

#	Submission Format	Submitted Comment	Project Team Response
1	Email	<p>I urge you to ensure that the plan must commit to a second phase update process to flesh out key parts of the plan including: a full comprehensive restoration plan, reevaluation of the Management Unit section of the plan with new resource inventory information, which is currently not incorporated in the plan.</p> <p>Statewide Planning Goal 17 (Estuarine shorelands) should be updated simultaneously with Goal 16 (Estuarine Resources) since adjacent shoreland habitats will be impacted by expected sea level rise. Currently the update process has only considered Goal 16.</p> <p>Please provide for public comment on the statewide guidance document that will provide a framework for updating other Oregon estuary management plans.</p>	<p>The Project Team received eleven individual emails with nearly verbatim language outlining these points. As such, they have been given the same response.</p>
			<p>Commit to Second Update Phase: Updating any Tier 2 or 3 recommendations from the Needs & Gaps Assessment or any other components of the Yaquina Bay EMP will need to be performed by the local jurisdictions of Lincoln County and the Cities of Newport and Toledo. In the new Plan Part XI - Plan Updates, the Project Team has included a recommendation that Tier 2 and 3 recommendations be completed. The Project Team cannot commit to perform actions it has no authority or funding to do.</p>
			<p>Full comprehensive restoration plan: There already exists a recent (2022) and comprehensive OWEB approved Strategic Action Plan (SAP) that encompasses restoration actions in Yaquina Bay. This SAP led to a successful Focused Investment Partnership grant from OWEB that has led to over \$12 million in restoration investments in the Yaquina and Alsea Bays over the next six years. Furthermore, this is a regulatory land use plan and not a restoration plan. Goal 16 requires listing of potential restoration sites, not a comprehensive restoration plan. This Draft Plan does not preclude a separate comprehensive restoration planning process from taking place, but it is not a suitable home for it.</p>
			<p>Re-evaluation of Management Units based on new resource inventory information now currently incorporated: All management units were re-evaluated based on the data and map inventory which includes the 2019 ODFW CMECS data. The estuarine regulatory extent (boundary of the estuary) was painstakingly vetted with aerial images. Lastly, experts such as ODFW technical staff were consulted on the locations of specific habitats and natural resources which directly led to shifting management unit boundaries. However, the map viewer was slow to be publicly released and the Project Team and DLCD, which has provided free hosting services of the map viewer, apologizes to the public and the Advisory Group for that issue. In order to partially rectify this error, an additional Advisory Group meeting was held on Tuesday July 25th for the explicit purpose of convening a deep conversation on any potential areas in which management unit descriptions, classifications, or boundaries do not reflect current conditions described in the spatial data.</p>
			<p>Update Statewide Planning Goal 17 simultaneously: The YBEMP is currently structured to fulfill the spatial planning and implementation requirements of Goal 16; it is not directly applicable to adjacent shoreland areas. Local government land use authorities (Newport, Toledo and Lincoln County) have in place coordinated land use designations and implementing regulations for adjacent shorelands that comply with Goal 17. The scope of the current project is to modernize the YBEMP; the project scope does not extend to a review and revision of the existing city and county comprehensive plan elements that implement Goal 17, which would be a complex undertaking. As required by Goal 16, proposed revisions to the YBEMP include consideration of the adjacent upland characteristics and existing land uses. In addition, to ensure coordination with estuarine designations, general policy guidance for the planning of adjacent shorelands is provided in the Sub-Area policies.</p>
			<p>Allow for public comment on statewide guidance document: The EMP guidance document is intended to be utilized by staff at jurisdictions, external technical assistance providers, and DLCD staff. It will be reviewed by the Steering Committee and the Advisory Group, which totals 48 people of diverse backgrounds and expertises, and revised based on that feedback. It will be available for public viewing after submitted to DLCD as a grant deliverable. There is neither a timetable for public review prior to finalization nor a specific cause for public review as it is a guidance document for an audience of planning practitioners.</p>

2	Email	<p>As a coastal resident who is concerned deeply about climate change, and the protection and restoration of coastal habitat, please protect the Yaquina Bay watershed and neighboring areas. The coastal range is already being devastated by clear cutting and other extensive development.</p> <p>We need a stronger Tier 2 plan to focus on climate resiliency and habitat protection so we can protect this area for the fish and wildlife and for future generations to enjoy.</p> <p>Please stop the degradation of our coastal communities and way of life.</p> <p>Thank you for your hard work and opportunity to comment and participate in this process.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The vast majority of the Yaquina portion of the current Lincoln County Estuary Management Plan has been updated in the DRAFT Plan. Tier 2 recommendations from the Needs & Gaps Assessment are to be completed at the discretion of the local jurisdictions of Lincoln County and the Cities of Newport and Toledo. The DRAFT Plan recommends the completion of all Tier 2 recommendations in Plan Part XI - Plan Updates. However, neither of the Tier 2 recommendations can directly address an increase focus on climate resiliency or habitat protection. To do so would likely require the completion of the Tier 3 recommendation that can only be completed by the state through a goal change.</p>
3	Email	<p>The County needs to address climate change impacts more fully in the update process.</p> <p>The updated plan should include a clear process to allow future revisions.</p> <p>The definition of "mitigation" should be expanded to include minimizing and avoiding adverse impacts to critical habitat.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Climate Vulnerability inclusion in the Impact Assessment process was determined by the Steering Committee to be the only climate change vehicle to influence future human-directed changes to Yaquina Bay that could be incorporated into the DRAFT Plan.</p> <p>The creation of Plan Part XI - Plan Updates outlines a clear process for future revisions.</p> <p>Several commenters have advocated for incorporating the definition of "mitigation" employed by state and federal regulatory authorities, rather than the narrower, more specific definition used in the Statewide Planning Goals. These alternative definitions incorporate avoidance and reduction of adverse impacts (followed by compensation) in a hierarchy of preferences. Commenters have stated that because the current goal definition of mitigation is limited to compensation for impacts of dredge or fill in tidal wetlands through resource replacement, this means that local permit decisions are not required to consider avoidance or reduction of impacts. This represents a misunderstanding of Goal 16 implementation requirements.</p> <p>Implementation requirement 2 of Goal 16 requires a showing, for all estuarine alterations, that "adverse impacts are minimized". Correspondingly, implementation requirement 1 directs required impact assessments to include a showing of "methods which could be employed to avoid or minimize adverse impacts". These provisions are incorporated into implementing land use regulations and represent the functional equivalent of the more expansive state and federal definition of "mitigation", but expressed in different terminology. To avoid confusion and ensure alignment with Goal 16 and Oregon's estuarine resource replacement policy (ORS 196.830), retaining the current Statewide Planning Goals definition of mitigation is recommended.</p>
4	Email	<p>Please accept our comments regarding the updating of the YBEMP. Estuaries are one of the most important habitats on earth. The Yaquina Bay estuary is one of those places. Even though it has been used for years for human activity, the estuary must continue to support all species, especially those that are native to the ecosystem. The management plan MUST give equal weight to the non-human residents and users of the estuary. The ecosystem MUST be preserved!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Estuary management plans are regulatorily defensible when each management unit is appropriately classified (as Natural, Conservation, or Development) based on the existing conditions. Areas with existing development must be classified as Development or Conservation based on the type of development uses and habitats also present. The Plan update sought to ensure that sizable important habitats that were present in Development or Conservation management units be protected and so, in the case of the new management units 1a, 31a, 34a, and 34b, these areas were separated and classified as Natural to appropriately protect them. Goal 16 and estuary management plans are designed to protect habitats and ecosystems in the absence of nearby development. In Development management units in which both economically important development uses (e.g.: ports, navigation channels) and important habitats co-exist, special policies are often included to direct the protection of those habitats.</p>

5	Email	<p>I am a retired research scientist and was the Branch Chief of Newport's Environmental Protection Agency facility in Newport for 17 years where a principal focus of our research was the ecological structure, function, and threats to coastal estuaries, particularly including research on the resources of Yaquina Bay. Please accept these comments on the update to the Yaquina Bay Estuary Management Plan (YBEMP). I am submitting information which quantifies the exceptional resources in the Sally's Bend and Idaho Flats regions of Yaquina Bay.</p> <p>Sally's Bend is classified as a natural area in the YBEMP. I would strongly suggest that it is inappropriate to retain language in the YBEMP which denotes a portion of Sally's Bend as a "future development" site. As documented by the information below, any development use here, including the dredging of new channels, vessel activity, etc. would threaten the extremely high natural values of this area. Given the great difficulty and limited success of seagrass restoration, any impacts to this resource would not be able to be mitigated.</p> <p>I therefore ask that you incorporate this information into the description of the Sally's Bend management unit (and Idaho Flats MU) and that you remove reference to Sally's Bend in the Future Development Site section of the update to the YBEMP.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. This issue was raised during two Town Halls and Lincoln County staff did some digging to provide the following answer. Many people have, with good cause, pointed out that it does not make sense to both protect this area with exceptional natural resources and identify it for development. However, this is merely a legacy holdover from the original EMP and has no regulatory impact on the habitats and ecosystems in the management units in question. Due to Plan Part IX - Future Development Sites being wholly obsolete in being predicated on 40 year old economic development analysis and the challenges posed by its special policies in specific Natural Management Units, the Steering Committee has decided to remove the Plan Part and its special policies. In its place is a description of why it was removed and a recommendation for an updated Future Development Sites.</p>
6	Email	<p>You have got to be kidding me, not a one on your list of partners care about the waters of our Oregon Coast so please do not just suck resources and pretend you care. WHERE IS THE SCIENCE, Where are the water and soil testing beyond ph, turbidity, temp because there is a long list of non profits that do nothing but take grants, I suspect you are no different. Your so called partners profit off the illness of our children and the endangered habitat they vote to destroy with every meeting.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Like all of Oregon's estuary management plans, the DRAFT Plan is a land use regulatory document that prescribes what uses and activities owners of the estuary may be able to perform. The Yaquina Bay Estuary Management Plan is segmented into Management Units, a geographic area that is classified as Natural, Conservation, or Development. Each classification allows, conditionally allows, or does not allow specific uses or alterations in the estuary such as oyster aquaculture (use) or installing pilings (alteration). Operational activities that occur at any industrial sites on Yaquina are not regulated by this Plan, but by the appropriate state or federal agency such as Oregon's Department of Environmental Quality and US Environmental Protection Agency (for wastewater discharge) or Oregon Health Authority and US Environmental Protection Agency (air pollution).</p>
7	Email	<p>I was recently made aware of the new Draft Yaquina Estuary Management Plan. I believe more needs to be done to strengthen the plan.</p> <p>Healthy Oregon estuaries are important to me. I have birded, enjoyed and, eaten local seafood from the Yaquina and it's estuaries.</p> <p>I'm grateful for the Willamette Partnership, agencies, and advisory group for the updates in the current draft Yaquina Estuary Management Plan. They have included climate vulnerability considerations, a list of restoration/mitigation sites, and have developed a mapping tool to help guide management decisions.</p> <p>I urge you to ensure that the plan must commit to a second phase update process to flesh out key parts of the plan including: a full comprehensive restoration plan, reevaluation of the Management Unit section of the plan with new resource inventory information, which is currently not incorporated in the plan.</p> <p>Statewide Planning Goal 17 (Estuarine shorelands) should be updated simultaneously with Goal 16 (Estuarine Resources) since adjacent shoreland habitats will be impacted by expected sea level rise. Currently the update process has only considered Goal 16.</p> <p>Please provide for public comment on the statewide guidance document that will provide a framework for updating other Oregon estuary management plans.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Each has been responded to individually as follow.</p> <p>Commit to Second Update Phase: Updating any Tier 2 or 3 recommendations from the Needs & Gaps Assessment or any other components of the Yaquina Bay EMP will need to be performed by the local jurisdictions of Lincoln County and the Cities of Newport and Toledo. In the new Plan Part XI - Plan Updates, the Project Team has included a recommendation that Tier 2 and 3 recommendations be completed. The Project Team cannot commit to perform actions it has no authority or funding to do.</p> <p>Full comprehensive restoration plan: There already exists a recent (2022) and comprehensive OWEB approved Strategic Action Plan (SAP) that encompasses restoration actions in Yaquina Bay. This SAP led to a successful Focused Investment Partnership grant from OWEB that has led to over \$12 million in restoration investments in the Yaquina and Alsea Bays over the next six years. Furthermore, this is a regulatory land use plan and not a restoration plan. Goal 16 requires listing of potential restoration sites, not a comprehensive restoration plan. This Draft Plan does not preclude a separate comprehensive restoration planning process from taking place, but it is not a suitable home for it.</p> <p>Re-evaluation of Management Units based on new resource inventory information now currently incorporated: The comments that the Management Unit Descriptions need to be substantially revised and expanded are based principally on the assertions that (a) the revised drafts of the MU descriptions do not take into account current resource inventory information and, (b) that the MU descriptions represent the primary information used by local jurisdictions to make individual land use decisions on proposed estuarine alterations. Neither of these statements is accurate. The new inventory information proposed for incorporation into the plan was available and informed the evaluation of each management unit. This information was considered in revising MU descriptions and in arriving at recommended MU boundaries and classifications. To the extent that errors or omissions were made in interpreting this information for purposes of the MU evaluations, the project team is open to specific input to rectify such errors or oversights. The purpose of the MU descriptions is to provide a summary of the information that is relevant</p>

