

MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY COUNCIL

June 28, 2022

The minutes of the proceedings of a City Council and Urban Renewal work session of the City of Coos Bay, Coos County, Oregon, held at 5:30 pm in Council Chambers, 500 Central Avenue, Coos Bay, Oregon.

Those Attending

Those present were Council President Rob Miles and Councilors Lucinda DiNovo and Stephanie Kilmer. Mayor Joe Benetti and Councilor Sara Stephens attended remotely by teleconference. Councilors Drew Farmer and Carmen Matthews were absent. City staff present were City Manager Rodger Craddock, City Attorney Nate McClintock, Assistant City Manager Nichole Rutherford, Finance Director Melissa Olson, Public Works and Community Development Director Jim Hossley, Deputy Public Works and Community Development Director/City Engineer Jennifer Wirsing, and Police Chief Chris Chapanar. City staff attending remotely by teleconference was Community Development Administrator Carolyn Johnson.

Flag Salute

Councilor President Rob Miles opened the meeting and led the council and assembly in the salute to the flag.

Review of the Upcoming City Council and URA Board Action Items:

Discussion with Representative from Tesla Regarding Electric Vehicle Supercharger Station

Deputy Public Works and Community Development Director/City Engineer Jennifer Wirsing stated at the May 17, 2022 meeting, Council directed staff to move forward with the investigation of installing a Tesla Electric Vehicle Supercharger Station at the public parking lot located at S 4th Street and Curtis Avenue. Council also requested a Tesla representative attend a work session so they could learn more about this program. Should Council want to move forward, Tesla had identified the next steps: staff would work with Tesla to complete a draft agreement, staff would present agreement to Council for approval, and upon approval of the agreement, Tesla would work with Pacific Power to understand the improvements required, if any, to upgrade the electrical to service the EV charging station. According to Tesla approximately 20-25% of the initial locations identified end up not being viable or need to be amended. This could be for a variety of reasons; however, any amendment and/or modification to the agreement would be presented to Council for approval.

Tesla representative Alex Schoknecht was available to answer questions and stated the Supercharger Station would be compatible with non-Tesla vehicles, the pricing to use a Supercharger would be more than home service, the goal was for driving an electric vehicle to be less than driving a similar gas vehicle, and the average time for a charge was thirty minutes.

Presentation by Neighbor Works Umpqua Regarding Coos Bay CDBG Residential Home Repair Program

Public Works and Community Development Director Jim Hossley stated in August of 2020, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds for a Regional Housing Rehabilitation Program (Program) were awarded with \$400,000 for rehabilitation of stick-built homes or manufactured homes on fee-simple land and another \$100,000 for rehabilitation of manufactured homes in manufactured home parks located in Coos Bay, Reedsport, and Coos County. Funds of \$15,000 maximum per project have been made available for owner-occupied households at or below the federal low-moderate income limits (80% of the area medium income), adjusted for family size. The City Council agreed for the city to act as the Program's lead agency (grantee). The program required authorization of individual grants by the city. City staff time had been expended for that effort. However, Neighbor Works Umpqua (NWU) as the sub-grantee handled the bulk of the day-to-day operational program administration. NWU Home Repair Department assists very low-, low- and moderate-income families with grants for home repair to conserve the existing housing supply, encourages maintenance of existing residential neighborhoods, stimulate investment, and improves the general housing conditions of the region. NWU has a long track record of administering and completing home repairs in Southwestern Oregon with 100 + homes repaired since 2015. Typical non-cosmetic repairs correct life/health/safety issues (plumbing, dry rot repair, mold remediation, indoor air quality, sewer or water connections), improves accessibility (widening doorways, building ramps, installing grab bars), and repair or sometimes replacing critical home components (roofs, heating/ventilation/cooling systems, windows, foundations, deteriorated siding, etc).

NWU staff Robert Whitsell and Erica Mills presented the program status; stated to date thirty-one family homes were repaired and thanked everyone who was involved in the projects. Cheryl Bularz, North Bend stated she was very grateful for the program and Coos Bay for being there for her.

