

## APPLICATION INFORMATION SHEET

### 1. Applicant Identification

The Oregon International Port of Coos Bay  
125 W Central Avenue, Suite 300  
Coos Bay, OR 97420

### 2. Website URL

<https://www.portofcoosbay.com/>

### 3. Funding Requested

- (a) Grant type: EPA Community-wide Assessment Grant  
(b) Federal funds requested: \$500,000

### 4. Location

The Port serves the Coos Bay Harbor, Port of Charleston Bay and the watershed of the Coos and Millacoma Rivers, all in Coos County, Oregon. This includes one incorporated city and two unincorporated communities.

### 5. Target Area and Priority Site Information

- Census Tracts: 41011000702 (Terminal One), 41011000800 (Eastside properties), 41011000502 (PCIP Property), 41011000502 (RV park).
- Priority sites
  - Terminal One Site: 63779 Mullen Rd, Tax Lot ID 25S13W35TL0040000, Coos Bay
  - Eastside Residential Site: Tax Lot ID 25S13W26DTL0010000, Coos Bay
  - Eastside Industrial Site: Tax Lot ID 25S13W25TL001000 Coos Bay
  - Pacific Coast Intermodal Port Project (PCIP) Site: Tax Lot ID 25S13W18-100, Coos Bay
  - Seaport RV Park: 63301 Boat Basin Rd, Coos Bay

### 6. Contacts

#### (a) Project Director:

Rick Adamek, Director of Asset Management  
The Oregon International Port of Coos Bay  
541-696-5040 | Email: [RAdamek@PortofCoosBay.com](mailto:RAdamek@PortofCoosBay.com)  
125 W Central Avenue, Suite 300, Coos Bay, OR 97420

#### (b) Chief Executive/Highest Ranking Elected Official:

Lanelle Comstock, Chief Executive Officer  
The Oregon International Port of Coos Bay  
541-267-7678 | Email: [LComstock@PortofCoosBay.com](mailto:LComstock@PortofCoosBay.com)  
125 W Central Avenue, Suite 300, Coos Bay, OR 97420

## 7. Population

Coos County: 64,832

- City of Coos Bay: 15,867

## 8. Other Factors

Sample Format for Providing Information on the Other Factors	Page #
Community population is 15,000 or less.	N-5
The applicant is, or will assist, a federally recognized Indian Tribe or United States Territory.	NA
The priority site(s) is impacted by mine-scarred land.	NA
The priority site(s) is adjacent to a body of water (i.e., the border of the priority site(s) is contiguous or partially contiguous to the body of water, or would be contiguous or partially contiguous with a body of water but for a street, road, or other public thoroughfare separating them).	N-1, N-2
The priority site(s) is in a federally designated flood plain.	N-3
The reuse of the priority site(s) will facilitate renewable energy from wind, solar, or geothermal energy.	N-4
The reuse of the priority site(s) will incorporate energy efficiency measures.	N-3, N-4
The proposed project will improve local resilience to the impacts of extreme weather events and natural disasters.	N-3, N-4, N-7
At least 30% of the overall project budget will be spent on eligible reuse/area-wide planning activities, as described in Section I.B., for priority sites within the target areas.	N-9, N-10
The target area(s) is impacted by a coal-fired power plant that has recently closed (2014 or later) or is closing.	N/A

## 9. Letter from the State or Tribal Environmental Authority (not included in the three-page limit)

Attached.

## 10. Releasing Copies of Applications

N/A



# Oregon

Tina Kotek, Governor

Department of Environmental Quality  
Western Region Eugene Office  
165 East 7th Avenue, Suite 100  
Eugene, OR 97401  
(541) 686-7838  
FAX (541) 686-7551  
TTY 711

January 22, 2026

Terri Griffith  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,  
Region 10 1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 155  
Mailstop: ECL-133  
Seattle, WA 98101

RE: FY2026 EPA Community-wide Assessment Grant Application for Port of Coos Bay

Dear Terri,

The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality is pleased to acknowledge the Community-Wide Assessment Grant Application from the Port of Coos Bay. The Port of Coos Bay is a special district located along the southern coast of Oregon. Since the decline of logging industrial through the 1990s, the Port has less ship traffic and struggles economically. The focus of the grant application is on five key sites: Terminal One (former mill site), eastside residential and Industrial sites (former dredge spoil sites), Pacific Coast Intermodal Project site (former fish farm), and the Seaport RV Park. These target sites are in areas that have known or potential presence of hazardous substances and/or petroleum contamination that could pose a risk to human health and the environment. In turn, these uncertainties create barriers to reuse and redevelopment that would provide opportunities for improved job growth.

Port of Coos Bay is requesting \$500,000 in funding for assessments to be accomplished over the 4-year grant period. Port of Coos Bay anticipates performing several Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs), cleanup plans, reuse plans, and community engagement activities.

DEQ will support this initiative by using 128(a) State Response grant funding to assist Port of Coos Bay with work plan development, provide technical assistance on the DEQ Cleanup process, and on-board projects. DEQ encourages EPA to fund the Port of Coos Bay Community-Wide Assessment Grant application. Please contact Mary Camarata, DEQ Western Region Brownfields Coordinator at [mary.camarata@deq.oregon.gov](mailto:mary.camarata@deq.oregon.gov), 503-983-2277 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

*Ruth Hyde*

Ruth Hyde (Jan 22, 2026 10:47:39 PST)

Ruth Hyde  
Western Region Administrator

ec Lanelle Comstock, Port of Coos Bay, [lcomstock@portofcoosbay.com](mailto:lcomstock@portofcoosbay.com)  
Sarah Sieloff, Haley and Aldrich, [SSieloff@haleyaldrich.com](mailto:SSieloff@haleyaldrich.com)  
Issa Mullener, Haley and Aldrich, [IMullener@haleyaldrich.com](mailto:IMullener@haleyaldrich.com)  
Lucy Bishop, Haley and Aldrich, [LBishop@haleyaldrich.com](mailto:LBishop@haleyaldrich.com)  
Margaret Olson, EPA, [olson.margaret@epa.gov](mailto:olson.margaret@epa.gov)

Rebecca Wells-Albers, HQ Brownfields Coordinator, [rebecca.wells-albers@deq.oregon.gov](mailto:rebecca.wells-albers@deq.oregon.gov)

# NARRATIVE CRITERIA

## 1. Project Area Description and Plans for Revitalization

### TARGET AREAS AND BROWNFIELDS

#### 1.a. Overview of Brownfield Challenges and Description of Target Areas

The Oregon International Port of Coos Bay (Port) requests a \$500,000 EPA Brownfields Community-wide Assessment Grant. The Port is a special district in Coos County (the County, pop. 64,832) on Oregon's remote southern coast. The Port is situated within the Coos Bay estuary, encompassing the Coos and Millacoma Rivers, which flow into Coos Bay proper, and the Pacific Ocean located approximately 12 river miles to the west. The Port's jurisdiction covers 610 sq mi, including the City of Coos Bay and extending north, east, and southwest to encompass numerous unincorporated communities. The County has approximately 60 miles of Pacific Ocean frontage and lies within the ancestral homelands of the Coquille Indian Tribe, the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians, and the Siletz Indians. The County includes 28 unincorporated communities and seven incorporated cities (populations range from 615 to 15,867). The City of Coos Bay (10.6 square miles) is the County's largest city, and sits on Coos Bay Harbor (the Bay), Oregon's largest bay.

