

Coos County Urban Renewal Agency Board Meeting

Thursday, May 28, 2026, 7:30am

125 W. Central Ave, Suite 230, Coos Bay, OR 97420
Port of Coos Bay Commission Chambers

**COOS COUNTY URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY
NORTH BAY DISTRICT**

125 West Central Avenue, Suite 300 • Coos Bay, Oregon 97420 • 541-267-7678

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Coos County Urban Renewal Agency Board
and all Interested Parties

FROM: Lanelle Comstock, Agency Administrator

DATE: May 21, 2026

SUBJECT: CCURA Board Meeting Notice

NOTICE OF REGULAR CCURA BOARD MEETING

The Board of Directors of the Coos County Urban Renewal Agency – North Bay District, Coos County, State of Oregon, will hold a regular Board Meeting and Budget Hearing on **Thursday, May 28, 2026 at 7:30 a.m.** in the Port of Coos Bay’s Commission Chambers located at 125 West Central Avenue, Suite 230, Coos Bay, OR 97420.

The purpose of the hearing is to discuss with interested persons the FY 2026/27 budget as approved by the Coos County Urban Renewal Agency’s Budget Committee. Copies of the budget document may be inspected or obtained at www.portofcoosbay.com/coos-county-urban-renewal-agency or by calling the Port’s Administrative office at 541-267-7678.

Members of the public are invited to attend the meeting in person or view the meeting live on the Port of Coos Bay’s YouTube Channel at the following link: www.youtube.com/portcoos.

Members of the public may provide public comment in person, via Zoom, or in writing. If members of the public would like to provide public comment during the meeting via Zoom, please call the Port’s Administrative office at 541-267-7678 by 3:00 p.m. on Wednesday, May 27, 2026. Written comment will be accepted until 3:00 p.m. on Wednesday, May 27, 2026, by sending an email to portcoos@portofcoosbay.com with the subject line ‘Public Comment’.

LC/cs

**COOS COUNTY URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY
REGULAR BOARD MEETING
Thursday, May 28, 2026, 7:30 a.m.**

Port of Coos Bay Commission Chambers, 125 West Central Avenue, Suite 230, Coos Bay, Oregon 97420
Watch Live on YouTube: www.youtube.com/portcoos

TENTATIVE AGENDA

1. **CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

2. **INTRODUCTION OF BOARD MEMBERS AND GUESTS**

3. **CONSENT ITEMS**
 - A. Approval of December 11, 2025 Regular Board Meeting Minutes 5
 - B. Approval of May 6, 2026 Budget Committee Meeting Minutes 7

4. **OPEN BUDGET HEARING – FY 2026/27 BUDGET**

5. **BUDGET HEARING – FY 2026/27 BUDGET**
 - A. Public Hearing
 - B. Review of Budget Document

6. **CLOSE BUDGET HEARING – FY 2026/27 BUDGET**

7. **OPEN BOARD MEETING**

8. **ACTION ITEMS**
 - A. 2026Res01: Adopting a Budget, Making Appropriations, Imposing and Categorizing Taxes –
Combined for Fiscal Year 2026/27..... Megan Richardson, 11

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

10. **SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING DATE** – To Be Determined

11. **OTHER/ADJOURN**

Consent Items

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

7:30 a.m. Thursday, December 11, 2025

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

Meetings are broadcast live on [YouTube](#). Hyperlinks below redirect to recording.

ATTENDANCE

Agency Board Members: Todd Goergen, At Large (Chair); Elise Hamner, Port Commissioner; Kyle Stevens, Port Commissioner; Jessica Engelke, City of North Bend; Lucinda DiNovo, City of Coos Bay; Joe Benetti, City of Coos Bay; John Sweet, Coos County; and Drew Farmer, Coos County. Absent: Matt Hamilton, City of North Bend.

