

OREGON INTERNATIONAL PORT OF COOS BAY
Coos Bay, Oregon
REGULAR PCIP COMMISSION MEETING
8:00 a.m., Tuesday, January 6, 2026

Port Commission Chambers, 125 Central Avenue, Suite 230, Coos Bay, Oregon 97420

This is not an exact transcript. To watch a live stream of this meeting, go to www.portofcoosbay.com.

ATTENDANCE

Commission:

Kyle Stevens, President; Nick Edwards, Vice President; Kyle ViksneHill, Treasurer; Elise Hamner, Secretary; and Arnie Roblan, Commissioner.

Staff:

Melissa Cribbins, Executive Director of the PCIP Project; Keith Leavitt, Chief Commercial Officer of the PCIP Project; Lanelle Comstock, Chief Executive Officer; Megan Richardson, Director of Finance and Accounting; Rick Adamek, Director of Asset Management; Ray Dwire, Charleston Marina Manager; Krystal Karcher, Administrative Services Manager; and Christina Sanders, Administrative Assistant.

Media & Guests:

David Ferryman; Brian Forquer, NorthPoint; Tallon Trentz, IUOE 701; J.R. Johnson; Richard Miller; Gene Davis, Stantec; Jan Hodder; Mike Graybill; Mike Powter; Aaron Simons, ILWU; Tim Verney, David Evans and Associates; Jamie Fereday; Dave Crane; Steve Miller; Mo Aakre, South Coast Business; Dennis Hitchcock; Paul Poresky; Dean Lundie; Christine Moffitt; Anne Donnelly; Caddy McKeown, PCIP/NorthPoint; and Rick Osborn, PCIP.

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

President Stevens called the meeting to order at 8:01 a.m.

2. INTRODUCTION OF COMMISSIONERS, GUESTS AND PORT STAFF

3. PCIP PROJECT UPDATE

A. Melissa Cribbins reported on progress, stating the PCIP team has been drafting and finalizing responses to community questions, including those from the League of Women Voters. Some responses were sent recently. Earlier questions were incorporated into the website FAQs with assistance from JLA.

Ms. Cribbins completed quarterly reports for the Rail Crossing Elimination grant and the CRISI grant. Work continues to place the INFRA grant under contract, supported by the recent appointment of a new MARAD head. Bi-monthly meetings with the Build America Bureau address potential RIF loans and other financing options. The Rebel Group's economic analysis received positive feedback. David Miller and Associates continues to respond to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers questions through the Doctor Check system for the channel modification. Ms. Cribbins stated that a planned Washington, D.C. trip in November was postponed due to a government shutdown and rescheduled for February 2026, and Staff are arranging meetings for that trip.

Keith Leavitt provided further detail on the Rebel Group's comprehensive economic and market analysis, which is updating earlier studies, sharpening outreach language for ocean carriers and Union Pacific, and building the financial case for upgrades to the Port-owned Coos Bay Rail Line. He described the project as resting on three interconnected elements: federal navigation channel modifications, terminal development under a future lease with NorthPoint, and substantial rail infrastructure investment. He also noted ongoing work to finalize a Memorandum of Understanding with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which will serve as the lead agency for the National Environmental Policy Act process. This is expected to involve a roughly two-year Environmental Impact Statement once grant agreements are signed and planning and design efforts reach the necessary level.

B. Brian Forquer, Vice President of Development for NorthPoint, updated the Commission on the public-private partnership driving the PCIP. Infrastructure enhancements encompassing channel modifications, terminal construction, and rail upgrades will generate new revenue through efficient container transfers from the North Spit to Eugene while continuing to serve existing customers. Requests for Proposals covering design, permitting, and environmental clearance are being prepared, with consultant selection slated to begin in the first quarter of 2026.

David Ferryman introduced himself and outlined his extensive 34-year career in the railroad industry. His background includes senior engineering leadership at Canadian National Railway, where he oversaw 20,000 miles of track and a \$1.4 billion annual budget, as well as earlier experience with BNSF. He expressed strong enthusiasm for contributing to the refurbishment of the Coos Bay Rail Line and drew encouraging parallels to the successful transformation of the Port of Prince Rupert. He highlighted favorable industry trends, including growth in intermodal traffic and potential consolidation among Class I railroads, as factors that could benefit the Coos Bay initiative.