From the 1850s through the latter 20<sup>th</sup> century, the timber industry drove the County's economy. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, local sawmills closed due to industry consolidation, trade dynamics and environmental policies that could not be managed by small operations. From 1980 to 2024, County timber jobs declined by 60%, from 80,000 to 32,000.<sup>1</sup> The downturn generated long-term economic hardship, population decline and economic stagnation. For example, Marshfield High School was built with a grant from the federal Public Works Administration in 1940 when the timber industry seemed unstoppable. In the 1970s it had over 2,000 students. In recent years, however, it has become a symbol of the City's decline. When the mills closed, higher income workers left and took their families, reducing local employment, school enrollment, and the tax base. Now only 800 students remain, and limited local economic opportunity constrains workforce retention and long-term community stability. Today, the City is largely a bedroom community. Only 23% of City residents both live and work in the City, while 62% commute outside the City for work.<sup>2</sup>

Mill closures devastated the County's tax base and left behind numerous former timber-related industrial properties with known or suspected contamination in soil and groundwater, including petroleum, metals, and hazardous substances related to wood treating, like creosote. Many of these brownfields are located on or near waterfronts. They pose potential risks to human health, limit public waterfront access, and affect sensitive ecological resources like rare plants, coastal birds, and Coho salmon. Brownfields also pose fiscal impacts: underused parcels often generate limited tax revenue while requiring public resources to address dumping, trespassing, camping, and vandalism. Collectively, these conditions constrain land availability for both economic development and housing, which are critical for economic recovery. From 2011 to 2023, Southern Oregon's home price index increased 133%, while median household income (MHI) increased 53%. To afford the average mortgage, the average resident would need to earn 48% more.<sup>3</sup> The City is both stagnant and unaffordable, which limits workforce growth and makes the City less attractive for investment. As a result, community priorities focus on expanding affordable housing and local employment. Because wetlands, protected forest lands, mountainous topography, and the prohibitive cost of extending infrastructure limit greenfield development, brownfield reuse is the Port's most feasible option to create developable land for jobs, industry and housing within City boundaries. **The Port has identified Census Tracts (CTs) 5.02, 7.02, and 8 as target areas (TAs) for assessment.** These three CTs surround the Coos Bay estuary and the City on the south, west and east and include a concentration of underused waterfront and industrial properties. CT5.02 (58.9 sq mi) is bounded on the north by Horsefall Road, on the west by the Pacific Ocean, on the south by Whiskey Run Lane, and on the east by State Highway 101 (the Oregon Coast Highway) and Libby Lane. CT7.02 (10.8 sq mi) is bounded north and east by Isthmus Slough, on the west by Coalbank Slough, and on the south by State Highway 101. CT8 (10.9 sq mi) is bounded on the north by Coos Bay, on the west and east by the Coos River, and on the south by Coos Sumner Lane. These TAs contain brownfields that occupy some of the County's most strategically located industrial, commercial and residential waterfront land. Assessing and prioritizing key waterfront brownfield sites will reduce uncertainty regarding environmental conditions, support cleanup and redevelopment planning, and help return properties to productive economic and recreational reuse. Redevelopment of

<sup>1</sup> Kammin, W. (Feb. 6, 2024). "Offshore Timber: The Reindustrialization of Pacific Coast Logging Communities." Univ. of Washington.

<sup>2</sup> Census. (2023). On the Map Inflow/Outflow Analysis.

<sup>3</sup> Ibidem

these sites can improve environmental quality in and around the Bay, protect sensitive species and habitats, catalyze economic development, expand local jobs, increase options for housing, and improve community stability and vitality.

### 1.b. Description of the Priority Brownfield Sites

The priority site in CT7.02 is the Port-owned **167-acre Terminal One/former Georgia Pacific (GP) Mill site (63779 Mullen Road, Tax Lot ID 25S13W35TL0040000)**, a former hub for timber processing, shipping, and manufacturing that operated from at least the early 1900s to 2019. The Port acquired the site in 2022. The Site is located just outside the City and is surrounded on the north by the Bay, on the west and east by Isthmus Slough, and on the south by Newport Lane, a major road. Existing buildings on-site total over 83,420 square feet with up to 34-foot ceilings. A 2025 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) identified manufacturing and petroleum operations as potential sources of contamination, including metals, petroleum and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs). This site is the Port’s top priority due to its connections to existing infrastructure and strong potential for mixed-use redevelopment. Priority sites in CT8 are **the 130-acre Eastside residential site (Tax Lot ID 25S13W26DTL0010000) and immediately to its west, the 190-acre Eastside industrial site<sup>4</sup> (Tax Lot ID 25S13W25TL001000)**. **The two sites are within the City and are surrounded on the west, north and east by the Bay, and on the south by a residential area and the Coos River Highway.** These sites are Port-owned and were created from dredge spoils placed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineering during navigation channel maintenance in the 1940s and 1950s. Contaminants of concern for both Eastside sites include metals, petroleum, pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and dioxins from contaminants in dredge spoils. No past environmental assessments for these sites exist, but they are suspected to be former mill sites. These sites are priorities due to their waterfront location, proximity to existing neighborhoods, and reuse potential for workforce housing on the residential parcel and public greenspace and waterfront access on the industrial parcel. Priority sites in CT5.02 are the **175-acre Pacific Coast Intermodal Project (PCIP) site (Tax Lot ID 25S13W18-100) and the 1.35-acre Seaport RV Park site (63301 Boat Basin Rd)**. Both are outside City limits. The **PCIP site** encompasses a former fish farm that closed in 1989, and which the Port acquired in 1993. It is bounded by open sand dunes and forest to the north, the Bay to the east, the Bay entrance channel to the south, and the Pacific Ocean to the west. Contaminants of concern include petroleum and metals. There are no past environmental assessments. The Port has signed an agreement to lease the PCIP Site to a private developer, and the site is a priority due to its catalytic potential to create jobs and be a major economic driver in southern Oregon. **The Seaport RV Park** is a privately-owned site in the unincorporated community of Charleston, located south and west of the City. It is bound by the Charleston Community Baptist Church to the north, the Charleston Marina and Charleston Bay to the east, Cape Arago Highway (State Route 540) to the south, and the major thoroughfare Boat Basin Road to the west. Local agencies have documented crime and safety issues at the site, and the surrounding community has identified it as a priority due to safety and health concerns. Contaminants of concern include metals and petroleum. No past environmental assessments exist for this site. The site is a priority due to its connection to a major transportation corridor and proximity to residential areas.