Guests: Lanelle Comstock, Port Staff; Rick Adamek, Port Staff; Ray Dwire, Port Staff; Krystal Karcher, Port Staff; Christina Sanders, Port Staff; Paul Slater, Coos County; Colton Totland, Coos County; and Rod Taylor, Coos County.

1. [Call Meeting to Order](#)

Chair Todd Goergen called the meeting to order at 7:33 a.m.

2. Introduction of Board Members And Guests

3. [Consent Items](#)

A. Approval of July 30, 2025 Regular Board Meeting Minutes

Upon a motion by John Sweet (Second by Elise Hamner), the Agency Board Members voted to approve the July 30, 2025 Regular Board Meeting Minutes. **Motion Passed Unanimously.** (Ayes: Benetti, DiNovo, Engelke, Farmer, Goergen, and Hamner, Nays: None. Absent: Hamilton.).

4. [Discussion Items](#)

A. Transpacific Parkway Project Update

John Sweet presented the draft Request for Proposals (RFP) for a consultant to oversee the engineering, design, environmental compliance, public engagement, and coordination work for the project on the Transpacific Parkway. Mr. Sweet explained that the County Road Department had prepared the RFP and wanted feedback from the Board to ensure it reflected shared expectations while maintaining County/URA control over the process.

Elise Hamner asked what the maximum indebtedness limit is and where the Agency is right now. Lanelle Comstock stated the current indebtedness limit is \$37,200,000, with the CCURA set to expire in 2038. At the time the budget was approved, approximately \$8.3 million was available, including \$7 million allocated toward capital outlay and \$885,000 was allocated for this professional services RFP. Actual cash on hand was approximately \$2.8 million, with plans to secure a \$5 million loan to reach the budgeted total. Current outstanding debt was expected to be paid off by July 2026 with the remaining debt service amount of \$5,424. The Board noted the importance of maintaining some level of indebtedness to preserve URA functionality, and Staff indicated they would pursue the planned loan or, if necessary, a small interim loan to bridge any timing gaps.

Ms. Hamner asked Paul Slater about the contractor that is selected interacting with adjacent property owners and what Mr. Slater's expectations are. Mr. Slater noted that larger adjacent property owners such as the Port and major companies could be coordinated with directly, while recreational users and the general public would be engaged through a series of public input meetings. Mr. Slater anticipated that qualified proposing firms would be large engineering companies experienced in major transportation projects, likely partnering with local civil, survey, or public involvement specialists.

Chair Goergen asked how much activity would actually need to exceed or be outside of the existing rights-of-way. Mr. Slater explained that most improvements were expected to fit within the existing right-of-way, though limited additional right-of-way might be needed in specific areas such as turn lanes at the US 101 intersection, near Boxcar Campground, at major business accesses, and possibly at the railroad crossing to bring it up to current standards, and the BLM boat ramp.

Mr. Sweet asked about drainage which Mr. Slater has identified as a major focus, including upgrading some large existing pipe (6–7 feet in diameter near the old Weyerhaeuser ponds) to meet modern fish passage and stormwater requirements, as well as addressing known flooding issues in several locations along the route. The Menasha Bridge was reported to be in good condition, with only minor potential improvements such as guardrail end treatments anticipated.

Lucinda DiNovo asked about environmental services referenced in Task 8 of the RFP, specifically whether an archaeological baseline report would include consultation with local tribes. Mr. Slater confirmed that consultation with the tribes and coordination with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) would definitely occur.

Board Members reiterated the need to finalize financing arrangements to maintain URA indebtedness after the current debt is paid off in July 2026. Staff indicated they would begin working on the loan process, with potential follow-up at a future meeting.

Ms. DiNovo raised the importance of public communication about the significant and exciting project and asked how that would be communicated to the public. The Board agreed that Port Staff should prepare a memo and press release for local media, post information on appropriate websites, and promote the RFP issuance to generate interest and attract strong consultant proposals. External Affairs staff were tasked with coordinating with County personnel to include supportive quotes from Commissioners.

