



# COMMUNITY PLANNING: A LESSONS LEARNED GUIDE TO REVISING LAND USE PLANS

South Slough Reserve | Coos County Planning Department | 2019



COMMUNITY PLANNING: A  
LESSONS LEARNED GUIDE TO  
REVISING LAND USE PLANS

FEBRUARY 2019

**Prepared for:**

Department of Land Conservation and  
Development by the South Slough National  
Estuarine Research Reserve and the Coos  
County Planning Department, under direction  
from the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds  
steering committee.

**Report Authors:**

Jenni Schmitt, *South Slough National Estuarine  
Research Reserve (South Slough NERR)*  
Jill Rolfe, *Coos County Planning Department*

Schmitt, J. and J. Rolfe. 2019. Community  
Planning: A Lessons Learned Guide to  
Revising Land Use Plans. Report prepared  
for Department of Land Conservation and  
Development and the Partnership for Coastal  
Watersheds. South Slough National Estuarine  
Research Reserve and Coos County Planning  
Department, Charleston, OR.



This work was sponsored by the National  
Estuarine Research Reserve System  
Science Collaborative, which supports  
collaborative research that addresses  
coastal management problems important  
to the reserves. The Science Collaborative  
is funded by the National Oceanic and  
Atmospheric Administration and managed  
by the University of Michigan Water Center  
(NAI4NOS4190145).

**Cover photos:**

South Slough NERR



# Table of Contents

<b>Purpose</b> .....	1
<b>Background</b> .....	2
<b>Beginning Steps</b> .....	2
<b>The PCW Process</b> .....	4
Assessing areas for improvement .....	4
Benefits .....	4
Costs .....	4
Time .....	4
Considerations .....	4
Amassing current information .....	4
Benefits .....	5
Costs .....	5
Time .....	6
Considerations .....	6
Engaging the broader community .....	6
Benefits .....	6
Costs .....	6
Time .....	7
Considerations .....	7
Option scenarios for the jurisdictions to consider .....	7
Benefits .....	7
Costs .....	7
Time .....	7
Considerations .....	7
Incorporating new information into existing plan .....	8
Benefits .....	8
Costs .....	8
Time .....	8
Considerations .....	8
<b>General Considerations</b> .....	8
Best Practices .....	8
Things to watch out for .....	9
<b>Resources</b> .....	10
PCW Product Links .....	10
Consultants .....	10
Funding Sources .....	10
Contacts .....	10



## PURPOSE

Coos County, City of Coos Bay and City of North Bend co-manage the Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan (CBEMP) where Coos County is considered the lead agency for updates to the plan. A revision process for the CBEMP was initiated through a desire from the Partnership for Coastal Watersheds (PCW) to modernize the local estuary management plan and provide information to the local governments to facilitate an update. The PCW is a group of civic-minded community members representing land use planners, coastal managers, business interests, tribal interests, conservation interests and community interests.

As the first community in Oregon to make large strides in fully revising an estuary management plan, this Lessons Guide has been developed so that other communities can examine and learn from our process. While our focus is the estuary management plan, this guide has value for community planning and land use plan updates in general. This guide is split into five main sections:

- 1. Background** - A brief overview of Oregon land use plan and update processes.
- 2. Beginning Steps** – This section delineates considerations to contemplate prior to beginning a planning process or update, as well as first tasks to undertake.
- 3. The PCW Process** – This is broken into discrete but cumulative segments that can be used as distinct phases. Each segment provides a brief overview and includes breakdowns of benefits, costs and other considerations. Please be mindful that the Coos estuary is the largest in Oregon and costs shown reflect the size and complexity of its management plan.
- 4. General Considerations** – This section describes general best practices as well as circumstances to be careful of.
- 5. Resources** – The final section lists PCW products described in this document, contact information, subcontractor names and grant funding options.

## BACKGROUND

Oregon State law requires each city and county to have a local comprehensive plan along with zoning and land-division ordinances to put the plan into effect (ORS 197.175). Comprehensive plans must follow the guidelines and rules of the statewide planning goals and acknowledged plans become the controlling document for land use in the areas they cover.

Comprehensive plans have three main elements:

- Inventory of uses and resources of local lands;
- Goal and policy statements that indicate local objectives over a specific period and guidance on how to achieve them; and
- Detailed maps to show desired uses for each property throughout the plan area.

