PORT OF PORT ORFORD
Special Board Meeting
Tuesday, November 10, 2020 @ 6:00 P.M.

1. **Call to Order** by Commission Chair, Aaron Ashdown @ 6:05 P.M.

2. **Roll Call**
   Commissioners: Tom Calvanese (TC), Dave Bassett (DB), Leila Thompson (LT), Brett Webb (BW), Aaron Ashdown (AA),
   Staff and Contractors: Shannon Souza (SS), Pat Cox (PC)

3. **Declaration of Potential Conflicts of Interest** – None

4. **Public Comment** – None

5. **Unfinished Business** – None

6. **New Business**
   a. **Redevelopment Update**
      TC gave brief overview for guests in attendance via zoom.

      SS discussed the time frames and what was projected to be accomplished in them. In addition, she spoke about the updated strategy. There will be a reorganization of our funding goals for updating funder/partner inventory, priorities, opportunities, and timelines. Funding plan is to update funder/partner inventory, priorities, opportunities & timelines.

      **United States Economic Development Administration (EDA)**
      - CARES acts funds exhausted,
      - Stacking applications in the queue awaiting federal funding developments,
      - Typical Awards in $1.5-3 range with some up to $5M,
      - EDA encouraged us to differentiate project components and budgets that could be funded independently.
      - The Port qualifies for 20% match with lower match potential if evidence of COVID related match impacts.
      - Partially or unfunded projects with merit will brough to the Regional Economic Diversity Summit at which EDA advocate for other agency funding.

      **Wild Rivers Alliance:**
      $200,000 Grant Award contingent on award of $3M EDA funding
      Updates to Port Commission approved strategy and scope of phase for participation will be confirmed with fund steering committee.
Craft 3: Ford Family Foundation:

- Loaned funds to be expended at end of a brick-and-mortar project.
- County Emergency Management – State Homeland security Grants:
  - Will coordinate with Curry County Emergency Response Manager to prepare application by January 30, 2021.

Federal Emergency Management Administration:

- Building resilient infrastructure and communities, next intake is next summer.
- Have notified state coordinator of plan for participation in 2021 pre-application process.
- Reorganize & streamline development and funding strategy for:
  - Most immediate investment & community gains
  - Adaptability to information, needs and resources
  - Modular expansion of scope through sequential phases for independent yet synergistic progressive development rapid

Define first fundable project phase that:

- Is within range of the initially presented budget - $6.765M (RIF application 2018)
- Is consistent with funder requirements
- Results in immediate benefits to the Port and community.

Overview of Scope for State Funding Request Update 2020:

- Seawater Delivery design
- Seawater Delivery Construction
- Site Plan with Geo hazard mitigation
- Design stormwater design
- Site improvements
- Utilities: Waste, Lift and Stormwater
- Site Geotech, monitoring and design (Slope stability plus)
- Diver Access, Geo Hazard Mitigation, Stabilization and Egress Protection contingency.

Additional Scope for full Federal funding ask:

- Seafood hub structure design
- Onsite Energy
• Communications
• Seafood hub structure construction.

BW asked SS to help clarify why were we looking at the resilience of the location of the electric building when we do not have plans for that specific location. SS answered that we do not know enough about the site location for the Seafood Hub to state that it is a location that can be resiliently constructed. We need to determine that. While crew is already mobilized, they can also assess the other building. We will need to be able to demonstrate resiliency to secure the funds from FEMA.

AA asked if Coos Curry had any Geotech studies on file? SS stated she had not asked them.

LT expressed concerns about getting off track and expanding. SS replied that we did not want to get to the end of the geologic assessment and determine it is not a feasible location and then have to go back to where we are now. SS recommends compartmentalizing the scopes of work as alternates. If we have components and the preliminary budget for those components, we can issue and RFP and when we get it back, make sure the bids are compartmentalized. This way we can then say that we are not choosing that alternative at that time.

BW asked SS if we are going to take advantage of the opportunity and do a Geotech study on the entire Port property or just the agreed upon site and the other area of interest. BW said that we have been pulled off track for at least 2 years on the siting of this project and that it feels like we are being drug off in that direction again. Given the composition of some of the meetings recently, it looks a little off. BW asked SS is she agreed that we have a preferred upon site and this work is being done in a matter to make that project on that site successful? SS replied yes.

AA had a question about the funding for communication improvements. SS answered stating that in part, the funding is for communications and to help in stepping into more secure day to day operations. It will also provide a basis for future economic opportunities. AA asked if that would include fiber optics/high speed internet. SS replied yes.

BW asked SS if she was talking about an underwater cable? What communication wire needs to go there if it is not going into the ocean. SS said no and explained that if we get into broadband services (higher efficiency, more powerful routers, signal boosters) that is a placeholder as we move forward, we want the most affordable and effective communications we can have.

LT confirmed with SS that the communication system is part of the project construction and that its separated to meet the need of funding. SS also stated that its separated to differentiate for those funders what elements they would be participating in.
BW asked SS if these capacities would have anything to do with offshore energy discussions that may have been had or would investigating that entire area be important to bringing ocean energy ashore. BW said if so, he thought that the Commission should discuss whether they want to support that. He states that offshore energy has been a big contentious issue with commercial fisherman and does not see any reason why any cable needs to move through there. SS stated it was not about that at all.

AA commented to BW that in fact, conversations would happen further down the road and that he believes that the things in discussion (Onsite Energy and Communications) are just placeholders to separate out the funding part of it.

LT confirmed with SS that the onsite energy budget is for wherever it will be located.

BW said as long everyone agrees that we are a fishing community and that everything we do for this project should not run counter to the history of who we are and what we are trying to do.

SS said that we can put out the RFP out and make it modular too. Ask for the numbers to specific elements that you are going to do and in addition, ask what the cost would be for additional items. Then the Port can look at those numbers, see how they fit in the budget, see what has been funded and then decide at that point.

LT said to SS that that it seems at some point, there must have been something in your understanding of the preliminary engineering report or, LT stated she’s just not sure where the concept transferred from relocating to keeping power where it is so somewhere, someone deduced and had a conversation, she’s not really sure and indicates it just changes where our original focus was. How did we decide that one place was better than another if we do not technically have that information yet? SS shared what her process was. She indicated all these questions will be asked and looked at by our funders. If we can move forward, better understand the existing site and what the mitigative actions would be, in terms of construction and that budget, and at the same time, not lose any ground get information on other areas in the site, why wouldn’t we do that?

AA indicated he is hoping that we can have a good proposal ready to approve a week from today.

SS spoke about first funding phase –

• Seawater delivery design
• Site Geotech monitoring and design
• Site plan with geo hazard mitigation design
• Rainwater Harvest and Low impact stormwater design
• Seawater Delivery Construction
• Diver Access
• Geo hazard mitigation, stabilization, and egress protection
• Contingency
• Site improvements
• Utilities: Waste, Lift and Stormwater

TC asked SS to say a little more about egress protection and if she was talking about the road from the dock and how important it is. SS said that stabilizing the slope is a priority for the Port, regardless of where any structures are. That is how you get in and out, that is how the fleet remains safe.

TC asked SS if the budgeted line incorporates design needed for the Seafood Hub. SS said that the design work is incorporated into 2022.

Adjourn 7:29 P.M.