

To: Senate Rules Committee
Re: HB3382

HB3382 “Authorizes certain ports to construct, maintain and improve deep draft navigation channel improvements without demonstrating compliance with state or local land use law.”

Hello, my name is Jamie Fereday, and I am a resident of Coos Bay, Oregon.

This will be my fourth testimony concerning this bill and I am alarmed that HB3382 has gotten this far. If you haven't taken the time to read the written testimony or watched the in person or virtual testimony, it would be worth your while and those whom you represent. Over 300 testimonies and only 3 in support, not counting the legislators who proposed it. The opposition is because the bill goes against what people in this state expect of good governance. This bill is an end run around our tried-and-true land use laws that put public input first, Goal 1 Citizen Involvement. The Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan is currently up for renewal, being decades old, but it seems there is urgency to get this bill through before there is any strengthening to its provisions. This and other estuaries along the west coast have lost 85% of their tidal functions and this bill will further that destruction in this estuary. The Port of Coos Bay has not the best track record in being the proper steward of the list of values that exist here (listed below). I retired from teaching biology and because we live next to the Coos Estuary my curriculum focused largely on the functions of estuaries. The list of ecological services of these places provide have no match on Earth, and yet we continue to ignore them and degrade them. Ask a fisherman where 80% of their catch live as juveniles. Ask a coastal scientist about how tidal marshes compare to forests as carbon sequestration sinks. Unaltered estuaries are the best at what they do and this bill is the worst for its intent. This bill is obviously in support of the current effort to install a container terminal in Coos Bay. It is a grandiose scheme of a mid-western development & warehousing company, not a maritime shipping expert. The Port's own consultant studies, show problematic economic results in such a scheme to move large amount of goods to and from this port, especially with a rail structure that needs billions of dollars to upgrade to proper standards. Then, there doesn't seem to be a lineup of suppliers to export goods in support of this facility. The bill mentions mitigation. Mitigation of damaged natural systems has been lacking at best in general. One of the most impacted and vulnerable habitats in estuaries is eel grass beds. This project will most certainly impact these. Studies show that eel grass beds are one of the most difficult to recreate.

To summarize my main objections, HB3382 would weaken if not ignore two key Statewide Land Use Planning Goals. Goal 1 Citizen Involvement, and Goal 16, Estuarine Resources.

To allow such a bill become law is antithesis to the Oregon Way

Please join me in opposing this bill,



Jamie Fereday

Recent studies should open immediate discussion about employment opportunities in wetland restoration in estuaries and watersheds to further these often-overlooked benefits:

- Fish habitat – rearing sites and nurseries (which will bolster our fishing families)
- Sediment trapping/nutrient storage
- Filtering capacity/reducing water pollution
- Flood protection (sea-level rise mitigation)
- Migrating wildlife feeding stops
- Carbon sequestration (blue carbon – tidal marshes one of the best)
- Cultural/tribal attributes
- Recreation

These studies worth consulting:

Insights into estuary habitat loss in the western United States, Brophy

Understanding the Economic Benefits of Tidal Wetlands Restoration, Shaw

Shifting Sediment Dynamics in the Coos Bay Estuary in Response to 150 Years of Modification, Sutherland, et.al.