

OREGON INTERNATIONAL PORT OF COOS BAY
Coos Bay, Oregon
REGULAR COMMISSION MEETING
11:00 a.m., Thursday, January 15, 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:

Lanelle Comstock, Chief Executive Officer; Megan Richardson, Director of Finance and Accounting; Rick Adamek, Director of Asset Management; Brian Early, General Manager, Coos Bay Rail Line; Ray Dwire, Charleston Marina Manager; Krystal Karcher, Administrative Services Manager; and Christina Sanders, Administrative Assistant.

Media & Guests:

Lucinda DiNovo, City of Coos Bay; Troy Cribbins, City of Coos Bay; Jennifer Wirsing, City of Coos Bay; Nichole Rutherford, City of Coos Bay; Carmen Matthews, City of Coos Bay; Joe Benetti, City of Coos Bay; Amanda Moore, Baker Tilly; Brad Coleman, ILWU; Garth Johnson, ILWU; Aaron Simons, ILWU; Mike Graybill; Dean Lundie; and Christine Moffitt.

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

President Stevens called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

2. INTRODUCTION OF COMMISSIONERS, GUESTS AND PORT STAFF

3. PORT PROJECT UPDATE

A. FY 2024/25 Annual Financial Report

Amanda Moore of Baker Tilly presented the audit results for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2025. Ms. Moore explained that the audit was conducted in accordance with Generally Accepted Auditing Standards (GAAS) and Governmental Auditing Standards (GAGAS), with additional compliance testing performed under Oregon minimum audit standards related to budgetary compliance, procurement, and investment practices. Because the Port expended more than \$750,000 in federal awards during the fiscal year, a Single Audit under Uniform Guidance was also required and performed. Key areas of audit focus included internal controls over financial reporting and information technology systems; cash and investments, including third-party confirmations and Oregon compliance verification; revenue

recognition and cutoff; leases and subscription-based information technology arrangements; capital assets, including additions, disposals, and depreciation estimates; long-term debt; accrued liabilities such as PERS pension obligations; financial close processes; and compliance testing for one major federal program.

The audit resulted in an unmodified (“clean”) opinion on the Port’s financial statements, confirming that they were fairly presented in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). The Oregon minimum audit standards report noted a small number of budgetary over-expenditures, which were disclosed in the notes to the financial statements. The Governmental Auditing Standards report identified no significant deficiencies or material weaknesses in internal controls. Ms. Moore clarified that the internal control review is performed to support the audit and does not constitute an opinion on the effectiveness of internal controls. The Uniform Guidance report also issued a clean opinion with no findings of noncompliance. Ms. Moore noted that issuance of the Uniform Guidance report was delayed until the week of the meeting due to the late release of the federal compliance supplement in late November.

The only significant risk identified during the audit was the standard presumption of management override of controls. This risk was addressed through journal entry testing, and no exceptions were noted. Ms. Moore reported that there were no significant unusual transactions, audit difficulties, disagreements with management, or circumstances requiring modification to the form of the audit report. Two new accounting standards, GASB Statement No. 101 related to compensated absences and GASB Statement No. 102 related to certain risk disclosures, were implemented during the year; however, both had minimal or no material impact on the financial statements. No uncorrected misstatements or material adjusting journal entries were required, and management did not consult with other accountants regarding audit or accounting matters. Ms. Moore further noted that no other significant matters arose during the audit that required communication to the Commission.

Ms. Moore thanked the Port’s staff for their cooperation and noted that the audit proceeded smoothly despite the delay in the federal compliance supplement. She also outlined the Baker Tilly audit service team, noting her continued role as Engagement Reviewer, Leslie Daggett’s promotion to Audit Manager, and the addition of Anna Waldron as Concurring Reviewer, providing an independent perspective to support audit quality and independence.