8	Email	<p>The Yaquina Estuary management is vital to all Oregonians and our visitors, who, like me, relish our moments by the sea to enjoy birding year round.</p> <p>I would like to thank the Willamette Partnership, agencies, and advisory group for the updates in the current draft Yaquina Estuary Management Plan, particularly for the inclusion of climate vulnerability considerations.</p> <p>The plan, however, must also commit to a second phase update process to flesh out key parts including: a full comprehensive restoration plan, and reevaluation of the Management Unit section of the plan with new resource inventory information (currently not incorporated in the plan).</p> <p>In addition, Statewide Planning Goal 17 (Estuarine shorelands) should be updated simultaneously with Goal 16 (Estuarine Resources) since adjacent shoreland habitats will be impacted by expected sea level rise. Currently the update process has only considered Goal 16.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Each has been responded to individually as follow.</p> <p>Commit to Second Update Phase: Updating any Tier 2 or 3 recommendations from the Needs & Gaps Assessment or any other components of the Yaquina Bay EMP will need to be performed by the local jurisdictions of Lincoln County and the Cities of Newport and Toledo. In the new Plan Part XI - Plan Updates, the Project Team has included a recommendation that Tier 2 and 3 recommendations be completed. The Project Team cannot commit to perform actions it has no authority or funding to do.</p> <p>Full comprehensive restoration plan: There already exists a recent (2022) and comprehensive OWEB approved Strategic Action Plan (SAP) that encompasses restoration actions in Yaquina Bay. This SAP led to a successful Focused Investment Partnership grant from OWEB that has led to over \$12 million in restoration investments in the Yaquina and Alsea Bays over the next six years. Furthermore, this is a regulatory land use plan and not a restoration plan. Goal 16 requires listing of potential restoration sites, not a comprehensive restoration plan. This Draft Plan does not preclude a separate comprehensive restoration planning process from taking place, but it is not a suitable home for it.</p> <p>Re-evaluation of Management Units based on new resource inventory information now currently incorporated: The comments that the Management Unit Descriptions need to be substantially revised and expanded are based principally on the assertions that (a) the revised drafts of the MU descriptions do not take into account current resource inventory information and, (b) that the MU descriptions represent the primary information used by local jurisdictions to make individual land use decisions on proposed estuarine alterations. Neither of these statements is accurate. The new inventory information proposed for incorporation into the plan was available and informed the evaluation of each management unit. This information was considered in revising MU descriptions and in arriving at recommended MU boundaries and classifications. To the extent that errors or omissions were made in interpreting this information for purposes of the MU evaluations, the project team is open to specific input to rectify such errors or oversights. The purpose of the MU descriptions is to provide a summary of the information that is relevant</p>
9	Email	<p>Please update and strengthen the Yaquina Estuary Management Plan, incorporating the best policies to protect key wetland habitats, fish and wildlife while supporting the local economy.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The purpose of estuary management plans are "To recognize and protect the unique environmental, economic, and social values of each estuary and associated wetlands; and To protect, maintain, where appropriate develop, and where appropriate restore the long-term environmental, economic, and social values, diversity and benefits of Oregon's estuaries." This quote is from Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 16 - Estuarine Resources. The DRAFT Plan has been updated with detailed and up-to-date spatial data that describe ecosystems and habitats present in Yaquina Bay.</p>
10	Email	<p>Yes, we need to update the Yaquina Bay plan and others to protect habitats for fishes and wildlife and water quality.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The updated DRAFT Plan will continue to protect the areas that were protected previously in the original Plan and should support habitats for fishes and wildlife into the future.</p>

11	Email	<p>Our unspoiled Oregon coast is amazing to our out-of-town visitors. And to us, actually. We love visiting, dining, and birding the coast. The health of this complex and productive habitat is important to us.</p> <p>We appreciate all the work that the Willamette Partnership, agencies, and advisory group have done to create and update the current draft of the Yaquina Estuary Management Plan. We are pleased that they included climate considerations and restoration/mitigation sites and developed a great mapping tool to help guide management decisions.</p> <p>Please be sure that the plan commits to a second phase update to complete key parts such as a comprehensive restoration plan and reevaluation of the Management Unit section of the plan with new resource inventory information.</p> <p>Statewide Planning Goal 17 (Estuarine shorelands) should be updated simultaneously with Goal 16 (Estuarine Resources) since adjacent shoreland habitats will be impacted by expected sea level rise. Currently the update process has only considered Goal 16.</p> <p>Please provide for public comment on the statewide guidance document that will provide a framework for updating other Oregon estuary management plans.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Each has been responded to individually as follow.</p> <p>Commit to Second Update Phase: Updating any Tier 2 or 3 recommendations from the Needs & Gaps Assessment or any other components of the Yaquina Bay EMP will need to be performed by the local jurisdictions of Lincoln County and the Cities of Newport and Toledo. In the new Plan Part XI - Plan Updates, the Project Team has included a recommendation that Tier 2 and 3 recommendations be completed. The Project Team cannot commit to perform actions it has no authority or funding to do.</p> <p>Full comprehensive restoration plan: There already exists a recent (2022) and comprehensive OWEB approved Strategic Action Plan (SAP) that encompasses restoration actions in Yaquina Bay. This SAP led to a successful Focused Investment Partnership grant from OWEB that has led to over \$12 million in restoration investments in the Yaquina and Alsea Bays over the next six years. Furthermore, this is a regulatory land use plan and not a restoration plan. Goal 16 requires listing of potential restoration sites, not a comprehensive restoration plan. This Draft Plan does not preclude a separate comprehensive restoration planning process from taking place, but it is not a suitable home for it.</p> <p>Re-evaluation of Management Units based on new resource inventory information now currently incorporated: The comments that the Management Unit Descriptions need to be substantially revised and expanded are based principally on the assertions that (a) the revised drafts of the MU descriptions do not take into account current resource inventory information and, (b) that the MU descriptions represent the primary information used by local jurisdictions to make individual land use decisions on proposed estuarine alterations. Neither of these statements is accurate. The new inventory information proposed for incorporation into the plan was available and informed the evaluation of each management unit. This information was considered in revising MU descriptions and in arriving at recommended MU boundaries and classifications. To the extent that errors or omissions were made in interpreting this information for purposes of the MU evaluations, the project team is open to specific input to rectify such errors or oversights. The purpose of the MU descriptions is to provide a summary of the information that is relevant</p>
12	Email	<p>I strongly believe we must protect the health of Oregon's estuaries. The new draft Yaquina Estuary Management Plan is a good start, but more needs to be done to strengthen the plan.</p> <p>In particular, the plan must commit to a second phase update process to expand upon key parts of the plan including a full, comprehensive restoration plan and reevaluation of the Management Unit section of the plan with new resource inventory information that currently is not incorporated in the plan.</p> <p>In addition, because adjacent shore land habitats will be affected by expected sea level rise, the Statewide planning goal 17 for estuarine shore lands should be updated simultaneously with Goal 16 for estuarine resources. The update process currently has considered only Goal 16.</p> <p>Finally, there needs to be provision for public comment on the statewide guidance document that will provide a framework for updating other Oregon estuary managements plans.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for doing everything possible to protect the Yaquina estuary.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Each has been responded to individually as follow.</p> <p>Commit to Second Update Phase: Updating any Tier 2 or 3 recommendations from the Needs & Gaps Assessment or any other components of the Yaquina Bay EMP will need to be performed by the local jurisdictions of Lincoln County and the Cities of Newport and Toledo. In the new Plan Part XI - Plan Updates, the Project Team has included a recommendation that Tier 2 and 3 recommendations be completed. The Project Team cannot commit to perform actions it has no authority or funding to do.</p> <p>Full comprehensive restoration plan: There already exists a recent (2022) and comprehensive OWEB approved Strategic Action Plan (SAP) that encompasses restoration actions in Yaquina Bay. This SAP led to a successful Focused Investment Partnership grant from OWEB that has led to over \$12 million in restoration investments in the Yaquina and Alsea Bays over the next six years. Furthermore, this is a regulatory land use plan and not a restoration plan. Goal 16 requires listing of potential restoration sites, not a comprehensive restoration plan. This Draft Plan does not preclude a separate comprehensive restoration planning process from taking place, but it is not a suitable home for it.</p> <p>Re-evaluation of Management Units based on new resource inventory information now currently incorporated: The comments that the Management Unit Descriptions need to be substantially revised and expanded are based principally on the assertions that (a) the revised drafts of the MU descriptions do not take into account current resource inventory information and, (b) that the MU descriptions represent the primary information used by local jurisdictions to make individual land use decisions on proposed estuarine alterations. Neither of these statements is accurate. The new inventory information proposed for incorporation into the plan was available and informed the evaluation of each management unit. This information was considered in revising MU descriptions and in arriving at recommended MU boundaries and classifications. To the extent that errors or omissions were made in interpreting this information for purposes of the MU evaluations, the project team is open to specific input to rectify such errors or oversights. The purpose of the MU descriptions is to provide a summary of the information that is relevant</p>

