

# Strategic Business Plan Update - Public Comment Period

Actual Written Comments Submitted

January 15, 2026 – January 29, 2026

---

## Justin Ludwig – Public Comment Regarding Strategic Business Plan – 01/17/2026

The Coos Bay Pacific Coast Intermodal Port (PCIP) isn't just a single project, it's a combination of sunk costs, institutional face-saving, and speculative capital that will cause real harm. The unlikelihood that it will succeed doesn't affect the motivations of its supporters. The PCIP is a major \$2.3 billion project to build an automated ship-to-rail terminal, which ostensibly would provide local jobs and offer container ships a new choice of entry into the U.S. market. However the amount of containers it proposes to handle doesn't match the capacity of its rail, or the market's demand. I learned about this project from friends who were concerned about the environmental impact of dredging the Coos Bay estuary to accommodate the containers ships in such small rural city on the Oregon Coast. While the ecological impact would be a certainty, the economic benefits are very much uncertain. What's perhaps not being talked about is the effect this project may have on the U.S. labor movement, specifically the International Longshore & Warehouse Union (ILWU) that represents dockworkers across the West Coast. If you first consider the sunk-cost problem, which includes government agencies that have already poured time, staff hours, and political capital into Coos Bay as an "industrial port of the future," it's easy to see why this project is still being proposed. Some longtime residents may remember the failed Jordan Cove LNG pipeline. Its studies, permits, environmental reviews, and rail planning are still waiting for their return on investment. Bureaucracies hate admitting errors even more than they hate wasting money. Promoting Coos Bay as "strategic infrastructure" put enormous pressure on lawmakers to make good on earlier decisions to invest. The PCIP is salvage operation that hopes to make lemonade out of lemons. Once completed, though, the environmental harm can't be undone; which is why organizers oppose it now even if they suspect it will fail later. There's no time like the present; environmental harm, public subsidy transfers, and labor precedent all happen up front. If the project collapses in five years, the estuary will already be dredged, public funds transferred, and precedent set for bypassing community consent. And the developer, NorthPoint, doesn't need the port to thrive long-term in order to turn a profit. With entitlements, land control, public infrastructure subsidies, and future options, they can keep regulators cooperative, unions hopeful, and investors patient. If the project advances far enough, NorthPoint wins whether the port hits 100% capacity or becomes a half-used, industrial asset that's quietly sold or repurposed. RISK is paid by the public, while profit is collected by the developer. That's an economic model that doesn't respect the locals. Some unions may support the PCIP because they see near-term construction jobs, which is reasonable but doesn't consider long-term port labor strategy. For ILWU in particular, a lightly staffed, partially automated and geographically isolated port would be a pressure-release valve to any labor negotiations that occur elsewhere along the West Coast. To earn fair wages and benefits, labor unions must negotiate with big business. Even if it never handles high volumes, its mere existence weakens bargaining power by giving shippers a talking point and planners a hedge. "We have alternatives" is often more important than the alternatives themselves. Is there really demand for more ports? The largest port complex in the United States, Los Angeles and Long Beach, together handled roughly 16.5 million TEU in 2023 (an estimated 70% capacity, according to the Journal of Commerce). Their union workforce is well-organized and under robust local media scrutiny that provides sunlight to any unfair labor practices. Other

major West Coast ports, Seattle/Tacoma and Oakland, are even further below their maximum capacity, having handled 2.97 million TEU and 2.07 million TEU, respectively. For Oregonians wondering, Portland only handled roughly 116,000 TEU in 2023. In contrast, Coos Bay has very little news media, and relatively few affordable housing units to accommodate the strong labor force that would be needed to negotiate leverage at the table with supply-chain companies and large corporations. This isolated rural economic zone would be easy to manage. While other port cities have daily newspapers, Coos Bay has a small biweekly newspaper and a semi-satellite TV station, KCBY. It's easy to see why Coos Bay would be ideal for big business looking to avoid public scrutiny of any potential labor issues. Los Angeles newsrooms together hundreds of journalists and producers; Seattle a little more than 100, Portland a little less, and Coos Bay only a handful. The PCIP project doesn't include any plans for additional news media jobs in Coos Bay to hold big business and developers accountable, unsurprisingly. So which is more important, short-term job creation or long-term labor leverage? That's a question developers with capital can exploit if there's indecision among labor. While they extract value from the process, the ecosystems and wildlife have no say in the matter. The indigenous people who have lived in the area for centuries may sadly watch another catastrophe occur, while a few very rich people with stakes in NorthPoint will get a little richer. The local Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians are recognized as key stakeholders in the project, but according to former Tribal Chair Brad Kneaper, in his letter to the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management dated June 14, 2024, the Tribe viewed the PCIP as a "reasonably foreseeable cumulative-impact project" to the Coos Bay estuary, which is a cultural site. According to the letter, the Tribe objected to the "segmentation" of such projects which inflict "cumulative harm" that is routinely underestimated by federal and state agencies. What should be done? Maybe it would be better to build a desalination plant to get some water out of the ocean and back to the land. If something has to be built, let it be something that is sure to help, and not something that is sure to harm.

