5.6	The legend does not indicate what the green boundary lines are (municipal boundaries?).	Map modification made.	Completed
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.3, 5.6	The fact that the mapped flood zones outside the CBEMP boundary are contiguous with those inside the CBEMP boundary suggests that the upper extent of the CBEMP boundaries have been prematurely truncated in many of the primary inlets of the estuary (e.g., Cooston, Haynes, N. Slough). Revision should adjust the CBEMP to reflect contiguous areas within the 100-year flood zone that abut the CBEMP boundary. Large expanses of the estuary are either permanently flooded or intertidal areas that are flooded on a daily, monthly or seasonal/annual basis yet they are mapped as 1% chance of flooding (e.g., 1 x every 100 years). This map would be more informative to map permanently flooded or regularly flooded areas as distinct from areas subject to 1% and 0.2% chance.	There was a decision made in the 1980s to not include sources of riverine flooding in the boundary of shoreline units.	No action

3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.3, 5.6	I presume this is a very incomplete data set for the 0.2% chance flood zone as virtually no areas in this category appear in these maps.	Confirmed that we have the most updated flood shapefile.	No action
3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	5.3	The flood map (Map 5.3) shows areas of the State Parks ocean shore within the 100-year flood zone but these areas are not mapped in the 2100 sea level rise area. The inundation areas in the upper reaches of the primary tidal inlets are also indicative of the fact that the upper limits of the CBEMP boundary artificially truncate the actual extent of the estuary.	The dataset is built off of other data and will not match.	No action
3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	5.3	Are the colors wrong on this map? If not, it needs a total revision. The green in S. Slough? What is the definition of a "beach." How does it differ from a mudflat? The area from Pigeon Point to Sitka Dock is an estuarine intertidal.	Wrong map identifier.	No action
3/14/2023	stickies on map				mapping	5.5	may be better to show this slope layer with topo lines instead?	Will need data source if it is to be included. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	stickies on map				mapping	5.6	Please add hatch-marks to wetland areas that are used for agriculture.	Do not have this information.	No action
3/14/2023	stickies on map				mapping	5.6	It would be useful to have a separate agriculture layer.	Will need data source if it is to be included. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
2/27/2023	feedback form				mapping	5.6, 5.8, 5.9	Always nice to see possible impacts of life on the shoreline.	No response needed.	No action
2/22/2023	feedback form	Jamie	Fereday		mapping	5.6-5.7	Wetland inventories should not be used as this data seems outdated. In contrast, the CMECS Aquatic Biotic, restoration and tidal LMZ prioritation (5.11, 5.12 6.2, 6.3) should be used to address CBEMP data gaps here and be instrumental in redrawing the boundaries of the development zones.	LWI map removed/number reserved for future if new data source available. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.7	This map is an incomplete characterization of local wetlands. So few areas within the local planning area have been subject to inventory.	Noted. LWI removed. Refer to CMECS maps and 5.6 NWI.	Map removed

2/27/2023	feedback form	Win	McLaughlin		mapping	5.8	Sea level rise is against baseline -> this doesn't work well on the Oregon coast because of rapid (geologically speaking) uplift! Uplift is fast enough to counter much of projected sea level rise. Likewise issue with Tsunami map: it depends on tsunami source.... Cascadia megathrust earthquake would also drop coast down 1-5 meters elevation, making tsunami impacts very different. Liquefaction also needs to be accounted for with several hazard maps!	These maps are not intended to be comprehensive. The mapping is provided by DOGAMI and NOAA. SLR projections are updated in 2022. The 2 foot increase is expected in 2100. The data atlas may not be updated to reflect the new information but this map is updated with text that confirms the date of the expected 2 foot SLR.	Map updated
3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	5.8, 5.9	The filled land area at the confluence of Isthmus Slough and the Marshfield Channel does not indicate impact/innundation on Map 5.8 or 5.9 (tsunami). If the airport is likely subject to flooding/innundation by a 6' increase in sea level or a small tsunami, it is likely (IMO) that the filled lands at the mouth of Isthmus Slough would also be a candidate site for innundation by either sea level rise or a tsunami.	No response needed.	No action
3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	5.10	Additions to this map: Tribal property, kayak launches. Should title reflect this covers designated recreation areas?	Will need data source if it is to be included. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	5.12, 5.13	The blue colors ... are indistinguishable. Maybe make a series of maps. Local inventories would be helpful to designate the data layers.	Map modification made.	Maps modified
3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	5.12, 5.13	Need for ground truthing to make this map very useful for planning purposes.	Phase 2 work program.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Mike	Graybill		mapping	5.13	Several dredge deposit areas are not shown: Charleston Marina, Apco 1 & 2, Barview wayside, east side fill at mouth of Isthmus Slough, dredge spoil islands in upper and lower bays, Clam Island bay, north of Coos River on E. Bay Drive, among others.	Updates to CMECS will need to be made separate from this process. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
2/19/2023	letter	Beverly	Segner		mapping	5.14	The CMECS Geological Substrate map (5.14) does not denote any bedrock associated with the navigation channel, which has been reported to have been encountered during the last channel deepening from 35' to 37'.	Updates to CMECS will need to be made separate from this process. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2

3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	5.14	The bedrock in the lower bay is not mapped. This is very important as any dredging to deepen the navigation channel will have to remove bedrock. A data source for this feature is available from the Army Corps of Engineers and the FERC EIS for the JCEP project.	Updates to CMECS will need to be made separate from this process. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	5.14	I think the channel bottom S. of the Charleston Bridge is shell substrate -- not shown on map.	Updates to CMECS will need to be made separate from this process. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	5.14	color palate needs work!	Map modification made.	Map modified
3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	5.14	The North Spit needs data filling in the sand palate.	Updates to CMECS will need to be made separate from this process. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	stickies on map				mapping	5.14	Surveys relating to the late 1990s dredging of the lower bay from 35' to 37' encountered bedrock in various locations. Survey by the Jordan Cove Energy Project's proposed "navigation reliability improvements" (a dredging project) identified the locations and depths below the soft sediment overlying it.	Updates to CMECS will need to be made separate from this process. To be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	stickies on map				mapping	6.4	Green dots on green is hard to see.	Map modification made.	Map modified
2/21/2023	email	Christine	Moffitt		mapping	all	My review of the most recent maps has been difficult as I found that there were no details as to the data they were based on and the dates of these data.	Map modification made.	Map modified
2/21/2023	email	Christine	Moffitt		mapping	all	Many of the colors used in several maps to delineate categories or regions provided no clear resolution as they were not discernable in shades of grey or brown or other colors. These problems in output layers are unacceptable and must be corrected.	Map modification made.	Maps modified. Further changes in Phase 2.