Comprehensive plans guide officials in land use decisions, such as whether to allow a zone change or grant a

conditional use permit. Because comprehensive plans are so vital in major land use decisions, the law requires an open, transparent process to create or amend them, including citizen and stakeholder input.

Comprehensive plans are meant to be flexible enough to change as community needs, goals and resources change. In fact, state rules encourage the periodic review and update of local comp plans. However, most of the counties and cities that are not mandated to go through periodic review will choose to update portions of their plans when funding and time permit.

Developed in the late 1970's and early 1980's, most estuary plans in Oregon are in dire need of being updated. The Coos Estuary Land Use Analysis assisted the cities and county in updating the Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan, which is the portion of the comprehensive plan that focuses on the Coastal Goals: Goal 16 Estuaries, Goal 17 Coastal Shorelands, and Goal 18 Beaches and Dunes.

## BEGINNING STEPS

**Plan ahead:** We found that this is not a quick one-year process. A full update will likely take two to three years to complete, or more depending on the available data and size of the estuary. Outline a scope of work to help conceptualize a rough timeline, both of which will be useful to share with potential team members.

**Do your research:** It is helpful to understand how the comprehensive plan and implementing ordinances and codes were originally developed. Often you can learn what worked best for your jurisdiction during original plan development to understand why certain processes were done. It is also important to understand both historical and current contentious issues and projects.

**Budget accordingly:** A full plan revision will take money so budget planning is a major consideration. The scope, desired timeline, and budget should be developed concurrently to successfully prepare for expected costs. To help alleviate budgetary pressures, the revision can be done in phases (see PCW Process below) to allow incremental and successive steps as funding allows. You can also find cost-saving measures by hosting meetings in house or finding conference rooms free to community

groups on a first come, first served basis (e.g., libraries, fire stations, or visitor's centers).

**Assemble a team:** There are many components to a full plan revision and we recommend the formation of a team to provide necessary ancillary support. Team members who are not vested in one outcome should be selected; they should be impartial and understand this is a community-wide project. Team members can be staff or stakeholders and members can cover more than one position. Roles include:

- **Organizer** – responsible for coordinating the effort including organizing and facilitating project team and stakeholder meetings, and may include grant writing and soliciting technical review.
- **Fiscal agent** – responsible for budget tracking, paying invoices and assisting in securing contracts
- **Administrative manager** – in charge of report writing, keeping track of deliverables and timeline, subcontract development, and disseminating meeting minutes.

- **Technical assistance team**
  - Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) staff (coastal representative or other) to ensure consistency with Oregon Statewide Planning Goals and identify any other goals that need to be considered within the update
  - Local planning director and/or staff (county and/or city)
  - Consultant (optional)
- **Stakeholder steering committee or advisory committee** (see below)

**Involve stakeholders:** Stakeholders need to be involved at every level. Depending on the component, this requires commitment to the project in terms of volunteer hours for meetings and review. Stakeholders can include members of citizen advisory committees or planning commissions, but they should not be the sole stakeholder representation, as a diversity of backgrounds and interests will provide a necessary depth to the feedback. Not everyone is well-versed in estuary policies or land use process, but they still need to inform revisions to those policies and processes.

When identifying stakeholders, make sure industries for your area are represented proportionate to your area's economic make-up (e.g., Tillamook might have higher agriculture representation than say Gold Beach).

Stakeholders are a crucial part of the planning process, in part by allowing community buy-in while obtaining a more comprehensive understanding of local perspectives. A second benefit is receiving technical expertise and product review that is free of cost. Use of stakeholders can vary from a full steering committee, such as the PCW, to periodic discussions with an advisory group.

**Develop a process:** Once a project team has been assembled (including stakeholders), develop a mission statement, goals and desired outcomes. This is helpful during times when conversations begin to deviate. For example, if conversations veer into discussions on specific divisive projects, it will provide an avenue to maintain focus on the broader goal of a plan update. This is also the time to clarify duties of individual team members, including stakeholders. Review the timeline with the project team and amend it accordingly, then schedule regular meeting dates and times. Project meetings should be documented, and it is helpful to email or post online written minutes following meetings.

