

Comments and Public Inquiries Received for Application No. 187-18-00153: Jordan Cove Energy Navigation and Efficiency and Reliability of the Coos Bay Deep Draft Navigation Channel.

Number	Name	Date Received	For or against	Synopsis (please see attachment for full comments)
1	Rick Skinner	April 25, 2019 (after 5PM)	For	In favor of proposal. Channel needs better navigation. Faster and more channelized water would help to scour out sediment to the Ocean. Direct correlation to ships in the Bay and our local economy.
2	Brad Mitchell	May 1 & 7, 2019	Against	Expressing frustration over the volume of materials submitted by the applicant in the first open record period and the limited amount of time to respond. Also the size of the file (downloading challenges).
3	Melissa Bishop	May 7, 2019	Against	Is a nurse. Keeping people healthy requires healthy environment. JECP would become larger producer of greenhouse gas. Ships would adversely affect shoreline and sea life. Also asked a question about submitting comments to the FERC comment site.
4	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	May 10 & 13, 2019		Procedural inquiry regarding the application's open record period.
5	Natalie Ranker	May 16, 2019	Against	Outlined State agency, (DSL, DEQ) feedback on applications, reviews under their purview. Attached DSL letter and referenced DEQ's denial of the clean water permit. Noted eelgrass impacts. Only JCEP tankers need the increased depth.
6	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	May 16, 2019	Against	Oregon Shores objects to the process that is occurring for this Application. Numerous submission materials existed when the original application was submitted and should have been included then.

				<p>The complete DEQ 401 Water Quality Certification Evaluation and Findings Report.</p> <p>The Applicant's approach is inconsistent with Goal 1 and the intent of the law to allow for meaningful public participation. Oregon Shores believes that the City of Coos Bay ("City") should not allow the Application to proceed in this way, but instead ask the Applicant to withdraw its application and resubmit with a complete package of initial materials sufficient to evaluate the proposal for compliance with all relevant criteria at the outset.</p> <p>Oregon Shores urges the City to consider the DEQ's decision as well as the DSL's concerns in making its own final decision on the proposed City NRI.</p> <p>Like the original Application, the Applicant's ORP Submission fails to justify the four approvals being sought. All Statewide Planning Goals need to be addressed. Contrary to the Applicant's assertion "that NRI areas are not eelgrass habitat and so dredging these areas would not cause the impacts" asserted to Dungeness crabs, aquatic segment 52-NA contains extensive eelgrass beds with associated important fish and waterfowl habitat. DEIS is not finalized and, on its own, does not demonstrate compliance with relevant criteria.</p>
7	Jan Dilley	May 16, 2019	Against	Directs staff attention to the DEQ decision and includes some direct links to related items.
8	Jody McCaffree	May 16, 2019	Against	<p>Request for more time to review the large amount of information that the applicant submitted as part of the first open record period. Not reasonable to rebut that amount of information in 3 weeks. Inconsistent with Goal 1.</p> <p>Need has not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Use or alteration would unreasonably interfere with public trust rights.</p>

				<p>Feasible alternative LNG terminal locations exist but have not been considered.</p> <p>Adverse impacts are not minimal.</p> <p>Jordan Cove Memorandum/Reports do not consider ALL impacts.</p> <p>Included numerous Exhibits</p>
--	--	--	--	---