Chair Goergen declared a conflict of interest for the record, stating that his family owns a large adjacent property and he would abstain from any votes related to the project.

Upon a motion by Drew Farmer (Second by Joe Benetti), the Agency Board Members voted to approve the Request for Proposals for the Transpacific Parkway project with minor revisions pending County review. **Motion Passed 7-0-1.** (Ayes: Benetti, DiNovo, Engelke, Farmer, and Hamner. Nays: None. Absent: Hamilton. Abstain: Goergen).

5. **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

6. **Schedule Next Meeting Date**

Doodle Poll for next meeting date.

7. **Other/Adjourn**

Chair Todd Goergen adjourned the meeting at 7:52 a.m.

DRAFT MINUTES
COOS COUNTY URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY
BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING
Wednesday, May 6, 2026, 7:30 a.m.

Port of Coos Bay Commission Chambers, 125 W. Central Ave, Suite 230, Coos Bay, OR 97420

Meetings are broadcast live on [YouTube](#). Hyperlinks below redirect to recording.

ATTENDANCE

Agency Board Members: Chair Todd Goergen; Jessica Engelke, City of North Bend; Matt Hamilton, City of North Bend; Joe Benetti, City of Coos Bay; Lucinda DiNovo, City of Coos Bay; Elise Hamner, Port of Coos Bay; Kyle Stevens, Port of Coos Bay; Drew Farmer, Coos County; and John Sweet, Coos County.

Budget Committee Members: Ed Ellingsen; A. LaMar Hoy; Rod Taylor; Timm Slater; and Jayson Wartnik. Rosey Thomas; George Wales; and Jeff Bunnell were absent.

Guests: Lanelle Comstock, Port Staff; Megan Richardson, Port Staff; Ray Dwire, Port Staff; Rick Adamek, Port Staff; Krystal Karcher, Port Staff; Mary Green, Port Staff; and Christina Sanders, Port Staff.

1. [Call Meeting to Order](#)

Todd Goergen called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.

2. [Introduction of Board Members and Guests](#)

3. [Selection of Budget Committee Chair](#)

Upon a motion by John Sweet (second by Joe Benetti), the Budget Committee Members voted to appoint Todd Goergen as the Budget Committee Chair. **Motion Passed Unanimously.** (Ayes: Benetti, DiNovo, Ellingsen, Engelke, Farmer, Goergen, Hamilton, Hamner, Slater, Stevens, Sweet, Taylor, and Wartnik. Nays: None. Absent: Bunnell, Hoy, Thomas, and Wales.)

4. [Review FY 2026/27 Budget Document](#)

Megan Richardson reviewed the proposed budget document for FY 2026/27. Available cash on hand, at the time of publication, is \$2,920,898. Estimated previously levied taxes to be received total \$8,000. Interest earnings are budgeted at \$95,000 and tax increment revenues total \$428,383. Resources for FY 2026/27, with taxes, total \$3,452,281.

The budget for expenses includes supplies, insurance, publications and advertising, legal counsel, management, audit, and professional services. Total expenses for materials and services are \$883,500, with current debt service budgeted at \$5,212. This is the last debt service payment on this loan; then it will be complete. Budgeted expenditures total \$888,712. The unappropriated ending fund balance is \$2,563,569, for a total of \$3,452,281.

Ms. Richardson provided the Committee with an email showing the estimate that Paul Slater sent regarding the amount Coos County would charge in addition to the contract for the engineering and design. She stated the County is charging for direct hours, totaling approximately \$10,000, and a 15% markup fee for processing. This information was not included in the published budget, as it was not available to Ms. Richardson then. She explained the line item under Expenditure for Management Fee was originally budgeted at \$40,000, which included \$15,000 for the Port, with the remainder being for Coos County. Ms. Richardson stated she is not confident that amount will be sufficient to cover the upcoming fiscal year based on the email from Mr. Slater. Based on the 15% and Mr. Slater's \$10,000 estimate, Ms. Richardson proposed to increase the Management line item under Materials and Services by \$105,000, for a total of \$145,000, to cover what the estimate is for the project. Total Materials and Services changed to \$988,500, Total Expenditures to \$993,712, and the Unappropriated Ending Fund Balance would then be reduced to \$2,458,569.