4. CONSENT ITEMS

A. Approval of December 2, 2025 Regular PCIP Commission Meeting Minutes

Upon a motion by Commissioner Hamner, (second by Commissioner ViksneHill), the Board of Commissioners voted to approve the December 2, 2025 Regular PCIP Commission Meeting Minutes. **Motion Passed Unanimously.** (Ayes: Stevens, Edwards, ViksneHill, Hamner, and Roblan. Nays: None).

5. MANAGEMENT REPORTS

All Management Reports were included within the Meeting Packet.

6. ACTION ITEMS/REPORTS

A. Letter to Confirm Declaration of Intent to Business Oregon

The State of Oregon is preparing for the May 2026 bond sale of \$20,000,000 for the PCIP project work. Staff recently submitted a spend plan to the State for the remaining funds. Of the remaining funding, \$10,000,000 is pledged as half of the match for the CRISI grant. The other \$10,000,000 will be used for the channel modification work.

Given the timing of the upcoming funding, Business Oregon had requested that the Port complete the letter that was included in the packet, on Port letterhead, and submit to Business Oregon the Official Declaration

of Intent to Reimburse Capital Costs with Lottery Revenue Bonds. This is to ensure that any expenses that may be incurred for the \$20,000,000 project are eligible for reimbursement from the funds if the costs are incurred before the anticipated bond sale in May 2026. Once received by Business Oregon, they will review and submit the document to Department of Administrative Services.

Commissioner Hamner asked for clarification on the language in the letter to the Department of Administrative Services. Commissioner Hamner inquired what “grantee” referred to in this context, asking if it meant the Port of Coos Bay / PCIP, and requested explanation of how the cash flow and reimbursement process would actually work.

Ms. Cribbins responded that this clause was included to cover situations where expenditures might temporarily exceed the currently available bond funds before the next tranche arrives. Ms. Cribbins stated that the Port had sufficient cash flow to pay bills in the interim, explaining that at the current rate of spending, the remaining \$5M was not projected to be depleted within the next six months, and that the language was a standard requirement to enable reimbursement eligibility.

Commissioner Hamner inquired about capitalization of costs mentioned in the letter, asking whether all project costs were required to be capitalized as assets. Ms. Cribbins stated confirmation from Business Oregon verified that expenditures could include non-capitalized costs, eliminating the need to revisit the letter at a future meeting.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Roblan (second by Commissioner ViksneHill), the Board of Commissioners motioned to authorize President Kyle Stevens to sign and submit to Business Oregon the letter to confirm the Declaration of Official Intent to Reimburse Capital Costs with Lottery Revenue Bonds. **Motion Passed Unanimously.** (Ayes: Stevens, Edwards, ViksneHill, Hamner, and Roblan. Nays: None).

7. INFORMATION ITEMS

PCIP Financials were included in the Meeting Packet. Commissioner Hamner stated the current budget was adopted prior to her becoming a Commissioner, and of the \$5M in capacity she noticed the line items in the budget were off. Commissioner Hamner asked if a supplemental budget needed to be passed. Ms. Richardson explained that this budget was put together by Business Oregon, and she is unaware of what Business Oregon’s process is; however, Ms. Richardson stated she does report those line items to Business Oregon.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. Jan Hodder expressed concerns about the due diligence shown by the Port of Coos Bay Commission and its contractors in advancing the Pacific Coast Intermodal Port (PCIP) project. Ms. Hodder described the information presented to the public as overwhelmingly promotional rather than balanced or evidence-based. Ms. Hodder directed attention to the new “Myth-Busting” page on the project website, particularly the claim that the terminal and railroad will create over 8,000 direct and indirect jobs between Coos Bay and Eugene once operational. Ms. Hodder questioned the evidence supporting this figure, noting that a 2023 five-page report commissioned by the Port relied on the 2021 Port of Prince Rupert Economic Study, which reported 1,740 direct maritime jobs. Applying an industry-standard multiplier yielded roughly 9,400 total jobs, but Ms. Hodder pointed out that Prince Rupert spans more than 1.5 million acres with a 12-mile waterfront and includes multiple terminals beyond containers such as grain, wood pellets, propane, coal, cruise ships, and ferries. Ms. Hodder stated that the report's job numbers therefore encompass far

broader operations and are misleading when applied to PCIP. Ms. Hodder called this an example of inadequate due diligence and urged the Commission to provide the community with realistic, well-supported job estimates instead of relying on flawed comparisons. Ms. Hodder also highlighted other website statements needing clarification, including claims of local Oregonian ownership stakes, approval of a low-interest rail loan, and excitement from Asian shipping companies. Ms. Hodder referenced a recent media quote from Executive Director Melissa Cribbins indicating that website language is under review and recommended making this a high priority.