Review of Official Canvass of Votes - May 2022 Election Results

Assistant City Manager Nichole Rutherford stated the Charter of the City of Coos Bay dictated the results of elections be made a matter of record in the journal of Council proceedings. This recording shall include:

Total Ballots Cast: 4,159

Total Registered Voters: 11,166

Total Votes Cast: 4,015

Total Votes For/Against Ballot Measure 6-196: Yes 1,584; No 2,431

Measure(s) Enacted or Approved: None

Establishment of a Multi-Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTE) Program

City Manager Rodger Craddock stated one of the Council's goals was to increase housing supply. A number of other Oregon cities have enacted a multi-unit property tax exemption (MUPTE) program in an effort to stimulate higher density housing projects in their cities. City

staff believed such a program was needed to increase rental housing units in Coos Bay. The City of Coos Bay has been working to find solutions to the ongoing housing crisis. In 2020, with the support of the City Council and Planning Commission, the City completed a Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) which revealed Coos Bay needs at least 604 new housing dwellings over the next twenty years to keep up with the estimated pace of population growth. Since the completion of the HNA in 2020, there have been a reported reduction in rentals in Coos Bay in part due to the increased state rental related regulations and the COVID-19 eviction moratoriums. A number of former rental units have been sold or turned into short term rentals, resulting in decreased supply and increased demand. The city was recently notified by DLCD we were now considered a "severely rent burdened city" meaning at least twenty-five percent of the renters in Coos Bay spend more than fifty percent of their household income on gross rent for housing.

The Council and Urban Renewal Agency have undertaken a number of projects to include, but not limited to: amending the City's Development Code to reduce barriers to building new housing; provided gap financing to a developer who developed upper floor housing in an underutilized downtown building; provided an Improvement Program Grant to a downtown building owner which was used in part to remodel and put back into service several dormant apartments; provided a land incentive to another developer who built a nine plex set of apartments; entered into an agreement with the County and a non-profit to clean up a contaminated former school site which would be developed into a multi-unit affordable working family housing complex; and provided two residential lots to Habitat for Humanity for a redeveloped housing project.

A MUPTE Program was a state-enabled housing incentive program that allowed cities of all sizes across Oregon to exempt property taxes on residential improvements of approved multi-unit properties for up to ten years. Although the State of Oregon enables this program through the Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS), each city has the opportunity to shape the program to achieve its goals by controlling the geography of where the exemption is available, application process and fees, program requirements, criteria, and program cap. Additionally, the city is allowed to select projects on a case-by-case basis. The intent of a MUPTE Program was to lower operating costs in the early years of a housing development so it becomes more financially feasible. The Council reviewed and discussed the MUPTE incentive, as well as, MUPTE related ordinances from Salem, Eugene, Newport, Cottage Grove, and Florence at their work session on May 24, 2022. Staff was asked to evaluate and recommend potential ordinance language. Based on staff's evaluation, it was recommended the Council consider language / program which would be substantial similar to that of the city of Cottage Grove, which was provided to Council.

Mr. Craddock stated there would need to be access to fixed route public transportation and had spoken to a CCAT representative who stated they would work with the city to add a fixed route if needed. Council discussion ensued; consensus to exclude the URA boundaries, four-plex or better, and for staff to move forward with the program.

Discussion Regarding Development of an Empire Master Plan

City Manager Rodger Craddock stated Councilor DiNovo noted interest in development of an Empire Mast Plan to help identify and guide future projects that enhance this vital area of the overall community. The Empire area has great potential that a Master Plan could help to identify projects and guide the future of the area towards a thriving and busy core area. This process would likely require a subject matter expert, with experience in development of

successful Master Plans and staff would like direction from the Council on next steps. Budget implications were not known, with costs associated with completing a Master Plan to be funded by the Empire Urban Renewal District with potential to apply for a grant. Council discussion ensued; consensus to halt Empire Design Standards plans which would be encompassed into the Master Plan and for staff to move forward.