#### STAKEHOLDER REPRESENTATIVES TO CONSIDER:

- State agencies (including permitting agencies)
- Ports
- Tribes
- Community interest groups and non-profits (e.g., watershed associations, parks, museums, service clubs, Surfrider)
- Land use organizations (e.g., planners, attorneys, architects, engineers, geologists)
- Development and industry interests (e.g., Building association, agriculture, forestry, commercial fishing)
- Education districts (e.g., community college or K-12 school boards)
- Business community (e.g., visitor bureaus, realty agencies, local small businesses)
- Recreational interests (e.g., recreational fishing, water sports)

**Maintain transparency:** Land use planning can evoke strong feelings and maintaining transparency so that project efforts and products are not misconstrued can be difficult. Communicating to the public from the outset is crucial in order to maintain clarity regarding intentions and objectives, and to reaffirm the revision is not about any specific project. While public comment is part of the official process of plan adoption, having early conversations with the community helps secure buy-in, foster trust, and prevent agenda-driven arguments and political posturing. In addition, discovering concerns about the project early in the process will help you address hurdles.

It is helpful to develop a communication strategy to detail audience and messaging. Include the general public as well as officials of local affected jurisdictions as audiences. Keep in mind planning commissions, citizen advisory boards, and local community groups that are involved in planning processes. Communication can take several forms including presentations to targeted groups, one-pagers, media releases, website postings, or public meetings or open houses. Part of the messaging should include the fact that estuary management plans are regulated by state laws and goals.

# THE PCW PROCESS

## ASSESSING AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Coos County used a technical assistance grant to hire University of Oregon's Institute for Policy Research and Engagement (IPRE) to provide a qualitative analysis of the estuary plan based on current state regulatory framework, implications of any legal decisions that occurred since the plan was adopted and a general evaluation of plan usability from an end-user perspective. Recommendations from this assessment determined the suitability of current estuary management to meet existing and future needs and included suggestions for consideration for a plan update. Final product was a 29-page report called the Coos Bay Goal 16 Estuary Management Plan Assessment (see Resources for link to report).

### Benefits

Recommendations from this sort of analysis provides insight for the project work team by highlighting limitations or areas where the plan could benefit from improvement. This can be a way to help frame and guide participant interest and is a low-cost measurable initial milestone. Finally, analysis results are a helpful tool when talking with local decision-makers and provide justification when applying for grants.

### Costs

- Subcontractor: \$10,000 for IPRE subcontract to conduct interviews with users of the plan and develop the assessment report.
- Other costs: \$100 for meeting supplies
- Stakeholder volunteer hours: On average four hours per person, including meetings, interviews with several stakeholders, and draft product review.
- Project team members' time: On average 60 hours per team member; for coordinating project, organizing stakeholder meetings, reviewing draft report, etc.

### Time

Nine months from funding award to completion.

### Considerations

Not all plans will require this level of analysis.

## TOPICS INCLUDED IN COMMUNITIES, LANDS & WATERWAYS: DATA SOURCE REPORT:

- Cultural History
- Community Evaluation
- Communities and Neighborhoods
- Community Demographics
- Zoning and Land Use
- Jobs and Employment
- Schools and Education
- Physical Description (Geographic Features, Meteorology, Human Infrastructure, Hydrology, Geology, Land Cover)
- Water Quality (Physical Factors, Nutrients, Bacteria, Other Pollutants)
- Sediment Quality (Contaminants, Composition)
- Stream and Riparian Habitat
- Vegetation (Rare and Endangered Species, Seagrasses and Algae, Tidal Wetlands, Terrestrial)
- Fish (Salmon, Lamprey, Sturgeon, Other Fishes)
- Clams and Native Oysters
- Crabs (Dungeness, Red Rock, Other Crabs)
- Birds (Terrestrial, Aquatic, Species of Concern)
- Mammals
- Invasive Species (Vegetation, Vertebrates, Terrestrial and Aquatic Invertebrates)

## AMASSING CURRENT INFORMATION

Data supporting the existing plan inventories were collected in the 1970's and 1980's and technologies and status of resources described in the inventories have drastically changed since that era. To remedy this, the PCW obtained two grants to update the written inventory conditions and the inventory maps.