B. Mike Graybill recommended that the Commission solicit public comment on the draft Strategic Business Plan before formal adoption, stating constructive input would enhance its quality and demonstrate a genuine commitment to hearing from Port District residents and others. Mr. Graybill encouraged the creation of a mechanism for the Commission to openly discuss and debate substantive PCIP issues, including opportunities to receive and consider viewpoints from constituents. Mr. Graybill stated that he had previously raised four pages of questions and concerns based on a single 52-page commissioned document, issues he viewed as deserving of answers and public Commission debate. Mr. Graybill expressed disappointment that no such debate has occurred in public view, suggesting the project has not received the thorough attention it requires. Mr. Graybill commented on the Commission's time spent on topics such as RV Park rates, while major decisions, including potential allocation of \$83 million for dredging at a yet-unbuilt dock that may lack a customer, receive little open discussion. Mr. Graybill asked the Commission to manage the PCIP project more transparently and expressed willingness to discuss his posed questions further. Mr. Graybill's written testimony is attached to the end of these minutes.

C. Jamie Fereday stated he agreed with Mr. Graybill's suggestion for more open discussion. Mr. Fereday stated he had previously provided information on balancing industry and environmental considerations, and recommended two books: *Fen, Bog & Swamp* by Annie Proulx, which explores human effects on estuaries worldwide, and *The Blue Machine* by Helen Czerski, which details Industrial Revolution consequences for the ocean and links them to climate change. Mr. Fereday offered to provide copies of either or both books to any Commissioner that wants them.

D. Dave Crane thanked the Port for its community efforts, describing it as a real asset for the area. Mr. Crane stated his opposition for the PCIP project, stating there is an absence of lined-up shippers and attributed this to higher shipping costs from Coos Bay compared to other West Coast ports. Mr. Crane urged the Commission to place the project on hold until firm commitments are secured and shippers are actively involved. Mr. Crane also expressed support for the unions' efforts to provide employment for their members.

E. Paul Poresky expressed opposition to the Pacific Coast Intermodal Port Project. Mr. Poresky stated it is an unrealistic idea that wastes taxpayer money on out-of-area beneficiaries such as NorthPoint in Kansas City and David Miller and Associates in Pennsylvania. Mr. Poresky recommended redirecting funds to improve existing local infrastructure for Port district residents. Mr. Poresky criticized repeated payments to external consultants including Rebel Group and DMA. Mr. Poresky questioned the Commissioners' accountability since they are appointed by the governor in Salem, and questioned if the Commissioners prioritize environmental protection, sustainability, and the long-term welfare of the South Coast. Mr. Poresky's written testimony is attached to the end of these minutes.

F. Dean Lundie described two waterfront properties he owns along the Coos River. One is the old Coos Bay Boat Building Center, and the other is the former Union Oil Terminal Dock with approximately 900 feet of solid pier near Ace Hardware. Mr. Lundie proposed using or donating the Union Oil property to advance the multi-year Connect the Boardwalk walking and bike path between North Bend and Coos Bay. Mr. Lundie stated that a survey by the City of North Bend already includes railroad properties

but the route stops at the tribal casino property. Mr. Lundie raised safety concerns about accessing driveways from Tremont and Bayshore Drive and U.S. 101, but stated that recent speed limit reduction to 35 miles per hour will help. Mr. Lundie stated that the world's most beautiful cities are built around rivers, and suggested incorporating a section of railroad track in front of his property into the path design. Me. Lundie's visual aid is provided at the end of these minutes.