Commissioner ViksneHill inquired about the useful lives assigned to the Port’s capital assets, noting their significance as an accounting estimate, and asked whether the audit identified any concerns related to asset useful lives or potential impairment triggers. Ms. Moore confirmed that the audit did not identify any issues or concerns in these areas and stated that the audit team focused on consistency in depreciation practices and ensuring assets were not fully depreciated while still in active use.

Commissioner ViksneHill asked about the long-term debt note related to Terminal One, specifically asking whether debt service payments would commence only upon completion of construction, potentially in 2026, and whether this differed from prior budget expectations in which payments were anticipated regardless of construction status. Megan Richardson responded that debt service was under budget because no repayment schedule was in effect during the period. She noted that in prior years, interest payments were due as loans closed, but that interest payments were not required during the current period.

Commissioner ViksneHill asked whether the audit identified any concerns related to the Port’s ability to continue as an ongoing concern. Ms. Moore stated that the audit team discussed this matter with

management and did not identify any conditions that would raise concerns about the Port's ability to continue operations for the applicable assessment period. She explained that governmental auditing standards require the auditor to assess management's ability to operate for twelve months from the June 30 fiscal year-end, and she saw nothing that would indicate the Port would not make it the next six months.

B. Port and Rail Financial Update

Ms. Richardson presented the financial update for November 2025, covering the General Fund and Coos Bay Rail Line (CBRL) operations.

For the General Fund, Operating Income totaled \$274,000, exceeding budget slightly due in part to Administration filling vacant space in the Hub Building. Port Operations revenues fell short of budget due to the timing of annual property agreement renewals. Railroad Operations revenues fell short of budget due to lower car movements. Charleston Operations revenues exceeded budget with higher revenues in Building & Dock Leases, Marina, Shipyard, RV Park, and Travel Lift.

Operating Expenses were under budget by \$76,000. These savings reflect ongoing cost discipline, with some maintenance and projects deferred to manage cash flow.

Total Operating Results showed a loss of \$42,000, better than budget by \$80,000. Charleston Operations recorded a gain of \$39,000 versus a budgeted loss, while Railroad Operations remained positive but below budget.

The General Fund Net Result for November was \$1,200,000, exceeding budget by \$443,000. Fiscal year-to-date (July through November 2025), the General Fund Net Result was \$1,100,000, better than budget by \$889,000.

For the CBRL Fund in November, Operating Income was short of budget by \$149,000. Administration Income was short of budget due to lower car movements. Mechanical revenues were short of budget by \$52,000 due to reduced car movements and limited funds for car repair supplies. The Net Result was a loss of \$20,000, short of budget by \$31,000.

Fiscal year-to-date for the CBRL Fund, the Net Result was a loss of \$156,000, short of budget by \$209,000. Cumulative carloads totaled 1,596, short by 449, with movements below target each month from July through November.

C. City of Coos Bay Front Street Multi Use Trail Project & the Railroad

Lanelle Comstock introduced the discussion on the City of Coos Bay's Front Street Multi-Use Trail Project and its implications for the Port-owned rail corridor along Front Street. Ms. Comstock recounted attending a Coos Bay City Council meeting with other Port staff, including Rick Adamek and Ray Dwire, and Commissioner Hamner. Ms. Comstock stated during that meeting Joe Benetti, Mayor of Coos Bay, questioned the future of the railroad on Front Street. Ms. Comstock stated that while the Swingspan Bridge remains out of service and rails-to-trails options south of town are under consideration, the status of the rail through town is uncertain. Any removal of tracks would involve a time-consuming process, including feasibility studies, community engagement, and the rail banking procedure through the Surface Transportation Board (STB). Ms. Comstock welcomed the City to speak further on the matter, and noted

that she had consulted legal counsel regarding timelines for potential rail removal if pursuing a rails-to-trails project.