The Communities, Lands & Waterways: Data Source is an encyclopedic compilation of all available data in the Coos area that describe socioeconomic and environmental conditions. Chapters highlight status and trends of environmental factors and natural resources within the estuary and surrounding watershed, provide anticipated effects of climate-related changes on those topics, and

describe data limitations and data gaps. Additionally, the report highlights cultural and socioeconomic aspects of the communities surrounding the Coos estuary. Chapters were peer reviewed by the PCW and technically reviewed by outside experts.

The Coos Estuary Map Atlas is a series of maps and tables that analyze and portray current conditions and uses within the estuary. Current GIS data was used to provide a map-based understanding of land uses and physical features in a defined study area created by combining the official estuary management plan boundary and Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries tsunami inundation scenario maps. This was done to provide context for lands potentially at risk for sea level rise or tsunami inundation, and to provide a broader context of adjacent land uses.

Topics included in the Coos Estuary Map Atlas:

- Study area boundaries (CBEMP boundary, XXL tsunami Inundation zone, atlas extent)
- Zoning, management units, and property use
- Improvement status and value ratio, public ownership, special districts, employment density
- Physical features (eelgrass, snowy plover, oyster and clam beds, habitat maps (national and local wetlands inventories, Coastal and Marine Ecological Classification Standard), public spaces and estuary access
- Hazards (flood zones, landslide susceptibility, slope, tsunami inundation, sea level rise)
- Focus areas (dredge material disposal sites, mitigation and restoration sites, tidal wetland landward migration zones, economic areas and zones, urban renewal districts)

## Benefits

Updating the maps and written information for the inventories is a crucial step to modernizing the factual base of the plan. It also incorporates more user-friendly modern-day technologies such as GIS and searchable pdf documents. This step provides guidance for information still needed in an update by highlighting gaps in current data.

## Costs

- **Subcontractor costs:**
  - The Communities, Lands & Waterways: Data Source cost approximately \$300,000. Costs supported data compilation, analysis and writing by South Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve (environmental and natural resource chapters) and the Coos Watershed Association (socioeconomic chapters). Costs also supported project coordination, grant proposal development and reporting, product branding, technical review solicitation, and website creation.
  - Coos Estuary Map Atlas was completed for approximately \$50,000. Costs covered IPRE subcontract for atlas compilation including data acquisition and analysis and technical review solicitation.
- **Other costs:**
  - Meeting costs (including occasional room rental, meeting supplies, and refreshments) for the Communities, Lands & Waterways: Data Source were about \$1,500.
  - The same meeting costs for the Coos Estuary Map Atlas were around \$900
- **Stakeholder volunteer hours:**
  - PCW committee members each donated roughly 48 hours to the Communities, Lands & Waterways: Data Source inventory; technical review took nearly 400 hours spread across 42 reviewers.
  - PCW members each donated approximately 18 hours for the Coos Estuary Map Atlas. while the technical reviewers lent approximately 20 hours of review divided between two reviewers.
- **Project team members' time:**
  - A full-time assistant project coordinator was hired for the Communities, Lands & Waterways: Data Source to coordinate and complete data acquisition, analysis and writing tasks while the Project Lead spent approximately 75% of the time coordinating project efforts including editing chapters, writing grant reports, coordinating stakeholder meetings and other organization and administrative duties.

- The Coos Estuary Map Atlas took approximately 90 hours for Project Lead coordination. Other project team members including the county planning director contributed approximately 40 hours each.

## Time

- **Communities, Lands & Waterways:** Data Source took approximately two and a half years to complete from grant funding to publication.
- **Coos Estuary Map Atlas** took approximately 18 months from grant funding to completion.

## Considerations

Depending on the size of the estuary and surrounding communities, inventory conditions and mapping can be completed by members of the project team, by planning staff, or through a contractor. Mapping data needs to cover the entire estuary and coincide with the written portion of the inventory. Review by both stakeholders and technical experts is crucial. This is one area where the large Coos estuary, which is very data heavy, had a lot of information to amass and therefore was likely more expensive to compile than other Oregon estuaries.

## ENGAGING THE BROADER COMMUNITY

The PCW acquired new and updated policy information necessary to revise the estuary management plan through several levels of public engagement: focus groups, targeted outreach, and a public open house.