G. Anne Donnelly responded to earlier comments about the Commissioners' lack of local accountability stating that the Commissioners serve as the governing body of a special district and therefore have a clear legal fiduciary duty to the district's taxpayers. Ms. Donnelly stated that a strong case exists for gross negligence in the handling of the PCIP project and public resources. Ms. Donnelly stated that the Oregon Legislature has issued no mandate or legally significant direction, and criticized the practice of placing legislative intent statements at the top of agendas. Ms. Donnelly described this as misleading and indicative of a misunderstanding of the Commission's role. Ms. Donnelly commented on growing community concern that the Commissioners may not fully recognize their legal obligations to district residents.

H. J.R. Johnson thanked the Port and the Commissioners for their efforts and forward-looking vision. Ms. Johnson described the PCIP project as a rare opportunity to bring significant economic development and jobs to the area after a long absence of such prospects. Ms. Johnson acknowledged the negative feedback expressed during the meeting and affirmed that some residents support the Commission's work and believe the Commissioners care about the community.

9. COMMISSION COMMENTS

There were no comments.

10. NEXT MEETING DATES

- A.** Regular Commission Meeting - Thursday, January 15, 2026, 11:00 a.m.
- B.** PCIP Commission Meeting - Tuesday, February 3, 2026, 8:00 a.m.

11. ADJOURN

President Stevens adjourned the meeting at 8:47 a.m. and entered into Executive Session, as authorized under ORS 192.660(2), to:

- (e) conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions;
- (f) consider information or records that are exempt by law from public inspection; and
- (g) consider preliminary negotiations involving matters of trade or commerce in which the governing body is in competition with governing bodies in other states or nations.

Testimony of Michael Graybill before the OIPCB management commission

Second regularly scheduled PCIP meeting 6 January 2026.

I seek clarification on matters related to the navigation channel, turning basins, and terminal dredging linked to the proposed NorthPoint container terminal project:

1. Commission involvement in and oversight of cost estimates, contingencies, and risk assessments

- a. Dredging Project Contingency Costs
 - i. Sub Appendix 12 applies a 10% contingency value to estimated costs
 - ii. US Army Corps of Engineers guidance recommends using cost estimate contingency values of 20-50% (Sub-Appendix 12 pg. 36)
 - iii. Fuel costs alone should support use of a larger contingency value. The estimated cost for the 17,819,477 gallons of fuel to be used by dredging equipment is based on projections 5 years beyond date of estimate (PDF pgs. 58 & 132 of 152). Even a slight variation between projected and actual fuel costs is likely to result in significant cost overruns in this category alone.
 - iv. The June 2024 estimate is based on 15 June 2027 construction start date. **Is the June 2027 construction start date still reasonable?**
 - v. **Was selection of the 10% contingency value used in the cost estimate a decision made in consultation with the commission?**
 - vi. **Has the commission even discussed the contingency values used in the cost estimates?**
 - vii. **How will cost overruns be addressed?**
- b. The Sub-Appendix 12 total project cost estimate of \$657,247,000 (Sub-Appendix 12 Table 4-5) explicitly excludes multiple project costs and risk factors having potentially significant cost implications
 - i. Permitting, mitigation or weather-related costs or risks are explicitly not included in the estimate (pg. 39)
 - ii. **How and when will estimates for additional costs identified in Sub-Appendix 12 (such as mitigation and permitting) be added to the estimated total costs in Sub-Appendix 12?**
- c. Cost estimates used in separate project submittals to the Corps of Engineers vary by as much as \$22,134,000
 - i. Table 32 in Appendix C (Economics) lists project costs at \$551,368,000
 - ii. Sub-Appendix 12 (Basis of Estimate) lists project costs at \$657,247,000
 - iii. **Is the Commission aware of these internal inconsistencies?**

- iv. What resources/capacity/process does the Commission have to identify and reconcile information that is internally inconsistent?
- d. Allocation of dredging costs between port and dock owners
 - i. Sub-Appendix 12 provides two separate estimates: one for terminal dredging work and one for channel and turning basin work.
 - ii. The volume estimate for terminal dredging is 1,926,000 CY (Table 3-1)
 - 1. PCIP Berth pocket 1,615,000 CY sand plus 157,000 CY rock
 - 2. Roseburg 154,000 CY sand (pg. 145 of 152)
 - iii. The cost estimate for dredging both terminals (Attachment B PDF pg. 125 of 152 and Tables 4-3, 4-5) is \$83,745,000 (Table 4-5)
 - a. Coos Bay Terminal \$81,350,000 (PDF pg. 126 of 152)
 - b. Roseburg \$992,907 (pg. 145 of 152)
 - iv. Who will bear the estimated \$83,745,000 cost of the terminal dredging work? OIPCB? Roseburg? NorthPoint?
 - v. If plan is for terminal operators to bear these costs, have agreements to do so been negotiated?
 - vi. Longstanding USACE/OIPCB practice is for terminal operators to bear costs to maintain depth between terminal berth face and channel. If plan is for OIPCB to bear these costs who made that decision and why?