The federal Surface Transportation Board (STB) process for "rail banking" is not abandonment but a way to preserve the corridor for potential future rail use while allowing interim trail development. This process requires feasibility studies, community engagement, and STB approval. Segments that have been inactive for over two years, like the area south of town, could qualify for a class exemption allowing rail salvage in as little as two months after filing. However, the Front Street section, last used six to seven months ago, would require either waiting 17 to 18 months or pursuing an individual exemption involving public comment, safety, and environmental studies, potentially taking about six months. Ms. Comstock noted that significant preparatory work, including feasibility planning, outreach, and identifying a trail sponsor such as a non-profit or agency that would assume development, management, maintenance, and liability, must occur before any STB filing. Even with expedited processes, the overall timeline would be at least a year, conservatively.

Carmen Matthews presented visuals and details of the City's 30 percent design for Phase 1 of the Front Street project, focusing on the northern portion from Cedar Avenue to Bayshore Drive. Mr. Matthews stated the City has separated the project into phased design increments to incorporate multimodal transportation infrastructure, resulting in a slight reduction in parking stalls in the focus area, while accommodating a 12-foot multi-use path on the east side of Front Street connecting to the Coos Bay Village Boardwalk and extending north. This includes a new parking lot installation. Mr. Matthews emphasized transparency and inclusion, noting the Port's significant role as a stakeholder along Front Street and downtown, and invited input from the Commission to help shape the plan.

Mr. Benetti expressed appreciation for the positive working relationship with Ms. Comstock and Port staff, highlighting past collaborations and optimism for the future. Mr. Benetti advocated for removing the rail along Front Street, describing it as a "win-win" that would improve public safety by eliminating hazards from bike and pedestrian accidents involving the tracks, avoid the high costs of ADA-compliant crossings, ongoing maintenance, and allow for approximately 14 additional parking spaces in Phase 1. Mr. Benetti suggested drafting an agreement to preserve reactivation options while enabling immediate trail progress.

Mr. Benetti stressed that the project would focus on Phase 1 only, with subsequent southern portions to be addressed later, and urged pursuing the individual exemption for a potential one-year timeline to align designs and maximize parking benefits for businesses, fostering a working waterfront.

Commissioner Hamner thanked the City of Coos Bay for attending and commended Port Staff's efforts over the past year to build relationships with the City of Coos Bay, City of North Bend, and the Coquille Tribe, noting the rail's potential impacts on all parties. Commissioner Hamner emphasized the railroad's 115-year history in the area and the need for internal, legal, and thoughtful processes.

Commissioner Hamner recounted attending the City Council meeting where maritime industry partners expressed concerns about access to their businesses, encouraging them to engage directly with the City and attend this meeting for transparency. Commissioner Hamner advocated balancing modern recreational elements like cycling and walking while celebrating industrial heritage, including long-standing businesses and museums, and urged involving maritime partners to connect the area's past and future in the project.

Mr. Benetti affirmed the process included multiple public meetings, including personal meetings with businesses. He drew comparisons to Newport's working waterfront, where parking is an issue but industry attracts visitors, and proposed side streets for truck traffic, permit parking for businesses, and additional accommodations further down. Mr. Benetti reiterated phasing to manage costs and avoid harming businesses, offering his accessibility for further discussions.

Lucinda DiNovo added that the plan stemmed from a 2017 community-led process to celebrate the area's rich history, envisioning a waterfront like Astoria's with pedestrian/bike paths alongside industry. Ms. DiNovo highlighted safe access for interpretive panels, showcasing businesses like Koontz Machine with its historical displays, and Coos Bay Ironworks, while respecting current operations where Marshfield began. Ms. DiNovo praised the improved Port transparency and collaboration, stating she hoped for a supportive letter allowing the City to proceed without extra taxpayer costs.

Commissioners expressed appreciation for the City's urgency but noted challenges with the Port's parallel processes. Commissioners discussed a motion that would allow staff to move forward with research into the rails to trails and rail banking processes, tentatively in support of the City's Front Street Project. The motion's scope should encompass the full corridor through Coos Bay and North Bend (including Tribal involvement) while excluding the Swingspan Bridge due to separate federal processes.