13	Email	<p>we agree with portland audubon-</p> <p>"Where Oregon's forests and rivers meet the ocean, estuaries are the engines that power salmon, thousands of migratory birds, Dungeness crab, oysters, cultural resources and jobs for many in coastal communities. The Yaquina Estuary Management Plan is being updated with an opportunity for public comment right now! It will serve as a blueprint for estuary management plan updates for nearly 20 other major estuaries in Oregon. Originally written in 1982, the Yaquina plan is in much need of an update as climate change issues have emerged, several impacted species have been listed as endangered, and habitat restoration has become recognized as a vital conservation tool."</p> <p>our region is at risk</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
14	Email	<p>Thanks to those responsible for the updates on the current draft Estuary Management Plan. I urge a second phase update to include a full comprehensive restoration plan and reevaluation of the Management Unit section. Statewide Planning Goals 17 and 16 should also be updated. Healthy Oregon estuaries are important for the future of our state. Thank you for your time and consideration of this important issue.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Each has been responded to individually as follow.</p> <p>Commit to Second Update Phase: Updating any Tier 2 or 3 recommendations from the Needs & Gaps Assessment or any other components of the Yaquina Bay EMP will need to be performed by the local jurisdictions of Lincoln County and the Cities of Newport and Toledo. In the new Plan Part XI - Plan Updates, the Project Team has included a recommendation that Tier 2 and 3 recommendations be completed. The Project Team cannot commit to perform actions it has no authority or funding to do.</p> <p>Full comprehensive restoration plan: There already exists a recent (2022) and comprehensive OWEB approved Strategic Action Plan (SAP) that encompasses restoration actions in Yaquina Bay. This SAP led to a successful Focused Investment Partnership grant from OWEB that has led to over \$12 million in restoration investments in the Yaquina and Alsea Bays over the next six years. Furthermore, this is a regulatory land use plan and not a restoration plan. Goal 16 requires listing of potential restoration sites, not a comprehensive restoration plan. This Draft Plan does not preclude a separate comprehensive restoration planning process from taking place, but it is not a suitable home for it.</p> <p>Re-evaluation of Management Units based on new resource inventory information now currently incorporated: The comments that the Management Unit Descriptions need to be substantially revised and expanded are based principally on the assertions that (a) the revised drafts of the MU descriptions do not take into account current resource inventory information and, (b) that the MU descriptions represent the primary information used by local jurisdictions to make individual land use decisions on proposed estuarine alterations. Neither of these statements is accurate. The new inventory information proposed for incorporation into the plan was available and informed the evaluation of each management unit. This information was considered in revising MU descriptions and in arriving at recommended MU boundaries and classifications. To the extent that errors or omissions were made in interpreting this information for purposes of the MU evaluations, the project team is open to specific input to rectify such errors or oversights. The purpose of the MU descriptions is to provide a summary of the information that is relevant</p>
15	Email	<p>Once again you refuse to mention GP and its toxic waste, the cities who pump their discharge into the rivers all for your profit. This is why it will soon be unlivable and you will be part of the reason. Greedy Bunch who do not truly care.</p> <p>You make the Mill very happy. Another bullshit non profit of fools.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Estuary management plans regulate new uses or new alterations inside the estuary. These plans do not have any regulatory authority over the existing operations of water-adjacent facilities such as Georgia Pacific. The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality regulates wastewater and stormwater discharges. The Oregon Health Authority regulates point source air pollution. Evidence of pollution that toxic waste entering Yaquina Bay should be shared immediately with the relevant regulatory authority. However, we understand that there are instances in which the data or information isn't available or has not been collected yet while residents may already be suffering health effects. A new EPA funded Pacific Northwest Environmental Justice Center will be providing support for issues such as described here. Willamette Partnership, a member of the Yaquina Bay EMP update project team, will co-lead this new center so please reach out to learn more.</p>

16	Email	<p>Please update and strengthen the yaquina Estuary Management Plan, incorporating the best policies to protect key wetland habitats, fish and wildlife while supporting the local economy..</p> <p>Please commit to a second phase update process to flesh out key parts of the plan including: a full comprehensive restoration plan and reevaluation of the Management Unit section of the plan with new resource inventory information.</p> <p>Statewide Planning Goal 17 should be updated simultaneously with Goal 16 since adjacent shoreland habitats will be impacted by expected sea level rise. Currently the update process has only considered Goal 16.</p> <p>Please provide for public comment on the statewide guidance document that will provide a framework for updating other Oregon estuary management plans.</p> <p>Thank you for the current draft Yaquina Management Plan that included climate vulnerability considerations, a list of restoration/mitigation sites, and a mapping tool to help guide management decisions. I hope you will consider these other suggestions.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Each has been responded to individually as follow.</p> <p>Commit to Second Update Phase: Updating any Tier 2 or 3 recommendations from the Needs & Gaps Assessment or any other components of the Yaquina Bay EMP will need to be performed by the local jurisdictions of Lincoln County and the Cities of Newport and Toledo. In the new Plan Part XI - Plan Updates, the Project Team has included a recommendation that Tier 2 and 3 recommendations be completed. The Project Team cannot commit to perform actions it has no authority or funding to do.</p> <p>Full comprehensive restoration plan: There already exists a recent (2022) and comprehensive OWEB approved Strategic Action Plan (SAP) that encompasses restoration actions in Yaquina Bay. This SAP led to a successful Focused Investment Partnership grant from OWEB that has led to over \$12 million in restoration investments in the Yaquina and Alsea Bays over the next six years. Furthermore, this is a regulatory land use plan and not a restoration plan. Goal 16 requires listing of potential restoration sites, not a comprehensive restoration plan. This Draft Plan does not preclude a separate comprehensive restoration planning process from taking place, but it is not a suitable home for it.</p> <p>Re-evaluation of Management Units based on new resource inventory information now currently incorporated: The comments that the Management Unit Descriptions need to be substantially revised and expanded are based principally on the assertions that (a) the revised drafts of the MU descriptions do not take into account current resource inventory information and, (b) that the MU descriptions represent the primary information used by local jurisdictions to make individual land use decisions on proposed estuarine alterations. Neither of these statements is accurate. The new inventory information proposed for incorporation into the plan was available and informed the evaluation of each management unit. This information was considered in revising MU descriptions and in arriving at recommended MU boundaries and classifications. To the extent that errors or omissions were made in interpreting this information for purposes of the MU evaluations, the project team is open to specific input to rectify such errors or oversights. The purpose of the MU descriptions is to provide a summary of the information that is relevant</p>
17	Email	<p>Healthy Oregon estuaries are important to us all because our personal health is directly connected to the health of our natural environment, which is suffering unsustainably. We value an increasingly healthy, diverse, and robust natural environment for us all. Protecting our estuaries is an important part of this.</p> <p>We are grateful to the many people from Willamette Partnership, agencies, and advisory group for the updates in the current draft Yaquina Estuary Management Plan. They have included climate vulnerability considerations, a list of restoration/mitigation sites, and have developed a mapping tool to help guide management decisions.</p> <p>We urge that the plan must commit to a second phase update process to flesh out key parts of the plan including: a full comprehensive restoration plan, reevaluation of the Management Unit section of the plan with new resource inventory information (currently not incorporated in the plan).</p> <p>In addition, Statewide Planning Goal 17 (Estuarine shorelands) should be updated simultaneously with Goal 16 (Estuarine Resources) since adjacent shoreland habitats will be impacted by expected sea level rise. Currently the update process has only considered Goal 16.</p> <p>Lastly, please provide for public comment on the statewide guidance document that will provide a framework for updating other Oregon estuary management plans.</p> <p>With best wishes for your wellness,</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Each has been responded to individually as follow.</p> <p>Commit to Second Update Phase: Updating any Tier 2 or 3 recommendations from the Needs & Gaps Assessment or any other components of the Yaquina Bay EMP will need to be performed by the local jurisdictions of Lincoln County and the Cities of Newport and Toledo. In the new Plan Part XI - Plan Updates, the Project Team has included a recommendation that Tier 2 and 3 recommendations be completed. The Project Team cannot commit to perform actions it has no authority or funding to do.</p> <p>Full comprehensive restoration plan: There already exists a recent (2022) and comprehensive OWEB approved Strategic Action Plan (SAP) that encompasses restoration actions in Yaquina Bay. This SAP led to a successful Focused Investment Partnership grant from OWEB that has led to over \$12 million in restoration investments in the Yaquina and Alsea Bays over the next six years. Furthermore, this is a regulatory land use plan and not a restoration plan. Goal 16 requires listing of potential restoration sites, not a comprehensive restoration plan. This Draft Plan does not preclude a separate comprehensive restoration planning process from taking place, but it is not a suitable home for it.</p> <p>Re-evaluation of Management Units based on new resource inventory information now currently incorporated: The comments that the Management Unit Descriptions need to be substantially revised and expanded are based principally on the assertions that (a) the revised drafts of the MU descriptions do not take into account current resource inventory information and, (b) that the MU descriptions represent the primary information used by local jurisdictions to make individual land use decisions on proposed estuarine alterations. Neither of these statements is accurate. The new inventory information proposed for incorporation into the plan was available and informed the evaluation of each management unit. This information was considered in revising MU descriptions and in arriving at recommended MU boundaries and classifications. To the extent that errors or omissions were made in interpreting this information for purposes of the MU evaluations, the project team is open to specific input to rectify such errors or oversights. The purpose of the MU descriptions is to provide a summary of the information that is relevant</p>