**Focus Groups:** Three focus groups composed of experts were formed to develop a vision for the future of the estuary related to updating the estuary management plan, and to provide insight to the how lands within the plan could benefit updated designation. Local experts were assigned to one of three focus groups depending on their area of expertise: Economic Development, Natural Resource Protection and Restoration, or Socio-cultural Interests. Participants from each group committed to four meetings (one full-day and three partial days). All participants convened together at the first meeting to learn about the project, the current status of the estuary plan, and statewide planning process with a focus on the goals that estuary plan is based on. At that meeting, desired outcomes and rules of engagement were established. The first meeting established a common foundation between the groups. Groups were integrated and asked a set of questions related to natural resources, economics, socio-cultural interests, and regulatory topics (for full description of process, see Land Analysis Report under Resources).

At the second and third set of meetings each group was presented with a set of questions specific to each focus group's area of expertise. The refined answers were developed into recommendations for a plan update. These recommendations were reviewed during the final meeting that all participants attended, and then finalized based on their feedback.

**Open House:** A public open house was organized to solicit feedback from the broader community and test legitimacy of project results. A survey was developed to gauge how open house participants felt about the status of the current plan, which area of interest they most associated with (i.e., natural resource protection, economic development, socio-cultural interests), and how well they agreed with focus group recommendations. The open house began with presentations on who the PCW is, statewide planning goals, and status and limitations of the existing Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan. Information stations were set up to provide greater detail on the Communities, Lands & Waterways: Data Source, Coos Estuary Map Atlas, assessment of the Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan, and focus group recommendations.

**Targeted Outreach:** The project team frequently gave project updates to local organizations and entities to maintain transparency and receive feedback from the community. Audiences included city councils, county commissioners, planning commissions, tribal councils and staff, boards of commissioners (e.g., watershed association, development councils, invasive species councils), chamber of commerce, community organizations (e.g., rotary club), and professional meetings (e.g., Pacific Estuarine Research Society, Oregon Coastal Planners Network Meeting) to name a few.

## Benefits

It is important to include public interests when developing recommendations on ways to improve the plan. The best way to do this is to include the public during the development phase when you can still be responsive to their reactions. Ultimately, multiple and diverse perspectives will create a stronger plan.

## Costs

- **Subcontractor:** Facilitator costs for focus group meetings were nearly \$20,000; University of Oregon's IPRE spent approximately \$30,000 to develop recommendations based on the focus group workshops, attend PCW meetings, and present products at the public open house.

- **Other costs:** Refreshments and meeting room costs were \$3,000 for the focus groups, public open house and regular PCW meetings. The open house took nearly \$3,800 to advertise including the flyer copies that were mailed out in a classified paper that reached the most residences.
- **Stakeholder volunteer hours:** The PCW members each lent around 24 hours for meetings and a combined 80 hours for staffing the public open house.
- **Project team members' time:** Project coordination including organizing workshops, PCW meetings, and the open house and developing and providing presentations to local audiences took approximately 0.5 FTE for the project lead; team members spent on average 120 hours each including workshop development and implementation, giving presentations, attending stakeholder meetings, and staffing the open house.

## Time

- From initiation and development of focus group objectives to final recommendations took 10 months. Focus group meetings were completed in one month with a follow-up meeting three months later to review final recommendations.
- Public open house took about three months to plan, advertise, and execute.
- Targeted outreach was strong in the first six months of the project to introduce PCW efforts to the community. Project updates were provided to various groups throughout the project.

## Considerations

Facilitator costs may have been more than needed had the PCW known exactly what they wanted up front. The facilitator was paid to travel to the PCW several times to develop the workshop in conjunction with them. If this step was completed prior to facilitator involvement, it would reduce costs.

Especially for public meetings, ensure the message is clear that this is about updating and revising a common plan and not about any one specific project.

Depending on the community, the effort involved in advertising for a public open house may require multiple mechanisms (e.g., press release, social media, flyers). To get the widest possible audience (e.g., average citizens

who are not aware of land use plan issues), it may be beneficial to have a presence at popular community events such as festivals, wine walks and others, to promote the open house.

