

**From:** Jan Hodder [mailto:jhodder111@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 17, 2020 11:28 AM  
**To:** Planning Department  
**Subject:** Hodder comments on File # AP-20-001 of File # EXT-20-005.

**This Message originated outside your organization.**

---

Please accept these comments for inclusion in the hearing for File # AP-20-001 of File # EXT-20-005.  
I have also sent these comments via the postal service.  
Please acknowledge receipt.

Comments of Janet Hodder, 63840 Fossil Point Road Coos Bay OR 97420

Date: December 17, 2020

Sent via email Dec 17, 2020 and mailed to Coos County Planning.

Comments related to: File # AP-20-001 of File # EXT-20-005 – Request for Planning Director Approval for an extension of the expiration of a Conditional Use Application, File Numbers HBCU-10-01/REM-11-01 (County Order No. 12-03- 018PL) approval pursuant to Coos County Zoning and Land Development Ordinance (CCZLDO) § 5.2.600 Expiration and Extension of Conditional Uses.

One of the relevant criteria for an extension of this permit is that the county can grant an extension if it determines that the applicant was unable to begin or continue development during the approval period for reasons for which the applicant was not responsible.

AND

The criteria also says that an additional one-year extensions may be authorized. - **NOT should be authorized** – but may be authorized.

The route of the pipeline in this application runs from the LNG plant across Highway 101 and underneath the estuarine waters of Haynes Inlet. That alone is a reason why this permit should not be extended. Not because of any environmental or social implications of choosing this route, but because the applicant has not taken responsibility for the work needed to meet the criteria to **begin the process of development** of this route. They could have applied for a DSL removal-fill permit for this route, but they have not done so. They could have applied to DEQ for a 401 water quality permit for this route, but they have not done so. As we are all aware, there are numerous other permits that the applicant is required to obtain before beginning development of any of their chosen routes. They have not applied for these for the Haynes Inlet route. The county is not required to grant an extension to this applicant as they **could have applied for these permits – nothing has stopped them.**

Staffs finding that the applicant provided a reason for the applicant's inability to continue development is spurious for the following reason.

In Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline's application for their Joint Coastal Zone Management Act Certification they note on page 24 that, I quote, "*A map of the proposed Pipeline route is shown in Figure 1.1-1 within JCEP's Application to FERC,*" end quote. If Staff were to look at this figure, which is in JCEP Resource Reports as part of the Application to FERC, they would see that there is no mention of the Haynes inlet route in the figure. This provides further evidence that the applicant is no longer considering this route, and explains why they have not applied for any permits to continue development. It is not that an appeal of the CZMA certification is pending through the Department of Commerce as the staff report implies. The CZMA certification does not contain all of the relevant permits for the Haynes Inlet route. A denial or acceptance of the appeal will not change the fact that this applicant has not met the counties' criteria that they can grant an extension if they determine that the applicant was unable to begin or continue development during the approval period for reasons for which the applicant was not responsible. Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline is totally responsible for the delay and the County should deny this permit extension.