18	Email	<p>I've spent a lot of time in Oregon Estuaries (including Yaquina) looking for evidence of the subduction zone earthquake. And from that research I learned a lot about the ecological importance of estuaries.</p> <p>I appreciate the updates that have been incorporated in the plan such as climate vulnerability considerations. However, the plan must commit to a second phase update process to flesh out key parts of the plan including: a full comprehensive restoration plan, reevaluation of the Management Unit section of the plan with new resource inventory information (currently not incorporated in the plan).</p> <p>Statewide Planning Goal 17 (Estuarine shorelands) should be updated simultaneously with Goal 16 (Estuarine Resources) since adjacent shoreland habitats will be impacted by expected sea level rise. Currently the update process has only considered Goal 16.</p> <p>Please provide for public comment on the statewide guidance document that will provide a framework for updating other Oregon estuary management plans.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Each has been responded to individually as follow.</p> <p>Commit to Second Update Phase: Updating any Tier 2 or 3 recommendations from the Needs & Gaps Assessment or any other components of the Yaquina Bay EMP will need to be performed by the local jurisdictions of Lincoln County and the Cities of Newport and Toledo. In the new Plan Part XI - Plan Updates, the Project Team has included a recommendation that Tier 2 and 3 recommendations be completed. The Project Team cannot commit to perform actions it has no authority or funding to do.</p> <p>Full comprehensive restoration plan: There already exists a recent (2022) and comprehensive OWEB approved Strategic Action Plan (SAP) that encompasses restoration actions in Yaquina Bay. This SAP led to a successful Focused Investment Partnership grant from OWEB that has led to over \$12 million in restoration investments in the Yaquina and Alsea Bays over the next six years. Furthermore, this is a regulatory land use plan and not a restoration plan. Goal 16 requires listing of potential restoration sites, not a comprehensive restoration plan. This Draft Plan does not preclude a separate comprehensive restoration planning process from taking place, but it is not a suitable home for it.</p> <p>Re-evaluation of Management Units based on new resource inventory information now currently incorporated: The comments that the Management Unit Descriptions need to be substantially revised and expanded are based principally on the assertions that (a) the revised drafts of the MU descriptions do not take into account current resource inventory information and, (b) that the MU descriptions represent the primary information used by local jurisdictions to make individual land use decisions on proposed estuarine alterations. Neither of these statements is accurate. The new inventory information proposed for incorporation into the plan was available and informed the evaluation of each management unit. This information was considered in revising MU descriptions and in arriving at recommended MU boundaries and classifications. To the extent that errors or omissions were made in interpreting this information for purposes of the MU evaluations, the project team is open to specific input to rectify such errors or oversights. The purpose of the MU descriptions is to provide a summary of the information that is relevant</p>
19	Email	<p>First of all I want to thank the Willamette Partnership, agencies, and advisory group for the updates in the current draft Yaquina Estuary Management Plan. You have included climate vulnerability considerations, a list of restoration/mitigation sites, and have developed a mapping tool to help guide management decisions. It's a great start and is greatly needed.</p> <p>Oregon estuaries are important to me for so many reasons. I love to go birding at our estuaries, I am thankful for the estuaries in being a place where wildlife can rear their young, where climate mitigation takes place and where there is quiet and nature (hopefully undisturbed) to be enjoyed. I am appreciative of the smaller fish who grow in the estuaries to become larger fish for my consumption. Oysters may not be for me but my family loves them...all from Yaquina Bay!</p> <p>I strongly urge that the plan must commit to a second phase update process to bring out key parts of the plan including: a full comprehensive restoration plan, reevaluation of the Management Unit section of the plan with new resource inventory information (which currently is not incorporated in the plan).</p> <p>Statewide Planning Goal 17 (Estuarine shorelands) should/needs be updated simultaneously with Goal 16 (Estuarine Resources) since adjacent shoreland habitats will be impacted by expected sea level rise. Currently the update process Statewide Planning Goal 17 (Estuarine shorelands) should/needs be updated simultaneously with Goal 16 (Estuarine Resources) since adjacent shoreland habitats will be impacted by expected sea level rise. Currently the update prohas only considered Goal 16. We know sea level rise is coming, let's get prepared!</p> <p>Please allow public comment on the statewide guidance document that will provide a framework for updating other Oregon estuary management plans.</p> <p>Thank you again for the opportunity to share my thanks and concerns, may we all want what's best to help nature help us.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Each has been responded to individually as follow.</p> <p>Commit to Second Update Phase: Updating any Tier 2 or 3 recommendations from the Needs & Gaps Assessment or any other components of the Yaquina Bay EMP will need to be performed by the local jurisdictions of Lincoln County and the Cities of Newport and Toledo. In the new Plan Part XI - Plan Updates, the Project Team has included a recommendation that Tier 2 and 3 recommendations be completed. The Project Team cannot commit to perform actions it has no authority or funding to do.</p> <p>Full comprehensive restoration plan: There already exists a recent (2022) and comprehensive OWEB approved Strategic Action Plan (SAP) that encompasses restoration actions in Yaquina Bay. This SAP led to a successful Focused Investment Partnership grant from OWEB that has led to over \$12 million in restoration investments in the Yaquina and Alsea Bays over the next six years. Furthermore, this is a regulatory land use plan and not a restoration plan. Goal 16 requires listing of potential restoration sites, not a comprehensive restoration plan. This Draft Plan does not preclude a separate comprehensive restoration planning process from taking place, but it is not a suitable home for it.</p> <p>Re-evaluation of Management Units based on new resource inventory information now currently incorporated: The comments that the Management Unit Descriptions need to be substantially revised and expanded are based principally on the assertions that (a) the revised drafts of the MU descriptions do not take into account current resource inventory information and, (b) that the MU descriptions represent the primary information used by local jurisdictions to make individual land use decisions on proposed estuarine alterations. Neither of these statements is accurate. The new inventory information proposed for incorporation into the plan was available and informed the evaluation of each management unit. This information was considered in revising MU descriptions and in arriving at recommended MU boundaries and classifications. To the extent that errors or omissions were made in interpreting this information for purposes of the MU evaluations, the project team is open to specific input to rectify such errors or oversights. The purpose of the MU descriptions is to provide a summary of the information that is relevant</p>

20	Email	<p>Thank you to the Willamette Partnership, agencies, and advisory group for the updates in the current draft Yaquina Estuary Management Plan. Please update and strengthen the Plan, incorporating the best policies to protect key wetland habitats, fish and wildlife, while supporting the local economy. I recognize that estuaries, like wetlands and coral reefs, are key ecosystems for biodiversity and are critically, vitally important. I have gone birdwatching at the Columbia River and Nehalem River estuaries, and have observed firsthand the richness of species diversity sustained by these habitats.</p> <p>Please commit the plan to a second phase update process to flesh out key parts of the plan including: a full comprehensive restoration plan, reevaluation of the Management Unit section of the plan with new resource inventory information (currently not incorporated in the plan). Statewide Planning Goal 17 (Estuarine shorelands) should be updated simultaneously with Goal 16 (Estuarine Resources) since adjacent shoreland habitats will be impacted by expected sea level rise. Currently the update process has only considered Goal 16.</p> <p>Please provide for public comment on the statewide guidance document that will provide a framework for updating other Oregon estuary management plans.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Each has been responded to individually as follow.</p> <p>Commit to Second Update Phase: Updating any Tier 2 or 3 recommendations from the Needs & Gaps Assessment or any other components of the Yaquina Bay EMP will need to be performed by the local jurisdictions of Lincoln County and the Cities of Newport and Toledo. In the new Plan Part XI - Plan Updates, the Project Team has included a recommendation that Tier 2 and 3 recommendations be completed. The Project Team cannot commit to perform actions it has no authority or funding to do.</p> <p>Full comprehensive restoration plan: There already exists a recent (2022) and comprehensive OWEB approved Strategic Action Plan (SAP) that encompasses restoration actions in Yaquina Bay. This SAP led to a successful Focused Investment Partnership grant from OWEB that has led to over \$12 million in restoration investments in the Yaquina and Alsea Bays over the next six years. Furthermore, this is a regulatory land use plan and not a restoration plan. Goal 16 requires listing of potential restoration sites, not a comprehensive restoration plan. This Draft Plan does not preclude a separate comprehensive restoration planning process from taking place, but it is not a suitable home for it.</p> <p>Re-evaluation of Management Units based on new resource inventory information now currently incorporated: The comments that the Management Unit Descriptions need to be substantially revised and expanded are based principally on the assertions that (a) the revised drafts of the MU descriptions do not take into account current resource inventory information and, (b) that the MU descriptions represent the primary information used by local jurisdictions to make individual land use decisions on proposed estuarine alterations. Neither of these statements is accurate. The new inventory information proposed for incorporation into the plan was available and informed the evaluation of each management unit. This information was considered in revising MU descriptions and in arriving at recommended MU boundaries and classifications. To the extent that errors or omissions were made in interpreting this information for purposes of the MU evaluations, the project team is open to specific input to rectify such errors or oversights. The purpose of the MU descriptions is to provide a summary of the information that is relevant</p>
21	Email	<p>1) With respect to whether the Plan reflects current conditions in the Bay or if there is anything missing or not accurate: Yes. Comment may be applicable to all tidegate areas, but the comment is with respect to Unit 24. The additional information added regarding the mouths of Boone and Nute siew do not address the current conditions of the bay, but rather imply a future direction without consideration for maintaining the current conditions.</p> <p>2) With respect to whether there are concerns with the implementation of the Plan or the requirements it places on applicants who seek to use or alter the estuary: Yes. Comments apply to all tidegate areas, but I will specifically address Unit 24. There is no specific allowance for the maintenance and preservation of the tidegate or dikes, despite these features acting as the boundary for the estuary. Additionally, this becomes concerning given that the new plan expands the allowances for a potential restoration site. Without allowing for both use cases, this has an implication of bias as to the intent of land use going forward.</p> <p>3) With regards to the updated maps and ifis there information visualized that does not reflect your personal knowledge of the Bay: No.</p> <p>4) Additional comments to share with the Project Team that could improve the Plan:</p> <p>Two Comments:</p> <p>Review time and public involvement was lacking.</p> <p>I would have liked to see the property owners directly affected by changes/updates to the plan notified.</p> <p>Lack of including 'Mill 4 Drainage District' as part of the stakeholders/reviewer process despite adding additional information within that management unit (24) is concerning.</p> <p>The time between town halls to public comment was not enough to obtain outside independent review.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We will address each of your points in order.</p> <p>1) The Resource Capability sub-section in the narratives of each Management Unit provide guidance to support the administration of the Plan. Natural classification Management Units, such as MU 24, have the most restrictions on potential uses or alterations. An application which seeks to perform a conditional use (as per its classification) is subject to what is called a Resource Capability Test. The information listed in the Resource Capability subsection of that Management Unit provides that additional guidance that County or City Planning staff can utilize to determine whether to permit the conditional use. The Natural classification lists "Active Restoration" as a conditional use. Therefore, it makes sense to include this new language describing "these sloughs represent a significant restoration resource, and alterations undertaken for the purpose of active restoration in this portion of Unit 24 would be consistent with the resource capabilities of the area." Please reach out to the Lincoln County Planning Department or DLCD staff for more information on the resource capability test. Restoration of any sites can only be performed by landowners or through willing sellers.</p> <p>2) Natural classification management units, such as MU 24, have a list of permissible and conditional uses. One of the permissible uses is "f. dredging necessary for on-site maintenance of existing functional tidegates and associated drainage channels and bridge crossing support structures." (Page 35 of DRAFT Plan) Maintenance is therefore already an allowable use in Management Unit 24.</p> <p>3) N/A</p> <p>4a) This is a preliminary planning process to create a DRAFT Plan and Inventories for local jurisdictions to review and potentially change through the formal Plan Amendment process which will include multiple public comment periods and in-person opportunities with elected officials and Planning Board representatives. The public engagement for this planning phase included many components over a long time period. The Project Team placed announcements about the Town Halls in all major news publications in the Newport/Toledo area, requested that information be posted on community calendars</p>

22	Email	There industrial waste is killing a generation or we are forced on bottled reverse osmosis dead water that cant sustain life. DO YOU KNOW WATER REALLY? I really doubt it.	Thank you for your comment, please see rows 6 and 15 for responses to the same submitter.
23	Email	You got enough problems with Salem trying to use the Willamette as a drinking water source, this bunch washes garbage with our drinking water and flushes their waste waster directly above Newport and all who reside and vacation there. GET REAL!	Thank you for your comment, please see rows 6 and 15 for responses to the same submitter.
24	Email	Thank you for the work you and your team is doing to update an estuary management plan for Yaquina Bay. Hopefully the plan will serve as a model for other coastal communities to update their plans. With that in mind, I believe the plan should be as robust and as flexible as possible. Coming up with a plan that balances protecting natural habitats for a variety of species that make the estuary their home with meeting community needs for appropriate development is a huge challenge, particularly in view of the rapid changes that are occurring in the environment because of climate change. Climate change is here and it's aggressive. Climate change impacts must be addressed fully in the update process. Otherwise we will be unprepared for what's just around the corner. This also means the updated plan should include an effective process for future revisions that may need to be made in response to these changes.	Thank you for your comment. Climate change was incorporated as fully as was deemed possible within the regulatory authority provided by Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 16 - Estuarine Resources. A list of Climate Vulnerabilities was drafted and vetted by a Technical Sub-Group composed of climate and estuarine experts. Each sub-area includes only Climate Vulnerabilities that apply to that sub-area. Proposed alterations are activities or uses which would break ground inside the estuary such as dredging. Any proposed alteration requires an Impact Assessment of the project's potential to impact natural resources. The DRAFT Plan includes an additional question where the project applicants must also describe how the proposed alteration might interact with any relevant Climate Vulnerabilities within the applicable Sub-Area. Incorporating climate change more into an estuary management plan will likely require a Goal Change at the state level. As for including "an effective process for future revisions," the DRAFT Plan includes the new Plan Part XI- Plan Updates which outlines how specific areas of the Plan can be updated. Moreover, it identifies the potential for Sea Level Rise due to climate change as a likely scenario in which maps of the estuary regulatory extent (area that is regulated under the Plan) or specific boundaries of former or new management units may need to be updated due to Sea Level Rise.
25	Email	I am concerned that the current updates/Tier 1 to the Yaquina Bay Estuary Management Plan do not include the ability for future adaptation, particularly relative to sea level change. A Tier 2 process needs to be in place to: - incorporate the latest/current natural resource and climate information - allow for re-evaluation of management units/area designations based on current information, particularly the upslope expansion of vulnerable areas. - provide adequate means for community reponse/involvement	Thank you for your comments. The DRAFT Plan addresses all Tier 1 recommendations as described in the Needs & Gaps Assessment. The Tier 2 recommendations of that Assessment were listed as updating Plan Parts V - Estuarine Use Standards and IX - Future Development Sites. Neither of the Tier 2 recommendation Plan Parts address any of the future needs described here. However, all of these future needs were addressed in the Tier 1 recommendations and in the DRAFT Plan. 1) Up-to-date natural resource and climate change data was incorporated into the Map Inventories and all of that data was reviewed when drafting narrative and boundary revisions to each Management Unit. Examples of such data includes ODFW's CMECS dataset which was developed for the purpose of updating Oregon's estuary management plans and locally callibrated data on Sea Level Rise and Landward Migration Zone map. 2) See the previous answer. All upslope expansion areas are, by definition, outside of the estuary and therefore cannot be included as Management Units. However, there are instances in which areas upslope of tide gates or dikes are described to facilitate active restoration in Natural Management Units. 3) Community involvement is critical to planmaking and required by Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 1. Please see Row 21, section 4a, for more information on the outreach strategy undertaken for this planning process. There will be additional opportunities for public engagement and involvement during the Plan Ammendment process to be undertaken by the local jurisdictions.

