

**COOS COUNTY URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY
REGULAR BOARD MEETING
7:30 a.m. Thursday, April 15, 2021
Via Zoom**

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Agency Board Members:

Chairman Todd Goergen, At Large; Eric Farm, Port Commissioner; Pat Goll, City of North Bend; Joe Benetti, City of Coos Bay; and John Sweet, Coos County.

Guests:

John Burns, Port Staff; Lanelle Comstock, Port Staff; Mike Dunning, Port Staff; Krystal Moffett, Port Staff; and Nathan McClintock, Legal Counsel.

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chair Todd Goergen called the meeting to order at 7:43 a.m.

2. INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

3. CONSENT ITEMS

A. Approval of September 29, 2020 Board Meeting Minutes

Upon a motion by John Sweet (Second by Eric Farm), the Agency Board Members voted to approve the September 29, 2020 Board Meeting Minutes. **Motion Passed.**

4. ACTION ITEMS

A. Transpacific Parkway Drainage Project Alternatives – Presented by Mike Dunning

The analysis from SHN Engineering was included in the meeting packet. Mike Dunning shared the summary of alternatives to address the flooding issues on Transpacific Parkway. For both the northern and southern end, the first alternative is to do nothing. There is also the option to raise the roadway elevation; this is the highest cost option and does not solve the flooding problem.

Other options presented include restoring the flow in the existing culvert; although the condition is unknown and there is uncertainty as to how well it drains currently. Alternative B would be to repair or replace that existing culvert depending on its condition, which could include replacing the discharge piping or constructing a transmission ditch. A ditch would be an ongoing

maintenance issue. Alternative C would be to install an additional culvert and is a good option, scoring the highest according to the matrix.

Mr. Dunning shared photos of the flooding in the northern area. The best alternative here is a siphon drain that would discharge into the bay. This would maintain a certain level in the wetland but drain the excess water. A small culvert would also be needed under the road to direct water into the pond. Mr. Dunning then shared a photo of the southern portion showing the existing culvert with the flooding superimposed. The photo also shows the proposed placement of a transmission ditch, which for about the same cost another culvert could be installed that would not present maintenance issues. Details of the placement can be refined in the 30% design process.

Mr. Dunning discussed price breakdown for the options presented. Total cost for Alternative B, to restore the flow in the existing culvert on the southern end, is \$41,403. The next option is to install a new culvert in place of the existing, for a total of \$155,724. This is not the best option. The next option is to restore the flow of the existing culvert, at a total of \$50,623. The next option to install a new culvert with no repairs to the existing discharge pipe, is estimated to be just over \$61,000. The next option is to install new discharge piping in place of the existing, for an estimated cost of \$180,448. The last option is to install a new culvert instead of a transmission ditch on the west side of the road. This is the recommended alternative for the southern end. Total estimated costs for this option are \$69,062.

For the northern area, Alternative B is to redirect the waterflow to the bay with a siphon and ABS piping. Pat Goll asked about the diameter of the proposed siphon. Mr. Dunning stated details like this can be better refined in the next phase of the project. Eric Farm stated that with forestry roads, the minimum diameter is typically 18" for a cross drain culvert.

Mr. Dunning stated that with Board approval, he will ask SHN to develop a cost breakdown for permitting activities and to develop 30% design for the chosen alternatives, which will then be brought back to the Board for approval before moving forward. To date, there has been \$19,500 spent of the \$20,300 authorized for this phase of the project.

John Sweet asked if repairing the damaged culvert is included in the estimate. Mr. Dunning confirmed the alternatives include inspecting and cleaning out the existing culvert. Mr. Sweet asked if this project could be done incrementally, by first cleaning out the culvert to see if that takes care of the problem. Mr. Dunning stated the water recedes away from the culvert because the low point is behind it. Without something to collect water at the low point, it will not alleviate the problem.

Mr. Dunning stated he is seeking Board approval to move forward with SHN providing a formal estimate for Phase 2 to include 30% design, estimated permitting costs to add a culvert across the road, adding the siphon pipe to the bay, and locating the low area on the southern end to have a culvert installed connecting to the existing culvert.