---

### **Jack O'Leary – Public Comment Regarding Strategic Business Plan – 01/19/2026**

Since the Ford Family and Weyerhaeuser have already contributed millions to the development of the North Spit, don't you think they should have a "say" in what to do out there? I live in Empire and I see NO need to develop south when the North has all the infrastructure and the NOISE can go out there to NB where there is no housing!!!

---

### **John Blanchard – Public Comment Regarding Strategic Business Plan – 01/24/2026**

I appreciate the opportunity to provide input on the 2025 Strategic Business Plan for the Oregon International Port of Coos Bay, and I commend the Port's efforts to drive economic growth and innovation in our region. While I support the vision behind the Pacific Coast Intermodal Port (PCIP) and Coos Bay Rail Line (CBRL) projects, I recognize the challenges posed by the associated debt obligations (approximately \$1.4 million in annual servicing, plus interest on lines of credit due to delayed reimbursements) and limited staffing resources. The \$100 million in Oregon Legislature bonding approved in June 2025 represents a significant commitment to these initiatives, even amid substantial funding uncertainties. I wonder if there might be value in exploring ways to complement this with targeted investments in repairing existing infrastructure, ensuring that urgent local needs are addressed alongside these ambitious endeavors. This approach

could build on the Port's track record of pursuing large-scale projects, learning from past experiences to maximize community benefits. For example, the Jordan Cove LNG terminal (2005–2021) and offshore wind proposals (BOEM 2024) highlighted important lessons about engaging with Tribes, landowners, environmental groups, and fishing communities to mitigate impacts on habitats, cultural resources, and local industries. Insights from the League of Women Voters of Coos County (LWVCC)—with their long-standing study of the Port since 1962, including the 2023 update and 2025 "A Deeper Understanding" presentations on PCIP—could further inform this balance, addressing questions around global supply chain integration, land and rail logistics, and cost estimates (\$2.4–\$4.4 billion). Incorporating such public input and independent analyses would strengthen the Port's responsiveness to community perspectives. This concern is further underscored by the state's recent investment in the Mid-Willamette Valley Intermodal Center (MVIC) in Millersburg, a rail-to-truck facility developed with \$25 million in public funding (via HB 2017) and totaling around \$35 million. Opened in late 2022, the center was projected to handle up to 40,000 containers of agricultural and wood products annually, yet it has seen limited activity, with no containers shipped as of reports through mid-2025, due in part to container shortages and demand challenges. While the project has adapted with proposals for other uses, it offers a valuable case study for ensuring that rail and container initiatives like PCIP and CBRL are positioned for success, minimizing risks and optimizing public resources for proven local priorities. To enhance the plan's impact, I recommend prioritizing immediate, actionable steps that align with the SBP's objectives and deliver quick wins for the community: Explore offering current leaseholders—particularly at Charleston Marina—the option to purchase leased properties, fostering private investment and alleviating some Port burdens. This supports Property Goal 1, Objective 1.4 (identify properties to sell, Short-term) and Financial Goal 1, Objective CF.3 (pro forma analysis for selling/leasing, Mid-term). Prioritize replacing aging docks and upgrading electrical systems at Charleston Marina to improve safety and reliability, tackling deferred maintenance. This aligns with Property Goal 3, Objective 3.3 (list maintenance/repair issues with costs, Mid-term) and Financial Goal 1, Objective CF.2 (obtain estimates on critical assets like docks/electrical, Mid-term). Bolster commercial fishing, a cornerstone for local and national food security and sustainable marine resources, through dedicated infrastructure improvements, partnerships (e.g., with Tribes and agencies), and initiatives for local processing and marketing. This advances Property Goal 3, Objective 3.1 (convene stakeholders for Marina activities, Short-term) and Environmental Goal 1, Objectives 1.2–1.3 (environmental partnerships and sustainability funding, Mid- to Long-term). By emphasizing fiscal responsibility through Financial Goal 1's Capital Facilities Plan, investing in existing assets, and supporting established industries, the Port can provide meaningful, near-term benefits to Coos Bay residents while pursuing its long-term vision.

Thank you for considering this feedback and for your dedication to our community's future.