2/19/2023	letter	Beverly	Segner		mapping	all	The state of the maps proposed for incorporation into the plan is inadequate at present. In some cases, the data on which they are based is outdated (2015) and it is unclear how, when, and by whom the data was collected. We suggest that such information be provided as meta-data within the document, to ensure full transparency and allow gaps in information to be clearly identified in future planning efforts. Additionally, many of the maps are difficult to read or insufficiently detailed.	Data cited on maps is updated. Data Atlas contains more elaborate reference. Only "active" layers on maps are sourced (not base layers).	Maps modified
2/19/2023	letter	Beverly	Segner		mapping	all	These maps should be peer-reviewed by a technical advisory board and resource inventories should be ground-truthed before they are adopted as a final document.	Maps are inventory and are not regulatory in nature, with the exception of the Management Unit Classifications (Plan Maps).	No action at this time. Further review in Phase 2.
2/19/2023	letter	Beverly	Segner		mapping	all	These maps should be adapted in the future to include data collected from multiple state agencies and ultimately integrated into a user-friendly GIS platform, on which data layers can be used to align management units on top of resource inventories.	Service under creation by DLCD.	In progress
2/19/2023	letter	Beverly	Segner		mapping	all	All metrics should have a definition and units, and the source and year of data collection should be clearly indicated in the map legend.	Legends have been updated with year and source.	Maps modified
2/19/2023	letter	Beverly	Segner		mapping	all	maps of dynamic habitat and species of concern should be as recent as possible and updated frequently.	Phase 2 work program.	Phase 2
2/19/2023	letter	Beverly	Segner		mapping	all	recommend using "maximum observed extent" eelgrass layer, offered from PMEP, which reflects the historical and average eelgrass distribution over time.	Added PMEP data to the map. Generally all areas were covered but this new layer adds a few areas adjacent to already mapped regions.	Maps modified
1/7/2023	feedback form	Jenni	Schmidt		mapping	all	update .gdb with edits for newly updated maps, make available on some public website. Add UO (Sutherland) bathymetry/lidar layer to .gdb and contour maps	Check with County/PCW for additional mapping.	No change
2/22/2023	feedback form	Joanna	Lyle		mapping	all	Link to geodatabase? Layer labels are unclear/nonspecific. It would be useful to know specifics! Data sources/references should be included too. (Map 5.8 is a good example.)	Data source and references added where possible.	Maps modified

3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	M2	I do not see a corresponding information for this map in the Atlas.	The atlas does not include the M maps.	No action
3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	M2	Suggestions for updates are needed as this map has very little value. Additions could include trail access, boat ramps, piers and docks.	This map is a replica of the 1980s map. The other (non-M) maps contain updates.	No action
3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	M2	In addition to the heron rookery there is now an egret nesting rookery on the east side of the Charleston Bridge. Other colonial nesters (e.g., eagle nesting sites) may also occur and should be included within the CBEMP boundary.	This map is a replica of the 1980s map. The other (non-M) maps contain updates.	No action
3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	M5	Consider adding the spoil islands in upper Coos Bay adjacent to the Mill Casino as potential restoration sites.	This map is a replica of the 1980s map. The other (non-M) maps contain updates.	No action
3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	Restoration sites inventory	How will the data on this map be reconciled with the M5 Mitigation Sites map?	The M5 map is the existing replica of the mylar. The restoration sites map is intended to provide updates and could be used in future phases.	Phase 2
3/14/2023	feedback form	Jan	Hodder		mapping	Sea level rise	To make the map easier to read it would be helpful to have more distinct colors for the four scenarios.	Color palettes modified.	Map modified
2/17/2023	letter via email	Courtney	Krossman	Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua & Siuslaw Indians	mapping	all	Some maps included in the Phase I revision are would already be considered out of date; it is especially important that inventories and data for culturally significant and sensitive species, including, but not limited to, eelgrass, triangle sedge, and razor clams, are updated in a manner that reflects current conditions poor data will yield poor decision making.	Additional maps and data can be included in future phases of the project.	Phase 2
1/30/2023	letter	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	mapping		We understand that the maps have not been incorporated into the matrixes,and the matrices have not been updated/amended. Please confirm. Why are they in the amendment file if they have not been amended? How will the updated the maps affect them if they are not updated?	Future phase will consider updating management units including the matrices. Existing management units rely on the matrices as developed.	Phase 2

1/30/2023	letter	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	mapping		Is there a reason the Coos Estuary and Shoreland Map Atlas (included in the AM19-03 file) are not included in the AM22-05 file?	Website fixed to include Atlas.	Website modified
2/25/2023	email	Bill	Grill		mapping		Obvious mapping errors (North Bend School District off by half a mile, several maps without Coos Bay UGB) shows lack of attention to detail. What other errors are there in the maps and detail being circulated? "If at some point, revisions are to be brought forward to Goal 16 or 17 inventory data... such as any proposed modification to a Goal 16 eel grass bed or major marsh (as examples)... the consequences could be potentially catastrophic to LCDC-acknowledged planning and zoning designations and even to the North Spit development exceptions that withstood a vigorous challenge before the Oregon Court of Appeals."	School District area dates to 2019. Additional data will be considered in future phases including revisions of maps, etc.	Phase 2
2/19/2023	letter	Beverly	Segner		mapping		The current, time-constrained update process falls far short of meeting Goal 1 requirements of the statewide land use planning system	Additional time and opportunity for review and comment offered.	Public comment period extended
2/22/2023	feedback form	Jamie	Fereday		mapping		why are some obvious tidal areas, such as Ross Slough, outside the CBEMP? Several other tidal zones not included	Will need data source if it is to be included. To be considered in Phase 2.	Need data....
2/21/2023	feedback form	Steve	Skinner		mapping		CBEMP boundary/study area boundary -- needs bright color boundary lines or different notable shading colors within boundary lines, so one can see the actual area being looked at.	Map modification made.	Map modified
2/21/2023	feedback form	Steve	Skinner		mapping		Substrate map: is virtually useless in current format. Impossible to detect all those shadings.	Map modification made.	Map modified
2/21/2023	feedback form	Steve	Skinner		mapping		Tsunami Map: maybe scientifically correct, but is useless as depicted. Should show the result of tsunami wave(s) of varying heights coming straight over North Spit ponds (lowest point) and into Bay, e.g., 100+ feet/worst case scenario, 50 feet, 20 feet, etc.	Data is as provided by DOGAMI.	No action
2/21/2023	feedback form	Steve	Skinner		mapping		Landslide Risk Map: doesn't show any risk along Highway 101 in North Bend where there is a known high-risk slide area.	Data is as provided by DOGAMI.	No action
2/21/2023	feedback form	Steve	Skinner		mapping		Wetlands map: seems incomplete. I would cite Willanch Slough as an example.	LWI map removed (for Phase 2). NWI map is based upon DSL layer.	Phase 2