### 1.c. Identifying Additional Sites

The Port was established in 1909, and has owned many properties for decades, but lacks details about their potential environmental legacies. The Port will develop a site inventory to identify and prioritize additional sites for assessment. The inventory will include a GIS map with site photos, condition notes, links to available environmental data, and Coos County Assessor’s information. On a quarterly basis, the Port will convene its Brownfields Advisory Committee (BAC) to prioritize sites using criteria developed with community partner input (2.e–f). Criteria will include contamination potential, access feasibility, groundwater and water quality impacts, community concern, neighborhood reuse benefits, redevelopment potential and market interest, ability to resolve tax and lien issues, alignment with existing plans and revitalization efforts, and potential to create jobs or improve access to parks, waterfronts, and public services.

## REVITALIZATION OF THE TARGET AREAS

### 1.d. Reuse Strategy and Alignment with Revitalization Plans

Reuse of Terminal One envisions a mixed-use center commercial and industrial space and affordable housing, consistent with the City’s 2020 Housing Needs Analysis, which was informed by significant feedback from community-based organizations and residents. Groundwater beneath Terminal One is tidally influenced, and portions of the site are within the federally designated 100-year floodplain (floodplain). Redevelopment plans will require that sensitive uses are located outside the floodplain and may explore elevating portions of the site. The envisioned reuse of the Eastside

---

<sup>4</sup> “Eastside industrial site” is the local, colloquial name for this site, despite its intended reuse for open space.

Residential Site, which is not in the floodplain, is workforce housing, consistent with the Port's 1996 Eastside Development Strategy, the City's 2020 Housing Needs Analysis (HNA), and a City/Port housing feasibility study focused on the Eastside Residential Site that will be completed in April 2026. Reuse strategies for the Eastside Industrial Site, which is in the floodplain, include trails, greenspace, and public waterfront access. This reuse aligns with the City's 2023-2033 Parks, Recreational & Cultural Facilities Plan which identifies the creation of safe waterfront parks and trails as a key community-informed goal. Both Eastside sites are surrounded by an active diking system around Coos Bay that has experienced failures in the recent past, and financial hardship has affected the timing and adequacy of repairs. The envisioned reuse of the PCIP Site would create an international, intermodal shipping container terminal, the first ship-to-rail facility on the U.S. West Coast as part of a partnership between the Port and an industrial real estate developer. This reuse aligns with the Port's 2025 Strategic Business Plan, which identifies the PCIP as a significant opportunity to diversify and expand the regional economy. It also aligns with the County's 2011 Transportation System Plan, which emphasizes the need for enhancing existing rail corridors and providing a transportation system that supports economic development. A container terminal is an appropriate reuse for this site, which is not in a floodplain. The envisioned reuse for the Seaport RV Park is mixed-use commercial and residential, consistent with the Port's Strategic Business Plan, which identifies the site as an important economic development opportunity and community asset for workers in Charleston, supporting tourism, housing, and small businesses. This reuse is appropriate for a site not in the floodplain. Reuse strategies for all priority sites also align with several County-wide plans, including 1) the County's 2024 Comprehensive Plan, which identifies sustainable land use and natural resource protection as priorities, and which brownfield redevelopment supports; 2) the Coos Economic Development Corporation's 2023-2026 Strategic Plan, which emphasizes investment in infrastructure and workforce housing to generate jobs, and was developed with significant input from local elected officials and other economic development stakeholders; 3) the Port's 2025 Strategic Business Plan, which supports enhancing regional economic development, promoting maritime industries, and fostering sustainable growth; and 4) the Coos County Estuarine Resilience Action Plan, by the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, which supports strengthening community resilience through flood-resilient infrastructure and economic development.

### **1.e. Outcomes and Benefits of Reuse Strategy**

Manufacturing-and commercial-focused reuse strategies for the Terminal One Site, the PCIP site and the Seaport RV Park support economic development by encouraging development of new industries like shipping, and by creating space for manufacturing and small businesses. These reuse strategies are anticipated to generate significant numbers of jobs, which will raise incomes and facilitate economic mobility for residents. The PCIP Site alone could potentially create 2,600 construction jobs, 2,500 permanent jobs, and 7,000 indirect jobs throughout the region and the state, which are estimated to generate nearly \$50 million annually in state income taxes.<sup>5</sup> Residential reuse, which is included in reuse plans at the Terminal One Site, the Eastside Residential Site, and the Seaport RV Park, can generate desperately needed workforce housing, with health and economic benefits for residents. Co-locating housing with jobs via mixed use development at the Terminal One Site and Seaport RV Park has the additional benefit of substantially reducing transportation costs for residents and air pollution generated by commuting. Finally, reuse of the Eastside Industrial Site for greenspace and public waterfront access will meet a significant local need for recreational space in the City. Reuse will bolster local resilience to extreme weather by removing or containing contaminants that might otherwise wash into the Bay, contaminating water and sediment and impacting aquatic life, including threatened and endangered species like Coho salmon. Any building-related reuse will also bolster seismic resilience by including such activities as deep foundational designs to account for earthquake related liquefaction and subduction due to the presence of the Cascadia Subduction Zone and the potential for very large magnitude earthquakes in this region.<sup>6</sup> Reuse may also consider specific measures to elevate sites or develop protection systems that can minimize the risk of flooding and economic disruption in extreme weather. Any buildings constructed will incorporate energy efficiency measures consistent with Oregon Energy Efficiency Specialty Code (OEESC), which exceeds the standards set by many states. To improve local resilience to extreme weather, reuse plans will also consider opportunities to incorporate solar energy generation into reuse.

---

<sup>5</sup> International Oregon Port of Coos Bay. (2025). <https://pcipproject.com/>

<sup>6</sup> Oregon Department of Emergency Management. (2025). Cascadia Subduction Zone.

## STRATEGY FOR LEVERAGING RESOURCES

### 1.f. Resources Needed for Site Reuse

The Port has a pending request to Business Oregon (BizOR) for a \$20,000 Brownfields Technical Assistance Grant, which it will use to complete a brownfield inventory of at least 59 suspected brownfields throughout its jurisdiction. A decision is anticipated in March 2026. If this unsecured funding is awarded, the Port will redirect funding from its EPA grant budget away from inventory development and toward assessment or reuse planning (3.f). For the PCIP site, the Port has already secured over \$100 million in state and federal funding to support design and pre-planning. This includes \$160 million from the Oregon State Legislature (2006, 2023, 2025), \$25 million in 2024 through the Federal Infrastructure for Rebuilding America (INFRA) Grant Program for design and pre-construction work, and \$29.75 million in 2024 from the federal Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements (CRISI) Program for rail upgrades. The Port plans to apply for a U.S. Department of Transportation's (U.S. DOT) Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing (RRIF) loan, for improvements to the Coos Bay Rail Line (CBRL), a critical component of PCIP site reuse. The Port is eligible to apply for a variety of state and federal resources to support site cleanup and reuse. If additional assessment funding is required, the Port will seek a grant from BizOR's Brownfields Redevelopment Fund. It will seek cleanup funding from EPA Brownfields Cleanup grants, and from grants and low-interest loans through BizOR's Brownfields Redevelopment Fund, and BizOR's Brownfields Cleanup Fund. US Economic Development Administration Public Works & Economic Adjustment Assistance grants could support infrastructure for industrial reuse, while BizOR Community Development Block Grants could support design and construction of infrastructure for any reuse. The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality's (DEQ's) Clean Water State Revolving Fund can support design and construction for sewer and stormwater infrastructure. Finally, the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department could fund trail infrastructure, facilities and signage at the Eastside Industrial Site through its Recreational Trails Program.