---

**Karie Silva – Public Comment Regarding Strategic Business Plan – 01/26/2026**

Re: Comment on the Oregon International Port of Coos Bay Strategic Business Plan (SBP)

Chair and Commissioners,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Strategic Business Plan (SBP) for the Oregon International Port of Coos Bay. I have been advocating since 2023 for the long-term viability of

the Charleston fishing fleet and the working waterfront that supports it. My comment focuses on one critical SBP priority: restoring and modernizing the Charleston Shipyard's marine ways system.

The SBP's Capital Improvements Plan identifies Charleston shipyard improvements as a high priority and specifically notes that "the single most requested improvement" to the shipyard is "a full replacement of the Marine Ways to pull and push ships." The SBP further explains that a new marine ways system would allow the shipyard to work on larger vessels and potentially expand market share, and it cites a June 2025 replacement quote of approximately \$3 million or more.

From the perspective of working vessel owners and operators, a reliable marine ways system is not optional infrastructure — it is essential safety and maintenance capacity. The ability to haul out, repair, and return vessels to the water safely is foundational to the continuity of the fleet, the local workforce, and the broader maritime services that depend on an active shipyard.

I respectfully ask that the Port implement what the SBP already recognizes by including, in the SBP's near-term action plan, a clear and detailed outline for the marine ways replacement project — including (1) a timeline, (2) identified funding pathways, and (3) a plan for maintaining shipyard operations during construction. The SBP describes the Capital Improvements Plan as the first five to six years of action within the longer planning horizon; this is the right window to move from identifying the need to executing the project.

Strengthening the Charleston Shipyard aligns with the SBP's broader economic development goals and supports the Port's responsibility to maintain essential working waterfront infrastructure. The fishing fleet and maritime trades are a durable, year-round economic base, and modern shipyard capacity helps retain vessels and related spending locally rather than pushing work to other ports.

Thank you for considering these comments and for incorporating the SBP's own high-priority shipyard findings into timely, funded action.

Respectfully submitted,  
Karie Silva  
F/V Jeanette Marrie  
Charleston, Oregon

---

**Shelley Estes – Public Comment Regarding Strategic Business Plan – 01/27/2026**

Thank you for forwarding the plan to Brenda and Jackie. I am also on the Council. I have read the plan. I think it is a great plan, but my main focus is revitalization of Charleston. I go to Charleston often. I think Charleston is a gem that has been dis-guarded. I walk in the dry dock and cannot believe the beautiful wooden boats that are dilapidated. When I lived in Homer, Alaska, they had a wooden boat society and a wooden boat festival. These are great tourism events, and many people attended these wonderful events. <https://www.alaska.org/detail/kachemak-bay-wooden-boat-festival> Charleston also has GREAT eateries that are not well promoted. Monkey Business, Foggy's, Portside and Millers. The Visitor Center needs to be expanded and re-done; the horrible looking RV park needs to be fenced in or bought. The other RV Park by the Marina is in dis-repair

as well. The crabbing docks are dilapidated, and one has I think an abandoned boat on it. I go crabbing often there and just cry as the years go by and nothing is done. Charleston has SO MUCH potential to rival Bandon. We even have a golf course and the best sunsets at Sunset Beach, which always looks like crap because they never fix the road going into the park. So, my recommendation as a tribal Council from the Coquille Indian Tribe is: Invest in Charleston, Please leave our Clam Gardens and Eel Grass alone, which could be impacted by the Intermodal Port going in. Invest in local businesses that are making a difference in our community. Promote bird tourism, wooden boat tourism, Whiskey Run Bike Trails, Food Map for eateries, Marine Vessel and Fishing tourism and repair. The Marina is looking much better but tell the Coast Guard to paint their buildings! Look at other ports that are economically and environmentally friendly to cross reference their successes in the region. Thank you for listening to my two cents,

Shelley Estes Representative #1 Coquille Indian Tribe.

---

### **Mike Graybill – Public Comment Regarding Strategic Business Plan – 01/29/2026**

Members of the Port of Coos Bay Management Commission

28 January 2026

Michael Graybill  
(personal addresses omitted)

Dear Commissioners

Because a scheduling conflict prevents me from attending your regularly scheduled February 2026 meeting, I offer these written comments on the November 2025 Strategic Business plan document in advance of the meeting.

First, thank you for providing time to allow public review of the November 2025 strategic business plan report compiled by Points Consulting. I have reviewed the document in its entirety and have offered line-by-line comments and suggestions to Executive Director Comstock.

