

Number	Name	Date Received	For or against	Synopsis (please see attachment for full comments)
1	Kelley Argenta	October 18, 2019	Against	Natural Aquatic areas are managed for resource protection preservation and restoration. JCEP is requesting to change the zone to a DDNC-DA zone. There is a reason that areas have been designated NA. JCEP is not worth losing our natural resources. Community needs to explore other revenue sources and keep the ones we have. JCEP needs to be stopped completely and permanently.
2	Geoffy Tollin	October 19, 2019	Against	Natural Aquatic areas are managed for resource protection preservation and restoration. JCEP is requesting to change the zone to a DDNC-DA zone. There is a reason that areas have been designated NA. JCEP is not worth losing our natural resources. Community needs to explore other revenue sources and keep the ones we have. JCEP needs to be stopped completely and permanently.
3	Andy and Lynn Nasburg	October 18, 2019	For	Our relatives arrived in the area in the 1890s. Encourage the proposal to amend the CBEMP. We've seen the economy on the south coast gradually decline from the loss of timber resources. LNG project will create a very valuable addition to our deep-water port. The proposed dredging will not cause drastic damage. The proposal will be a big plus factor in bringing in big ships.
4	Mrs. Bear	October 19, 2019	Against	Science would be a great thing to quote to defend your decision. The issue is very polarizing. Requesting Council to see a science presentation.
5	Ronni Jennings	October 21, 2019	Against	No LNG wanted or needed in Coos Bay. We want our coastline to remain as is.

6	Karma Detra	October 23, 2019	Against	We have a beautiful state and don't need a pipeline that will leak over time. Why let Canada use our land to sell their oil?
7	Barb Shamet	October 28, 2019	Against	Massive opportunity for wind energy in Port of Coos Bay. Coos Bay can become a major hub on the Pacific coast for this promising new industry. Cites reference from Sec 2. Act of Congress, 1859, February 14, admitting Oregon to the Union. LNG represents a violation to our "public right of way" on Oregon's waster and is a poor use of Oregon's waters. Proposal is contradictory to the Salmon restoration recovery plan.
8	Bill Nolan	October 28, 2019	Against	Extreme objection to the project. Ruins people's lives and property values. The fisheries are in trouble already, and the proposal will probably finish off our fisheries. Please do your job to protect the environment from the greed of the few wealthy industrialists.
9	Bill Gaunt	October 30, 2019	For	In favor of the JCEP project and all necessary permits including the dredging of Coos Bay. Coos Bay desperately needs new businesses. Just one block from City Hall there is a sign that reads "this entire block for sale." Timber revenue, once the backbone of Coos Bay is going away. Coos Bay has a very rare resource – a shipping port within a couple miles of the Pacific Ocean. We need to develop this resource or continue to see more and more businesses shutting down locally.
10	Felice Kelly	October 30, 2019	Against	The proposal goes against the letter and spirit of Goal 16. The City Council should consider the 30-50-year timeframe as Oregon has passed HB 3543 which aims to reduce carbon emissions. If approved, JCEP would be the state's largest carbon emitter. The proposal does not deserve a Goal 16 exception.

11	Patrick Kenyon (or John Hall?)	October 30, 2019	Against	Is for jobs in the community but has concerns the JCEP is a “zombie” corporation, these corporations reduce their tax burden and gain advantage from local governments in incentives to start new ventures. LNG market is unstable as other countries may undercut American liquid gas markets. How do we tell young people that buying property is good when the property can be taken by eminent domain, even by foreign investors?
12	Larry and Sylvia Mangan	October 31, 2019	Against	We are not opposed to routine maintenance dredging of the port, but we are opposed to this project. The proposal is not necessary, the Coast Guard has determined the Channel to be suitable as is. LCOG staff has found the project should be denied. Planning Commission ruled against their recommendation, typically they follow staff recommendations unless they want to arbitrarily disagree and do what they wanted to do from the inception. The project will have unacceptable effects on public resources, such as crabs, salmon and clams, and would unduly restrict the public access to their rightful uses. Please deny this project.
13	Jan Hodder, PhD	October 31, 2019	Against	The applicant’s representative’s September 27, 2019 submission contains only one reference to NRI #4. The applicant has still not yet adequately addressed adjacent uses in OAR 660-004-0020(d), a Goal 16 exception cannot be granted unless the proposed uses are compatible with other adjacent uses or will be so rendered through measures. The applicant has failed this requirement in two ways: They demonstrate in their statements that their activity associated with the construction of NRI #4 will adversely impact the USACE FNC, and two, they have again failed to address the impacts on the 52-NA area that is adjacent to the proposed NRI #4. In both cases, they still have not addressed any measures to reduce the adverse impacts of changes in the hydrographic regime and