Troy Cribbins clarified that the City remains in the design phase and sought a consensus or non-binding direction from the Commission indicating support for rail removal in the project area. Mr. Cribbins explained that such direction would allow the City to finalize designs without incorporating expensive rail accommodations such as ADA crossings, thereby avoiding unnecessary taxpayer costs on elements likely to change later.

Commissioners reiterated support for the project but emphasized due diligence, fiscal responsibility, and avoiding liabilities, suggesting 30 days for research on federal regulations. President Stevens highlighted the Port's long history of waterfront collaboration including the boardwalk vision, the importance of engaging maritime stakeholders, and balancing recreation with industrial heritage. The Commission reached consensus to direct Staff to research the legal requirements for the rail banking process, engage stakeholders, explore trail sponsorship, and collaborate with the City, with a follow-up report at the February meeting, potentially extending to March if needed.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Hamner (second by Commissioner ViksneHill), the Board of Commissioners motioned to empower staff to proceed over the next month with researching the Port's legal obligations, the required process for rail banking through the Surface Transportation Board, and related requirements, with the understanding that the Commission supports collaboration with the City of Coos Bay and directs Staff to examine the full corridor through Coos Bay and North Bend, including involvement of the Coquille Tribe. Staff is to return at the February 19, 2026 meeting with a detailed report and recommendations. **Motion Passed Unanimously.** (Ayes: Stevens, Edwards, ViksneHill, Hamner, and Roblan. Nays: None).

4. CONSENT ITEMS

- A. Approval of December 18, 2025 Regular Commission Meeting Minutes
- B. Approval of December Invoices

Commissioner Hamner requested that Staff include more detailed information in the minutes, especially regarding the rail discussion from the prior meeting. Commissioner Hamner stated the minutes serve as

a historical document, detailing how the Commission gathered information, deliberated on issues, analyzed data, and arrived at decisions.

Commissioner Hamner highlighted the comprehensive work done by Staff members that covered the history of traffic on the rail line, including the decline in business and the current status of the bridge. Ms. Comstock responded that staff will expand the relevant sections of the previous minutes to incorporate more of this background and detailed deliberation.

Minutes for the December 18, 2025 Regular Commission Meeting were not approved.

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

5. MANAGEMENT REPORTS

All Management Reports were included within the Meeting Packet.

President Stevens acknowledged the detail included in the Management Reports, and observed that most operations in Charleston appeared to be performing well overall.

President Stevens emphasized that public-facing items, such as the public restrooms, should receive higher priority for repairs and improvements whenever funding allows over non-public use areas. President Stevens stated that public amenities directly impact visitors and the community, making them important to address promptly. President Stevens mentioned that he had personally visited one of the facilities during the current crabbing season and had seen its condition firsthand. President Stevens expressed appreciation for staff flagging these issues in the report and encouraged continued focus on cleaning up and maintaining these public areas to enhance user experience.

6. ACTION ITEMS/REPORTS

A. FY 2024/25 Annual Financial Report

Baker Tilly has completed the annual financial report on behalf of the Oregon International Port of Coos Bay for fiscal year ending June 30, 2025.

The financial statements were presented in accordance with the financial reporting model in the Governmental Accounting Standard Board (GASB) Statement No.34.

There were no adjustments that had a material effect on the Port's reporting process. There were also no material weaknesses or reportable conditions for internal control, or any instances of non-compliance with the general-purpose financial statements.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Hamner (second by Commissioner ViksneHill), the Board of Commissioners motioned to approve the Annual Financial Report for Fiscal Year 2024/25. **Motion Passed Unanimously.** (Ayes: Stevens, Edwards, ViksneHill, Hamner, and Roblan. Nays: None).