Secondly, I am pleased to report that Director Comstock has been very receptive to the comments I have made and went out of her way to make time in her schedule to meet with me to discuss my comments. As a resident of the port district for 50 years, I am happy to report that the recent change in staff leadership at the port is dramatic and most welcome. I encourage you to continue your efforts to transform the port into a transparent organization that is responsive to input from constituents in the port district. The port is moving in the right direction! Thank you for your leadership to that end.

General comments regarding the Points Consulting report:

1. Points Consulting should be acknowledged for conducting an impressive level of historic research needed to characterize a context for the planning effort and for leading the commission through a series of valuable planning exercises. The 196-page report includes excellent

documentation of the process used to characterize the past and current status of various demographic and economic conditions in the port district and region. It also includes detailed results of interviews and meetings held during the brief period of their contract.

2. The entire document is framed in the voice of the consultants that compiled the report. A strategic plan, however, should be in the voice of the management commission, not the voice of the contractors who compiled the report.

3. By design, a strategic plan necessitates a forward-looking perspective. The intent of this plan, required by statute, is to identify the direction the port intends to take in the next ten years. While there is certainly forward-looking content in the consultant's report, the bulk of the document is dominated by an abundance of rearward-looking, and context setting information. This mixing of content serves to obscure the forward-looking action elements that form the substance of the strategic plan that will be the focus of the work of the port during the next decade.

Comments regarding the portion of the document that contains forward-looking information that is traditionally included in a strategic plan

1. The mission and vision statements presented on page 7 of the report are commendable. My only suggestion would be to include a reference in the preamble to the Mission and Vision section, affirming that as a government organization, the port is chartered and operates as a special tax district. The mission statement should include a reference that, as a special district, the commission has an obligation to provide services benefiting the taxpayers of the district.

2. Despite being clearly articulated, a number of objectives are presented under goal headings that lack a clear nexus with that heading. As an example, items 2.2 and 2.3 (Page 10) appear under the heading "property goals" yet it is not clear what nexus "Consider sitting on a tourism board..." or "Increase collaboration/partnership with the Bandon Dunes foundation..." has with how the port intends to manage property under its jurisdiction in the next 10 years. I have provided other examples to Director Comstock.

3. Other objectives are listed under goal headings that appear to constrain the ability of the commission to attain the intent of the objective. For example: item 1.2 is listed as an objective of the property goal entitled "Set priorities for involvement in regional economic development". An objective under this broad goal is to "pursue methods of industry diversification outside of wood products industries..." While I'm in support of this objective, I believe and hope you would agree that attaining the intent of this goal and this objective is likely to necessitate port involvement in regional economic development activities and initiatives that do not have any direct nexus with property owned or managed by the port. For example, I expect the port would be a strong advocate for economic development in the port district that is centered on property outside of property owned by the port (e.g. the wood pellet transload facility on the Coquille tribal property) yet by presenting this objective under the Port's property goal a reader will be left with the impression that the port will confine its participation in regional economic development ventures to the property under its management. I doubt that is the commission's intent.

4. There are several glaring omissions of goals and objectives that should be included in the strategic plan. As an example, the strategic plan makes almost no reference to how the port intends to engage in the process to revise the Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan (CBEMP). The

omission of substantive reference to the CBEMP revision plan in the report is understandable given that there was no active work on the plan revision underway during the time that the consultants were under contract. It is clear that work to revise this fundamental land use policy document will take place during the next 5 years, and it is clear that changes to the plan will define allowable land uses within the port district that have major links to how the estuary and its adjacent shorelands might be used to support economic development. The Port is a central estuary user and estuary property owner. The port was a central player in the development of the existing estuary management plan, and it is advisable that it should play a similar role in the revision of the plan. The strategic plan for the port should address the omission of reference to the CBEMP in the report by developing one or more goals and objectives to articulate the port's intent to participate in the CBEMP revision process. I have provided other examples of possible omissions to director Comstock.

Recommendations to the Port Commission for next steps toward adoption of a 2026-2036 strategic plan.

1. The commission should move to “accept” the findings and recommendations included in the document prepared by Points Consulting.
2. In order to facilitate use and distribution of the action element of the strategic plan, the commission should direct staff to edit the November 2025 report from Points Consulting in a manner that presents the forward-looking action-oriented content in a brief, free-standing document.
3. The voluminous, context setting content in the consultant's report should be compiled and made available as a separate companion piece that supports the strategic plan document.
4. The staff should be directed to address gaps or omissions in the plan and to respond to comments that were identified during the public comment period.
5. A deadline for the above actions should be established that provides adequate consideration of staff workload and capacity.
6. The commission should acknowledge the efforts of the staff to solicit comments as well as the voluntary efforts of those who provided comments and recommendations during the comment period.