2/21/2023	feedback form	Steve	Skinner		mapping		Wetlands map: doesn't show Empire Lakes area which includes wetlands all around the upper lake in particular, as well as wetlands between Acherman and Morrison extending west from Morrison... all of which drain into Chichras (sp?) Creek which empties into the Bay.	Outside of study area.	No action
2/21/2023	feedback form	Steve	Skinner		mapping		Economic Zones map: still list Georgia-Pacific, but does not list Airport Business Park.	Economic Zones were not updated in Phase 1. Could be revisited in Phase 2.	Phase 2
2/21/2023	feedback form	Steve	Skinner		mapping		Estuary Features map: shows Airport boat launch which will probably never be accessible again and also shows a commercial boat launch at Virginia Sreet and Pony Slough which does not, to my knowledge, exist.	To be considered with future phases.	Phase 2
2/21/2023	feedback form	Steve	Skinner		mapping		Toxic Sites map: Didn't see one. Known sites are Sitka mill to south and Georgia Pacific area (a dead zone), but I know there is another site not listed which is where the giant Cape Arago Mill sat on Empire between Newmark and running several blocks north to the bluff. You can see "ooze" around low tide.	To be considered with future phases.	Phase 2
2/21/2023	feedback form	Steve	Skinner		mapping		Historic Reference map: Didn't see one. Would be useful and helpful to public to see map(s) of what the estuary looked like prior to 1850, then 1900, 1950...	If the data exists these maps can be included in future phases.	Phase 2
2/21/2023	feedback form	Steve	Skinner		mapping		Maps: maybe too many; were school districts and employment maps really relevant?	To be considered with future phases.	Phase 2
2/17/2023	letter	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	mapping		Maps: The maps are much improved, and we appreciate your willingness to prolong the adoption timeline to ensure the maps are higher resolution, more transparent about data sources, and contain all necessary background information. However, an online GIS map-viewer that allows users to layer data information (MUs on top of biotic resources, for example) is still not posted on the county website. We recommend such a spatial tool be incorporated for the Phase 2 update.	To be considered with future phases.	Phase 2

5/26/2023	email	Steve	Miller		mapping		I would urge that updated biological survey data be incorporated to represent the most current condition of various aspects of Coos Bay's estuarine life and habitat. Using so much data sourced from 2015 would not appear to provide an adequate appraisal of those resources for the purpose of this update.	To be considered with future phases.	Phase 2
1/30/2023	letter	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	definitions		Please provide citations to the state or federal laws that are the source of the proposed amendments to four definitions.	Citations added in Revisions memo.	Revisions memo
2/17/2023	email	Gabrielle	Bratt	Coquille Indian Tribe	definitions		CBEMP Part 1: a few of the definitions like "archaeological resources", "natural" and "natural resources" could definitely use some updating. But again, I'm not sure if this would be a now-update or a later one. At the very least, I think where the "natural resources" definition has the phrase "usefulness to man" should become more gender-neutral.	Natural resource definition amended as recommended.	Change made
5/26/2023	email	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	definitions		Definitions: Temporary Alterations: The definition of temporary alterations is not consistent with the DSL definition, which could cause inefficiencies in the usability of the plan/permitting process. According to the DSL removal-fill guide, "Temporary impacts are defined as those that are rectified within 24 months of initiating the impact," as opposed to the three-year definition provided in the current CBEMP. This is an important distinction, and we suggest deferring to the DSL definition to standardize.	To be considered with future phases.	Phase 2
2/20/2023	email	Michelle	McMullin	NOAA Federal	Phase 2		I agree that phase 2 will be a worthwhile endeavor given that much of the plan was developed prior to Endangered Species Act listing of anadromous fish species that are present in the Coos Bay estuary and also prior to designation of critical habitat of those species.	No response needed at this time.	No action

2/17/2023	letter via email	Courtney	Krossman	Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua & Siuslaw Indians	Phase 2		There are other maps that are not included in the Phase I Revision that, in the Tribe's view, should be updated, including cultural resource inventories.	Phase 2 work program.	Phase 2
2/25/2023	email	Bill	Grill		Phase 2		"The cost in dollars, staff time and local official time far exceeds the benefit of even tinkering with the acknowledged plan. At best there is little to benefit from the effort underway and at worst, hard-fought decisions to allow limited development of the North Spit can fall jeopardy to potential inventory changes affecting estuarine management units and shoreland goal exceptions."	40 years of change (environmental, social, economic, and cultural) need to be acknowledged and reflected in the CBEMP. No changes in Phase 1 to North Spit development potential.	No action
2/19/2023	letter	Beverly	Segner		Phase 2		Phase 1, focusing on modernizing the format, making technical changes, and updating the maps, constitutes an acceptable scope for a first step -- so long as it is clearly understood to be the preliminary to a complete revision of the plan.	No response needed at this time.	No action
2/17/2023	letter	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	Phase 2		We request that the local jurisdictions explicitly commit to continuing the planning process, now that these initial, technical changes have been dealt with. We would suggest that the changes now under consideration in "Phase 1" be clearly recognized as simply the first steps in an essential, comprehensive EMP review, update, and full revision. Standing alone, the "Phase 1" revisions are not adequate to address the inefficiencies in the EMP implementation and the challenges of the climate crisis.	No response needed at this time.	Phase 2
2/17/2023	email	Gabrielle	Bratt	Coquille Indian Tribe	Phase 2		There is definitely room for improvement when it comes to cultural/archaeological resources, Tribal engagement and interest in not only those cultural sites but also educational outreach, natural resources projects like watershed restoration, etc. But again, these seem to be larger-scale updates that will happen in Phase 2.	No response needed at this time.	Phase 2

3/15/2023	email	Ken	Bonetti		Phase 2		Ensure a comprehensive update and timeline to address climate change adaptations and establish climate justice imperatives.	No response needed at this time.	Phase 2
2/27/2023	feedback form	Donna	Bonetti		Phase 2		Dredging the bay for a port would damage sensitive wetlands and water for fisheries. When and where is the airport going to move? It is not a question of if but when and where. I suggest somewhere near the Bandon Golf Course. Maybe soon!	No response needed at this time.	Phase 2
2/27/2023	feedback form	Ken	Bonetti		Phase 2		It's clear from the map a large port facility and dredging would damage many aquatic plant areas, clams, and oyster beds along the North Spit to Jordan Cove. Construction would do a lot of damage and resulting large ship traffic plus large industrial port facilities and pollution would finish off what is left of sensitive sea and estuary life.	No response needed at this time.	Phase 2
1/30/2023	letter	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	Phase 2		What is the specific reason the more recent work by the Institute for Policy Research and Engagement developing the Coos Bay Coastal Hazard Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Plan, the Coos Bay Climate Hazards Adaption Plan, and relevant hazards mapping is not being included in this phase 1 amendment? As you know, they recommend adopting a sea level rise/flooding overlay in the zoning codes and urge the adoption of a regulation that prohibits maladaptive development in flood areas. If it will be taken up in Phase 2, have you been told when that will start?	No response needed at this time.	Phase 2
5/25/2023	email	Beverly	Segner		Phase 2		Commitment to a comprehensive Phase 2: Resources need to be accessed and allocated for this process. We have made a great start. It is vital that we keep going.	Commitment of resources will be at the discretion of the County Commission and/or City Councils.	Phase 2
5/25/2023	email	Beverly	Segner		Tribal Sovereignty		... including a section about Tribal Sovereignty as it relates to the CBEMP is important.	This could be part of the additions made for Phase 2.	Phase 2

