

PUBLIC COMMENT LCDC NOTES – November 14, 2013

Due to audio difficulties staff notes were combined for the public comment portion of the agenda.

Item 2 Public Comment

This part of the agenda is for comments on topics not scheduled elsewhere on the agenda. The chair may set time limits (usually three minutes) for individual speakers. The maximum time for all public comments under this agenda item will be limited to 30 minutes. If you bring written summaries or other materials to the meeting please provide the commission assistant with 20 copies prior to your testimony. The commission is unable to take action, at this meeting, on items brought to their attention in this forum.

Summary of those who testified and main point(s); including commission comments:

Shirley Kalkoven- board member of OCZMA; they will be sending a letter of support for OPAC's letter regarding the TSP.

Doug Olson – Tillamook PUD. Position of Tillamook PUD is that there will be no cost to customers/ratepayers. Neutral as to source. Have tracked TSP; Tillamook PUD is very concerned as a matter of public policy...three years of intensive meetings, all bubbled up; seemed like there was consensus and then commission went in a different direction (feels like LCDC thumbed its nose).

Paul Hanneman – Regarding the 2013 legislative session, legislation would have been more severe but for Governor's threat of veto. Director can issue an order without LCDC—one of the few agencies that can do this. Will be looking to change statute that allows the director to approve orders. Recitation in first paragraph – outset was inflammatory to us and not accurate. Issue is not over. WORRIX- is it your feeling that if local people would have had longer there would have been more consensus? Commission heard disparity and disagreement.

Peggy Lynch – League of Women Voters. Presented 2013 Oregon values and beliefs survey – can get online. Survey is done regularly – previously Oregon progress board project. The public's number 3 issue is that the environment is important, has value, and deserves consideration in decision-making. Only higher rating issues were education and health care. The land use system is considered important for saving farmland and reducing sprawl.

John Holloway - Member of federal fish committee and another committee. Disturbing trend in state – lack of value of the fishing industry. Example of the marine reserves, didn't receive adequate public input. Read a written statement. Last January – TSP, staff report adopted as a basis for rulemaking, fishing community was told that LCDC had to work with OPAC, but that didn't happen. WORRIX: What effects have marine reserves had on fishing? Holloway: As yet, not much (but concerned about where will go). LAMB: When deliberated in January; we

considered all of the evidence and testimony. If asking to revisit, what is the new information? Holloway – not asking to reconsider, more expressing feelings of fishing industry that they are being ignored, will be hard to get people to serve. WORRIX – notes that there was a great deal of acceptance of the recommendations. Holloway – agrees, concerned about cumulative impact.

Laura Buell – Member of FACT. Important loss of fishing ground. Wind versus fish.

Bud Miller – resident of Pacific City. Not here to offer new ideas. Opposed to the whole decision and order. Here to express concern about timing. Appalled in January. Adopting a staff report is not the correct basis. Staff report not available until a week before. At the meeting it was apparent that the OPAC report was not received by LCDR before the meeting. Decision “had” to be made in January, but took 9 months for the order to come out. September meeting, requested review, but the order was published. Riddled with procedural errors, no explanation why the OPAC report was ignored. 9 months delay evidences that there was no immediate need. Fails to reflect opinions of a majority – destroyed public confidence that they will be listened to in the future.

David Yamamoto – Pacific City. TSP Advisory Committee member. Astonished at the perfunctory adoption of the staff report. Disdain for OPAC recommendation has undermined confidence in the planning program. Specific issue: addition of Nestucca site at the last minute. Cited rule that allegedly was not followed. Comment about not “returning” to the council. WORRIX – hard to hear about lack of enthusiasm about participating. We understand citizen involvement. Notes that the commission had been following the process for a very long time. May have been disagreement in end result, but there was a sincere attempt to listen. JOSI: Agree that the staff report came out rather late in the process. It wasn’t what OPAC had recommended (pleased that OPAC took the position it did). Just lost the last OPT project because they can’t make it pencil. Lost a lot of political capital. Would be surprised if it ever goes to Pacific City – doesn’t ever see it happening.

Gus Meyer – Tillamook. Involved for 3-4 years. Citizen involvement was excellent, but largely unaddressed. Never had one comment back on comments made. Goal 5 not addressed. Goal 9, Goal 11. Asking for 10-year moratorium on the Nestucca site.

Onno Husing - Lincoln County Planning Director and form roles. The county has a true planning partnership with DLCD staff that the county cherishes. The county board supports OPAC’s recommendation and has a letter in the mail. The rules being in effect do not preclude the need for a thorough review. The TSP conflicts with Goal 19 which calls for protection of fishery resources. Three quarters of the MRE study sites are in high value fishing grounds.

Jason Bush - Oregon Wave Energy Trust Director. The TSP is necessary and good for the economy. We are going to need more energy when other sources are going off-line, and ocean energy is part of the answer. Oregon has the best waves in the continental US. Believes the TSP struck the right balance. Believes it had the intended effect. At the recent OWET conference the

feedback was good. Good conversations between industry and community leaders that are prepared to work together.

Charlie Ceicko – Neskowin. Chronology with OPAC meeting followed by the order was disturbing and concerning. Even though letter was not received, staff knew it was coming. Therefore, letter doesn't seem fair. Would like to see issue re-opened and sent back to OPAC to try to achieve some consensus.

LIDZ – Appreciate comments though painful to hear. Reviewed a large part of testimony, including OPAC and TSPAC reports. Did not walk into the room with an agenda. Six hours of testimony. Had competing interests to consider. We did our best, am sorry that you think the outcome was wrong and that the process was flawed. Lots of public process, hearings up and down the coast. As thorough a process as he has seen. Worked hard on the decision. I am sorry that many of you feel there was a breach of trust. Feel we listened carefully and will look for ways to increase the dialog with the coast.

WORRIX – Explains commission's need to balance all of the state interests. Part that you felt ignored – obviously a total disconnect between what the community feels and what the commission feels. We will look for ways to have a dialogue with people on the coast – wants to use the time we have to make sure that we have the balance right/framework to continue discussion.

JOSI – Can't just shift it back to OPAC. Need to go through formal process of amending rule. What would be the implications of opening it back up, what does that mean in terms of process?

SHIPSEY – when you acted in January, you adopted the rule. Appendix D – lays out what the federal government believes are the enforceable policies of the plan. Long process of negotiating with the federal government what the enforceable policies are (for FERC, BOEM). Effective upon filing. Filed with FERC as a comprehensive plan – all parties agreed to do as part of "controlling" destiny. Would need to amend the Administrative Rule, following the APA, Chapter 195. When adopted the TSP – no later than 7 years LCDC will revisit.

JOSI – would like to say yes, but with timing, potential to jeopardize the relationship with federal government about developing our own plan it doesn't make sense to re-open although my heart would like to.

WORRIX – Tried our best. Don't have enough trust right now to revisit. Need to communicate more effectively. Will need to revisit in 7 years anyway. Keep the feds out of our plan. Commission asked if any members are interested in reopening rule. No.

Elaine Cox – Rules are amending lengthy process.

Rick Glick – With DWT, representing Oregon LNG. OLNG wasn't addressed under Item 8, hearing from the RST. Want to add OLNG to your radar screen, there is no more significant

economic development uplift. There is a reason for this project to be on the Oregon coast. Receive natural gas from BC, deliver to Asia. And there will be in fact LNG terminals developed on the west coast. This project represents a \$7.1 billion investment – about 1600 permanent jobs, \$60 million annually in property taxes. Land zoned industrial in Astoria. Seems artificial not to at least have in mind the LNG. JOSI – please don't come here. Political dynamite in some areas.