Discussion Regarding Selection of Trash Cans Replacement Project

Public Works and Community Development Director Jim Hossley stated city staff had been exploring public trash can options for both the downtown and Empire areas. The end goal was to increase the number of cans in Empire along with making it harder for those who dig through and throw trash out of the cans. Staff recommended twenty-nine cans in the downtown area and seventeen in the Empire area. Commercial trash cans are extremely expensive. They start at \$456 up to \$4,500 per can. City staff looked at traditional sidewalk style trash cans, as well as self-compacting trash cans; both types would be serviced by city staff and looked at having one of the local waste haulers provide and service them. A map showing proposed locations for new trash cans in Empire and Downtown and possible traditional style trash cans were provided to council. The example was all weather, lockable, offers protection from the trash being windblown, and was not easy for a person to get into and remove the contents. It was also the least expensive at \$456.25 each. Cost for forty-six garbage cans would be approximately \$21,000, not including shipping and assembly time. It was advised to order at least fifty to have extra on hand which would be an additional cost. There were other models of traditional style trash cans available with some costing well over \$1,000 each. Self-compacting trash cans were nice, sturdy containers. They were very expensive to purchase and would likely increase the city's operational costs related to trash collection. The cost for self-compacting cans ranged from \$2,500 (28-gallon volume) to \$4,500 (150-gallon volume) per can. The cost for shipping was several thousands of dollars as well (staff received a quote to ship six cans for \$3,475). The compaction was solar powered. This may be problematic in the winter in Coos Bay's coastal climate. Digital monitoring of the trash can's garbage level was an option which may assist staff identify which cans need to be emptied and which did not. However, this feature adds to the purchase price and ongoing maintenance & operation costs. Ignoring the cost, self-compacting cans may seem like the way to go as it could cut down the daily trips to empty them, however they would result in heavier bags. The weight of the compacted garbage in the self-compacting trash cans likely required employing a two-person crew to haul away the trash. The trash crew would also need to use a dolly and a lift gate to get the trash bags into the back of the truck.

Staff came across news articles from several large cities about their experience with self-compacting trash cans. Based on the articles, these cities were planning to remove them or have removed them from service. People did not like touching the handles to open the garbage receptacles (covered with refuse), so they left their trash on the ground next to the can. Also, because the handles were metal, the handles were often being stolen. A foot pedal option was available to open some models of these cans for an additional cost. The battery life for the self-compacting cans was three to five years. The cost of a replacement battery was \$75 to \$100 and each can has two batteries. Staff also looked into using one of the local waste contractors to provide and service the trash cans. The possibility of using fewer trash carts and empty them fewer times per week since they are larger than our present trash cans; assuming forty carts provided by the contractor and serviced three times per week, the monthly charge would be \$5,491.20 (\$65,894.40 annually). This would be approximately \$29,000 more annually than currently spend. Currently a temporary worker services fifty trash cans five times/week for an annual cost under \$37,000. It is not necessary

to empty all fifty cans each day. The option to use a contractor did not appear to make economic sense. Staff recommended to purchase the traditional style trash receptacle similar to the provided example and continue to use the temporary worker to empty five days per week. Since there are many options, and significant cost to purchase, Council may want to direct staff to order one to three different models and put them in our high traffic areas to see what works best. Funding for this project would come from Urban Renewal. Cost would depend upon the direction Council wishes to proceed and the minimum cost would exceed \$25,000.

Council discussion ensued and suggested in at least high-use areas to put in a hybrid self-compacting trash cans with concerns of vandalism on the more expensive cans. Council consensus to try to order a couple different options to test in high-use areas.

Discussion of Council Goal to Establish Uniform Standards for the Placement of Streetlights

Public Works and Community Development Director Jim Hossley stated one of City Council's goals for 2021-2023 was to "Draft a streetlight policy to establish uniform standards for the placement of streetlights in the City for the Council's consideration". The proposed policy was intended to meet this goal and provide guidance for the uniform installation of streetlights in the City's right-of-way. Coos Bay Municipal Code (CBMC) Chapter 18, Engineering Design Standards, states due to limited resources, the City would not install, pay for power, or maintain new streetlights in existing improved right-of-way. Chapter 18 further states the City may consider paying for power and maintenance of new streetlights installed in dedicated street right-of-way as part of the acceptance of new subdivision infrastructure. Where specialty light fixtures were desired, financial responsibility for monthly power and maintenance costs shall be determined prior to design approval. Per the draft policy, if the City needs to replace or contemplate installation/removal of streetlighting in existing right-of-way, the City will consider factors such as traffic, crash data, and roadway characteristics to support lighting replacement/removal decisions. The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) provides the threshold or minimum conditions for when to consider streetlighting. However, meeting of AASHTO Roadway Lighting Design Guide lighting warrants does not obligate the City to undertake a lighting project on either existing or proposed streets. Per the draft policy, the City would also refer to the ODOT Lighting Policy and Guidelines. The proposed draft policy sets guidelines for installation of streetlighting when installing new or replacing new traffic signal poles. The policy also provides general guidelines for spacing of streetlights based on street classification. The draft policy also states that LED luminaires are the standard for new lighting installations along City streets.

