

**From:** Mike Graybill <mhodbill@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 10, 2024 10:55 AM  
**To:** Chelsea Schnabel; Chelsea Schnabel; Jill Rolfe; Reed Dlcd  
**Subject:** Mike Graybill's 3minute testimony 01/10/24  
**Attachments:** [Three Recommendations for actions by the City Councils of North Bend and Coos Bay and the Coos County Board of Commissioners.docx](#)

This Message originated outside your organization.

---

Greetings friends in planning.

I attach the one-page, three-minute testimony I intend to provide at the joint work session of the Coos County Commissioners and the city councils of North Bend and Coos Bay for your review and consideration

My intention is to offer three actions that are simple and easy to follow.

My overarching intention is to offer a path forward that builds a forum for collaborative, and forward looking dialogue centered on how our communities can best benefit from our relationship with the estuary.

My best hope is that the actions I have proposed will build and test a citizen engagement model designed to support your work to revise the CBEMP while also augmenting the capacity of the elected officials who represent us. I am confident this can be accomplished without unnecessary delaying work on the next steps in the plan revision process.

I look forward to seeing you at the meeting this evening.

Best regards

Mike

541-294-8235

Sent from my iPhone

**Three Recommended motions for action by the City Councils of North Bend and Coos Bay and the Coos County Board of Commissioners.**

1. Amend the Estuary Management Plan to incorporate the digital versions of the original mylar maps.
2. Appoint a committee to read the current digital draft of the plan and provide a report to the elected officials responsible for revision of the plan.
3. Defer action on additional amendments until after receiving the citizen committee report.

**Taking these three actions will result in the following five outcomes.**

1. The planning staff will be able to use a modern Geographic information system when consulting and implementing the plan.
2. The capacities of the planning departments and the governing bodies will be augmented through the work of a voluntary working group.
3. An opportunity will be provided to “test drive” the structure and operation of the advisory groups described in the proposed CBEMP amendment, setting the stage for how elected bodies will be able to receive public input during forthcoming steps in the plan revision process.
4. Engaging citizen volunteers in the task of reading the current plan will provide an opportunity to familiarize members of the public with the present-day structure and administration of the CBEMP in a structured setting, sanctioned by the elected bodies, where in-depth discussions can take place. This will set the stage for the next steps in the plan revision process.
5. The elected officials will provide a structured means of building supportive and trusted relationships between interested citizens, elected officials, and planning department staff.

**There is no need to amend the Estuary Management Plan in order to constitute a committee having the structure described in the draft amendment or any other structure chosen by the city councils or County commissioners.** The composition of the volunteer group appointed to undertake this “first reading of the existing plan” can be identical to the structure proposed in the draft plan amendment if the County Commission or City Councils so choose. It is not necessary to amend the plan to appoint a committee structured in this way. Consider when this plan was originally developed. There was no estuary management plan in place to define the structure of the advisory committees that provided council to the elected officials who oversaw that process. The elected councils and commissions already have the authority to appoint and direct the work of volunteer committees.

**Taking these actions will not jeopardize opportunities to provide additional financial support for the next steps in the plan revision process.** In fact, it will serve to build a coalition of informed and motivated citizens willing to advocate for adequate funding to support the plan revision process.

**Taking these actions will not unnecessarily delay or pre-empt ongoing work to revise the plan.** There is no legal or policy deadline driving the plan revision process. This is a voluntary action under the direction of the elected bodies who developed and administer the plan. There are no mandates for completion of the revision process. While the citizen committee/s chosen by the elected officials are engaged in the assignment given to them by the elected officials, planning department staff can continue their efforts to move forward with the next steps of the plan revision process.