## OPTION SCENARIOS FOR THE JURISDICTIONS TO CONSIDER

Based on stakeholder feedback, focus group recommendations, and public response, three scenarios were developed by University of Oregon's IPRE that local jurisdictions can consider in their process to modernize the estuary management plan. This consisted of a preliminary evaluation that decision-makers can reference when considering if, when and to what extent, an update of the plan will occur. The evaluation is structured around a set of criteria commonly used for policy analysis: technical feasibility, economic and financial possibility, political viability, administrative ease, and efficacy of the option (based on the assessment of the plan – see Assessing Areas for Improvement above). This included a decision-making matrix that summarizes how well each criterion is met for every option. Full Options Scenario report is within the Final Report ([link to](#)

## Benefits

This is an effective way to frame discernable options by providing an evaluation of pros and cons for a suite of alternatives, which responsible jurisdictions can consider.

## Costs

- **Subcontractor:** University of Oregon's IPRE used approximately \$5,000 to develop the options report.
- **Other costs:** Refreshments and meeting room costs were \$300 for monthly PCW meetings.
- **Stakeholder volunteer hours:** PCW members donated about three hours each for this process.
- **Project team members' time:** On average this process took 20 hours for the team lead and 15 hours for project team members.

## Time

This process took about six months from start to completed product.

## Considerations

None

## INCORPORATING NEW INFORMATION INTO EXISTING PLAN

The project team and IPRE contractor developed a framework for updating and amending the plan. The IPRE researched and outlined relevant state and local processes for such an update, reviewed county and city estuary management plan policies, interviewed planners from affected jurisdictions, and “crosswalked” focus group recommendations with the plan. Based on this information, IPRE developed a series of recommendations on which policies to remove, modify or add in order to incorporate the focus group recommendations and new data into the inventories (i.e., Communities, Lands & Waterways: Data Source, Coos Estuary Map Atlas). In addition, they drafted policy options for changes to implementing ordinance and code amendments.

### Benefits

Developing a framework sets the stage for the implementing agency to easily incorporate any new information into the existing plan.

### Costs

- Subcontractor: \$40,000
- Other costs: Refreshments and meeting room costs were \$300 for stakeholder meetings.
- Stakeholder volunteer hours: Stakeholders each donated roughly 12 hours for meetings and interviews.
- Project team members’ time: Team members spent around 15 hours each for this process.

### Time

Six months from start to completion.

### Considerations

Since this step involves identifying how the county and cities’ plans differ and align with recommendations and modern data, it is beneficial to form a sub-group that includes city and county planners, tribal planners, and port authorities.

## GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Consider a community visioning process prior to developing recommendations. This would make it easier to address target visions (e.g., what do people want our bay to look like, what do we want to see more or less of in the future, etc.) and then formulate policy (by people who are better versed in policy) based on that vision. Alternatively, we would include more time for focus groups to devote to visioning. However, a separate visioning process is not necessary if the focus is kept on improving the estuary management plan since input often already contains visioning elements.

### BEST PRACTICES

**Collaboration:** When working with stakeholders from various and sometimes conflicting interest groups, set a foundation of commonality and collaboration by discussing commonalities and values. For example, speak to the importance of a healthy estuary for all estuary users, which acknowledges the interconnectedness of economic, socio-cultural and natural resource interests. Discuss limitations of the current plan, including the outdatedness

of zoning-related data, the exclusion of modern science-based data, or limitations in accessibility of the current plan. Despite differing interests, stakeholders are in it together and can only improve the plan with collective and dedicated effort. The PCW uses insightful discussion and collaborative consensus for its decision-making process.

**Focus groups:** Participants should be aware of and supportive of the collaborative approach. Select focus group participants that are knowledgeable on a range of issues; this will make for more robust and encompassing input on what an updated plan should include. Include socio-cultural interest groups, not just economic development and natural resource protection interests. This is an important to fully encompass how the estuary is used by the community. Have representation from the various state and federal offices that oversee development and policy, to help workshop participants gain a basic foundation for what might be considered overlapping information when discussing regulations, zoning and other aspects of updating a plan. Hand out a fact sheet on the purpose of the plan prior to initial discussions, and for people to reference during conversations.

Simplify the message of what you are trying to accomplish and develop clear goal/outcome statements to help people advance conversations. Having discussions facilitated can help this; however, plan for conversations that stray from the original purpose. When this happens do not shut down the dialogue but steer it back on track by clarifying what the plan does or does not do.

