

**COOS COUNTY URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY
REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

1:00 P.M. Friday, October 19, 2018

Port of Coos Bay Conference Room, 125 Central Avenue, Suite 230, Coos Bay, Oregon 97420

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Agency Board Members:

Chairman Todd Goergen, At Large; Eric Farm, Port Commissioner; Brianna Hanson, Port Commissioner; Mike Erbele, City of North Bend; Joe Benetti, City of Coos Bay; John Sweet, Coos County; Melissa Cribbins, Coos County; and Nathan McClintock, Legal Counsel

Guests:

John Burns, Port Staff; Megan Richardson, Port Staff; and Krystal Moffett, Port Staff.

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chair Todd Goergen called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

2. INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

3. CONSENT ITEMS

A. Approval of May 30, 2018 Regular Board Meeting & Budget Hearing Minutes

Upon a motion by John Sweet (Second by Eric Farm), the Agency Board Members voted to approve the May 30, 2018 Regular Board Meeting & Budget Hearing Minutes. **Motion Passed**

4. ACTION ITEMS

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Transpacific Parkway Drainage Issue

John Sweet presented to the Board information regarding the drainage issue on Transpacific Parkway, towards the south end. Mr. Sweet visited the site recently with the County roadmaster

and surveyor. Mr. Sweet referenced the pictures in a slideshow, where there appears to be a natural drainage. Mr. Sweet stated the pictures must have been taken in the wintertime, as there is quite a bit of water on the roadway. The standing water covers part of the road as you approach DB Western. The natural drainage through the willows and other vegetation, just to the west side of that road, is not obvious and comes from quite a ways up the road. As the water gets to the end of the road it empties into a large depression, then there is a pipe underneath the road that continues to an outfall in the bay. That pipe had been repaired at some point, and there is a small amount of water that seeps out but most of the water just doesn't get there. There are two main points of blockage. To the west of the road, there is a lower area with brush and a culvert pipe that connects to the larger pipe, (Reference picture C.) At the first point of obstruction, people riding ATV's through the area have caused sand to blow and build up, (reference picture A). This area is approximately 30 feet wide by 60 feet long and about 4 feet deep that needs to be removed; a total of 270 yards of sand there.

Mr. Sweet spoke about a safety issue in picture A with people firing rifles into the bank and the limited line of sight. On his recent visit, Mr. Sweet observed spent shell casings.

The next point of obstruction (reference picture B), there is quite a bit more sand there; a distance of about 180 feet and would likely need to dig out a ditch 30 feet wide, for a total of 900 yards. The next point (reference picture C) is the turnaround area and there is a large depression there that most of the water aggregates in. There is a culvert there with an open end back into a pond. The culvert was cut at one point in time, though it still serves its function, if the ditch is maintained. Currently sand has backed up into both open ends of the culvert so only about two thirds is available for drainage.

Mr. Sweet spoke of the need to clear the points of obstruction to increase the drainage capacity; that most of the problem is on Port property. People using Port property, both legally and illegally, have contributed to the problem. Mr. Sweet recommended using Urban Renewal funds to clear the pathways where the natural flow is obstructed. Mike Erbele asked if it would be wise to install a culvert. Melissa Cribbins stated a culvert would be easier to maintain than a fence. Mr. Sweet spoke of boulders being placed in the area, though it didn't take long for people to move them. Brianna Hanson asked whose jurisdiction it would be to put in boulders or other barriers. Mr. Sweet stated he would need to ask the County road department. Todd Goergen asked what permits would be required, or if there would be any wetland issues. Eric Farm stated even doing good work trying to alleviate a problem, there would still need to be the proper permits in place. John Burns stated the Port could take the lead and reach out to the agencies to see what requirements there would be. Ms. Hanson pointed out the contractors who would do the work might also have good information and would provide a scope of work. Mr. Sweet spoke of his frustration with the length of time taken to address this problem. Ms. Hanson asked if there was a permit in place already for the outfall, and whether the work could be maintenance under that permit. Mr. Sweet stated that he is not sure whose outfall it is. Mr. Goergen asked whether the drainage system was put in when the road was extended. Mr. Sweet stated the drainage is natural, and the pipe and outfall preceded the road.

Mr. Goergen spoke of the two issues at stake; there is something endangering a public asset (the road) as well as a public safety issue. Ms. Hanson spoke of the safety issue and asked about putting

signs at the beginning of the road. Mr. Burns confirmed signs have been placed in the past, but people shoot the signs. Mr. Farm asked about passing a policy, possibly stating that shooting is allowed only if posted, essentially taking away the incentive to shoot the signs. Then if there are no signs expressly permitting it, it would be prohibited.

Mr. Sweet shared his recommendation to just dig it out and see if that is sufficient before going to the expense of a culvert. Mr. Sweet asked if this needed a motion. Mr. Goergen confirmed that consensus is for the Port to follow up if permits are needed before proceeding with work. Mr. Erbele spoke of needing a cost estimate with and without a culvert. Mr. Erbele stated if the cost of the culvert is not too much and it would have to be dug out a second time to install it later, it only makes sense to install it the first time.

Mr. Goergen asked if the Board would entertain a motion. Mr. Sweet moved for the Port to take care of the drainage issue on behalf of the URA. Mr. Farm seconded to open discussion, then questioned if more information was needed before making a motion. Mr. Goergen confirmed that once the Port has the information, the Board needs to reconvene in a timely manner to take action.

Mr. Goergen asked for the motion to be rephrased or restated. Mr. Sweet moved to authorize the Port to obtain a permit to open the ditch, and to excavate the areas of obstruction in order to restore drainage with the option to add culverts if needed. Mr. Farm seconded, with the stipulation added to bring a plan back to the Board for approval prior to execution. Mr. Sweet agreed, stipulating it should be no later than the end of the month. Ms. Cribbins asked for clarification of the motion. It was read back from minutes, and Mr. Goergen stipulated that execution of work is contingent upon Board approval of the cost.

Mr. Goergen asked for any further discussion or questions. There being none, Mr. Goergen called for a vote on the motion. **Motion Passed.**

7. SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting date will be determined, likely a conference call before the end of the month.

8. OTHER/ADJOURN

Mr. Goergen spoke briefly about ballot measure 6-168. Mr. Goergen shared that he wrote a letter to the editor that concisely explains the URA and how it is funded. Mr. Goergen encouraged everyone to vote and for anyone who has questions to please ask him.

Chair Todd Goergen adjourned the meeting at 1:37 p.m.