### 1.g. Use of Existing Infrastructure

The **Terminal One Site**, the **PCIP Site**, and the **Seaport RV Park** have road access and will reuse electrical, water, and sewer infrastructure. The **Eastside Residential and Industrial Sites** have road access and are adjacent to water, sewer, and electrical connections that could be extended to support reuse. If needed, the Port will seek resources in section 1.f to support infrastructure enhancements or installations.

## 2. Community Need and Community Engagement

### COMMUNITY NEED

#### 2.a. The Community's Need for Funding

Due to small population sizes and low incomes, the Port, City and County are unable to support the cost of brownfields assessment without EPA funding. The Port is a small organization with 20 employees and regional responsibility for economic development. 22% of its budget comes from property tax revenue, which is constrained due to the small size of the County and City and their limited tax bases. Two-thirds of its budget comes from fees for service, which require the Port to maintain infrastructure and facilities to effectively compete for tenants. For example, the Port runs the CBRL, a significant regional freight artery, maintenance of which has cost the Port over \$154 million since the 2015/16 budget year. The Port faces significant budgetary pressure due to maintenance costs on existing investments. Principal debt payments have increased fourfold since the 2015/16 budget year, rising from \$160,000 to over \$800,000 expected in the 2025/26 budget year. Debt interest payments have increased tenfold over the same period, rising from \$60,000 to over \$600,000 in the 2025/26 budget year. Secured state and federal funding for PCIP planning and development (1.f) cannot support brownfield assessment or reuse. The Port has no discretionary funding available to support site assessment.

The County must dedicate significant resources to meeting the needs of a low-income population spread over 1,806 square miles. Per Table 1, its median household income is 25% below the state's. The proportion of residents living in poverty exceeds state levels by 31%, while the proportion of residents receiving federal Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits exceeds state levels by 43% and is double US levels. Meanwhile, County residents ages 18-24 are 44% more likely to have less than a high school degree compared to the national average, which correlates strongly with low incomes and higher unemployment.<sup>7</sup> The County has no discretionary funding to support site assessment and works closely with the Port to meet economic development needs.

---

<sup>7</sup> "Education pays, 2024," *Career Outlook*, US Bureau of Labor Statistics, May 2025.

The City is small, low income, and lacks funding for assessment. Per Table 1, the City’s median household income is 31% below the state’s. The proportion of City residents living below the poverty exceeds the state by 19%, while the proportion of residents receiving federal SNAP benefits exceeds state levels by 65% and national levels by over 115%. City residents ages 18-24 are 48% more likely to lack a high school degree compared to the national average. The City’s budget must support essential public services, and it cannot fund assessment without external financial support.

The TAs show elevated levels. In CT 5.02, where the PCIP and Seaport RV Park sites are located, unemployment exceeds the national rate by 81%. 6% population decline from 2013 to 2023 indicates stagnant economic conditions. In CT8, where Eastside properties are, unemployment is low, but one-fifth of residents receive SNAP benefits and people ages 18-24 years with less than a high school degree exceed the County average by 300%. Finally, in CT 7.02, where Terminal One is located, poverty rates are almost double the national average, over one-fifth of residents receive SNAP benefits, and 17.3% of those 18-24 have less than a high school diploma. Across all TAs, residents are economically impoverished, more likely to depend on local government for public services and to be vulnerable to plant closures and other economic disruptions.

**Table 1. Economic and Population Data**

Indicator	CT 7.02	CT 8	CT 5.02	City of Coos Bay	Coos County	Oregon	United States
2013 Population	3,197*	2904	2654	15,982	62,753	38,687,21	311,536,594
2023 Population	3,309	2942	2494	15,867	64,832	4,238,714	332,387,540
Percent Change in Population (2013 to 2023)	3.5%	1.3%	-6%	-.7%	3.3%	9.6%	6.3%
Median Age	38.5	53.0	58.2	42.6	48.6	40.1	38.7
Median Household Income	65,014	85,938	66,199	55,292	60,313	80,426	78,538
Below Poverty Level	24.2%	4.8%	6.4%	14.2%	15.6%	11.9%	12.4%
Unemployment Rate	0.7%	2.1%	9.4%	5.4%	5.5%	5.4%	5.2%
Households with FS/SNAP	21.2%	20.2%	15.9%	25.4%	22.0%	15.4%	11.8%
<High School Graduate Ages 18-24	17.3%	57.5%	N/A	18.4%	16.7%	12.4%	11.6%

*Notes: Shading indicates disparities compared to the county, state, or the U.S. Data Source: U.S. Census 2023 American Community survey 5-year estimates (2019-2023) \*Only 2020 5-year estimates were available for CT 7.02.*

**2.b. Health or Welfare of Sensitive Populations**

Per Table 2, the TAs are disproportionately home to sensitive populations compared to U.S., Oregon, County, and City figures. Contamination may pose significant health threats to these groups due to pre-existing conditions and developing immune systems. 30.8% of CT 8 residents and 34.2% of CT 5.02 residents are over age 65, 83-104% more than US levels (16.8%). This subpopulation is expected to continue to grow until 2030.<sup>8</sup> 9.9% of residents over 65 in CT 7.02 and 10% in CT 5.02 live in poverty, 8-9% more than in the County (9.2%). 26.3% of CT 7.02 residents are under 18, 47% more than in the County (17.9%), 13% more than in the state (20.2%), and 24% more than in the US (22.2%). Of people under 18 in CT 7.02, 41.5% live in poverty, which is 92% more than in the County (21.6%), 212% more than in the state (13.3%), and 155% more than in the US (16.3%). 33.5% of CT 5.02 residents are females of reproductive age (aged 15-44), which exceeds the County rate (30.7%) by 9%. 16.5% to 25.7% of all three TAs are people with disabilities, exceeding state levels (15.1%) by 9-70% and US levels (13%) by 27-98%.

Health issues impacting these groups include exposure to contamination from past industrial activity and increased prevalence of asthma and chronic conditions like chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), cancer, heart disease, and obesity (Table 3). Low incomes, lack of affordable housing, food insecurity and substantially lower educational levels (Table 1) are major welfare concerns. Cost-related pressures have wide-ranging impacts, including increased risk of exposure to lead and other toxins in older and low-quality housing.<sup>9</sup> These potential contamination burdens may compound existing health conditions and increase TA residents’ sensitivity to potential contamination on or released by priority brownfields sites, which can aggravate chronic conditions if inhaled or drunk (2.c). Site assessment is the first step towards reducing risks of contaminant exposure and associated health impacts. Industrial and commercial reuse can support economic development and provide jobs, which can increase incomes and improve welfare by fostering

<sup>8</sup> Oregon Department of State Lands. (2022). Climate hazards adaptation plan.