Elise Hamner asked to discuss the changes more in depth, including the project cost and when it would be spent. Ms. Richardson stated that, according to the email from Mr. Slater, an engineering and design contract has already been signed with David Evans and Associates, and approximately \$314,000 will be spent this fiscal year. In fiscal year 2026/27, approximately \$761,000 will be spent, and in fiscal year 2027/28, approximately \$719,000 will be spent. There is also an additional approximate \$10,000 that is directly billed by the County, and an additional approximate \$10,000 will be billed for the third year as well. Mr. Slater noted that the project is scheduled to go to bid in the spring of 2028, with construction beginning that year. The Committee discussed the project's progression and timeline, emphasizing that the road work would proceed regardless of the container terminal's status, though certain elements, like rail crossings, might be impacted.

Jayson Wartnik asked about the beginning cash balance presented in the budget document, requesting clarification on how the figure corresponds to year-to-date activity and whether any internal estimates were applied. Ms. Richardson explained the figure of \$2,920,898 represented the cash balance as of the time of publication and that no specific increases were projected, noting that the Agency earns nominal monthly interest. Ms. Richardson further clarified that the Agency operates on a cash-based accounting system and acknowledged that the available starting balance could decrease by \$314,000, which would be a cautious approach if the Committee was worried about the Unappropriated Ending Fund balance and wanted to offset any outstanding engineering and design bills that haven't been paid yet. The Committee agreed to reduce the available cash on hand by \$314,000, which is what has been estimated will be paid out this fiscal year.

Mr. Wartnik asked for clarification on the total calculations reflected in the budget, stating that the beginning balance should represent the current cash position adjusted for anticipated activity over the remaining three months of the fiscal year. Ms. Richardson responded that while the beginning balance should be refined for accuracy, the unappropriated ending balance is not being spent, and the proposed budget includes enough revenue to cover anticipated expenditures and does not present a risk of a funding shortfall for the upcoming fiscal year.

Ms. Richardson went over the updated budget document, starting with the decrease in available cash on hand, changed to \$2,561,898, assuming that the estimate Mr. Slater provided gets paid. The changes to the expenses included increasing the Materials and Services Management line to \$145,000, bringing the Total Resources balance to \$3,093,569. Total Expenditures increased to \$993,712, and the Unappropriated Ending Fund Balance decreased to \$2,099,569, bringing the total balance to \$3,093,569.

The Committee discussed scheduling a separate meeting with David Evans and Associates to discuss the design process, answer questions, and provide a breakdown of the different phases of the project. Mr. Slater provided an email to Ms. Richardson that was shared with the Committee regarding the schedule.

5. [Public/Committee Comment](#)

There were no members of the public present to provide comments.

Joe Benetti suggested incorporating a bike path into the Parkway project design, noting potential tourism value and compatibility with existing trail systems. The Committee discussed concerns regarding safety and the mix of industrial traffic with recreational use; however, there was general agreement to explore the feasibility of the path during the design phase. Committee members discussed whether a bike path should be a core project expense or if it should be pursued via outside grants to avoid burdening local taxpayers. It was suggested that once a project cost for the roadway is established, seeking grant funding for such an amenity would be more feasible. Committee members reiterated the necessity of reviewing the David Evans and Associates contract to better understand the project's phasing and scope.

Ms. Richardson went over the updated budget document, starting with the decrease in available cash on hand, changed to \$2,561,898, assuming that the estimate Mr. Slater provided gets paid. The changes to the expenses included increasing the Materials and Services Management line to \$145,000, bringing the Total Resources balance to \$3,093,281. Total Expenditures increased to \$993,712, and the Unappropriated Ending Fund Balance decreased to \$2,099,569, bringing the total balance to \$3,093,281.

