

## MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY COUNCIL

March 1, 2016

The minutes of the proceedings of a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Coos Bay, Coos County, Oregon, held at 7 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 500 Central Avenue, Coos Bay, Oregon.

### **Those Attending**

Those present were Mayor Crystal Shoji and Councilors Fred Brick, Mark Daily, Jennifer Groth, Stephanie Kramer, Thomas Leahy, and Mike Vaughan. City staff present were City Attorney Nate McClintock, Finance Director Susanne Baker, Deputy Finance Director Amy Kinnaman, Library Director Sami Pierson, Community Development Director Eric Day, Public Works Director Jim Hossley, and Police Chief Gary McCullough. City Manager Rodger Craddock was absent; Public Works Director Jim Hossley acted in his place.

### **Flag Salute**

Mayor Shoji opened the meeting and led the Council and assembly in the salute to the flag.

Councilor Mike Vaughan entered the meeting at 7:01 p.m.

### **Public Comments**

Jon Youngblood, North Bend: expressed concern about the plight of homelessness across the Country and in the local area; provided the Council with a letter which detailed his concerns and suggestions for addressing the issues. Mr. Youngblood requested the matter be added as an agenda item for the next Council meeting to further discuss the issue. Mayor Shoji stated the 10-year homeless plan was written and adopted but never put into practice; suggested Mr. Youngblood could work with local organizations that focused on such matters.

### **Consent Calendar**

Mayor Shoji reviewed the consent calendar which consisted of 3a: approval of the minutes of February 16, 2016; 3b: adoption of Resolution 16-02 a supplemental budget approving a Coos Bay – North Bend Water Board Empire Boulevard water line project loan; 3c: adoption of Resolution 16-03 accepting a CityCounty Insurance Service (CIS) job analysis grant award, and; 3d: approval of a pedestrian crosswalk enforcement grant. Mayor Shoji requested agenda item 3d: approval of a pedestrian crosswalk enforcement grant down to the agenda as item 4a for further discussion. Councilor Groth moved to approve the consent calendar as amended approving the minutes of February 16, 2016, adopting Resolution 16-02 a supplemental budget approving a Coos Bay – North Bend Water Board Empire Boulevard water line project loan, and adopting Resolution 16-03 accepting a CIS job analysis grant. Councilor Kramer seconded the motion which carried with Mayor Shoji and Councilors Brick, Daily, Groth, Kramer, Leahy, and Vaughan voting aye.

### **New Council Business**

Councilor Kramer stated she spoke with a local contractor who expressed concern about the length of the City's permitting process; Coos Bay took four to six weeks to approve building

## **City Council Minutes – March 1, 2016**

permits; North Bend and County had a two week approval process. Councilor Kramer asked for staff report on the matter. Councilor Daily asked for update on the concept to require staff to live within City limits; consensus was to resend the staff report to Council which addressed the matter. Mayor Shoji inquired as to the City's social media policy to provide up-to-date news, specifically the Police Department's Facebook page. Police Chief Gary McCullough stated the department had a media policy for releasing information to the public; noted staffing levels limited the department's ability to provide real time news updates; stated he could provide a staff report on the matter.

### **Approval of a Pedestrian Crosswalk Enforcement Grant**

Mayor Shoji requested consent calendar item 3d: approval of a pedestrian crosswalk enforcement grant be brought down to the agenda for further discussion. Police Chief Gary McCullough advised the pedestrian crosswalk enforcement grant was a safety enforcement grant through the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). Chief McCullough noted the crosswalk enforcement events provided a great opportunity to educate people on crosswalk laws; noted there were six crosswalk safety operations planned to occur between May and September 2016. Councilor Vaughan noted a crosswalk safety concern at the intersection between McKay's and Myrtle Arms Apartments. Councilor Groth moved to approve the pedestrian crosswalk enforcement grant. Mayor Shoji seconded the motion which carried with Mayor Shoji and Councilors Brick, Daily, Groth, Kramer, Leahy, and Vaughan voting aye.

### **Continuation of a Public Hearing to Consider a Proposed Ordinance to Vacate a Portion of Pennsylvania Avenue – Approval Would Require Enactment of the Draft Ordinance**

Community Development Director Eric Day stated after reviewing the Planning Commission's recommendation on February 16, 2016 the City Council continued the public hearing and requested additional information be provided regarding the adjacent lots of record, Coos County zoning designations, Estuary Management designations for the proposed land vacation which extended along Pennsylvania Avenue between Southwest Boulevard and 13th Street. Mr. Day provided the Council with a brief history on the matter. Mr. Day cited an email from the Coos County Planning Department dated February 19, 2016 which noted the property (Tax Lots 3900, 4000, 4400, and 4500) were consolidated into a single tax lot as required by a conditional use permit approved (to site a single-family dwelling) last year and with Tax Lot 400 was a single parcel. The County zone designation of property outside the city limits was "Exclusive Farm Use" (EFU). Mr. Day provided a brief overview of the primary uses in the non-residential and residential uses zones. Mr. Day stated the two County Estuary Management Designations for the property outside the city limits were part of the Coos Bay Estuary Management Plan & Coquille River Estuary Management Plan which were regulated by the County. The general location of the proposed vacation as defined by the plans was: Isthmus Slough - Coalbank Slough; zoning designations were 40-RS and 38-CA; zoning districts: 40-rural shorelands and 38-conservation aquatic.