<sup>9</sup> Muller, C. et al. (2018). Environmental Inequality: The Social Causes and Consequences of Lead Exposure. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 44(1), 263–282.

economic mobility. Housing production can create safe, high quality, affordable housing without risks of contamination. Site reuse for trails and waterfront recreation will offer a gathering space to promote physical exercise and social connection, both of which are especially important for seniors and youth and can improve health outcomes.<sup>10</sup>

**Table 2. Sensitive Populations in the TAs**

Indicator	CT 7.02	CT 8	CT 5.02	City of Coos Bay	Coos County	Oregon	U.S.
Age Above 65	15.3%	30.8%	34.2%	23.4%	27.4%	18.6%	16.8%
Age Above 65 Below Poverty	9.9%	2.9%	10.0%	8.6%	9.2%	9.4%	10.4%
Age Under 18	26.3%	17.7%	10.1%	19.1%	17.9%	20.2%	22.2%
Age Under 18 Below Poverty	41.5%	N/A	0.8%	21.7%	21.6%	13.3%	16.3%
Female Ages 15-44	24.7%	20.5%	33.5%	33.0%	30.7%	39.2%	38.9%
Persons with Disability	16.5%	21.8%	25.7%	21.6%	23.3%	15.1%	13.0%

**Notes:** Shading indicates higher sensitive populations in the target area compared to City, County, state, or US. Data Source: U.S. Census 2023 American Community survey 5-year estimates (2019-2023) \*Only 2020 5-year estimates available for CT 7.02.

### 2.c. Greater Than Normal Incidence of Disease and Adverse Health Conditions

Historical industry and lingering brownfields have increased TA residents’ exposure to pollutants, contributing to disproportionate adverse health outcomes. Across all three TAs, rates of asthma, cancer, COPD, heart disease and obesity are higher than national rates, and many TA rates exceed those in the County and City. Asthma rates in the TAs exceed national rates by 9-37%. Cancer rates in the TAs exceed national rates by 45-68%. Rates of COPD in the TAs exceed national rates by 60-102%, and rates of heart disease in the TAs exceed national rates by 30-41%. By reducing the risk of contact with contamination, expanding access to safe and affordable housing, creating jobs that increase incomes, and providing space for recreation and social connection, this grant can help reduce drivers of poor health in the TAs. Mixed-use redevelopment that co-locates housing with jobs can reduce car-based commuting and associated air pollution, which can aggravate asthma, COPD, and heart disease. Reuse of the Eastside Industrial Site for safe outdoor recreation can also increase physical activity, helping to reduce cardiovascular disease risk and improve overall community health.

**Table 3. Disproportionate Health Burdens**

Health Indicator	CT 7.02	CT 8	CT 5.02	City	County	U.S.
Asthma in adults	13.4	12.4	12.2	13.0	12.7	9.8
Cancer in adults	9.6	11.0	11.1	7.5	7.6	6.6
COPD in adults	10.7	8.8	8.5	7.6	7.3	5.3
Heart disease in adults	9.0	8.4	8.3	6.2	9.4	6.4
Obesity in adults	36.4	33.4	31.8	34.2	34.2	32.9

**Notes:** 2023 CDC PLACES Data.

### 2.d. Economically Impoverished/Disproportionately Impacted Populations

Job losses and environmental impacts from mill closures have disproportionately impacted TA residents, who experience low incomes and lack of economic mobility. For example, children who

grow up in the TAs experience poor financial outcomes, with an average income at age 35 of \$31,000 – 49% below the County average and 61% below the state average (2.a).<sup>11</sup> Aging housing stock and increasing risk of extreme weather compound these challenges. The median housing age in the TAs is 1975, meaning a large share of homes were built before modern building codes, particularly pre-1980 wind, flood, and seismic standards and before lead and asbestos were banned in 1978. These older structures and accompanying infrastructure are more likely to be located in hazard-prone areas, to increase risk of exposure to hazardous substances, and to be less resilient to climate and weather extremes. Much of the housing around Coos Bay, particularly single- and multi-family homes, has minimal to fair construction quality.<sup>12</sup> 5% of buildings situated around the Bay are likely to be inundated by 2050, and 8% by 2100, given expected sea level rise plus a 1% chance flood scenario. The highest number of buildings exposed are in the community of Charleston, where the Seaport RV Park is, with 31% of buildings exposed in the 2100 scenario.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Park J-H et al. A Systematic Literature Review of the Relationships Between Social and Interpersonal Factors and Physical Activity Among Older Adults. *American Journal of Health Promotion*. 2024;39(4):664-678.

Stagnone, N. et al. (2025). Nature’s Medicine? The Associations of Organized Youth Sport, Unstructured Physical Activity, and Land-Use Recreation with Children’s Mental Health, Emotional Control, and Social Well-Being. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 22(7), 1012.

<sup>11</sup> Opportunity Insights and U.S. Census Bureau. *The Opportunity Atlas*. <https://opportunityatlas.org/>

<sup>12</sup> Oregon Department of State Lands, Coos Bay Climate Hazards Adaptation Plan (2022)

<sup>13</sup> Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, Coos County Enhanced Resilience Action Plan (2023)

In addition, local jobs are vulnerable to disruption, which stands to impact economically distressed people most. Economic diversity in the County is low compared to the rest of the state, and this is likely the case in the TAs as well. County-wide, 66% of residents work in just five sectors: local government (20%), health and education (14%), retail (13%), leisure and hospitality (12%) and professional and business services (10%).<sup>14</sup> This lack of diversity makes the local economy vulnerable to further disruption. Assessment and reuse planning at brownfields sites can increase the availability of modern, safe workforce housing in the TAs. It can also attract new industries and generate jobs, which can diversify the economy, increase local resilience to economic shocks, raise incomes and promote economic mobility.

## COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

### 2.e. Project Involvement and 2.f. Project Roles

Project partners in Table 4 will form the core of the Community Advisory Board (CAB) the Port will establish (2.g).