6. [Present The Motion To Recommend The Budget, Or Schedule A Follow Up Meeting](#)

Upon a motion by Jayson Wartnik (second by Rod Taylor), the Budget Committee Members voted to approve the proposed budget for the Fiscal Year 2026/27 with revisions to account for an estimated \$359,000 in engineering and design contract payments, a corresponding reduction to the available cash on hand, and forward to the Coos County Urban Renewal Agency Board of Directors for adoption. **Motion Passed Unanimously.** (Ayes: Benetti, DiNovo, Ellingsen, Engelke, Farmer, Goergen, Hamilton, Hamner, Hoy, Slater, Sweet, Taylor, and Wartnik. Nays: None. Absent: Bunnell, Stevens, Thomas, and Wales.)

Upon a motion by Joe Benetti (second by John Sweet), the Budget Committee Members voted to approve the certification to the County Assessor of a request for the maximum amount of revenue that may be raised by dividing the taxes under Section 1c, Article IX of the Oregon Constitution. **Motion Passed Unanimously.** (Ayes: Benetti, DiNovo, Ellingsen, Engelke, Farmer, Goergen, Hamilton, Hamner, Hoy, Slater, Sweet, Taylor, and Wartnik. Nays: None. Absent: Bunnell, Stevens, Thomas, and Wales.)

7. [Adjourn](#)

Todd Goergen adjourned the meeting at 8:24 a.m.

Action Items

**COOS COUNTY URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY
NORTH BAY DISTRICT
RESOLUTION 2026Res01**

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Coos County Urban Renewal Agency (North Bay District) hereby adopts the budget approved by the budget committee for fiscal year 2026/2027 in the sum of \$ 3,093,281.00 now on file at the Agency Office.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the amounts for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and for the purposes shown below are appropriated as follows:

<u>GENERAL FUND</u>		
Materials & Services	\$	988,500.00
Debt Service	\$	5,212.00
Capital Outlay	\$	-
Total Transfers to Other Funds	\$	-
Operating Contingency	\$	-
Total General Fund		<u>\$ 993,712.00</u>
 <u>UNAPPROPRIATED ENDING FUND BALANCE</u>		
General Fund	\$	2,099,569.00
Special Revenue Fund	\$	-
Special Reserve Fund	\$	-
Capital Fund	\$	-
Total Unappropriated Ending Fund Balance		<u>\$ 2,099,569.00</u>
 <u>TOTAL BUDGET</u>		 <u>\$ 3,093,281.00</u>

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Agency Board of the Coos County Urban Renewal Agency hereby resolves to certifies to the County Assessor for the North Bay District a request for the maximum amount of revenue that may be raised by dividing the taxes under Section 1c, Article IX of the Oregon Constitution.

The foregoing resolution was approved and duly adopted this 28th day of May 2026 by the Agency Board of the Coos County Urban Renewal Agency, North Bay District.