---

**Steve Skinner – Public Comment Regarding Strategic Business Plan – 1/29/2026**

- Reformatting:
  - Charts, graphs, etc. moved to addenda.
  - Properties need to be identified by street addresses (tax lots moved to appendices/addenda) accompanied by a map/maps showing locations. Use more than one map if data shown is too small to read.

- Introductions followed by narratives are too redundant and add to length. Less introduction, narratives to be followed by succinct summaries.
- Currently too long, too redundant. Needs to be more of a working document in specific suggested plans.
- No overall summary.
- No suggested roadmap to begin moving forward, E.g. financial stability & how to achieve.
- Individual interviews are maybe too few and not explained why chosen, others left out. Some interview statements beg more explanation, E.g. “We should sell (g-p?) site...” Why?
- Port has jurisdiction over bay/shoreline(?) Can it leverage that to work with property/business owners?
- Need strong, clear language to prevent future cart before the horse scenarios. Large corporate clients, in particular, need to do their due diligence before the Port takes them on as a client and should be required to be responsible for an evenly shared (?) degree of financing so the public taxpayer sector is not carrying the entire burden. Expand on this - needs robust discussion and review.
- NOTE: Discrepancy between client in Charleston (he pays) and PCIP (Port pays) in a nutshell.
- Community advisory board(s) selection should reflect the entire (stakeholder) community and never be a rubber-stamp insider body. Membership should require active involvement and responsibilities, not just showing up for meetings.
- What does “international” mean? Can it be leveraged?
- Can Port go after grant monies, E.g. Walton Family Foundation “working to provide clean water during climate change”.
- Can Eastside property be used to/for a solar array or mixed use agri-voltaic?
- Expand on aqua-culture. Bring back native clams.
- Diversity equals resiliency.

---

**Ashley Audycki – Public Comment Regarding Strategic Business Plan – 01/29/2026**

Hello,

I wish I could submit a more substantive comment on the Port of Coos Bay's Strategic Plan. I was made aware today by an engaged community member that the public comment on the Port's Strategic Plan was due by 5 pm. I recommend that the Port extend the public comment period and communicate about the opportunity more intentionally.

The start of this process had a strong sense of transparency and intentions to engage with community members in a meaningful manner. Through online surveys, stakeholder interviews, meetings, and a highly attended public open house, an immense number of community members took the time and effort to share their input on how the Port of Coos Bay should move forward. I

applaud the Port's initial efforts to make this strategic planning process a community-focused endeavor. I was surprised that this public comment period has not been highlighted in numerous places where Port of Coos Bay staff have been over the last month, which would have provided opportunities to share directly with local partners.

It is not in the public's best interest to not communicate more directly and openly about this opportunity to see how their feedback was incorporated. If the Port of Coos Bay is aiming to build trust with the community, I highly suggest that the Port of Coos Bay extend the public comment opportunity by 30 days from the date of the following communication tactics:

- Press release about the public comment opportunity with local media outlets (the last press release on the Port's website is dated August 2025).
- Send an announcement email to participants who shared their email with the Port for completing the survey, attending the open house event, and participating in the interviews.
- Share an outreach toolkit with an email template and social media post to engaged community organizations and other entities to add to the Port's reach

Again, I recommend that the Port of Coos Bay maintain the original tone for transparent, intentional outreach efforts, similar to those conducted last year for this Strategic Plan process, by extending the comment deadline and implementing the above-listed outreach tactics.

I welcome any follow-up discussions and opportunities to engage with the Port of Coos Bay to build out a Strategic Plan that reflects the public's best interest.

Sincerely,  
Ashley Audycki  
South Coast Regional Coordinator  
Rogue Climate

---

**Christine Moffitt – Public Comment Regarding Strategic Business Plan – 01/29/2026**

Dear Port Commissioners. I have been working on reviewing the strategic plan draft and am requesting that you extend the deadline for comments. I did not find out that the link was provided until this past weekend and have been really busy with other projects that had deadlines this week. I am delighted that this process was done, but request extension of the time for the community to review it. Also, this opportunity needs to be publicized as many of us missed that this was posted.

---

**Mandy Watson – Public Comment Regarding Strategic Business Plan – 01/29/2026**

Hello,

I am writing to request an extension of the public comment period for the Port of Coos Bay's Strategic Plan, currently scheduled to close today at 5:00 pm. I was only made aware of this opportunity today and I'm sure other people who would like to comment are in the same position. Given the strong community engagement efforts earlier in this process, extending the comment period would better ensure the public has a meaningful opportunity to review how their input was

incorporated and to provide feedback. Please extend the deadline and to communicate the opportunity more broadly.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kindly,  
Mandy Watson