2/16/2023 (received 5/26/23)	email	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	Tribal Sovereignty		We believe an amendment to section 1.6 directing the County to enter into a coordination and cooperation agreement with the Tribes should be adopted.	This could be part of the additions made for Phase 2. The Tribes have been incorporated into the multi-jurisdictional Steering Committee.	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	Tribal Sovereignty		We strongly suggest a section should be added to the plan to clearly outline how Coos County and the local planners intend to consult and engage with Tribal nations whose home territories include portions of Coos Bay-- the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians and the Coquille Indian Tribe-- on future updates and long-term maintenance of the plan. We cannot speak to the level of engagement tribes would prefer regarding estuary management, so we recommend local governments explicitly ask. This is necessary to ensure Tribal sovereignty is adequately respected and integrated into the CBEMP, and to foster co-management in stewarding estuarine resources. This plan for Tribal engagement should be incorporated now in the Phase 1 update, to set the stage for appropriate government-to-government coordination in the next Phase 2 update. Furthermore, tribal input should also be fully considered in advance to final decision-making on the current phase of the plan to make sure all governments are in agreement on how to proceed.	Tribal councils have been included in the Steering Committee. Further recommendations for inclusion would be part of Phase 2.	Change made, Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Larry	Basch		Tribal Sovereignty		To ensure Tribal Sovereignty is adequately respected and integrated into the CBEMP, a section should be added to outline how tribal engagement and consultation will be conducted in this and future CBEMP updates.	Tribal councils have been included in the Steering Committee. Further recommendations for inclusion would be part of Phase 2.	Change made, Phase 2
5/25/2023	email	Laurie	Friedman		Phase 2		I believe that it is important for the county to commit to a Phase 2 update. The current update process is a good start, but more time and resources are necessary for creating and implementing the best plan for any future development and usage of this precious community resource. An adaptive planning process should be a part of this plan, allowing for easier re-evaluation and revisions in the future.	No response needed at this time.	Phase 2

5/25/2023	email	Laurie	Friedman		Phase 2		I believe that we need greater community participation in Phase 2 of the CBEMP, in order to address the needs and concerns of the various groups and individuals who are most affected by these planning decisions. This includes participation from the commercial and recreational fishing interests, the local Tribes, tourism and local business interests and members of the scientific community.	No response needed at this time.	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Nolan & Janice	Lloyd		Phase 2		With the multitude of changes in the world and in the Bay Area, a simple Phase 1 update to modernize the language and exiting format won't be adequate to meet current and future challenges. We need to update or include sections pertaining to: <i>Management Units which need to be re-evaluated with new resource data. A plan for dredge materials disposal. A mitigation and restoration plan.</i>	No response needed at this time.	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Suzanne	Church		Phase 2		I think it essential to involve local citizens and tribal communities in input regarding the future of our beloved Coos Bay. I feel very, very strongly that such citizen led groups not include participation from big business or the port representation as a part of these groups. As a personal note, I was involved in fighting Jordan Cove and I have strong memories of the heavy handed opposition these "big money out of towners" lobbed in our direction. Please don't allow our bay to be spoiled by big money! I think it would be crucial to include the local fishing industry, the tourist industry, recreational interests, local tribal input, environmental concerns and individuals like myself who just want to fight for our bay.	No response needed at this time.	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Ken	Bonetti		Phase 2		Please commit to the Phase 2 update, particularly those sections that will ensure the plan can meet future conditions that will surely arise: management units, which need to be re-evaluated with new resource data, plan for dredge materials disposal, mitigation and restoration plan.	No response needed at this time.	Phase 2

5/25/2023	email	Ken	Bonetti		Phase 2		Please make sure the plan will be easily adaptive to streamline future revisions. We cannot afford to wait years to make changes when the need arises. An adaptive planning process should be embedded within the plan such that it can be maintained and regularly updated in the future. That means implementing a structured plan to re-evaluate and revise the plan in the future, including maps and resource inventories that should be updated as new data is collected.	No response needed at this time.	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Ken	Bonetti		Phase 2		Please increase stakeholder and citizen participation in guiding the comprehensive Phase 2 update of the CBEMP by creating a citizen advisory committee and technical advisory committee for this short-term update process.		
5/26/2023	email	Ken	Bonetti		Phase 2		A much more diverse citizen advisory committee is necessary to ensure the needs of the community are broadly represented. This would also expand citizen involvement in the update process. Importantly, representatives of government entities should not be on the citizen advisory committee. This includes the port authority, a governmental body with development interests that often conflict with the interests of the citizens. Port representation on the citizen advisory committee would be a conflict of interest. Government bodies should instead form a steering committee, separate from the advisory committee. The citizens' advisory committee should include the following stakeholders: the fishing industry, both recreational and commercial, the seafood industry, including aquaculture and seafood processing, local businesses broadly, tourism industry or commercial recreation businesses, recreational interests, the scientific community, the conservation/environmental community, at least 2 tribal members, one from each of the tribes whose territory includes the Coos Bay watershed - not as official representatives of the tribal government.	No response needed at this time.	Phase 2

5/26/2023	email	Ken	Bonetti		Phase 2		To guide technical scientific and policy changes to the plan during the Phase 2 update, a technical advisory committee composed of local experts is needed. This might include scientists from OIMB, state agencies, and member of the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds, for example.	No response needed at this time.	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Donna	Bonetti		Phase 2		Please commit to the Phase 2 update, particularly those sections that will ensure the plan can meet future conditions that will surely arise: o Management Units, which need to be re-evaluated with new resource data o Plan for Dredge Materials Disposal o Mitigation and Restoration Plan	No response needed at this time.	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Ken	Bonetti		Phase 2		To ensure Tribal Sovereignty is adequately respected and integrated into the CBEMP, a section should be added to outline how tribal engagement and consultation will be conducted in future CBEMP updates.	No response at this time.	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	Phase 2		The value of Phase 1 is strictly contingent on continuation of the EMP planning process to Phase 2, and this necessity should be clearly stated in the Phase 1 update.	No response at this time.	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	Phase 2		To be adaptive, the CBEMP must contain a specific protocol for monitoring plan success, re-evaluating, and regularly updating components. This would also include a clearly defined distinction between minor and major revisions, and the appropriate committees necessary to guide minor and major revisions. Key plan sections that require thorough updating are Management Units, which need to be re-evaluated with new resource data; Plan for Dredge Materials Disposal; and the Mitigation and Restoration Plan. The key elements that must be addressed in Phase 2 include (but aren't limited to): Climate resilience; restoration and reconnection of the estuary to its historical footprint; integration of planning considerations under Goal 16 with those of other goals (notably Goal 17, addressing shorelands, but also Goal 5, for wetlands, trails, and other features, Goal 7, Coastal Hazards, and others); water quality; endangered species; and habitat loss.	No response at this time.	Phase 2

