

From: [Ken Bonetti](#)
To: [Chelsea Schnabel](#)
Subject: Typo-Corrected: CBEMP Comments-My Apologies, Please Use
Date: Wednesday, January 3, 2024 5:24:50 PM

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

[Allow sender](#) | [Block sender](#)

January 3, 2024

Dear Councilors and Commissioners:

Re: CBEMP Update

First, thank you for the work that you have done up to this point on this important document. As a relatively new resident who came from an area lacking a comprehensive regional land use plan, I know firsthand what damage can be done to a once healthy and beautiful environment without informed guidance and commitment from political leadership to conserve, mitigate, and restore natural assets, as distinct from continued degradation.

I would like to make the following comments for the record:

- Please commit to full funding of Phase II. It would be good to partner with other organizations and state agencies, in addition to seeking grant funding, which alone may not be adequate.
- Please commit to an update that fully addresses climate change, justice and adaptation with in-depth community involvement.
- I see that staff preferred general wording to the composition of the citizens advisory committee, suggesting that it seems more efficient than listing individual categories of stakeholder interests. I still prefer the individual listings and an efficient process that allows those listings to be changed when necessary. Otherwise, how will we know that the composition of the citizens advisory committee is balanced and representative as we proceed to Phase II and Plan implementation. Can a mechanism be established to ensure the desired and necessary diversity? Finally, this section should be included in the body of this update rather than as a separate and likely weaker resolution.
- There needs to be more clarity with respect to the definitions between pages 5 and 13 in the staff report. It is unclear which definitions will ultimately be used and, in some cases, there are considerable differences among definitions adopted by different jurisdictions.
- **All local tribes need to be included in all steps in the update process and ongoing management of the Coos Bay Estuary.**
- I am a bit confused as to the real distinctions between major and minor amendments to the CBEMP. It seems the distinction between the two categories is not so clear cut as is assumed for changes pertaining to one parcel versus changes that

may have Bay wide impacts. Could not there be potential spillover effects from single parcel (i.e. minor) amendments? Could there be precedents established that indeed have Bay wide impacts or constitute an alteration of principle not in keeping with the spirit of the document? It seems such amendments require broader citizen and technical input than is envisioned for “minor” amendments. Perhaps a mechanism can be established to identify and address potentially broader implications from putatively ‘minor’ amendments.

These are the thoughts I had in the very limited time provided to study this rather lengthy and complex document.

Sincerely,

Ken Bonetti, North Bend