Mr. Dunning asked whether the County previously maintained a ditch on that road, which has not been done recently. Mr. Sweet stated no, it appears to have been natural drainage. Mr. Dunning asked about maintenance moving forward. Mr. Sweet stated the maintenance would just consist

of blocking off the access so that people cannot get in there. Mr. Dunning stated the Port has done this in the past and people move the blockades.

Mr. Sweet stated he will respectfully disagree but go with the engineers in order to move the project forward. He stated that he hates to see that much money being spent before trying a simple fix. Mr. Farm asked if there were any permitting concerns. Mr. Dunning stated there are not.

Todd Goergen stated this has been an issue for some time and needs to be resolved. The preferred alternatives seem to be the best option, though the engineers could look at Mr. Sweet's concerns. Mr. Goergen then asked if there was any additional discussion. There being none, Mr. Goergen called for a motion. Mr. Sweet stated he is unsure what motion is needed and asked if the intent was to move forward with engineering and 30% design phase. Mr. Goergen confirmed and then asked John Burns to clarify.

Mr. Burns stated the recommended motion is to give authorization for completion of 30% design, as presented for the preferred alternatives. Mr. Dunning stated the preferred alternatives are to add a culvert to the southern end on the west side of the road, to inspect the existing culvert to ensure it is clear and free, and to add a culvert under the road on the northern end and a siphon pipe in the pond near Southport to drain into the bay. Once a cost estimate of permitting and 30% design are obtained, it will be presented to the Board prior to moving forward.

Upon a motion by John Sweet (Second by Pat Goll), the Agency Board Members voted to give authorization for completion of 30% design to include cost estimates for the preferred alternatives as presented today, which are to add a culvert to the southern end on the west side of the road, to inspect the existing culvert to ensure it is clear and free, and to add a culvert under the road on the northern end and a siphon pipe in the pond near Southport to drain into the bay. **Motion Passed.**

B. Update Authorized Bank Account Signatories – Presented by John Burns

The Agency has used Umpqua Bank, Coos Bay Branch for their banking services since 2005. All bank accounts must be authorized and approved by the Agency Board. With the transition of new Board members, there is a need to update the signature authority documents for the bank. The Agency Administrator is not a signatory on the account. One Agency Board member is required to sign checks.

The Agency currently has one money market checking account. The following individuals will be authorized signatories on the Umpqua Bank Money Market checking account:

Todd Goergen	At Large – Chair
Eric Farm	Oregon International Port of Coos Bay, Commissioner – Vice Chair

A resolution is required to update the signature authority on the checking account at Umpqua Bank.

Upon a motion by John Sweet (Second by Pat Goll), the Agency Board Members voted to approve Resolution 2021Res01 updating signature authority with money market checking account at Umpqua Bank, Coos Bay Branch. **Motion Passed.**

5. **INFORMATION ITEMS**

A. Agency Financial Statements

Mr. Burns reviewed the Agency financial information. The account has more money than anticipated at \$1,494,203.57. The outstanding loan balance is \$30,000. The next payment is due on July 5, 2021. There are 6 payments left, with the final payment due on July 5, 2026.

Upon a motion by John Sweet (Second by Joe Benetti), the Agency Board Members voted to approve the Agency financial statements as presented. **Motion Passed.**

B. Budget Planning Calendar FY 2021/22

The budget planning calendar for the fiscal year 2021/22 was included within the meeting packet. Mr. Goergen stated he reached out the budget committee members whose terms were set to expire, and they have each agreed to continue on. The first budget committee meeting is tentatively scheduled for the week of May 3.

C. Independent Accountants' Report FY 2019/20

The independent accountants' report was included in the meeting packet. Mr. Goergen stated this year's budget committee will be sure to include the proper verbiage for the motion.

6. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

7. **SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING DATE**

To Be Determined.

8. **OTHER/ADJOURN**

Chair Todd Goergen adjourned the meeting at 8:37 a.m.