5/26/2023	email	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	Phase 2	<p>Matrices: The matrices are not user-friendly. Though it may not be in the scope of this current Phase 1 update to change this system, this should be a priority consideration in future updates to improve plan interpretation and usability. Text descriptions of each management unit, including cultural and natural resources present, the MU classification and justification, resource capability, management objective, and special policies for each management unit should instead be included next to an image of each management unit to make it extremely clear what the boundaries are and what is and is not allowed. The MU can be hyperlinked in a table of contents next to a map of the entire estuary to allow users to click on the MU of interest and immediately see all necessary information. Even better would be a digital GIS map of all the management units (and data layers of relevant resources), that directs a user to a page including all the above-mentioned background information when clicked.</p>	No response at this time.	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Larry	Basch		Phase 2	<p>The current update, therefore, should set a strong foundation for a more comprehensive update in Phase 2. Indeed, the community demands that the county continue the update process beyond Phase 1 so that the final EMP is adaptive and robust. There are three essential plan elements that are not currently updated in phase 1, and it is essential that these elements are updated. These include: - Updated Management Units and coastal shorelands boundaries, each of which are classified as Natural, Conservation, or Development, and which detail what kind of uses and alterations are allowed within each unit (aquaculture, development, restoration, etc.) in each region of the estuary; - A comprehensive plan, including emergency protection contingencies, for Dredged Materials Disposal - A comprehensive Restoration and Mitigation plan.</p>	No response at this time.	Phase 2

5/26/2023	email	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	Part 1 Policies		The Plan Update is the most important section to revise. It should include a guideline for future updates; a commitment to a continuation of the CBEMP update process to Phase 2; an outline of what committees will be formed; and a distinction between major and minor revisions. It should also address the need for funding for ongoing efforts.	No response at this time.	Phase 2
2/10/2023	email	Deanna	Wright	National Flood Insurance Program Coordinator, DLCD	Part 1 Policies		Section 6 Dredge Material Disposal section. Recommend to insert section for floodplain guidelines. If dredged material is placed within the SFHA it would be considered "development" and need a local floodplain development permit.	Reference to SFHA requirements added.	Text change
2/10/2023	email	Deanna	Wright	National Flood Insurance Program Coordinator, DLCD	Part 1 Policies		Beaches & Dunes section 4 should link to Coos Bay's Specific Standards for Coastal High Hazard Flood Zones designated VE, V or coastal A (Land Development Ordinance Section 4.11.256). These areas have special flood hazard standards associated with high velocity waters from surges and, therefore, additional standards may apply in those coastal flood zones near dune areas for development.	Reference to SFHA requirements added.	Text change
5/26/2023	email	Rick	Eichstaedt	CTCLUSI	Part 1 Policies		Could you ensure that the CBEMP documents properly refer to the Tribe? It should be "Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians" – no comma after "Umpqua." Also, page Volume II, Page 1, Section 4, page 53 refers to the Tribe as "Coos, Siuslaw, Lower Umpqua Tribe(s)." This needs to be corrected.	Changes made to correct CTCLUSI references.	Text change

2/16/23 (received 5/26/23)	email	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	Part 1 Policies		<p>We ask that you propose to rewrite Policy 3 to require (notwithstanding any other provision of the plan): 1) a Policy 4 resource capabilities test and impact assessment test for any and all development proposals which contain or may impact the natural resources identified in the new inventory maps; and 2) a Policy 4a needs assessment which would require denial unless findings could be made to demonstrate the public's need and gain would warrant a modification or loss of the resource or "estuarine ecosystem." This appears to be needed to have the possibility of consideration of the updated information and all of it will be revisited when the county gets to a "phase 2 amendment." This may take some time and effort to draft and we urge you to take the time to consider it and craft it, asking the County to postpone filing the PAPA on March 1, as planned, if necessary.</p>	<p>This work is outside of the scope of Phase 1.</p> <p>Phase 2</p>
----------------------------------	-------	--------	---------	---------------	--------------------	--	---	---

2/16/23 (received 5/26/23)	email	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	Part 1 Policies	<p>we ask that you consider and urge a process to be adopted as a new policy (similar and in addition to what is requested above) which will require any applicant for a use or activity that will be located in the hazard areas identified in Map 5.3 (Flood Zones), Map 5.4 (Landslide Susceptibility), Map 5.8 (Sea Level Rise), and Map 5.9 (Tsunami Inundation) (among others potentially) to be required to submit a hazard/geologic assessment prior to permit approval (administrative or otherwise) to be written by a qualified licensed professional (from a pre-approved list) that conforms, at minimum (and as may be made applicable to those specific hazards), to the requirements the County adopted for the Balance of County in Article 5.11 of its Land Development Code in 2019. There is no way to address any of the hazards identified in those maps and protect the community, otherwise, we believe. There is still no proposal to apply hazards overlays in the Estuary despite the County's notice to its Planning Commission and the public in 2019 that it would be presented in 2020. As understood, findings supporting the adoption of such are presented in the Coos Bay Climate Hazards Adaptation Plan finalized in September 2022, and prepared by the Institute for Policy Research and Engagement, which could be adopted now, as well.</p>	This work is outside of the scope of Phase 1.	Phase 2
----------------------------------	-------	--------	---------	---------------	--------------------	--	---	---------

2/16/23 (received 5/26/23)	email	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	Part 1 Policies	<p>Thirdly, we ask you to thoroughly consider and comment on the County's position that, aside from amending four definitions and the citizens involvement provision, 2.4, it is not making any substantive amendments. We do not find this to be accurate. There are numerous substantive amendments, despite their seemingly subtle nature. We have only begun to make a list of them but anticipate that you should also find this to be the case. General examples include: 1) restating an allowed use or activity to track the relevant goal or rule language to now including a use or activity not before listed, like "related dredging" for mining operation (see Vol 2 Pt 1 § 5 p. 38 3-DA Management Unit); 2) allowing uses conditionally which were not allowed before; and 3) moving an activity - like Navigation activities related to water-dependent commercial enterprises and activities - from a conditional activity (subject to policies 5 and 8 requiring impact minimization) to an allowed conditional use. See Vol. 2 Pt 1, § 5 p.6 CSDNC- DA management unit (electronic page 124). These are all substantive amendments to the management units. The CBEMP acknowledges that it may restrict estuarine development to be less intensive than uses allowed by Goal 16. Amendments which now only restrict development to that which is equal to that allowed by Goal 16 are substantive amendments and there should be no confusion about that.</p>	<p>These changes are based upon lawfully adopted plan amendments made by Coos Bay. This PAPA integrates those amendments into Coos County's version, but does not trigger substantive amendments/management unit "changes" by so doing.</p>	<p>See Revisions Memo for clarification</p>
----------------------------------	-------	--------	---------	---------------	--------------------	--	---	---