Discussion Regarding Food Trucks on Public Property

Public Works and Community Development Director Jim Hossley stated a Transient business, CBMC 5.05.010 definition, meant a business that operated from various city-owned properties and city rights-of-way and had no fixed permanent location from which the business was conducted, and which should not remain on public property at any one location in the city, for more than the time specific on any single day. The business was permanently affixed to wheels and must be removed each day. Resolution 19-20 adopted September 2019 states transient businesses may conduct business on the following specifically designated city-owned property: Boardwalk and the west, approximately, two-thirds of the Preway. Resolution 19-20 further states authorization to conduct transient business on public

right of ways or on the specifically designated city-owned property controlled by the City of Coos Bay, does not extend to city parking lots, or other public properties.

When considering potential city owned parking lot locations to designate space for food trucks, there are no city-owned parking lots in Eastside (city has a lease with the Port for boat ramp parking). There are also no compatible city owned properties in Englewood for food trucks. There are no city-owned parking lots in Empire that could be used for food trucks unless they were authorized to use a parking lot in Topits Park. The Empire boat ramp parking must be reserved for users of the boat ramp. There are several city-owned parking lots in downtown Coos Bay that may support food trucks. The most likely to be attractive to food trucks owners are the north Visitor Information Center (VIC) parking lot and the three parking lots north of Curtis Avenue between South 4th Street and South 2nd Court. Due to limited space in the VIC parking lot, it probably was not an option. Staff looked at these parking lots to consider pedestrian/customer safety, room to maneuver the trucks, vehicular travel through the parking lot, and space typically available. Due to vehicular traffic in parking lots, it was important to provide pedestrians (customers) frequenting the food trucks with adequate separation from moving vehicles. It was important to provide space for customers to queue up to order and wait for food to be prepared. Maps provided to council showed potential locations to designate food truck parking.

In addition to determining which, if any, lot(s) to allow food truck parking, Council may want to also consider the following: time limits for use of designated space by food trucks; prohibit food trucks to occupy the designated space outside established hours; setting specific days of the week on which food trucks may operate in public parking lots; limit number of days per week/month/year that an individual vendor may use a designated space; how designated spaces would be allocated to vendors, on a first come first serve basis or require vendors to reserve use of a space through the city or through a competitive bid process; size limitations for trucks (example ten foot wide including extensions or awnings, twenty-four foot long including trailer hitch, trailer or other extensions); separation between food trucks; insurance requirements; fire code related restrictions; city would be competing with private property owners who lease space to food trucks; electric Vehicle charging station in one of these lots would also take up several parking spots; and if food trucks should be able to use city park parking lots.

Mayor Benetti stated it appeared difficult to achieve what he had intended when suggested and suggested the city not move forward. Council discussion ensued and consensus not to move forward.

Council Comments

Councilor DiNovo stated there were some sound issues at the meeting and continued challenges with the system, wanted to move to Zoom platform from Microsoft meetings, get a new sound system, mount cameras to see the Councilors faces online, and have a tech person at all the meetings. Councilor Kilmer stated it would be difficult for the public to attend meetings virtually, it was difficult for her attendance virtually at the previous meeting, and encouraged staff to look at something better.

City Manager Rodger Craddock stated the mural on Hwy 101 was almost complete, Mike Vaughan stated it needed a second coat and invited Council to attend. The Community Coalition of Empire requested to undertake an art program similar to the Downtown Association was doing with the utility box wraps and asked Council if they wanted it to go

through the Empire Master Planning or consensus to draft an agreement. Council discussion ensued; consensus for the City Attorney to draft an agreement between the city and the Community Coalition of Empire.

Adjourn

There being no further business to come before the council, Council President Miles adjourned the meeting. The next regular council meeting was scheduled for July 5, 2022. These minutes were approved as presented by City Council on July 19, 2022.



Joe Benetti, Mayor

Attest: Nichole Rutherford
Nichole Rutherford, City Recorder