2. OIPCB policies regarding contracting, contract management, and transparency

- a. Recent OIPCB commission proceedings reference a contract with Rebel Consulting to develop an updated market analysis and conduct logistics and supply-chain modeling, and financial modeling associated with terminal and rail capital improvements. Although not explicitly stated, it appears the OIPCB is financing and managing this contract. NorthPoint Development holds a land lease from the port on a port owned property on North Spit. OIPCB presentations characterize the Port District's role in the design, construction, and operation of the proposed North Spit container terminal as one of lessor/landlord. Elsewhere in the district, port lease holders are typically fully responsible for development and operations costs on port properties leased to tenants.
- b. Providing project development support and services for a tenant, as appears to be the case for the PCIP, appears to run counter to standard practice for the Port. Consistent with standard practice, costs for the services identified in the Rebel consulting contract appear to be more appropriately borne by NorthPoint Development than by the OIPCB.

Is the OIPB commission funding and managing the contract with Rebel Consulting?
 What other support services are the port providing for NorthPoint's development

proposal? Will the scope of services and work products be made available for public review?

- c. The commission recently approved contract task order #19 for David Miller and Associates (DMA) in the amount not to exceed \$2,859,574. Will the work products associated with Task Order #19 be made available for public review?
- d. Staff reports indicate a PIDP grant application was submitted in late 2025 to help with additional railroad design and engineering costs. Can copies of the application be made available for public review? What are the overall estimated design and engineering costs for the rail component of the PCIP proposal?
- e. Staff reports indicate OIPCB (via DMA) is responding to the edits to the documents that have been filed with the US Army Corps. None of the revisions to 204f/404 submittals referenced in staff reports appear to have been made available for public inspection. Does the commission plan to post updated 204f/404 submittals on the port website? If not, can copies of the revised submittals be made available by other means such as posting hard copies at local libraries or making review copies available at the Port offices?
- f. The January 2026 commission packet indicates that the terminal and rail design and engineering contracting process will occur in the first quarter of 2026. Will the RFP for those services be made available for public inspection? Will the applications received be made available for public inspection?
- g. The FY 25-26 US DOT INFRA grant award of \$25,018,750 for the PCIP terminal planning identified on the DOT website as of May 2025 includes a note that the PCIP project is eligible for future project costs in the amount of \$50,037,500. Does the commission intend to pursue these eligible project costs? If so, what will the funds be used to support?

3. Evidence that the commission decisions are being supported by objective due diligence

- a. The port commission has yet to provide documentation demonstrating that a new container terminal on the North American West coast is needed. Importantly, the port has yet to address fact that there are multiple better, cheaper, simpler west coast container terminal investment options available that put the PCIP proposal at a potentially insurmountable competitive disadvantage.
 - i. Multiple unused, turn-key container terminals are currently available for reopening at other US West Coast ports.
 - 1. A fully operational container terminal in Seattle (terminal 46) has been sitting idle since ocean carrier Hanjin went bankrupt in 2017. No significant dredging or rail improvements are needed to return this

terminal to service. <https://www.postalley.org/2025/12/09/can-seattles-terminal-46-come-back-to-life/>