B. Hub Building Suite 250 Lease Agreement

The Oregon International Port of Coos Bay was approached by Regional Solutions who is interested in leasing space within the Hub Building, Suite 250. This suite includes 650 square feet of interior space and 117 square feet of common space, for a total square footage of 767. The lease rate will be \$850.00 per month.

The initial term of the three-year commercial lease agreement will begin on February 1, 2026 and expire on January 31, 2029 with the Oregon Department of Administrative Services for the benefit of the Regional Solutions Center. The lease will include two (2) extension options of three (3) years each. The lease will incur a 3% CPI increase each year in February.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Edwards (second by Commissioner Hamner), the Board of Commissioners motioned to approve the execution of a three-year commercial lease agreement with two (2) extension options of three (3) years each with the Oregon Department of Administrative Services to lease Suite 250 in the Hub Building. **Motion Passed Unanimously.** (Ayes: Stevens, Edwards, ViksneHill, Hamner, and Roblan. Nays: None).

C. 2026Res01: Declaration of Emergency –Timber Bridge Repair at MP 730.54

On December 15, 2025, Port staff were notified by the staff of Coos Bay Rail Line of an immediate need to replace nine failing caps on the bridge at MP 730.54 which was affecting the useability and safety of the bridge. After consulting with CBRL's Railroad Bridge Engineer of Record, Stantec, the bridge was taken out of service on Friday, December 19, 2025.

Until permanent repairs were to be made, rail service would be interrupted. Without timely repairs, CBRL customers would have been without service for an excessive amount of time.

On December 16, 2025, Chief Executive Officer Lanelle Comstock declared an emergency and authorized the Port to enter into a sole source contract with Scott Partney Construction to perform the necessary repairs to resolve this emergency condition. Scott Partney Construction has extensive construction knowledge of timber bridge repairs, had the supplies needed, and had the ability and work force to repair the bridge in the time frame necessary to limit the rail down time. The contracted total price of the project was \$113,835.

Scott Partney Construction repaired the caps, and the bridge was placed back into service on January 2, 2026.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Roblan (second by Commissioner Edwards), the Board of Commissioners motioned to adopt resolution 2026Res01 ratifying the Declaration of Emergency for emergency cap replacement at bents #12, #27 through 30, and #33 through 36 on the timber bridge located at MP 730.54. **Motion Passed Unanimously.** (Ayes: Stevens, Edwards, ViksneHill, Hamner, and Roblan. Nays: None).

D. Appointment of FY 2026/27 Budget Officer

Oregon Local Budget Law (ORS 294.305 through 294.565) governs the preparation of the Port's annual budget. Pursuant to ORS 294.331, the Port Commission is required to designate one person to serve as the Budget Officer, who shall prepare or be responsible for preparing the budget document under the

direction of the Chief Executive Officer. The Budget Officer also presents a balanced budget to the budget committee, publishes all notices required by Local Budget Law, monitors budget expenditures during the budget year and notifies the governing body of the need to make any budget changes required after adoption.

Port staff recommends Megan Richardson, the Port's Director of Finance & Accounting, to be appointed as the Budget Officer for the fiscal year 2026/27 budget process.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Roblan (second by Commissioner Edwards), the Board of Commissioners motioned to approve the appointment of Megan Richardson, Director of Finance & Accounting, as the Budget Officer for the fiscal year 2026/27 budget process. **Motion Passed Unanimously.** (Ayes: Stevens, Edwards, ViksneHill, Hamner, and Roblan. Nays: None).

7. **OTHER**

A. Strategic Business Plan Public Comment Period

Ms. Comstock stated while preparing the background materials to bring the updated Strategic Business Plan to the Commission for adoption, she reviewed the adoption process from the previous plan in 2015 and noted that a two-week public comment period had been provided before final adoption. To align with past practices, and in response to community input, the Port will open a two-week public comment period starting immediately and closing on January 29, 2026. Staff will post clear submittal instructions on the Port's website and promote the opportunity through social media. All submitted comments would be collected, reviewed by staff, and compiled into a report for the Commission in February 2026. Ms. Comstock added that she planned to bring the Strategic Business Plan forward for formal adoption during the February 19, 2026 meeting after the Commission had the opportunity to review the public comments and any resulting adjustments.