26	Email	<p>I virtually attended the presentation "Planning the Future of Yaquina Bay" in late June. Hearing that the Yaquina Bay Estuary Management Plan hasn't been updated since 1982 was very surprising and it's wonderful that it is finally being addressed. Lots of hard work is needed and you all are doing a great job. Thank you for participating in this presentation.</p> <p>I do have some concerns regarding how we address climate changes more expeditiously. The effects of climate change are already being seen on the Oregon coast and the changes are occurring at a fast rate. I live in Lincoln County and see the impact of sea level rising every winter during king tides, hotter and drier spring and summers and wildfires occurring more often. It's imperative that in the Yaquina Bay Estuary Management Plan we commit to a Tier 2 update which will allow us to make continuous updates to reflect climate change vulnerabilities and habitat loss. YBEMP should have a defined process to allow evaluation and revisions in the future and it must occur more frequently. One idea I read about is time based triggers.</p> <p>My family and I enjoy recreation on Yaquina Bay - fishing and crabbing - and I hope that the plan will ensure that we have this in the years to come.</p> <p>Thank you for letting the community be part of the process and comment on the plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Climate change is a pervasive issue and threat to Yaquina Bay as well as Oregon's other estuaries. The DRAFT Plan incorporated climate change information and potential vulnerabilities in Plan Parts I - Introduction, III - Sub-Areas, X - Plan Implementation, XI - Plan Updates, and Appendix D - Climate Vulnerability List. It was determined that in the absence of a new statewide policy or Planning Goal to address climate change's impacts on estuaries, what is currently included in the DRAFT Plan is the extent of what is defensible under Statewide Planning Goal 16 - Estuarine Resources. The Tier 3 recommendation from the Needs & Gaps Assessment is for the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) to "Develop a Statewide Estuarine Climate Change Policy."</p>
27	Email	<p>The Yaquina Estuary is important to me and to us all. I could reiterate the talking points, but you know them, so I won't. I think it's important to update Goals 16 & 17. People, places, things and weather are changing very fast compared to governance. We must be in front of the issue, not lag behind the problems. And what a very cool mapping tool! Keep up the work and progress. It's part of the solution.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The YBEMP is currently structured to fulfill the spatial planning and implementation requirements of Goal 16; it is not directly applicable to adjacent shoreland areas. Local government land use authorities (Newport, Toledo and Lincoln County) have in place coordinated land use designations and implementing regulations for adjacent shorelands that comply with Goal 17. The scope of the current project is to modernize the YBEMP; the project scope does not extend to a review and revision of the existing city and county comprehensive plan elements that implement Goal 17, which would be a complex undertaking. As required by Goal 16, proposed revisions to the YBEMP include consideration of the adjacent upland characteristics and existing land uses. In addition, to ensure coordination with estuarine designations, general policy guidance for the planning of adjacent shorelands is provided in the Sub-Area policies.</p>
28	Email	<p>Thank you for the presentations last night Ethan about the EMP update; I have a substantive comment on the draft for your consideration.</p> <p>I was surprised the Oregon State Lands person last night said the jurisdictional boundary was "mean higher high water" in Oregon. Even California isn't that low in the tidal zone (at a foot or so above MHHW). I was pretty sure Cal was the lowest & every other coastal state set it around the extreme high tide line.</p> <p>So I looked and the actual state rule is: Estuaries, Tidal Bays and Tidal Rivers. Estuaries, tidal bays and rivers below the head of tide are jurisdictional to the elevation of the highest measured tide (excluding storm surge), or to the upper edge of wetland, whichever is higher. According to: https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/viewSingleRule.action?ruleVrsnRsn=15649 but I don't suspect the rule changes based on the activity.</p> <p>Is there a substantial difference between the two? Yes. The highest measured tide, also known as the "highest observed water level" in Yaquina Bay was: 12.43ft above MLLW, or a full 4ft higher than the MHHW datum (at 8.34ft above MLLW) https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/datums.html?id=9435380</p> <p>The YBEMP draft states the following on p.4 of the PDF: "... As prescribed by Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 16: Estuarine Resources, the Plan regulates alterations and uses within estuarine areas, which are defined as estuarine waters, tidelands, tidal marshes and submerged lands up to the line of Mean Higher High Water (MHHW) or the line of non-aquatic vegetation. ..."</p> <p>Now hopefully this can just be changed to "the highest measured tide (excluding storm surge), or the upper edge of wetland, whichever is higher", but if I followed last night you adopted Laura Brophy's maps and I think she used a different method than what the state specifies (https://www.oregon.gov/dsl/WW/Documents/using_tidal_data_for_hmt.pdf). She used NOAA's extreme water level analysis and the exceedance probability selected returns a different elevation than what NOAA specifies. Switching the datums to NAVD88 returns a highest measured tide level of 11.66ft, which is 2ft higher than what Dr Brophy may have used.</p> <p>Is that a problem? Maybe not; maybe Dr Brophy's method does a better job of including all estuarine wetlands and not adjacent uplands. But you should check with State Lands to see if this type of interpretation of state rules is permissible I suppose. You should also note in the report for clarity that the mapping method used differs from the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. You are correct that the Plan's estuary extent should extend to the head of tide. It does, but should be better described. The official definition of the estuary in Appendix A - Definitions will be incorporated into the description on page 4 in the Introduction.</p> <p>DRAFT Plan: "For the purposes of this plan, the jurisdictional extent of estuaries extends upstream to the head of tide." (page 4)</p> <p>Appendix A - Definitions: ESTUARY: ...Estuaries extend upstream to the head of tide; their landward extent is Mean Higher High Water or the line of non-aquatic vegetation." (page 151)</p> <p>The jurisdictional/regulatory boundary of the Lincoln County estuary management plan is the extent of current estuarine conditions defined as extending upstream to the head of tide; their landward extent is Mean Higher High Water or the line of non-aquatic vegetation - whichever is furthest landward. That combination of criteria was confirmed by staff at the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and the Oregon Department of State Lands (DSL) and used by staff at the University of Oregon's Institute for Policy, Research, and Engagement when developing the Map Inventory. CMECS data was used as the backbone of the Map Inventory and was utilized when delineating the estuary boundary for the management unit maps. CMECS data was juxtaposed with every individual management unit, and, where appropriate, boundaries were realigned to capture the natural resources consistent with each management unit. The Project Team also sought the input and review of technical experts (e.g., ODFW, DSL) to evaluate the management units. The new map clearly shows the publication of where the head of tides are in Yaquina Bay.</p> <p>It is important to note that the boundary of the estuary is not static - it is intended to be dynamic. Any project proposed to be undertaken in the estuary requires a professional wetland delineator to determine delineate the boundary of the line of non-aquatic vegetation.</p>

29	Email	<p>First, I'd like to thank the Willamette Partnership, agencies and advisory group for your work on starting the update process for the Yaquina Estuary Management Plan by developing the GIS mapping tool that makes it easier to see and update the various sites along the river, for including a possible list of restoration/mitigation sites, and identifying the potential affects of climate change in various parts of the plan. As someone with a masters degree with specialties in Ecology and Ethology, I often find myself in the watersheds and along the coasts of Oregon (my residency), Washington, and Northern California recreationally birding, hiking, and kayaking (since I've retired), but also sometimes doing my own research or supporting others. I have both family and friends who fish the rivers and seas, here in Oregon particularly, and want to ensure clean and healthy watersheds and coastal areas for small commercial and private fishing. I am also extremely interested in estuary management for habitat protection, restoration, and conservation since these areas are so critical for "blue carbon" sequestration and are areas rich with unique species and wildlife. Although Yaquina more than most is a more "developed" estuary, there are still great opportunities for ensuring restoration and mitigation (beyond just the monetary contribution) in many of its upstream and even coastal areas that should be detailed.</p> <p>It is clear that this early draft with some updates from the old plan has been released to garner public feedback, and that a second phase update process should be anticipated including comprehensive restoration plans, removal of outdated parts of the plan (such as the off shore drilling for oil and gas p.133 although in theory offshore wind may still be relevant), and integration of the Management unit sections with the new resource information from the inventory. Both Statewide Goals 16 (estuary resources) and 17 (estuary shorelands) need to be adjusted for the impacts of rising sea levels. Given that there are a quite a few statewide Estuary plans needing to be updated and Yaquina is one of the first which could serve as a template for others, it seems important to be calling for public comment both on the statewide guidance document that will provide the frameworks, but also on the Phase two of the Yaquina plan once updates are finalized and a more thorough restoration plan completed.</p> <p>Thanks for your time and consideration,</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Offshore drilling for oil or gas are not listed as permissible or conditional uses under any of the classifications (Natural, Conservation, Development). An applicant would be required to seek a goal exception if it were to be applied for anywhere in Yaquina Bay. They are described in Plan Part IX - Future Development Sites which has no regulatory impact or purview in the estuary management plan or on any activities or uses in the Bay. It is an obsolete part of the plan that was never actually utilized in any capacity.</p> <p>The other comments which were described echo the same ones in Row 2 of this Summary of Public Input, please see the response given there.</p>
30	Email	<p>I wanted to first thank the Willamette Partnership, agencies and advisory group for the updates to the current draft of the Yaquina Estuary Management Plan!</p> <p>There is still work to do and we need a second phase update process to ensure there is a full comprehensive restoration plan, a reevaluation of the Management Unit section of the plan with new resource inventory information, and flesh out other key parts of the plan. We need to update Goal 17 in conjunction with Goal 16 because sea level rise will impact the shoreland habitats.</p> <p>We need a public comment period on the statewide guidance document that will provide a framework for updating other Oregon estuary management plans.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Each has been responded to individually as follow.</p> <p>Commit to Second Update Phase: Updating any Tier 2 or 3 recommendations from the Needs & Gaps Assessment or any other components of the Yaquina Bay EMP will need to be performed by the local jurisdictions of Lincoln County and the Cities of Newport and Toledo. In the new Plan Part XI - Plan Updates, the Project Team has included a recommendation that Tier 2 and 3 recommendations be completed. The Project Team cannot commit to perform actions it has no authority or funding to do.</p> <p>Full comprehensive restoration plan: There already exists a recent (2022) and comprehensive OWEB approved Strategic Action Plan (SAP) that encompasses restoration actions in Yaquina Bay. This SAP led to a successful Focused Investment Partnership grant from OWEB that has led to over \$12 million in restoration investments in the Yaquina and Alsea Bays over the next six years. Furthermore, this is a regulatory land use plan and not a restoration plan. Goal 16 requires listing of potential restoration sites, not a comprehensive restoration plan. This Draft Plan does not preclude a separate comprehensive restoration planning process from taking place, but it is not a suitable home for it.</p> <p>Re-evaluation of Management Units based on new resource inventory information now currently incorporated: The comments that the Management Unit Descriptions need to be substantially revised and expanded are based principally on the assertions that (a) the revised drafts of the MU descriptions do not take into account current resource inventory information and, (b) that the MU descriptions represent the primary information used by local jurisdictions to make individual land use decisions on proposed estuarine alterations. Neither of these statements is accurate. The new inventory information proposed for incorporation into the plan was available and informed the evaluation of each management unit. This information was considered in revising MU descriptions and in arriving at recommended MU boundaries and classifications. To the extent that errors or omissions were made in interpreting this information for purposes of the MU evaluations, the project team is open to specific input to rectify such errors or oversights. The purpose of the MU descriptions is to provide a summary of the information that is relevant</p>
31	Email	<p>Thank you for what you are doing to help protect the Yaquina Estuary for wildlife and human recreation.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

