I'd like to thank the Commissioners for the time extension that was granted for comments. In that spirit of consideration, I would ask them to also rethink all the timetables set-forth in changes to the ordinance. Many of them have been shortened to 12 days, and this is a further burden to citizens of Coos County, who after all are paying the bills.

Sec. 1.3.225 states “Complainant must own property in Coos County outside the city limits.” Because this criteria excludes a huge percentage of the taxpayers and doesn't protect their notification rights, this should be taken out.

Chapter II New Definitions includes “Commercial Power Generating Facility”. If this is meant to separate smaller generation for homes, apartments, small businesses and things that do little damage to the environment or create minimal nuisance to county residents, it should be refined. Projects like the South Dunes Power Plant are definitely commercial since it will exist solely to make money for a large foreign corporation and benefit their foreign customers. It should not be exempt in any way from protections for the public and regulations meant to control damage by commercial generation.

Sec. 4.1.130 subsection 1a. deletes the word "minor", and I do not think it should. In Subsection 1b. I oppose making "changes" an "administrative decision". In subsection 2, "changes to Coastal Shore-lands Boundary" should trigger notification of the public as it does in Chapter V.

Sec. 4.11.125 subsection 7 Natural Hazards should include our tsunami zone and the threats that it indicates. Both should be added to the Purpose Statement and included in the list of potential natural hazards.

Sec. 5.0.175 sparked a recommendation from the Planning Commission to insert the word "public" before the words transportation, utility, and entity. I support this. For our county government to allow no notification on a permit or zoning that includes eminent domain is particularly egregious if it concerns private property taken by a private entity.

Sec. 5.0.600 concerning hiring of hearings officers, I would like to see this expensive process used as little as possible, and there should be specific criteria for the need to do so.

Sec. 6.3.125 Property Line Adjustments contains the insertion of the word "estuary" which makes no sense in this land-oriented context. I don't think it's necessary and needs to be explained fully if it is to be included.

The property owners notifications that are listed by footage are inadequate. I have recently seen problems with this issue, within the system in North Bend, concerning the workers camp for Jordan Cove. Because the cost of notification is on the applicant, why can't the county insert language that they will cover costs when projects affect large groups of citizens or perhaps the whole county? Something that says the county may take that prerogative would be good.

Thank you for your time and attention.
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