B. CEO Updates

Ms. Comstock stated the City of Coos Bay, in partnership with the Port, applied for and was awarded a \$100,000 grant to conduct a study on the Port's property in Eastside to determine the feasibility of developing the property for housing. The City issued an RFP and awarded AKS Engineering. AKS presented their proposed scope and schedule of their project at the Coos Bay City Council Meeting, with video of that meeting available to view on the City's website. Ms. Comstock stated that AKS will be hosting three public meetings, including one open house in early February, regarding this process.

Ms. Comstock spoke about the Connect Oregon grant opportunity, which is now open. The Port hosted a meeting to discuss the scope of the work, which was attended by Gidding's Boatworks, including the potential buyers for Gidding's Boatworks, Tarheel Aluminum, a marine contractor who was there to provide their expertise, US Army Corps of Engineers to answer permitting questions, Commissioners Stevens and Edwards, Port Staff, and Senator David Brock Smith. Ms. Comstock stated it was a collaborative meeting, with consensus to focus the grant application on the Marine Ways and repairs to the Travel Lift slip. Staff is currently working on getting engineering designs and estimates and working on the application process which is due February 27, 2026.

Ms. Comstock stated she and Brian Early continue to meet with rail customers to discuss the rail's financial matters that were talked about in the December Commission meeting, and about demurrage. There was also a meeting scheduled with Union Pacific to discuss car hire.

Ms. Comstock stated at the December Commission meeting she indicated she would develop a plan for community advisory groups. Staff have met with Rob Holmlund, Development Director of the Humboldt Bay Harbor District, who has developed comprehensive and effective plans for community advisory groups. Mr. Holmlund has shared his plans, strategies, and guiding principles, which will be used as a template for the Port's own community advisory group efforts.

Ms. Comstock also noted that in November, Mr. Holmlund presented at SWOCC in a presentation titled "Work Development in Practice: Perspectives from Humboldt Bay," which focused on Humboldt Bay's proposed Offshore Wind and Heavy Lift Marine Terminal project and the associated community engagement efforts. Ms. Comstock further stated Mr. Holmlund will be hosting another virtual meeting on the same topic on January 22, 2026, from 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. She will forward the meeting information to the Commissioners so they may attend virtually. The meeting will likely include discussion of the Pacific Coast Intermodal Port (PCIP) project and community engagement.

Ms. Comstock stated that the Port has partnered with OIMB and will be getting two interns one day a week beginning on January 29, 2026 through March 12, 2026. One intern will work as a social media and content creator and will create content and marketing pieces that educate the community on Port operations and projects, property, and tourism. The other intern will facilitate a Charleston Marina interpretive signage project where they will develop and begin the project of placing the signage throughout the Charleston Marina Complex. The intern will research and apply for grant funding for the project, determine and create content and art for the signs utilizing OIMB students, determine placement of the signs throughout the Marina, and source signage, printing, and installation services. This project was outlined in the 2013 Charleston Marina Master Plan but was never adopted. Ms. Comstock stated this is a great partnership and grant funded opportunity for the Port to move forward with.

Ms. Comstock stated the Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan is about to go through its Phase 2 update. The Port holds a position on the Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan Steering Committee with Mr. Adamek representing the Port.

Ms. Comstock stated she is involved in the beginning stages of a Coos Bay mariculture working group, where stakeholders throughout the region are getting together to bring mariculture projects to Coos Bay, and stated she will present more on that as it progresses.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. Mike Graybill provided written testimony which is attached to the end of these minutes.