2. The Port of Oakland is working to find someone to lease Marine Terminals Outer Harbor Terminal (OHT) Berths 22-24. This 130-acre terminal has two 50' deep berths, equipped with 4 STS cranes and multiple plug ins for refrigerated containers. No major dredging costs or substantial rail infrastructure costs are required to reactivate this terminal. <https://www.oaklandseaport.com/facilities/seaport-facilities>
- ii. Entirely new west container terminals are under development that will expand the capacity and efficiency of existing ports in a manner not possible at the Port of Coos Bay.
 1. Roberts Bank Terminal 2
<https://canada.constructconnect.com/joc/news/projects/2025/11/construction-teams-shortlisted-for-roberts-bank-terminal-2-project>
 2. Pier 500 at Port of Los Angeles.
<https://www.freightwaves.com/news/busiest-u-s-port-plans-new-container-terminal-for-biggest-ships>
- iii. Major renovations of existing west coast terminals are underway to increase capacity and efficiency at existing ports.
 1. Terminal 5 Improvements Port of Seattle
<https://www.portseattle.org/projects/terminal-5-improvements>
 2. Pier B on the dock rail improvements Port of Long Beach
<https://polb.com/port-info/projects/#pier-b-on-dock-support-facility/americas-green-gateway-pier-b>
- b. The port commission has yet to demonstrate the cost competitiveness or cost effectiveness of the PCIP proposal. This erodes public confidence in the proposal. The cost to reactivate one or more of the existing US West Coast container terminals is almost certain to be far less than the \$657,247,000 needed to modify the Coos Bay harbor enabling container ships to stop by Coos Bay. Adding the cost to build a brand-new terminal on the North Spit and to refurbish a 130-mile-long short line rail segment to these significant dredging costs further decreases the likelihood that the PCIP proponents will ever be able to find a willing terminal operator or ocean carrier to partner on the PCIP project. **Aside from signing a May 2022 land lease with NorthPoint Development, have any firm agreements with terminal operators, shippers, or ocean carriers been negotiated for the PCIP project? How much longer will an unsuccessful search for partnerships continue before the project is deemed infeasible for reasons of lack of interest?**

Rec'd 1/6/26 ML

Dear Oregon International Port of Coos Bay;

Thank you for this opportunity to address the commissioners on the subject of the Pacific Coast Intermodal Port. There are very many people who would like the opportunity to comment on the PCIP. However, when you hold meetings at times when most of the people in Coos County are unavailable to comment you won't get a fair assessment of how people feel about the project. When meetings are held in the evening to discuss the proposal they have been well attended, but none of the Port Commissioners have taken the opportunity to hear expert testimony, the public's input and answer questions.

The title of the proposal "PCIP" gives the wrong impression. It makes this project seem singularly important, which couldn't be further from the truth. It disregards the fact that there are 9 other container ship ports on the Pacific coast that are better situated to effectively and economically ship containers to the Midwest. This is a documented fact, and the documentation has been available at the evening meetings. Were you to attend, you would learn that shipping companies would pass us by for better, less expensive means of getting goods to wholesalers.

I have lived in Coos County for over 45 years and during that time the International Port of Coos Bay has done little to improve the quality of life in Coos County. Meanwhile the Port has spent millions of dollars on consulting fees to outside firms and has accomplished little.

The good news is that while you have missed many opportunities to improve our area sustainably, you have not yet significantly damaged it.

So far your current project "PCIP" has supported firms from far away to the tune of millions of dollars: David Miller and Assoc. From Lancaster, PA; North Point Development from Kansas City, and Rebel Consulting.

The really bad news about "PCIP" in my opinion, is that it will most likely not succeed to be an economic boon, but it will do significant damage the environment, the quality of life for Coos County residents, our tourism industry, fisheries, property values, and the desirability of settling in the Coos area.

This could be your worst boondoggle ever,

Sincerely,

Paul Forestry
Jan 6, 2026

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

SHERMAN AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

VERMONT AVE
[80' dedicated width]

SHERIDAN AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

MAINE AVE
[80' dedicated width]

OREGON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

STANTON AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

STANTON AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

SHERMAN AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

VERMONT AVE
[80' dedicated width]

SHERIDAN AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

MAINE AVE
[80' dedicated width]

OREGON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

STANTON AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

SHERMAN AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

VERMONT AVE
[80' dedicated width]

SHERIDAN AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

MAINE AVE
[80' dedicated width]

OREGON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

STANTON AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

SHERMAN AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

VERMONT AVE
[80' dedicated width]

SHERIDAN AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

MAINE AVE
[80' dedicated width]

OREGON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

STANTON AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

Notes

- The basis of bearings for this survey is the line between ODOT control points # 516 and #520, as shown per Coos County Survey No. T-168. Said line bears South 03°06'17" East.
- Townsite of North Bend, see Coos County Surveyor plat image #85272567.