		<p>Defining "impacts": Even though I have provided verbal and written comments on this issue I still note that the plan - either in the glossary or elsewhere -- does not define terms such as "impacts", "significant impact" "adverse impact", minor impact, etc. (but neither does Goal 16). Because these terms are not clearly defined in the plan or by the state of Oregon, it is unknown when an impact may be determined consequential (e.g., significantly adverse). All human related actions in the estuary will create some type of impact to the estuary. Most of these are so minor as to be inconsequential with respect to any type of ecological function or damage. It is critical that standards and definitions be developed defining the types and degrees of impacts. These standards and definitions are important in order to support clear understanding as well as conversations between affected stakeholders, planning agencies, and other parties.</p> <p>Besides clear and transparent definitions there needs to be practical examples illustrating the classes/types of estuarine impacts that includes the intensity of the impact across space and time. Once definitions are developed the "impact" terminology must be consistently used throughout the Plan.</p> <p>Climate Change: I have also shared my concern regarding the significant uncertainty regarding potential climate change related impacts – predictions about sea level rise is a good example. Since this now a requirement in the impact report there needs to be clear instruction on how to use highly uncertain predictions with major error bars (which are also guesses) especially with respect to long term infrastructure projects (e.g. a dock with a forty year lifespan). Again, examples in the report would be useful.</p> <p>Five Year Plan Review: Given these and other issues, the Estuary Plan should undergo a limited review every five years or so to determine how well the plan is working and review plan requirements that may need adjustment (e.g., such as updating climate predictions).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Define Impacts: Impact and adverse impact are included in Goal 16 and definitions are not provided. Significant or minor impacts are relative terms that are utilized in the informational Impact Assessment which has no thresholds. Defining the degree of impact would be both ineffective given the variance of potential alterations that can occur in the estuary and would effectively establish thresholds where there are none. Climate vulnerability has been added in the draft update as a factor to be addressed in the required impact assessment of proposed estuarine alterations. (Goal 16, implementation requirement 1). The Goal 16 impact assessment requirement is informational and does not establish any approval criteria or threshold. Other implementation requirements establish these thresholds; i.e., implementation requirement 2, and the requirement for consistency with the resource capabilities for certain uses. These requirements must consider all impacts, including climate vulnerabilities, identified in the impact assessment.</p> <p>Practical Examples illustrating the classes/types of estuarine impacts: Examples of how to determine applicable climate vulnerabilities for a specific project type will be provided in the EMP Guidance document. The EMP Guidance document was drafted by the Project Team and will be under internal review by DLCD prior to public release. It was determined by the Steering Committee that providing examples inside of the Plan would insinuate thresholds which do not exist.</p> <p>Climate Change: Climate Vulnerabilities inclusion in the Impact Assessment is self-referential and only requires applicants to consider information in the Plan and Inventory. This does not require applicants to seek out the most up-to-date projections on sea level rise or other climate impacts unless they choose to do so of their own volition. Some form of an example will be provided in the EMP Guidance document.</p> <p>Five Year Plan Review: The draft update includes a new plan part that provides a description of the plan amendment process and general policy direction on the issues and situations that may warrant evaluation</p>
32	Email - Letter	Reference file with all letters - Elizabeth Ruther	Response Letter Completed
33	Email - Letter	Reference file with all letters - Cynthia Strong	Response Letter Completed
34	Email - Letter	Reference file with all letters - Fran Recht	Response Letter Completed
35	Email - Letter	Reference file with all letters - Phillip Johnson	Response Letter Completed
36	Email - Letter	Reference file with all letters - Jena Carter	Response Letter Completed
37	Email - Letter	Reference file with all letters - Micah Meskel	Response Letter Completed
38	Email - Letter	Reference file with all letters - Range Bayer	Response Letter Completed
39	Email - Letter	Reference file with all letters - Kent Doughty	Response Letter Completed
40	Email - Letter	Reference file with all letters - Anonymized	Response Letter Completed

Question	Response
What is the timeline for when the EMP guidance document will be made available?	It will be up to the discretion of DLCD as to when a draft version of the EMP Guidance document will be available for public review.
Where are the potential restoration sites? Which management units are being proposed to change?	The potential restoration sites are listed in the Restoration Sites Map. Two Management Units straddling the jetties (1, 1A, and 2) are changing from Conservation to Development. This was an error in the original plan and is being corrected as part of the update. Management Units 5 and 6 have been reconfigured to align with ODFW shellfish preserve Management Unit 31A is being proposed as a new Management Unit with a classification of Natural Management Units 31A and 34A have been restored and reconnected tidally Management Unit 34b, composed of over 20 acres of contiguous tidal scrub/shrub, is being proposed as a new Management Unit with a classification of Natural.
With reference to tsunami impact on the permitted and restricted uses, how much was considered for that impact?	Goal 16 does not provide authority to regulate upland land uses that could be affected by tsunami impact, however, the tsunami impact zones were included in the Map Inventory. It is impossible to fully know what the landscape will look like in the aftermath of a tsunami. A lot of the planning and landuses will need to be reevaluated at that time regardless of what we could do beforehand because so much will change.
I read the draft report, an enormous amount of work, but it's all topographical. But if you are looking at ODFW data, the clam beds are gone. Any way to mention that these habitats move around? The Plan considers them static.	The EMP is a land use management plan and not a natural resources management plan. So it is difficult to add in specific recommendations about managing clam beds. But language has been included in Plan Part VII - Mitigation & Restoration that acknowledges that the Bay is a dynamic system and that conditions can change, and that soft-sediment fauna and habitats can move over time.
Please provide clarification on how resources and conditions were re-evaluated based on new conditions.	All management units were re-assessed based on current conditions and data. Lincoln County consultant Matt Spangler reviewed all of the management units with IPRE and the data that is included in the Map Inventory. A further comparison of this spatial dataset with aerial photos was performed by Lincoln County staff. And direct consultations were conducted with habitat experts such as staff at ODFW to verify the natural resources and habitats present in each management unit. During this process it was determined that there were some issues with the original management units where their classifications and boundaries did not do a great job of aligning with the local conditions then or now and those issues have been addressed as part of this update.
I like the concept of "lessons learned". What would you have done differently considering we have oysters and sturgeon that are struggling? We have an opportunity to embrace blue carbon; could we revisit past mitigation projects to learn from them? Moreover, there seems to be a disconnect between the TMDL and this Plan update.	Estuary Management Plans are land use zoning tools and cannot address some of these challenges directly. However, some of these ideas are described as climate vulnerabilities and so may be required to be considered when prospective applicants seek to alter the estuary. Part X - Plan Implementation describes how most development activities in an estuaries are subject to regulation by one or more state and federal agencies. The Plan requires local jurisdictions get approval from relevant agencies before allowing specific development activities to occur. Management of any water quality issues (including temperature) is under the purview of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality.
Were all the MUs assessed?	Yes – the Project Team and Steering Committee looked at all existing inventories, CMECS data, and other data (e.g. from Hatfield, OSU, Ports, DSL, ODFW, etc), and exhaustively went through every single MU to evaluate boundaries and update narratives.
Our group will be restoring sites to tidally reconnect them. What does the application process look like from the County's perspective?.	If an area that was not tidally connected becomes tidally reconnected as a result of restoration, then they would be added to the area regulated by the EMP. That requires a Plan Amendment which is a formal process to update the Plan. This is not a fast or easy process. Individuals or organizations should meet with Lincoln County Planning staff and talk about these projects. It would be good to potentially wait until a bunch of projects can be grouped together and approach the County for an update.
There is a lack of reference to native oysters despite their persistence in the region. How come? We know there's a lot of opportunity to bring them back.	The soft-sediment fauna map inventory includes oyster beds. We have solicited data on native oysters from experts and researchers to include in the inventory but existing data sets are incomplete and not specific enough for including in any individual management units. However a reference to mature native Olympia oysters was included in Sub-areas: Sally's Bend, Yaquina, Oysterville, and Boone's. If you can include any additional data, that would be helpful and could be incorporated prior to plan amendment adoption. Please share it with Lincoln County (Megan Hoff) and/or DLCD (Meg Reed).
I have a question about the goal exception of the Poole Slough and whether it could be removed? Native oysters are substrate limited and for there are conservation areas in King and Poole Sloughs that have better substrate conditions for them.	Goal exceptions are decided at the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA). Removing a goal exception would require a process that is outside of the Plan update. However, what you are describing falls under a restoration opportunity. They would require a floodplain development permit in those areas though for restoration. If you have data that can be included in the inventory, please share.
The map of those natural areas, we should note the changes that need to be accounted for	We were unable to fully understand this question/comment in order to provide a response
Can we bring new data into this Plan?	Yes, while it may be too late to incorporate new data sets into this version of the draft Plan, the County will be starting the process of public hearings in order to formally adopt the updated Plan in Winter 2024 and will be able to add new, relevant data into the Plan before or during that process. Please reach out to Lincoln County (Megan Hoff) and/or DLCD (Meg Reed).
Can we get the slide presentation?	Yes, slides will be posted on the website.
For MU descriptions, is it within the scope of this project to describe where Olympia Oysters are located?	The soft-sediment fauna map inventory includes oyster beds. We have solicited data on native oysters from experts and researchers to include in the inventory but existing data sets are incomplete and not specific enough for including in any individual management units. However a reference to mature native Olympia oysters was included in Sub-areas: Sally's Bend, Yaquina, Oysterville, and Boone's. If you can include any additional data, that would be helpful and could be incorporated prior to plan amendment adoption. Please share it with Lincoln County (Megan Hoff) and/or DLCD (Meg Reed).
How are resource maps used by the County when making a decision on a permitted use?	Resource maps/map inventories are used primarily for developing management units, describing local conditions, resource capabilities, and classifications. So those resource maps are baked into the classifications that determine the permitted uses. However, the resource maps can be consulted if a conditional use is applied for and then are used to consider the resource capability test as to whether the conditional use would negatively impact the natural resources present.
Cities might implement this differently. Will they be attending these meetings?	Representatives have been invited to attend. The key contacts for each jurisdiction are Derrick Tokos for the City of Newport and Justin Peterson for the City of Toledo. (Note - Justin Peterson attended the Toledo Town Hall on 07/10/23)
Will the Yaquina EMP website be maintained going forward?	The online map viewer will be maintained by DLCD. The website is currently managed and hosted by Willamette Partnership, which has committed to keeping it live for another year while we work to transition the ownership and management to DLCD.