Todd Goergen, Chairman
Coos County Urban Renewal Agency

Kyle Stevens
Coos County Urban Renewal Agency

RESOURCES
GENERAL FUND
COOS COUNTY URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY - NORTH BAY DISTRICT

	HISTORICAL DATA			RESOURCE DESCRIPTION	Budget			
	ACTUAL		Adopted Budget This Year 25/26		Fiscal Year 2026/27			
	Second Preceding Year 23/24	First Preceding Year 24/25			PROPOSED BY BUDGET OFFICER	APPROVED BY BUDGET COMMITTEE	ADOPTED BY GOVERNING BODY	
1				1 BEGINNING FUND BALANCE:				1
2	1,917,337	2,397,352	2,878,000	2 * AVAILABLE CASH ON HAND (CASH BASIS),OR	2,920,898	2,561,898		2
3				3 * NET WORKING CAPITAL (ACCRUAL BASIS)				3
4	5,864	8,380	8,000	4 PREVIOUSLY LEVIED TAXES EST. TO BE RECEIVED	8,000	8,000		4
5	107,392	130,346	50,000	5 INTEREST	95,000	95,000		5
6	390,140	408,807	434,646	TAX INCREMENT REVENUES	428,383	428,383		6
7				6 MISCELLANEOUS				7
8				7 OTHER RESOURCES				8
9			-	8 GRANTS	-			9
10			5,000,000	9 LOAN PROCEEDS	-			10
11			-	10 TRANSFER FROM SPECIAL REVENUE FUND				11
12				11				12
13				12				13
14				13				14
15				14				15
16				15				16
17				16				17
18				17				18
19				18				19
20				19				20
21				20				21
22				21				22
23				22				23
24				23				24
25				24				25
26				25				26
27				26				27
28				27				28
29				28				29
30				29				30
31	\$ 2,420,733	\$ 2,944,884	\$ 8,370,646	30 TOTAL RESOURCES, EXCEPT TAXES TO BE LEVIED	\$ 3,023,898	\$ 2,664,898	\$ -	31
32				31 TAXES NECESSARY TO BALANCE BUDGET	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	32
33				32 TAXES COLLECTED IN YEAR LEVIED	\$ 428,383	\$ 428,383	\$ -	33
34	\$ 2,420,733	\$ 2,944,884	\$ 8,370,646	33 TOTAL RESOURCES	\$ 3,452,281	\$ 3,093,281	\$ -	34

DETAILED EXPENDITURES
 GENERAL FUND
 COOS COUNTY URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY-NORTH BAY DISTRICT

	HISTORICAL DATA			EXPENDITURE DESCRIPTION	Budget			
	ACTUAL		Adopted Budget This Year 25/26		Fiscal Year 2026/27			
	Second Preceding Year 23/24	First Preceding Year 24/25			PROPOSED BY BUDGET OFFICER	APPROVED BY BUDGET COMMITTEE	ADOPTED BY GOVERNING BODY	
1				1 MATERIALS AND SERVICES				1
2	970	1,069	1,000	2 SUPPLIES	1,500	1,500		2
3	2,044	706	3,000	3 INSURANCE	3,000	3,000		3
4	177	200	1,000	4 PUBLICATIONS AND ADVERTISING	1,000	1,000		4
5	0	0	6,000	5 LEGAL COUNSEL	6,000	6,000		5
6	15,000	15,000	15,000	6 MANAGEMENT	40,000	145,000		6
7	730	40	1,500	7 AUDIT	25,000	25,000		7
8	164	151	200	8 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES - Agency Operations	7,000	7,000		8
9	0	945	885,522	9 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES - Project Support	800,000	800,000		9
10	\$ 19,085	\$ 18,112	\$ 913,222	10 TOTAL MATERIALS AND SERVICES	\$ 883,500	\$ 988,500	\$ -	10
11				11				11
12				12				12
13				13				13
14				14				14
15				15				15
16			7,000,000	16 TOTAL CAPITAL OUTLAY	0			16
17				17 TOTAL TRANSFERS TO OTHER FUNDS	0	0	0	17
18				18				18
19				19				19
20				20 OPERATING CONTINGENCY				20
21				21				21
22	5,811	5,610	5,424	22 DEBT SERVICE - Umpqua	5,212	5,212		22
23				23 DEBT SERVICE - New Project	0	0	0	23
24				24				24
25	\$ 24,896	\$ 23,722	\$ 918,646	25 TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$ 888,712	\$ 993,712	\$ -	25
26	\$ 2,395,837	\$ 2,921,163	\$ 7,452,000	26 UNAPPROPRIATED ENDING FUND BALANCE	\$ 2,563,569	2,099,569.00	0.00	26
27	\$ 2,420,733	\$ 2,944,884	\$ 8,370,646	27 TOTAL	\$ 3,452,281	\$ 3,093,281	\$ -	27