5/26/2023	email	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	Part 1 Policies		<p>Rogue Climate strongly supports a comprehensive update of the Coos Bvay Estuary Management plan to follow Phase 1. A comprehensive update of the Coos Bay Estuary Management plan is critical not only for navigating potential development proposals, but also in planning for climate adaptaions. Climate change is increasingly impacting the South Coast, as evidenced by the recent heat wave in May 2023. Estuaries are an essential climate solution that help coastal communities mitigate impacts cush as sea level rise, ocean acidification, flooding, and more. The same consulatants from IPRE working on this current update also led a series of interviews, surveys, and focus groups in 2022, and issued a report addressing the climate vulnerability and adaptation needs of communities along the Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan boundary zone. As climate change continues to impact the estuary and the communities that depend on it, the CBEMP shour reflect the changes that are already happening to the estuary and plan for adaption, mitigation, and future hazards. The comprehensive CBEMP update - Phase 2 - is an essential step towards preparing Coos County to be resilient in the face of climate change. We urge you to ensure a comprehensive Phase 2 update moves forward.</p>	This work is outside of the scope of Phase 1.	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	Part 1 Policies		<p>Management Section 2.1 (Page 2): The language of this section appears to place the Port of Coos Bay inappropriately on the same footing as the local governmental jurisdictions. The idea of a management agreement among the county, the cities, and the Port being required for a “coordinated intergovernmental estuary plan” is troubling—the Port, a development interest run by political appointees, should be subject to the planning decisions of the county and cities. The Port should not be elevated to the status of co-manager, although it would be appropriate for the Port to be represented on a steering committee with the other governmental entities.</p>	The Port has been recognized as a partner agency since the original adoption of the CBEMP. They are represented on the steering committee with other governmental entities.	No action

5/26/2023	email	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	Part 1 Policies	<p>Management Units: Natural A10: Riprap may ultimately be allowable to protect infrastructure build prior to October of 1977, plus “unique natural resources, historical and archaeological values, and public facilities.” However, as with riprap permits on the outer coast, there should be a clear set of preferred actions, including natural vegetation, temporary protection, and moving structures, with hardened structures as the last resort. Natural B3: Active restoration should fall under Natural A. Natural B6: Language allowing boat ramps should additionally state “where installation and operation of ramps would not adversely affect natural or cultural resources.” Natural B8: “Temporary” should be defined and restricted in scope; the definition, which should be included in the definitions section of the plan, should limit “temporary” to two years, as per DSL fill-and-removal regulations (see also below). Natural B9: Nature of pipelines, cables, and utility crossings allowed should be specified. Conservation B3: Mining and mineral extraction should not be allowed in this category—they are clearly development activities and should be restricted to development units. If there is some very particular reason why a mining or other extractive activity would necessarily be allowed in an area designated for conservation, the reason should be explicitly stated. Conservation B6: Here again, “temporary” must be defined. Development A8: “Flow-lane” should be defined here and added to definitions.</p>	This work is outside of the scope of Phase 1.	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	Part 1 Policies	<p>#5 Estuarine Fill and Removal 1a: Allowing fill for non-water-dependent uses if a “public need...outweighs harm to navigation, fishing, and recreation” omits important considerations: habitat and biological productivity, endangered species, buffering floods, to name several. Perhaps this could be summed up as “harm to ecological functions.” #5 Estuarine Fill and Removal 1a: Mitigation should be of like kind wherever possible.</p>	This work is outside of the scope of Phase 1.	Phase 2

2/17/2023	email	Gabrielle	Bratt	Coquille Indian Tribe	Part 2	<p>Part 2:</p> <p>-There are definitely a lot more copy-edit issues in this document, like misspellings, commas instead of periods, weird spacing, etc.</p> <p>-In the Area 12 (pg. 13) section "South Slough Estuarine Sanctuary" needs to be updated to "South Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve" (SSNERR)</p> <p>-In section 3.4 it should be mentioned that the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians also have interest in the CoosBay/North Bend area.</p> <p>-pg. 5 in 3.4 it used the phrase "pre-historic", and "pre-contact" is the more appropriate, commonly used phrase.</p>	Scrivener's errors in Part 2 fixed.	Text change
2/20/2023	email	Michelle	McMullin	NOAA Federal	Part 2	<p>Volume II Part 2, 2.3 explains that tidegates were used to distinguish the "effective head of tide, and therefore the furthest extent of the estuarine area..." and that areas upstream of tidegates were not considered estuarine. This designation of estuarine areas is directly related to coastal shorelines as defined under Statewide Planning Goal #17. I recommend revisiting the use of existing tidegates to designate or define head of tide because it has the potential to underestimate estuarine areas in Coos Bay and the extent of coastal shorelines. Many tidegates are being replaced or are in planning to be replaced, with some tidegates allowing greater tidal inflow which will extend estuarine areas farther upstream.</p>	Modification to definition of tidegates (and hence delineation of boundary of estuarine areas) outside of scope of Phase 1. Could be considered as part of Phase 2.	Phase 2
2/20/2023	email	Michelle	McMullin	NOAA Federal	Part 2	<p>Volume II Part 2, 6.2.2 Drainage Diversion or 6.2.7 Toxic Materials: if these sections are referring to surface water runoff from upland disposal sites, I recommend adding additional protective language for upland disposal of materials that do not pass sediment evaluation tests (i.e., contain contaminants). For upland disposal of these types of materials, I recommend any surface water runoff be contained or otherwise managed. Surface water runoff from upland disposal sites, or return water, should meet state water quality standards. Generally speaking, this refers to more than just turbidity or suspended sediments.</p>	Outside of scope of Phase 1. Could be considered in Phase 2.	Phase 2

2/20/2023	email	Michelle	McMullin	NOAA Federal	Part 2	Volume II Part 1 #4a states that other State agencies only have 20 days to determine if a use is deemed consistent with the plan or if it can be made consistent. Please consider if this is indeed sufficient time for other State agencies to be sufficiently responsive considering frequently heavy workloads.	No change recommended at this time	No action
5/26/2023	email	Jan	Hodder		Part 2	My understanding from attending the public open house meetings was that the Data Source and the associated maps developed by the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds were informational only and would serve as the basis for a subsequent update of the CBEMP. I was surprised to see the recommendation that they be incorporated into the part 1 process. In the page 9 table it appears that not all elements of the CBEMP subheadings have a corresponding Data source. This seems to make for rather a mishmash of 1985/2015 information. Does this not have the potential to be confusing to users of the CBEMP prior to any formal update? The Data Source information is certainly comprehensive, although almost a decade old, and will serve as a good starting point for the next phase of the CBEMP update.	The Data Source is attached as Section 8 of Part 2. Chapters 2, 4 and 5 of Part 2 were deleted as the Data Source supersedes this information. New narrative for the remaining sections for Part 2 will be part of the Phase 2 project.	Phase 2