	How would other communities manage these kinds of EMP planning processes?	DLCD will help to support them, but each County will need to figure out how to staff and coordinate the EMP updates individually. An EMP Guidance document has been drafted by the Project Team and is currently under internal review at DLCD prior to public release. The Project Team will make available (through DLCD) any recommendations, templates, etc that could help leverage the work done in Yaquina.
Toledo Town Hall	Great first step. Will future revisions and Tier 2 recommendations happen?	The Needs and Gaps Assessment designated three of 15 identified modernization tasks as "Tier 2", meaning that these three tasks were deemed to be beyond the scope of the current update process. At present, there are no identified sources of funding that would allow the local governments (Newport, Toledo and Lincoln County) to commit to specific timelines to undertake these tasks.
	Part V - Estuarine Use Standards, who would be the entity for updating it?	It should be noted that the three Tier 2 tasks affect only two of the current ten plan parts. The 12 Tier 1 tasks identified in the assessment have been completed, the result being that the remaining eight plan parts have been comprehensively updated and/or revised. It is not correct that the completion of the Tier 2 work identified in the assessment would constitute a more "comprehensive" or "in depth" update. To the contrary, the Tier 1 priorities were selected to ensure that the foundational components of the plan; especially the spatial elements (i.e., MU boundaries and classifications) and the plan implementation provisions, along with the overall policies, mitigation and restoration, and sub-area guidance, were all fully updated. All three jurisdictions (Lincoln County, Cities of Newport and Toledo) would have to update Part V - Estuarine Use Standards in parallel, but one of the jurisdictions among the three could spearhead the update. However, there isn't a pressing need to update this section as it does not affect how the Plan is implemented.
	Was there anything voiced by the Advisory Group that could not be addressed, or was not attainable?	At the beginning of the process, the Project Team did not do a sufficient job of defining the sideboards of potential changes to the EMP. Both the environmental community and industry communities had early hopes for specific changes that ended up being outside of the scope of the update (due to limitations of Goal 16). These included more explicit incorporation of climate change risks/impact in to the Plan for the former and making it easier for dredging and filling for the latter.
	Part 10 - there's been a shift from salmon trawlers. Salmon populations have gone down, Sally's Bend is listed as a Development proposal. In Future Development Sites section it describes it as an area for dredging and filling. Does having it in a management plan make it a back door path for development?	Plan Part IX - Future Development Sites was not updated during this planning process. Many people have, with good cause, pointed out that it does not make sense to both protect this area with exceptional natural resources and identify it for development. However, this is merely a legacy holdover from the original EMP and has no regulatory impact on the habitats and ecosystems in the management units in question. Due to Plan Part IX - Future Development Sites being wholly obsolete in being predicated on 40 year old economic development analysis and the challenges posed by its special policies in specific Natural Management Units, the Steering Committee has decided to remove the Plan Part and its special policies. In its place is a description of why it was removed and a recommendation for an updated Future Development Sites.
	Would a new tidally influenced area be added to the Plan?	Yes. If an area becomes tidally reconnected as a result of restoration, then they would be added to the area regulated by the EMP. That requires a Plan Amendment which is a formal process to update the Plan. This is not a fast or easy process. Individuals or organizations should meet with Lincoln County Planning staff and talk about these projects. It would be good to potentially wait until a bunch of projects can be grouped together and approach the County for an update.
	What is the state's jurisdictional definition for the estuary boundary?	The estuary boundary is the regulatory extent of the Plan. Inside of the estuary boundary is regulated as Management Units that have a Natural, Conservation or Development classification. That estuary boundary was calculated using three criteria for whichever is furthest. These include the Mean Higher High Water mark (MHHW), head of tide, and the line of non-aquatic vegetation.
	In regards to Management Unit 24, when we go to repair a tide gate there, would we need a goal exception?	No. Management units classified as Natural, such as MU 24, have a list of permissible and conditional uses. One of the permissible uses is "f. dredging necessary for on-site maintenance of existing functional tidegates and associated drainage channels and bridge crossing support structures." (Page 35 of DRAFT Plan). Maintenance is therefore already an allowable use in Management Unit 24.
	Folks have been purchasing property on Boone's Slough. What is their plan for it?	The Yaquina Bay EMP does not cover or include detail on those kinds of activities/actions.
	In the original 1982 Plan, there was a smaller restoration list. How was it updated and will referencing the EMP potentially help private landowners apply for/get money to sell and restore?	The Project Team leveraged the existing work of researchers, state agencies, and conservation interests who have been planning and prioritizing sites for restoration in this watershed for decades. We set a list of requirements that if a plan or a strategy is publicly available that describes specific areas for restoration, then they would be incorporated into this Plan update. Only a handful of sources met those requirements and those were compiled as the list. Having these properties described as potential restoration sites can help conservation interests reach out to landowners to gauge their interest in being willing sellers.
	What's going to happen if the tide gates are removed from Boone's Slough? It would flood and ultimately destroy our land being used for food production. DLCD - are they writing the climate change guidance, what the process for that?	If all tide gates were removed then it is expected that much of the Slough would be tidally influenced again. However that would require landowners to agree to the tide gate removal. Developing climate change guidance would likely require a goal amendment and that is a very lengthy and time consuming process. Please consult DLCD as to the current status of this endeavor.
What was done in terms of outreach for these events. I saw nothing from you about this.	The Project Team placed announcements about the Town Halls in all major news publications in the Newport/Toledo area, requested that information be posted on community calendars (such as Newport and Toledo Chambers of Commerce calendars). We prepared a short blurb and social media post and asked that all members of the Steering Committee and Advisory Group (representing over 40 local and state agencies, The Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, nonprofits, organizations, and businesses) share the information about the Town Hall with their constituents and stakeholders. We emailed individuals who had reached out throughout the planning process and/or who attended the April 2023 Open House, and we posted info on the Yaquina Bay EMP Update website. We are not members of local Facebook or NextDoor groups and cannot post there. We realize it is not easy in this day and age to reach everyone in the community with this information and welcome feedback on how to do this better.	
The comment period is fairly short. Can we extend it to the end of July?	Unfortunately that is not possible. The public comment period is over three weeks long. The Project Team will need sufficient time to compile all comments, publish our responses, and make changes to the DRAFT Plan and Map Inventories if needed before the end of August. Please remember that there will be a full Plan Amendment Post-Acknowledgement process that must be undertaken by all three jurisdictions which will include lots of opportunities for in-person feedback like this and written comment periods.	

Virtual Town Hall

<p>What impact are you anticipating with the publication of this document?</p>	<p>With an updated and modernized Plan, jurisdictions will make decisions using more accurate information, data, and maps, users will have a better understanding of what uses and alterations are permissible, conditional, and not allowed across the estuary, and climate vulnerabilities relevant to specific areas of Yaquina Bay will now need to be taken into account by those seeking to alter the estuary.</p>
<p>The 2014 CMECS estuary and habitat maps developed by DLCD should be used for this updated estuary management plan – this is the purpose for which they were developed. Based on your slides, the Goal 16 language defines the inland extent of the estuary as "inland to the line of nonaquatic vegetation". How is "nonaquatic vegetation" defined? The 2014 CMECS estuary and habitat maps define the inland estuary boundary using current standards: this boundary is defined as the inland extent of areas subject to tidal influence at least once a year, which are mapped in the CMECS spatial data products using LIDAR DEMs combined with NOAA high water level models. During this town hall, please discuss how the current DLCD CMECS maps are being used in the revised estuary management plan, including their use in defining the boundaries of management units.</p>	<p>The jurisdictional/regulatory boundary of the Lincoln County estuary management plan is the extent of current estuarine conditions defined as extending upstream to the head of tide; their landward extent is Mean Higher High Water or the line of non-aquatic vegetation - whichever is furthest landward. That combination of criteria was confirmed by staff at the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and the Oregon Department of State Lands (DSL) and used by staff at the University of Oregon's Institute for Policy, Research, and Engagement when developing the Map Inventory. CMECS data was used as the backbone of the Map Inventory and was utilized when delineating the estuary boundary for the management unit maps. CMECS data was juxtaposed with every individual management unit, and, where appropriate, boundaries were realigned to capture the natural resources consistent with each management unit. The Project Team also sought the input and review of technical experts (e.g., ODFW, DSL) to evaluate the management units. The new map clearly shows the publication of where the head of tides are in Yaquina Bay.</p> <p>It is important to note that the boundary of the estuary is not static - it is intended to be dynamic. Any project proposed to be undertaken in the estuary requires a professional wetland delineator to delineate the boundary of the line of non-aquatic vegetation.</p>
<p>Specifically, why is there a potential future development site in the Sally's Bend MU, and generally, what has been done to update MUs and remove outdated goals and assumptions?</p>	<p>Plan Part IX - Future Development Sites was not updated during this planning process. Many people have, with good cause, pointed out that it does not make sense to both protect this area with exceptional natural resources and identify it for development. However, this is merely a legacy holdover from the original EMP and has no regulatory impact on the habitats and ecosystems in the management units in question. Due to Plan Part IX - Future Development Sites being wholly obsolete in being predicated on 40 year old economic development analysis and the challenges posed by its special policies in specific Natural Management Units, the Steering Committee has decided to remove the Plan Part and its special policies. In its place is a description of why it was removed and a recommendation for an updated Future Development Sites.</p>
<p>Could you speak about the significance and working of the proposed YBEMP's Tiers 1, 2, and 3?</p>	<p>Tier 1 updates are those that were deemed essential to the modernization of the Plan in terms of the accuracy of the boundaries of the Management Units and language and policies that ensures the implementation of the Plan is consistent with Goal 16. Tier 2 recommendations are updates that would be nice to have, but there had not been feedback over the years during administration of the Plan that Plan Parts V and IX were in need of modernization. Both of these Plan Parts require extensive analyses that were beyond the capacity and timeframe of the Project Team or project timeline. Tier 3 recommendations are actions that cannot be practicably achieved through local planning processes without additional policy support and/or technical assistance from outside agencies.</p>
<p>The CMECS mapping defines areas that were historically part of the estuary but are now disconnected from tidal influence, e.g. former tidal wetlands behind the Boone Slough, Nute Slough, and Depot Slough tide gates. These are potential restoration sites, and the CMECS mapping can be used to define their boundaries. These areas are also very vulnerable to impacts from sea level rise (because they are currently below the annual high tide line, often far below that line – e.g. many are subsided and below MHW – some are subsided below MTL). How is the Plan making use of this valuable spatial dataset (disconnected former tidal wetlands)?</p>	<p>These features are not part of the estuary and are not part of the regulatory extent of the EMP. However, the restoration site list includes many of these areas of landward migration outside of the estuary. That list was compiled from research that utilized CMECS data as its foundation.</p>
<p>Going back to the CMECS data, the estuary boundary itself does not reflect the CMECS maps so areas left out of this plan's boundary do not have management units. It doesn't look to me like those are included in the plan. For example, Boone Nute Sloughs and Olalla Slough are not covered in the plan, but they are considered part of the estuary in CMECS. Even though they are currently behind dikes, they are historically part of the estuary and may be available for restoration in the future. Can you please address that discrepancy?</p>	<p>The estuary boundary is a regulatory extent of current estuarine conditions defined by the Mean High Higher Water (MHHW) mark, head of tide, or line of non-aquatic vegetation.</p>
<p>Please explain how Goal 16 limits what you can change. Why isn't it a floor rather than a ceiling.</p>	<p>A primary directive of this plan update process was to develop a defensible plan that did not require goal exceptions or invite legal challenges to its authority. Goal 16 does prescribe a minimum of what needs to be done by every jurisdiction. Reclassifying management units in ways that are not congruent with current conditions would invite legal challenges. Adding new regulations would invite legal challenges. The draft Plan presented here does not breach the regulatory authority provided by Goal 16 and does not require any goal exceptions.</p>
<p>How does the intention to do adaptive management relate to the fact that Tier 2 and Tier 3 haven't been addressed?</p>	<p>Eight of the ten current Plan parts have been comprehensively updated and/or revised. Tier 2 tasks are not more substantive or important than the Tier 1 work. To the contrary, the Tier 1 priorities were selected to make sure that the foundational components of the Plan; the spatial elements (i.e. MU boundaries and classifications) and the Plan implementation provisions, along with the overall policies, mitigation and restoration, and sub-area guidance, all received the full update treatment.</p>
<p></p>	<p></p>
<p></p>	<p></p>
<p></p>	<p></p>
<p></p>	<p></p>