9. COMMISSION COMMENTS

Commissioner Edwards discussed the recent loss of a larger crab vessel in Charleston. On January 11, 2026, the fishing vessel Texas Lady dragged anchor and washed ashore. He acknowledged the outstanding response by Group North Bend, whose arrival time at Cape Blanco was 45 minutes in the middle of the night, describing it as amazing and noting that such quick response was essential for the

textbook rescue that followed. Commissioner Edwards detailed that the captain and his son were airlifted off the boat during heavy seas, the two dogs were also airlifted, and one crew member jumped into the water and swam ashore.

Commissioner Edwards commended the Sixes River Fire and Rescue and Port Orford Fire Department for their deployment. He expressed thoughts and prayers for the Leach family as they worked to remove the vessel from the beach and praised the community cleanup effort on Paradise Beach in Port Orford. Commissioner Edwards described how approximately 30 residents, along with state personnel, cleaned up foam and debris so effectively that it appeared as if nothing had happened. Commissioner Edwards noted that the F/V Texas Lady was a total loss.

Commissioner Roblan reported on his recent trip to Salem, where he testified before Senator Manning's committee the previous day. He stated the testimony was well received by committee members. Commissioner Roblan also highlighted that a financial statement is expected to be released in February, and expressed his willingness to share the information with interested parties and encouraged questions to be directed to any Port Commissioner. Commissioner Roblan noted he was pleased with the presentation and appreciated the opportunity to speak with familiar individuals, and stated that the testimony went well from the Port's perspective.

10. NEXT MEETING DATES

- A. PCIP Commission Meeting – Tuesday, February 3, 2026, 8:00 a.m.
- B. Regular Commission Meeting – Thursday, February 19, 2026, 11:00 a.m.

11. ADJOURN

President Stevens adjourned the meeting at 12:48 p.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;
- (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; and
- (j) carry on negotiations under ORS Chapter 293 with private persons or businesses regarding proposed acquisition, exchange or liquidation of public investments.

Oral testimony of Michael Graybill before the Coos Bay Port Commission

15 January 2026

Earlier this week two contractors and one member of the port commission appeared before a 5-member senate committee to provide an informational update on the Pacific Coast Intermodal Port Project (PCIP)

Correspondence before the meeting and testimony at the meeting focused on correcting what was characterized as misinformation.

Pointed testimony at the meeting accused the League of Women Voters as providing false or misleading information about the PCIP project.

Testimony made it clear that planning for the project was still preliminary and that over \$100 million of additional planning work for the terminal and rail line was yet to begin.

There was one glaring inconsistency included in the port's presentation that is fundamental to the entire project: that is the design capacity of the terminal. A port slide stated that the capacity of the terminal is to be 1.2 million TEU's per year

Yet documents submitted to the US Army Corps of Engineers clearly state the capacity is to be 2 million TEU's.

That is a variance of 800,000 TEU's per year!

My first question to this commission is WHICH IS IT?

Let's get this clear so we can all evaluate this proposal from a common factual basis.

My second point relates to the estimated cost of the PCIP project.

I have previously submitted testimony to this body. I have not received a reply to this request for clarification and am looking forward to getting clarity on these questions.

At the hearing the state senator from this district told the seated sub committee members and all others present that the cost estimate of \$4.36 billion as presented in recent reporting and informational forums was false, a fabrication, a lie.

I submit for your review and for the record table 32 from port documents submitted to the US Army Corps of Engineers in May 2024.

You will note that the project cost is \$4.36 billion.

I would hope that the two contractors and one commission member providing information at the Senate hearing are aware of the information in Table 32

Yet they sat in silence while the representative of this district demonstrated his lack of understanding of the project's cost.

My question to the commission is: **Will the port commission provide clarifying information to our state senator and to the members of the sub committee to correct the information he is using to characterize the PCIP proposal?**

Another one of the contracts that this commission awarded was to JLA. The purpose of that contract was to gather public perspectives on the PICP proposal.

The bottom line of that contract was to move beyond promotion and move forward with objective factual information about the PCIP

I'm all for that. Let's get on with it.