**Table 4. Project Partners**

Org./Entity	Point of Contact	Specific project involvement or assistance provided
Coos County	John Sweet, Commissioner, <a href="mailto:jsweet@co.coos.or.us">jsweet@co.coos.or.us</a>	Advise on zoning, land use, and infrastructure related to priority sites, esp. Terminal One. Coordinate on permitting and, where feasible, support streamlined review processes.
City of Coos Bay	Nichole Rutherford, City Manager, <a href="mailto:nrutherford@coosbayor.gov">nrutherford@coosbayor.gov</a>	Provide input on land use planning, zoning, and housing-related reuse strategies, esp. for the Eastside residential property. Share project updates, host public meetings, support outreach.
Charleston Merchants Association. <b>Mission:</b> Represent and support local businesses in the Charleston area	Tim Hyatt, President, [REDACTED]	Advise on reuse plans, particularly for Seaport RV Park. Share project updates and host community meetings. Assist with outreach to businesses and stakeholders, advise on market viability/reuse.
Bay Area Chamber of Commerce. <b>Mission:</b> Support regional economic development	Rosey Thomas, Director, <a href="mailto:rosey@oregonsbayarea.org">rosey@oregonsbayarea.org</a>	Support outreach to property owners and local businesses, share information on project activities, and provide feedback on site prioritization and economic conditions affecting the target areas.
South Coast Development Council. <b>Mission:</b> Support business growth, investment, and redevelopment in the South Coast region	Lexie Woodward, Director, <a href="mailto:lexie@scdinc.org">lexie@scdinc.org</a>	Share project updates. Provide feedback on site prioritization and reuse strategies. Advise on incentives, funding, and market conditions to support long-term economic development.
Southern Oregon Coast Regional Housing. <b>Mission:</b> Support regional housing needs.	Stephanie Hadley, Director, <a href="mailto:shadley@socrh.org">shadley@socrh.org</a>	Advise on housing needs and market conditions, and redevelopment feasibility for the Eastside residential property. Share project updates, assist with outreach to potential developers. Advise on housing-related permitting and incentives.
Coos Bay North Bend Visitor and Convention Bureau. <b>Mission:</b> Promote tourism-related economic activity	Janice Langlainais, Executive Director, <a href="mailto:janice@oregonsadventurecoast.com">janice@oregonsadventurecoast.com</a>	Provide input on tourism, market considerations, and stakeholder perspectives relevant to reuse planning, particularly for Terminal One, former Eastside industrial property and waterfront areas.
Coos Watershed Association. <b>Mission:</b> Protect and restore watershed health	Haley Lutz, Director, <a href="mailto:hlutz@cooswatershed.org">hlutz@cooswatershed.org</a>	Share project updates. Provide technical input related to watershed conditions, including studies on potential water contamination.

### 2.g. Incorporating Community Input

The Port will develop a Public Involvement Plan (PIP) for this project, which will draw on the comprehensive Community Engagement Plan for PCIP.<sup>15</sup> The Port will communicate project progress to the community at least quarterly through its website and social media. It will solicit community input on site prioritization and reuse through 4 community open houses and direct one-on-one outreach to priority site neighbors and other key stakeholders. The Port will document the feedback it receives and consider it during site prioritization, assessment planning, and development of cleanup and reuse plans, as appropriate. The Port will respond to community input by incorporating relevant feedback where feasible and by providing follow-up information through project updates or direct communication.

The Port will designate and publicize a staff point of contact and establish a brownfields-specific community advisory board (CAB) to advise on site prioritization and reuse. The CAB will meet quarterly, assist with community and property

<sup>14</sup> Oregon Department of State Lands, Coos Bay Climate Hazards Adaptation Plan (2022)

<sup>15</sup> JLA Public Involvement, Inc. (Dec. 9, 2024). "Pacific Coast Intermodal Port Project Community Engagement Plan."

owner outreach, provide feedback on next steps at priority sites, help prioritize additional sites based on the Port’s brownfields inventory, serve as project champions, and share project information with the community while conveying community feedback to the Port. The Port will track and evaluate progress on community engagement monthly, and goals and milestones quarterly. The Port will proactively address schedule or budget deviations, and adjustments will be made in alignment with its project goals and required outputs.

### 3. Task Descriptions, Cost Estimates, and Measuring Progress

#### DESCRIPTION OF TASKS/ACTIVITIES AND OUTPUTS

##### 3.a. – 3.d. Project Implementation, Anticipated Project Schedule, Task/Activity Lead, Outputs

**Table 5. Tasks, Activities and Outputs**

<b>Task 1 – Project Management</b>
a. <u>Project Implementation</u> : Procure QEP in compliance with 2 CFR 200.317-200.326 and the cooperative agreement (CA). Hold up to 48 monthly coordination meetings. Conduct progress and compliance reporting (quarterly, ACRES, annual Federal Financial Reports, final report). One Port representative will attend 1 National Brownfields Training Conference and 2 state/regional conferences.
b. <u>Anticipated Project Schedule</u> : Project activities will take place October 1, 2026, to September 30, 2030 (end of grant period). Procurement of QEP will be completed by January 2027. All other administrative tasks will be completed per the timeline in the CA.
c. <u>Task/Activity Lead</u> : Project director with support from QEP.
d. <u>Outputs</u> : Procure QEP, 16 quarterly progress reports, 1 final report, 16 ACRES updates, 4 annual financial reports, 48 monthly coordination meetings, 1 national conference and 2 state/regional conferences attended with 1 staff participating in each.
<b>Task 2 – Community Engagement &amp; Site Selection</b>
a. <u>Project Implementation</u> : Prepare public involvement plan (PIP) and site nomination form and project webpage. Develop and maintain site inventory with quarterly updates. Update Port Commission quarterly. Convene the CAB quarterly to guide grant activities, help disseminate outreach materials, and provide input on key milestones and site prioritization. Hold 4 community open houses at accessible hours with a virtual option for maximum participation. Conduct outreach to residents, businesses, community leaders, community groups near priority sites throughout the grant period. The Port will tabulate public input, review and incorporate into decisions, and publish responses on its project website.
b. <u>Anticipated Project Schedule</u> : Set up October 1, 2026–March 31, 2030, then ongoing until September 30, 2030.
c. <u>Task/Activity Lead</u> : Project Director with support from QEP.
d. <u>Outputs</u> : 1 PIP; site nomination form, fact sheets and other informational materials about priority and other sites (digital and print, translated as needed). Project webpage; brownfields inventory; 16 community advisory board meetings; 4 community open houses, outreach materials and notes; 16 Port Commission updates. 16 website and inventory updates.
<b>Task 3 – Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs)</b>
a. <u>Project Implementation</u> : Project Implementation. QEP prepare QAPP, site eligibility forms and access agreements for private property. QEP complete up to 5 Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) consistent with All Appropriate Inquiries Final Rule, latest ASTM standards, and DEQ rules and guidance. QEP complete up to 3 Phase II ESAs, prioritized based on Phase I ESAs and public input. QEP complete up to 2 hazardous building material surveys (HBMS). QEP to prepare SAP and HASP for each Phase II ESA. QAPP and site-specific plans will be reviewed and approved by EPA prior to sampling.
b. <u>Anticipated Project Schedule</u> : Prepare QAPP October 2026–March 2027. Phase I ESAs completed April 2027–August 2030, with Phase II ESAs scheduled as Phase I ESAs are completed, with public input incorporated into decision-making process.
c. <u>Task/Activity Lead</u> : Project Director with QEP support, and technical support from EPA/DEQ.
d. <u>Outputs</u> : QAPP, 5 Phase I ESAs, 2 HBMS, 3 Phase II ESAs with SAP, HASP, and Section 106 consultations.
<b>Task 4 – Cleanup and Reuse Planning</b>
a. <u>Project Implementation</u> : QEP prepare 2 Analysis of Brownfield Cleanup Alternatives (ABCA), 2 cleanup plans and 2 reuse plans. Cleanup plans will evaluate cleanup alternatives, costs, determine remediation/reuse planning to reduce health/environmental risks, and position site for preferred remedy identified in ABCA. Reuse plans may include market assessment, physical site plans, or implementation strategy for funding/risk management. Solicit public comment at community open houses, and tabulate, review and incorporate into decision process.
b. <u>Anticipated Project Schedule</u> : October 1, 2026–September 1, 2030.
c. <u>Task/Activity Lead</u> : Project Director with QEP assistance. EPA and DEQ to provide guidance. Where applicable, EPA to review to ensure technical and QAQC consistency.
d. <u>Outputs</u> : 2 ABCAs, 2 cleanup plans, 2 Site reuse plans.
<i>Notes: ACRES=Assessment, Cleanup &amp; Redevelopment Exchange; HASP=Health &amp; Safety Plan; QEP=Qualified Environmental Professional, QAPP=Quality Assurance Project Plan, SAP=Site Specific Sampling &amp; Analysis Plans.</i>

#### 3.E. COST ESTIMATES

Cost estimates are based on current market rates the Port pays and estimates based on recent environmental work. Costs assume \$46/hour plus 54% fringe for Port staff (total \$70.84/hour) and \$250/hour for the QEP.