Website Submissions	Does the language in the Plan	Do you have any concerns with the implementation	With regards to the updated map	What would you like to share with the Project Team that you	Please add any additional comments	RESPONSE
1	No, the Plan doesn't reflect the latest and best available mapping of the estuary. The full extent of the estuary, as mapped by DLCD in the 2014 CMECS Aquatic Setting and Biotic Component datasets, is not covered by the Management Units, causing substantial areas of the estuary to be left out of the Plan.	My concern is that not all actions taken within the estuary are covered by the Plan, because the Management Units don't cover the full extent of the estuary (as mapped by DLCD in the 2014 CMECS Aquatic Setting and Biotic Component datasets).	As described above, the true extent of the estuary, as mapped by DLCD in the 2014 CMECS Aquatic Setting and Biotic Component datasets, is not addressed.	Please use the updated estuary extent and habitat maps completed in 2014 by DLCD (CMECS Aquatic Setting and Biotic Component) to delineate the Management Units for the Plan.		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The jurisdictional/regulatory boundary of the Lincoln County estuary management plan is the extent of current estuarine conditions defined as extending upstream to the head of tide; their landward extent is Mean Higher High Water or the line of non-aquatic vegetation - whichever is furthest landward. That combination of criteria was confirmed by staff at the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and the Oregon Department of State Lands (DSL) and used by staff at the University of Oregon's Institute for Policy, Research, and Engagement when developing the Map Inventory. CMECS data was used as the backbone of the Map Inventory and was utilized when delineating the estuary boundary for the management unit maps. CMECS data was juxtaposed with every individual management unit, and, where appropriate, boundaries were realigned to capture the natural resources consistent with each management unit. The Project Team also sought the input and review of technical experts (e.g., ODFW, DSL) to evaluate the management units. The new map clearly shows the publication of where the head of tides are in Yaquina Bay.</p> <p>It is important to note that the boundary of the estuary is not static - it is intended to be dynamic. Any project proposed to be undertaken in the estuary requires a professional wetland delineator to delineate the boundary of the line of non-aquatic vegetation.</p>
2	I would like to see more on climate change resilience and habitat protection and restoration.	Please go further with Tier 2.	no	More information on what happens to this area if we do not plan effectively for climate change, ie. flooding, loss of habitat, etc	thank you for the opportunity to comment on an area we care so much about.	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>Climate change was incorporated as fully as was deemed possible within the regulatory authority provided by Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 16 - Estuarine Resources. The work of the Steering Committee determined that the inclusion of "climate vulnerabilities" in an Impact Assessment was the most effective method to incorporate climate change into the DRAFT Plan. A list of climate vulnerabilities was drafted and vetted by a Technical Sub-Group composed of climate and estuarine experts. Each Sub-Area of the estuary includes a list of climate vulnerabilities that apply to that Sub-Area. Any proposed alteration (activities or uses which would break ground inside the estuary such as dredging) requires an Impact Assessment of the project's potential to impact natural resources. The DRAFT Plan now includes an additional section where project applicants must describe how the proposed alteration might interact with any relevant Climate Vulnerabilities within the applicable Sub-Area. Incorporating climate change more into an estuary management plan will likely require a Goal change at the state level.</p> <p>The DRAFT Plan now also includes a new Plan Part XI-Plan Updates which outlines how specific areas of the Plan can be updated. Specifically, it identifies the potential for sea level rise due to climate change as a likely scenario in which maps of the estuary regulatory extent (area that is regulated under the Plan) or specific boundaries of former or new management units may need to be updated due to sea level rise.</p> <p>The Yaquina Bay Estuary Management Plan is a regulatory land use plan and not a natural resources management plan. While datasets and maps of natural resources are used to inform decision-making, and while restoration is an important component of the Plan (through the list of potential restoration sites), management of natural resources is not a purview of an EMP. That responsibility falls to other jurisdictions and plans such as ODFW and DSL.</p> <p>The draft Plan includes several new/updated data inventories and maps that will provide information to local decision makers and the public about the potential impacts of climate change on Yaquina Bay. This includes: Sea Level Rise (shows potential for flooding as a result of sea level rise), Landward Migration Zones (shows areas that might become tidally influenced habitat as a result of sea level rise), and Flood Zones.</p> <p>Tier 2 Update: Updating any Tier 2 or 3 recommendations from the Needs & Gaps Assessment or any other components of the Yaquina Bay EMP will need to be performed by the local jurisdictions of Lincoln County and the Cities of Newport and Toledo. In the new Plan Part XI - Plan Updates, the Project Team has included a recommendation that Tier 2 and 3 recommendations be completed. The Project Team cannot commit to perform actions it has no authority or funding to do.</p>
3	page 135 and 136 refer to an antiquated 1965 fill project and the unproductive and poorly planned lease of 95 acres of land for a lng gas tank as justification for a special policy that would allow for an additional 64 acres of the sensitive eelgrass and clam tidal areas to be filled, dredged, and have additional breakwater. Page 136 also recognizes this area as 'one of the most productive natural resource areas in the estuary.	I am vehemently against the conversion of any portion of the estuary known as Sally's Bend being further used for development. [Instead, I suggest the port of Newport re-examine the lease of land to the LNG tank companies. The ships it was meant to service were never allowed in, it is an eyesore, and the vast majority of available land is vacant]. Management Unit 10 is generally not invaded by humans for any use, and as such has great value for the benthic community, immature fish including salmonids, and the recreational shellfish such as crabs that are important for other crucial harvest goals. Also consider area's value in the winter during heavy rains, when it provides a calm refuge area for salmonid smolts. It would be wrong for us to advocate for our small salmon trollers on port dock 7 with one breath, and then not provide a safe place for outgoing salmon that provides both shelter in eelgrass and avoidance of predatory sea lions. (In 26 years of living and working around the bay I have never seen a sea lion there). As storms become more intense due to climate change having still water eddies will become even more important.	The maps are fantastic. Great improvement.	Please see concerns above. Also, the public comment period should be at least a month after the plan is released. Even a concerned fisherman needs time in port to get to comment, and in the summer they are at sea five of seven days. Management unit 10 is recognized as a crucial production area for estuary life. The only modification should be to add more dry land vegetation on the road side.		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The special policy in the Sally's Bend management unit is a legacy of Plan Part IX - Future Development Sites, which was not updated during this planning process. Many people have, with good cause, pointed out that it does not make sense to both protect this area with exceptional natural resources and identify it for development. However, this is merely a legacy holdover from the original EMP and has no regulatory impact on the habitats and ecosystems in the management units in question. Due to Plan Part IX - Future Development Sites being wholly obsolete in being predicated on 40 year old economic development analysis and the challenges posed by its special policies in specific Natural Management Units, the Steering Committee has decided to remove the Plan Part and its special policies. In its place is a description of why it was removed and a recommendation for an updated Future Development Sites.</p> <p>Management Unit 10 is classified as Natural in order to preserve the important natural resources found in this area.</p> <p>We appreciate the desire for a longer public comment period, however, 1) the Project Team will need sufficient time to compile all comments, publish our responses, and make changes to the DRAFT Plan and Map Inventories if needed before the end of August 31 (which is the end date of the Project Team's contract), and 2) there will be a full Plan Amendment Post-Acknowledgement process that must be undertaken by all three jurisdictions which will include lots of opportunities for in-person feedback like this and written comment periods in 2024.</p>

4	<p>Comment may be applicable to all tide gate areas, but the comment is with respect to Unit 24. The additional information added regarding the mouths of Boone and Nute slew do not address the current conditions of the bay, but rather imply a future direction without consideration for maintaining the current conditions.</p>	<p>Comments apply to all tidegate areas, but I will specifically address Unit 24. There is no specific allowance for the maintenance and preservation of the tidegate or dikes, despite these features acting as the boundary for the estuary. Additionally, this becomes concerning given that the new plan expands the allowances for a potential restoration site. Without allowing for both use cases, this has an implication of bias as to the intent of land use going forward.</p>	No.	<p>Two Comments: 1) Review time and public involvement was lacking. - I would have liked to see the property owners directly affected by changes/updates to the plan notified. - Lack of including 'Mill 4 Drainage District' as part of the stakeholders/reviewer process despite adding additional information within that management unit (24) is concerning. - The time between town halls to public comment was not enough to obtain outside independent review. 2) Comment may be applicable to all tidegate areas, but the comment is with respect to Unit 24. Would appreciate seeing something in the plan that allows (and promotes) the city/county to cooperate with land owners, stakeholders, and Army Corps of Engineers in the preservation, maintenance, and management of the estuary current conditions with respect to tide gates and dikes in order to maintain the current estuary ecology and minimize impacts due to degradation.</p>	<p>Per Request: Relationship of Reviewer to YBEMP: Land Owner within the bounds of the Yaquina Bay Management plan & Unit 24</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>With respect to no specific allowance for the maintenance and preservation of the tidegate or dikes, the Natural classification applied to Management Unit 24 conditionally permits the maintenance of existing functional tidegates in accordance with Goal 16. Correspondingly, this is listed in the draft zoning regulations that will be applied to MU 24 (and to all other similarly classified MUs) as a use that may be authorized. The draft regulation language is as follows: <i>(f) On-site maintenance of existing functional tidegates and associated drainage channels, including, as necessary, dredging and bridge crossing support structures.</i> While restoration is also a conditionally permitted use in the Natural classification, the plan and implementing regulations do not express or establish any preference or priority for this or any other use; any use authorized by Goal 16 may be permitted, subject to review.</p> <p>We appreciate the desire for a longer public comment period, however, 1) the Project Team will need sufficient time to compile all comments, publish our responses, and make changes to the DRAFT Plan and Map Inventories if needed before the end of August 31 (which is the end date of the Project Team's contract), and 2) there will be a full Plan Amendment Post-Acknowledgement process that must be undertaken by all three jurisdictions which will include lots of opportunities for in-person feedback like this and written comment periods in 2024.</p> <p>The district's improvements (i.e. dikes and tidegates) are noted in the description of MU 24, but there is no specific reference to the Mill 4 Drainage District itself. This is an oversight and will be added to the MU 24 description. In addition, the Mill 4 Drainage District will be identified as a stakeholder.</p>
---	---	--	-----	--	---	--