				associated sediment transport associated with NRI #4.
14	William and Maryann Rohrer	October 31, 2019	Against	Please reject the proposal, it is not within the public interest. The proposal will have harmful effects on habitats for birds, fish and wildlife. There is no way this proposal are worth the risks.
15	Steve Miller	October 31, 2019	Against	Applicant's rebuttals to commenters' concerns are largely unaddressed still. Claims that specifics cannot be addressed because various federal and state agencies are reviewing the proposal skirts a large proportion of the real concerns that relate to the permits being sought, which must therefore be considered to still remain incomplete. Included comment's on JCEP's DSL permit application, addressed to Mr. Lobdell.
16	Mike Graybill	October 31, 2019	Against	Applicant failed to demonstrate the project would not result in unacceptable negative impacts to the protected resources of the 52-NA zone as outlined in OAR 660-004-0020(d). The proposal will have a direct and negative impact on the 52-NA zone by reducing the overall area of the district and by permanently introducing an operations and maintenance program in the area currently bearing the designation as "Natural Aquatic." Inconsistent with Section 8.3 Land Use Goals 5 and 7. NRI improvements the applicant is seeking will not be attained by the construction of NRI #4 alone. The benefits will only be realized if all of the proposed NRIs are built. The NRI benefits will not be fully realized in the absence of the construction of the LNG terminal. Modeling work conducted by the applicant and provided to public agencies demonstrates that the work proposed will induce sediment erosion and deposition in the 52-NA zone. These impacts will be widespread and significant.

				Included 90% Design Package for Section 408 Review as submitted by the applicant to USACE. Please click on the link to see comments in their entirety.
17	Rick Eichstaedt (Representative for the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians)	October 31, 2019	Against	<p>The City has a public trust obligation to protect eelgrass resources. The doctrine is a background principle of state property law, reflecting the pre-statehood principle that as sovereign trustee, the state must manage public water and wildlife resources for the benefit of present and future generations. The City must ensure its management of the bed and banks of the Coos Bay does not adversely impact trust resources, including fish and eelgrass.</p> <p>Condition of Approval #1 should be revised to require the applicant to comply with all conditions provided by the USACE 404 Permit, DSL, DEQ 401, Memorandum of Agreement under the National Historic Preservation Act, and any conditions imposed by FERC.</p> <p>Condition of Approval #3 should be revised to add “prior to <u>and during</u> the commencement...”</p> <p>The IWWW should close on February 1 not on February 15.</p> <p>Condition of Approval #13 should be revised to include “<u>and final approval of the Jordan Cove Energy Project by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission</u>”</p> <p>Submitted five (see link below for fifth) additional studies related to herring spawn. Please click on the link for the studies in their entirety.</p>
18	Rick Eichstaedt (Representative for the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians)	October 31, 2019	Against	Supplemental study submitted “Wilson and Dill”

19	Steve Pfeiffer (Representative for the applicant)	October 31, 2019	For	<p>Includes response to ODFW's recent communication with JCEP regarding the truncated IWWW to end on February 1. Technical memo submitted rebuts ODFW's concerns regarding the impact of aquatic noise on herring, which OFDW erroneously relies upon for the proposition that dredging of NRI #4 will impact herring in Coos Bay.</p> <p>Cites guidance for Oregon Guidelines for Timing of In-Water Work to Protect Fish and Wildlife Resources (includes document)</p> <p>Please click on the link to see the full technical memorandum in its entirety.</p>
20	Jody McCaffree	October 31, 2019	Against	<p>Applicant has not supplied the hard evidence and data showing compliance in support of a rezone or a text amendment. JCEP is taking out land use permits for the Coos Estuary for which they are not the legal owner of. JCEP's application does not prove compliance with the management objective to the 52-NA Zone. JCEP has yet to reapply for their 401 Water Quality permit that was denied by ODEQ in May. How can the City of Coos Bay make a decision on this application when Jordan Cove has not provided sufficient information to the State and Federal agencies in order for them to be making a decision? JCEP has not met the criteria in order to be granted a Goal 16 Exception.</p> <p>Proposed NRI alterations do not solve navigational problems. There is not enough clearance in the Coos Bay for safe passage of LNG tanker ships even with the proposed NRIs. Cites an October 1, 2019 letter from Industrial Energy Consumers of America (IECA) written to Dorothy DeWitt, Director of the Division of Market Oversight at the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC), which states, "<i>when a foreign country entities buy or control firm natural gas pipeline capacity, it is serving their country's public interest, not the U.S. public interest.</i>"</p>

				<p>Earthquake issues remain. JCEP has no mitigation plans for negative impacts to tidal/habitat areas adjacent to their proposed NRI dredging.</p> <p>Please click on the click to see the comments in their entirety. Submitted Exhibits "A" thru "E".</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Comments and Public Inquiries Received for Application No. 187-18-00153: Jordan Cove Energy Navigation and Efficiency and Reliability of the Coos Bay Deep Draft Navigation Channel for the Second Open Record Period for City Council, October 1 to October 31.