**Table 6. Proposed Budget**

Budget Categories		Project Tasks (\$)				
		Task 1: Project Management	Task 2: Community Outreach & Site Selection	Task 3: Environmental Site Assessments	Task 4: Cleanup & Reuse Planning	Total
Direct Costs	Personnel	\$ 3,864.00	\$ 7,728.00	\$ 3,128.00	\$ 9,752.00	\$ 24,472.00
	Fringe	\$ 2,086.56	\$ 4,173.12	\$ 1,689.12	\$ 5,266.08	\$ 13,214.88
	Travel	\$ 3,800.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,800.00
	Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Supplies	\$ -	\$ 68.12	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 68.12
	Contractual	\$ 22,000.00	\$ 39,500.00	\$ 251,500.00	\$ 144,500.00	\$ 457,500.00
	Construction	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Other	\$ 600.00	\$ 345.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 945.00
<b>Total Direct Costs</b>		\$ 32,350.56	\$ 51,814.24	\$ 256,317.12	\$ 159,518.08	\$ 500,000.00
Indirect Costs						
<b>Total Budget (Direct + Indirect)</b>		\$ 32,350.56	\$ 51,814.24	\$ 256,317.12	\$ 159,518.08	\$ 500,000.00

**Table 7. Cost Basis and Assumptions**

Task	<b>COST BASIS (PORT = \$46/HR + 54% FRINGE = \$70.84/HR; QEP = \$250/HR)</b>
Task 1 – Project Management	<p><u>Personnel and Fringe Total = \$6,800.64 (Personnel = \$4,416 + Fringe (54%)= \$2,384.64).</u> Review 16 QEP-prepared quarterly reports and ACRES updates: \$1,133.44 (16hrs x 1hr/report x \$70.84/hr); Attend 48 team meetings (monthly): \$3,400.32 (48hrs x 1hr/meeting x \$70.84/hr); Prepare 4 annual Federal Financial Reports: \$283.36 (4yrs x 1 hr/year x \$70.84/hr); Review 1 final report prepared by QEP \$283.36 (4h x \$70.84/hr); financial management/EPA billing (monthly): \$1,700.16 (24 months x .5hr/month x \$70.84/hr)</p> <p><u>Travel: \$3,800.</u> Travel to one National Brownfields Conference for 1 Port staff: \$2,400 (1 person x 1 conf. x \$2,400); Travel to two state/regional Brownfields conferences for 1 Port staff: \$1,400 (1 person x 2 conf. x \$700)</p> <p><u>Contractual: \$22,000.</u> Prepare 16 quarterly reports and 16 ACRES updates: \$8,000 (16 qtrs x 2 hrs/qtr x \$250/hr); attend 48 team coordination meetings (monthly): \$12,000 (48 hrs x \$250/hr); Prepare 1 final report: \$2,000 (8h x \$250/hr)</p> <p><u>Other: \$600.</u> Registration for 1 Nat'l Brownfields Conf. and 2 state/regional BF confs.: \$600 (\$200/conf x 3 conf)</p>
Task 2 – Community Outreach	<p><u>Personnel and Fringe Total = \$11,901.12 (Personnel = \$7,728 + Fringe (54%)= \$4,173.12).</u> Review PIP: \$141.68 (2hr x \$70.84/hr); plan/attend 4 community open houses: \$1,133.44 (4 meetings x 4hrs/mtg x \$70.84/hr); 16 quarterly articles/media/website updates: \$2,266.88 (16 updates x 2hrs/update x \$70.84/hr); Develop project webpage: \$141.68 (2hr x \$70.84/hr); Conduct 16 CAB meetings: \$2,266.88 (16 mtgs x 2hrs/mtg x \$70.84/hr); Develop and update brownfields inventory \$1,416.80 (4h to establish + 1h/qtr to update x 16 qtrs); Direct outreach to community members (outside community meetings): \$4,533.76 (16 quarters x 4hr x \$70.84/hr)</p> <p><u>Supply Costs: \$218.04.</u> Office supplies for community outreach (nametags, pens, paper, flip charts, etc.) (\$218.04)</p> <p><u>Contractual: \$39,500.</u> Support Port, CAB with PIP development: \$1,500 (6hrs x \$250/hr); Develop site nomination form, fact sheets and other informational materials \$3,000 (12h x \$250/h); Plan/attend 4 community open houses: \$6,000 (4 meetings x 6hr x \$250/hr); Support quarterly CAB meetings: \$8,000 (16 qtrs x 2h/qtr x \$250/hr); Quarterly articles/media/website updates: \$4,000 (16 updates x 1hr x \$250/hr); Develop and update inventory: \$5,000 (4h to establish + 1h/qtr to update x \$250/hr); Direct outreach to property owners, community \$11,000 (44hrs x \$250/hr)</p> <p><u>Other: \$345.</u> Printing: \$345 (3 large-scale posters x \$115/poster)</p>
Task 3—Site Inventory Development	<p><u>Personnel and Fringe Total = \$4,817.12 (Personnel = \$3,128 + Fringe (54%)= \$1,689.12).</u> Review QAPP, HASP, SAPPs, ESA results, HBMS results, and Section 106 consultations: \$4,108.72 (58hrs x \$70.84/hr); Support QEP securing site access agreements \$708.40 (2h/Phase I x 5 Phase I's x \$70.84/hr)</p> <p><u>Contractual: \$251,500.</u> 5 Phase I ESAs: \$35,000 (5x \$7,000 ea); 3 Phase II ESAs: \$150,000 (3 x \$50,000 ea); 1 QAPP: \$12,500 (50 hrs x \$250/hr); 3 HASP: \$6,000 (8h/HASP x 3 x \$250/hr); 3 SAPs: \$13,500 (3 x 18h x 250/hr); Section 106 consultations: \$4,500 (3 x 6h x \$250/hr); 2 HBMS: \$30,000 (2 x 60h x \$250/hr)</p>
Task 4—Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs)	<p><u>Personnel and Fringe Total = \$15,018.08 (Personnel = \$9,752 + Fringe (54%)= \$5,266.08).</u> Oversee QEP, site visits, meetings, and correspondence: \$10,200.96 (48 months x 3hrs/mo x \$70.84/hr); review ABCAs (2), cleanup plans (2) and site reuse plans (2) and provide feedback: \$3,400.32 (48hrs x \$70.84/hr); Closeout reporting, regulatory communication, correspondence: \$1,416.80 (20hrs x \$70.84/hr)</p> <p><u>Contractual: \$144,500.</u> Prepare ABCA: \$40,000 (2 x 80h x \$250/hr); Prepare 2 cleanup plans: \$50,000 (2x 100hrs x \$250/hr); Prepare 2 site reuse plans: \$50,000 (2 x 100hrs x \$250/hr); Coordinate review of cleanup plans and risk-based options with state regulator: \$4,500 (18 hr x \$250/hr)</p>
<p><i>Notes: ACRES=Assessment, Cleanup &amp; Redevelopment Exchange; HASP=Health &amp; Safety Plan; QEP=Qualified Environmental Professional, QAPP=Quality Assurance Project Plan, SAP=Site Specific Sampling &amp; Analysis Plans.</i></p>	