Legend

- 3" diameter brass disc
- "CITY OF NORTH BEND PUBLIC WORKS"
- marked around rim w/ punch mark near center
- Found 5/8" dia. rebar w/ YPC, or as noted
- Coos County survey of record
- Block
- Iron Rod
- I.R.
- Iron Pipe
- Found
- I.P.

Legend (cont.)

- Found utility pole
- Found utility pole (abandoned)
- Found sanitary sewer manhole
- Found fire hydrant
- Found fence line as noted
- Found railroad tracks
- Found pavement surface
- PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN PATH

Narrative

The purpose of this survey was to re-tie control monuments within the limits of the North Bend Downtown Streetscape Project and to carry coordinates south along the east margin of the Oregon Coast Highway per CS T-168. Fieldwork performed using a Topcon GTS-243NW total station capable of measuring angles to three arc-seconds. Monuments located by side shots turned from a base line that was checked to ODOT control points #516 and #520. Coordinates for said points per CS T-168 held this survey.

Elevations were also adjusted through this traverse and checked with a differential level loop using a Topcon AT-63 level. Benchmark held for vertical control (datum NAVD88): Found 3 1/2" brass disc in top of concrete curb stamped "H.L.T6 1965" with an elevation of 25.34 feet per Coos County Survey T-168. Published elevation per National Geodetic Survey datasheet permanent identifier #0A06226 is 25.38 feet.

Minimum levels of precision were surpassed for linear and angular closure per field traverse standards set by Coos County Zoning and Land Development Ordinance, Section 8.1.500. (Horizontal precision greater than one in 115,000 this traverse.)

Certain topographic information shown within and along U.S. Highway 101 represents fieldwork performed by others. During the course of field operations for this City mapping project, certain ODOT control points were tied along with quality control checks on certain features, so that a topographic survey of U.S. Highway 101 provided by Oregon Department of Transportation could be translated and notated to the horizontal datum used herein. Any questions regarding field notes, point files, or surface model information for linework shown here within and along U.S. Highway 101 should be addressed to the ODOT Region 3 survey office in Roseburg, Oregon.

South Path Proximity Area

Proposed pathway within Stanton Avenue right-of-way dedicated for public use per Townsite of North Bend, circa 1902.

North Path Proximity Area

Proposed pathway within Stanton Avenue right-of-way dedicated for public use per Townsite of North Bend, circa 1902.

Coos Waterfront Walkway Section A

Proposed pathway within Stanton Avenue right-of-way dedicated for public use per Townsite of North Bend, circa 1902.

Coos Waterfront Walkway Section B

Proposed pathway within Stanton Avenue right-of-way dedicated for public use per Townsite of North Bend, circa 1902.

Graphic Scale

1 inch = 100 ft.

Topographic Survey

CITY OF NORTH BEND - ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT
P.O. Box 8, CITY HALL
830 CALIFORNIA AVE
NORTH BEND, OREGON 97459
541.750.0000 FAX 541.750.0544

Subject Location:
Stanton Ave. & Pkns. E. of Blocks 51 - 52, Townsite of North Bend, city plat #26, flat file #25, Public Works Department.

Located in 6L 1, Section 15, and 6L 4, Section 10, all in Township 25 South, Range 13 West, W.M., Coos County, Oregon.

CAD BY: DJW
DATE: Sep 01, 2017
JOB NO.: SC ROS 1
SCALE: 1" = 100'
CHK BY: FLD BK DITZEN
ACAD VER: 2011

Proposed CONNECT the BOARDWALKS (north segment)

<https://www.facebook.com/cooswaterfrontwalkway/>

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

SHERMAN AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

VERMONT AVE
[80' dedicated width]

SHERIDAN AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

MAINE AVE
[80' dedicated width]

OREGON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

STANTON AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

SHERMAN AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

VERMONT AVE
[80' dedicated width]

SHERIDAN AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

MAINE AVE
[80' dedicated width]

OREGON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

STANTON AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

SHERMAN AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

VERMONT AVE
[80' dedicated width]

SHERIDAN AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

MAINE AVE
[80' dedicated width]

OREGON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

STANTON AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

SHERMAN AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

VERMONT AVE
[80' dedicated width]

SHERIDAN AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

MAINE AVE
[80' dedicated width]

OREGON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

STANTON AVENUE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]

WASHINGTON AVE
[80' dedicated width]