If there are known strong personalities, try to separate them from one another during the initial meeting that all participants attend collectively, to limit having only a few voices providing feedback. Allow enough time for each focus group to drill down during successive meetings in order to obtain high quality policy recommendations. Record sessions for later reference and use a competent note-taker.

**Public meetings:** Use note-takers to record public input. Provide background information, either via presentations or as a packet mailed or emailed prior to the meeting.

## THINGS TO WATCH OUT FOR

**Consistent participation by stakeholders:** Stakeholder committee members are volunteers to the project, sometimes making it hard to ensure commitment to a project. Inconsistent attendance to regular meetings (due to work commitments or staff turnover for example) can cause setbacks when people ask for changes after a product has nearly been finalized. One way to help this is to provide timely meeting minutes to absentee members and require they read minutes and supporting materials, so they stay abreast of the project.

**Lack of clarity:** The group had difficulty defining “socio-cultural” in the context of estuary planning given the term cultural had a different meaning within the terms of the Statewide Planning Goals 5 and 17 then it did to the people that were part of the group. This unclarity translated into a lack of understanding as to how such a wide variety of socio-cultural interest would inform an estuary update. This in turn may have caused a lower attendance for socio-cultural focus group participation than desired. The terms should be defined using the statewide

planning goals, rules, statutes or comprehensive plans as guidance. It is important to define the terms of the groups prior to the selecting members to serve.

**Ensuring quality focus group discussion:** The focus groups are intended to be small and intimate, yet counter-intuitively it can be hard to get input from everyone. During our focus group discussions, some people were hesitant to speak their minds – for example due to fear of seeming to go against other organizations they work closely with, or not wanting to misrepresent their agency by speaking their own opinion. There was also a tendency for group discussion to focus on points voiced the loudest and not step back to see what was missed. For example, it was easy for people to get bogged down with wetland regulation process, which while related to estuary planning, is an entirely different mechanism.

Our focus groups were made up of both “visioners” and policy experts, who do not always speak the same language. It may have been easier to begin with a separate visioning process (as part of the workshop, or prior to this work). Translating desires and visions into actual estuarine management policy was challenging and often accomplished on the fly by the lead planner.

Prior to the focus group workshops, only a small handful of people were familiar with Oregon Statewide Planning Goals 16/17. Had people had more background on the goals 16 and 17 they may have had a much clearer idea on how to frame their recommendations (e.g., attendees could have determined if their recommendation fit as an ordinance or regulation). While the lead planner did an admirable job of translating peoples discussion points into policy recommendations, this tended to delay workshop progress due to people debating how to best word a statement rather than discussing the point itself.

Our series of workshops were extremely ambitious in terms of the amount of progress expected from each workshop. Having an additional half-day workshop might have allowed the participants, and the consultant team, more time to refine the ideas generated and “flesh out” the recommendations.

## PCW PRODUCT LINKS

---

**PCW Website:** <http://www.partnershipforcoastalwatersheds.org/>

**Coos Estuary Land Use Analysis Final Report:**

**Coos Bay Goal 16 Estuary Management Plan Assessment:** <http://www.co.coos.or.us/Portals/0/Planning/CBEMP%20Goal%2016%20Audit.pdf?ver=2017-09-06-084340-243>

**Communities, Lands & Waterways: Data Source:** <http://www.partnershipforcoastalwatersheds.org/lands-waterways-data-source/>

Coos Estuary Map Atlas:

## CONSULTANTS

---

University of Oregon Institute for Policy Research and Engagement

Website: <https://ipre.uoregon.edu/contact/>

Email: [csco@uoregon.edu](mailto:csco@uoregon.edu)

## FUNDING SOURCES

---

Department of Land Conservation and Development, Technical Assistance grant

## CONTACTS

---

**Coos County Planning Director:**

Jill Rolfe - [jrolfe@co.coos.or.us](mailto:jrolfe@co.coos.or.us)

**Oregon Coastal Management Program:**

- Hui Rodomsky, [hui.rodomsky@state.or.us](mailto:hui.rodomsky@state.or.us) (South Coast Regional Representative)
- Lisa Phipps, [lisa.phipps@state.or.us](mailto:lisa.phipps@state.or.us) (North Coast Regional Representative)