**3.F. PLAN TO MEASURE AND EVALUATE ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRESS AND RESULTS**

The Port will prepare a project work plan with a detailed schedule of milestones, including contracting a QEP; holding community advisory board meetings and community open houses; conducting direct outreach to neighbors and other interested parties; updating the brownfields inventory; quarterly and annual grant reporting. The Port will track results using Excel and will measure project results against its workplan on a quarterly basis, in coordination with required ACRES reporting. Measurable outcomes will include sites identified and assessed; regulatory closures achieved;

properties readied for reuse; acres of new or renovated commercial, industrial, mixed-use, residential, and recreational space; property transactions facilitated; jobs created or retained; and public and private funding leveraged. Tracking will also include changes in tax revenue and property values, infrastructure upgrades, and the value of site improvements. Should the Port fall behind, it will work with the QEP and its EPA Project Manager to prioritize remaining funds. Results will be reported in ACRES and the close-out report.

## **PROGRAMMATIC CAPABILITY**

### **4.a.-4.c. Organizational Capacity, Organizational Structure, and Description of Key Staff**

The Port's 4 key staff members regularly administer state and federal grants for infrastructure projects and have the skills to comply with all grant conditions, financial tracking, and agency reporting. Port staff can oversee complex projects with varying regulatory and administrative requirements. The Port will manage the grant internally and share project progress through partners. **Rick Adamek, the Port's Director of Asset Management**, will serve as the day-to-day project and grant manager. Rick has over 46 years' experience, including 9 with the Port, overseeing grant reporting for large Port projects. **Matt Friesen, the Port's Director of External Affairs**, will support Rick with public outreach. Matt has over 25 years' experience, including two with the Port in which he oversees community engagement. Matt holds a bachelor's degree from Gordon College. **Megan Richardson, the Port's Director of Finance and Accounting**, will be responsible for financial management, accounting, and financial reporting to EPA and reimbursement requests. Megan has over 17 years' experience and has successfully administered over \$100 million in funding across approximately 40 grants for the Port. Megan holds an associate's degree from Southwestern Oregon Community College. **Lanelle Comstock, the Port's Chief Executive Officer**, will support Rick, Matt, and Megan and provide general oversight as project director. Lanelle has over 29 years' experience. She oversees the Port's leadership team while reporting to the five-member Board of Commissioners. Lanelle holds a bachelor's degree from the University of Oregon.

### **4.d. Acquiring Additional Resources**

As demonstrated by its success implementing over \$100 million in state and federal grants (4.a-c), the Port has the staff and procedures to successfully acquire services to complete the grant through a competitive, qualifications-based process compliant with 2 CFR 200.317-200.326. The Port's existing systems will support efficient staff transitions if needed. This will eliminate project delays and ensure the implementation team maintains appropriate qualifications.

## **PAST PERFORMANCE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

### **4.f. Has Not Received an EPA Brownfields Grant but has Received Other Federal or Non-Federal Assistance Agreements**

#### *4.f.(1) Purpose and Accomplishments*

The Port has extensive experience administering federal and state assistance agreements supporting infrastructure, planning, and economic development. Project most similar to this one include a \$9.8 million U.S. DOT FASTLANE Grant implemented from 2017-2020. It completed structural, track, and drainage repairs in all nine tunnels (14,080 feet) along the CBRL. Outcomes included enhanced structural integrity and drainage, and reduced maintenance costs and delays. From May 2022 to June 2023, the Port implemented a \$75,000 Business Oregon Port Planning and Marketing Grant to fund a feasibility study for a multi-use Byproduct Recovery Center (BRC) in Charleston to support the regional seafood processing industry. Outputs included a feasibility study that characterizes wastewater streams for two existing seafood processors in Coos Bay to estimate the flow rate and loading of the BRC, and identification of potential permitting frameworks and their impacts on economic/technical project feasibility, plus an assessment of infrastructure requirements and evaluation of technologies for byproduct recovery. While the project did not move forward, outcomes included sharing project results with other Oregon ports who used it in their efforts to build seafood BRCs.

#### *4.f.(2) Compliance with Grant Requirements*

The Port complied with all grant reporting requirements, including complete and timely submission of workplans and programmatic, annual financial and close-out reports. All funds were utilized during the designated period of performance. The Port achieved all expected results in a timely manner and communicated these to project managers at funding agencies. Grants complied with all approved work plans, schedules and terms and conditions, and concluded on time. No corrective actions were issued.

## THRESHOLD CRITERIA

### 1. Applicant Eligibility

#### a) Applicant Types

The Oregon International Port of Coos Bay (the Port) is a General Purpose Unit of Local Government that is eligible for funding.

Attachment: Eligibility Documentation

#### b) Exemption from Federal Taxation under Section 501(c)(4)

The Port is not exempt from Federal taxation under Section 501(c)(4).

### 2. Community Involvement

The Port will communicate project progress to the community and partner organizations at least quarterly through its website, social media, and other electronic communications. It will coordinate with partner organizations to solicit community input on site prioritization and reuse through town halls, coordination with local organizations, and direct one-on-one outreach to priority site neighbors and other key stakeholders. It will also establish a brownfields-specific community advisory board (CAB) to advise on site prioritization and reuse. The Port will document the feedback it receives and consider it during site prioritization, assessment planning, and development of cleanup and reuse planning materials, as appropriate. The Port will respond to community input by incorporating relevant feedback where feasible and by providing follow-up information through project updates or direct communication.

The Port will designate and publicize a staff point of contact and will lean on the CAB to advise on and assist with community outreach. The CAB will meet quarterly and upon award will assist the Port in developing a written Public Involvement Plan (PIP) for this project, which will draw on the existing Community Engagement Plan for Pacific Coast Intermodal Port (PCIP) project. The CAB will provide feedback on next steps at priority sites, provide input on prioritizing additional sites based on the Port's brownfields inventory, serve as project champions, assist with property owner outreach, and share project information with the community while conveying community feedback to the Port. The Port will track and evaluate progress on community engagement monthly, and goals and milestones quarterly. The Port will proactively address schedule or budget deviations, and adjustments will be made in alignment with its project goals and required outputs.

### 3. Expenditure of Existing Grant Funds

The Port does not have an open EPA Brownfields Assessment or Multipurpose Grant.

### 4. Contractors and Named Subrecipients

#### CONTRACTORS

N/A.

#### NAMED SUBRECIPIENTS

N/A.