5/26/2023	email	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	Part 2	<p>We are concerned that this Phase 1 process does not address outdated data. As understood, the maps in Appendix A are the 1985 maps, and even if they contain new data, that new data is not being implemented through substantive plan changes. The May 1, 2023 Staff memo, however, states that the Data Source (identified as "background" in the AM 22-05 file) contains new information and that that information has been included in the revised CBEMP Part 2. Yet, that does not appear to be the case. Looking at the Part 2 document one does not find new narratives replacing the prior text. The CBEMP & Data Source Comparison chart starting on page 9 of the memorandum states that CBEMP Part 2 subheading 2 "The Setting" will be replaced with the Data Source Chapter 8. However, in the CBEMP Part 2 document in the file, Chapter 2 is not included. Moreover, the Part 2 headings do not track the CBEMP & Data Source Comparison chart and again, neither does the Part 2 document itself demonstrate what Data Source information is replacing the prior text. How is this updated information to be implemented in the regulatory system?</p>	<p>The Data Source is attached as Section 8 of Part 2. No additional changes were made to Part 2, apart from scrivener's errors/formatting corrections. New narrative sections for Part 2 will be part of the Phase 2 project. References to changes to Part 2 to reflect chapters of the Data Source have been removed.</p>	<p>Changes made, Phase 2</p>
5/26/2023	email	Donna	Bonetti		Part 1 Policies	<p>Make sure the plan will be easily adaptive to streamline future revisions. We cannot afford to wait years to make changes when the need arises. An adaptive planning process should be embedded within the plan such that it can be maintained and regularly updated in the future. That means implementing a structured plan to re-evaluate and revise the plan in the future, including maps and resource inventories that should be updated as new data is collected.</p>	<p>No response at this time.</p>	<p>Phase 2</p>
2/21/2023	email	Christine	Moffitt		Review	<p>The time frame (adoption of CBEMP by March 1, 2023) is clearly not sufficient time to review the output and engage in the process....The proposed current update process needs to be extended.</p>	<p>3 additional months of public comment were provided.</p>	<p>Public comment period extended</p>

2/19/2023	letter	Beverly	Segner		Review		I ask that a period for public comment and assessment be created to allow for meaningful evaluation and input on the maps. Further, that a draft document be submitted to the public for comments and revision <u>prior</u> to preparation of a final draft. And that the final draft be presented to the public for comment before it is submitted to the three local governments. rather than after.	3 additional months of public comment were provided.	Public comment period extended
2/19/2023	letter	Beverly	Segner		Review		The comment period should take place before the plan is considered separately by the three local governments. This public comment period must include a full public presentation on the plan—we would suggest both an in-person event, with people on hand to explain the maps, and a webinar...Completion of the “final” plan delivered by the consultants can include a full public comment period and still take place by June; consideration by the local governments can subsequently occur as part of their normal cycle of planning processes.	3 additional months of public comment were provided.	Public comment period extended
2/10/2023	email	Jan	Hodder		Review		I urge you to delay the adoption of the plan to allow several additional steps to be undertaken that will improve the product and allow for more robust next steps towards the ultimate final update of the plan. Specifically, I would encourage opportunity for a robust review of the maps and data sources with some significant ground truthing...Additionally updates post the 2015 data source document could be identified. Although this may slow the process the county could accept the current work of the consultants as a work product and outline the next steps for final adoption.	3 additional months of public comment were provided.	Public comment period extended
3/15/2023	email	Ken	Bonetti		Review		Establish a formalized Tribal consultation process that respects and acknowledges Tribal sovereignty and ensures meaningful Tribal participation.	3 additional months of public comment were provided.	Public comment period extended

2/22/2023	feedback form	Jamie	Fereday		Review		Recommendation for SWOCC/PCW/SSNERR to host Estuary Series aka Geology Lecture Series put on by Ron Metzger when he was teaching (now retired.) I will put energy into organizing these.	3 additional months of public comment were provided. A presentation was made to the CTCLUSI Tribal Council and outreach was made to Coquille tribal council.	Public comment period extended
2/22/2023	feedback form	CJ	Blaney		Review		I would love to have these maps available in the Coos Bay and North Bend libraries' reference sections.	The decision to physically display maps will need to be made by each jurisdiction.	No action
2/27/2023	feedback form	Connie	Earhart		Review		I would like to see a "permanent" display of these. Possibly at the Coos Bay Library?	The decision to physically display maps will need to be made by each jurisdiction.	No action
2/27/2023	feedback form	Charlotte	Hult		Review		Can we superimpose maps online? Make sure these are available in the libraries! Thanks for posting these. So much to learn.	On-line map viewer hosted by DLCD available as of June 1.	On-line map viewer
2/19/2023	letter	Beverly	Segner		Review		There is no clear evidence that indigenous perspectives were brought to bear on the current process.	3 additional months of public comment were provided. A presentation was made to the CTCLUSI Tribal Council and outreach was made to Coquille tribal council.	Public comment period extended
2/17/2023	letter via email	Courtney	Krossman	Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua & Siuslaw Indians	Review		It feels like the official Phase I Revision process happened without sufficient Tribal notice, opportunity to engage and was missing inventory information needed to assess the revision...Step back and expanded Tribal and indigenous engagement.	3 additional months of public comment were provided. A presentation was made to the CTCLUSI Tribal Council and outreach was made to Coquille tribal council.	Public comment period extended
3/15/2023	email	Ken	Bonetti		Review		Improve and ensure broad and formalized community engagement in the update process and make it more accessible to the community at large. There needs to be much more community engagement events, and a transparent, inclusive and accessible process.	3 additional months of public comment were provided. Two additional in-person review of maps were held.	Public comment period extended

5/25/2023	email	Beverly	Segner		Review		Thank you sincerely for positively responding to the requests to extend the public comment period for Phase 1 of the CBEMP including the addition of public hearings prior to final votes on the plan. This meant a lot to me as a citizen.	3 additional months of public comment were provided. No response needed.	Public comment period extended
5/25/2023	email	Beverly	Segner		Review		I would also like to compliment you on the quality of the meeting held earlier this month at the Coos Bay City Council Chambers. The presentations were excellent. And happily, the technology cooperated beautifully! Hopefully, the Phase 1 update will continue to completion in a good way to create accurate maps, documents, and a unified process as solid foundations for the CBEMP.	No response needed.	No action
5/25/2023	email	Beverly	Segner		Review		The integrity of the CBEMP and its viability must be protected to that it is a living plan with accurate documents, maps, and relevant procedures. Funding this process for the future needs to be prioritized as part of the plan itself.	Funding is not part of the plan amendmnet; rather commitment of resources will be the discretion of the County Commission and/or City Councils.	ongoing/Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Jan	Hodder		Review		I am pleased to see that the mylar maps that were originally developed for the 1985 CBEMP adoption have been digitized. I am strongly supportive of bringing the three jurisdictions (Coos County, City of Coos Bay, and City of North Bend) back into alignment under one guiding document and the work that is included in the document to do so.	No action required.	No action
5/26/2023	email	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	Review		From our understanding, this current comment period is for the Phase 1 update, which is limited in scope, primarily making the CBEMP document more user-friendly - digitized.1 We understand the importance of making structural updates such as converting the hand-drawn and mylar maps into a digitized format, and hyperlinking the textual document. We urge you to ask the planners to treat only those portions of the CBEMP that constitute a plan amendment as subject to the post acknowledgment amendment proceeding. This will help clarify what staff believes is a substantive amendment and what is merely a structural/digitizing reformatting.	All changes to adopted ordinances, including Scrivener's errors amendments, are PAPAs.	No action

5/26/2023	email	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	Review		<p>We are concerned that this Phase 1 process does not address outdated data. As understood, the maps in Appendix A are the 1985 maps, and even if they contain new data, that new data is not being implemented through substantive plan changes. The May 1, 2023 Staff memo, however, states that the Data Source (identified as "background" in the AM 22-05 file) contains new information and that that information has been included in the revised CBEMP Part 2. Yet, that does not appear to be the case. Looking at the Part 2 document one does not find new narratives replacing the prior text. The CBEMP & Data Source Comparison chart starting on page 9 of the memorandum states that CBEMP Part 2 subheading 2 "The Setting" will be replaced with the Data Source Chapter 8. However, in the CBEMP Part 2 document in the file, Chapter 2 is not included. Moreover, the Part 2 headings do not track the CBEMP & Data Source Comparison chart and again, neither does the Part 2 document itself demonstrate what Data Source information is replacing the prior text. How is this updated information to be implemented in the regulatory system?</p>	<p>The Data Source is attached as Section 8 of Part 2. No additional changes were made to Part 2, apart from scrivener's errors/formatting corrections. New narrative sections for Part 2 will be part of the Phase 2 project.</p>	Phase 2
5/26/2023	email	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	Review		<p>Additionally, we ask that you exercise your discretion and authority to work to remedy the Goal 1 problems by: 1) convening a series of public meetings to thoroughly review the Data Source information; 2) conduct a separate public meeting or more to thoroughly review the changes to the Part 1 management units; 3) direct that the prior versions of the documents (most were amended in May), and all comments received since January 1, 2023 be included in this record; and 4) direct that the minutes, agendas and packets (including prior versions of the documents) considered at the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds meetings be included in this record.</p>	<p>Review and further refinement/updating of the Data Source is recommended as part of Phase 2. No changes were made to Part 1 Management Units apart from those made to incorporate previously lawfully adopted changes in the Coos Bay version of the document (and applicable only to Coos Bay), hence no additional public meetings were required to review changes to Part 1. All comments received since January 2023 are incorporated in this document and attached for reference. Prior versions of the</p>	Comments attached.

2/16/23 (received 5/26/23)	email	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	Review		<p>Fourthly, we ask that you urge the County to remedy what we believe is a Goal 1 violation. This 5-year planning process has not had a public participation component, until an open house conducted on January 7, 2023, that only had 19 days of public notice, over the winter holidays. As we define it, public participation includes notice and opportunity to comment. The County has a current, adopted public participation plan which includes convening a citizens advisory committee (CAC) which shall be involved in all phases of the planning process and which shall represent the broad geographical area and varied interests. CBEMP Vol 2 pt 1 § 1.5. The CAC involvement, aiding the planning process by raising concerns and/or supporting revisions, is to occur prior to public hearings and determinations by the planning commissions. CBEMP Vol 2 pt 1 § 2.4. This has not occurred. This could be remedied by conducting 2 or well noticed (with sufficient lead-time) meetings to engage the public generally, to enable an understanding, to raise concerns and to voice support for the proposals. We urge you to ask for this public engagement before the PAPA is filed.</p>	<p>Coos County does not currently have a standing Citizen Involvement Committee. Additional opportunities for public comment were offered based upon this request (including three additional months of review time, map viewing at SWOCC, open house, etc.).</p>	Additional time for review and comment provided.
2/16/23 (received 5/26/23)	email	Ashley	Audycki	Rogue Climate	Review	<p>Finally, we ask that you consider and urge the County to consider and take steps to put in place a moratorium on development in the CBEMP management units, if this Phase 1 amendment does not require decision making to be based upon the updated inventories presented in the maps to be adopted and/or if the Phase 2 amendment will not be completed by 2026.</p>	<p>A development moratorium is not recommended at this time. The updated inventories were not intended on being regulatory in nature.</p>	No action	

5/26/2023	email	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	Review		Much of the Phase 1 process focused on necessary technicalities. As we commented on an earlier draft, these updates were badly needed, and by the end of this Phase 1 process, the CBEMP will be a more functional document for <u>interim</u> use. We commend the diligent work that has gone into removing outdated language and improving the plan's usability. We have concerns about the maps when it comes to their use over time, but what has been done to update and improve the maps constitutes a valuable <u>initial</u> step.	Staff concurs.	No action
5/26/2023	email	Phillip	Johnson	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	Review		Our understanding is that the intention is to submit the entire final draft of Phase 1 for consideration as a Post-Acknowledgment Plan Amendment. It is unclear why this should be the case. The majority of the changes to the current CBEMP consists of format changes, digitalization, and technical re-wording. It would not seem that such changes need a PAPA. There are some changes of substance in the current draft, however, and these might need a PAPA; some of our recommendations below would also need a plan amendment. We ask for clarity on this point. The draft should make clear to the local governments which changes can be made purely as technical updates, and which require (or are believed to require) a PAPA. This would facilitate a discussion of which substantial changes could be deferred to Phase 2, without delaying adoption of needed formal changes that might not require a PAPA.	Format changes and technical rewording require a Type IV application/Post-Acknowledgement Plan Amendment (PAPA), as any change to the adopted ordinance triggers these requirements.	No action

5/26/2023	email	Nolan & Janice	Lloyd		Review	We need to embed an adaptive planning process in the plan to make sure the CBEMP is maintained and updated regularly in the future. It has been more than 40 years since the plan was created and many changes have occurred in the world and here in the Bay Area that the original document could not possibly have anticipated. I am aware that this is something that plan updates struggle with universally but it is possible to do it. Adaptive management is a structured, iterative process that includes a system to monitor, re-evaluate and analyze plan success, and then adapt the plan accordingly. The CBEMP should have a structured plan to re-evaluate and revise the plan in the future, including maps and resource inventories that can be updated as new data is collected.	No response at this time.	Phase 2
-----------	-------	----------------	-------	--	--------	--	---------------------------	---------