Mayor Shoji opened the public hearing. No public comments were given and the hearing closed. Mayor Shoji stated a property vacation should not be provided unless the City was absolutely sure it would not be of any future use to the City. Councilor Leahy noted the proposed vacation met all required decision criteria for approval. Councilor Daily suggested the property should be retained future development. Councilor Brick was in favor of approving the

## City Council Minutes – March 1, 2016

property vacation. Councilor Kramer moved to not grant the proposed vacation of Pennsylvania Avenue. Councilor Daily seconded the motion which failed with Mayor Shoji and Councilors Daily and Kramer voting aye and Councilors Brick, Groth, Leahy, and Vaughan voting nay.

Mr. Day clarified the purpose of the Planning Commission's evaluation of the vacation was strictly to review if the vacation met required planning criteria; Council's approval was required because a property vacation was an exchange of real property.

Councilor Vaughan moved to enact the ordinance approving the proposed vacation of Pennsylvania Avenue, located between Southwest Boulevard and South 13<sup>th</sup> Street. Councilor Brick seconded the motion. Deputy Finance Director Amy Kinnaman read the ordinance by title only and Ordinance 474 was enacted by the following vote:

Aye:	Councilors Brick, Groth, Leahy, and Vaughan
Nay:	Mayor Shoji and Councilors Daily and Kramer
Absent:	None

### **Continuation of Negotiation of Contract for Operation, Maintenance, and Management of the Sewer Treatment & Collection System**

Public Works Director Jim Hossley stated at the February 16, 2016 Council meeting staff presented information related to the Request for Proposal process the City went through for selecting a Sewer Operation, Maintenance, and Management provider. At the end of the presentation to Council one of the two proposers, Veolia, provided a letter stating the selection committee had made an error in computing Veolia's fee proposal. After the meeting, staff evaluated the letter and the original fee proposal submitted by Veolia and confirmed an error was made. The correct value for determining Veolia's annual cost should have been calculated using a 16% markup (management fee) for direct costs and 10% markup for indirect costs. The error occurred when the 16% markup was used for both direct and indirect costs. Mr. Hossley stated no error was made in calculating CH2M's costs.

In their February 16, 2017 letter (erroneously dated January 16, 2016), Veolia also provided a cost where the markup for all indirect costs was 0%. With this option, the City would pay all indirect costs; staff recommended against this option due to the lack of City resources. Veolia's corrected estimated total cost over 10 years, assuming a 16% markup for direct and 10% for indirect costs respectively, was \$25,031,930. CH2M's estimated 10-year total cost, assuming an 18% markup for both direct and indirect costs, was \$24,470,619; the cost for CH2M was estimated to be \$561,311 less than Veolia's over 10 years. Mr. Hossley noted the Selection Committee graded and ranked the prequalification package, proposal, and interviews. Cost was only one factor considered when the selection committee; overall, the selection committee felt that CH2M provided the more robust proposal and offered the City more value.

Shilen Patel: stated he was a representative from Veolia; stated he was disappointed at the Selection Committee's recommendation. Mr. Patel provided the Council a letter which analyzed staff's calculations and recommendation process; suggested the City would be best served if the contract was awarded to Veolia. Gary Young, Regional Vice President for CH2M: noted CH2M's proposal was the lower cost proposal and better for the community; stated CH2M helped to support the local community; noted local staff lived in Coos Bay and surrounding area.

## **City Council Minutes – March 1, 2016**

Councilor Daily inquired how many people were employed by CH2M in Coos Bay whereby Mr. Young advised CH2M currently employed 14 staff members in Coos Bay. Mr. Young noted four staff members recently retired.

Councilor Groth moved to direct staff to negotiate a contract for the operation, maintenance, and management of the City's sewer treatment and collection system with CH2M. Mayor Shoji seconded the motion. Councilor Vaughan expressed concern about the recent employment turnover at CH2M. Councilor Daily suggested there was only a \$500,000 difference in cost over a 10-year period between the two proposals; expressed concern about unrealized complacency and recommended awarding the contract to Veolia. A call for the question was made which carried with Mayor Shoji and Councilors Brick, Groth, Kramer, and Leahy voting aye and Councilors Daily and Vaughan voting nay.

### **Consideration of Alternatives to Local Improvement District Options – Approval Would Require Adoption of Resolution 16-04**

Public Works Director Jim Hossley stated the City of Coos Bay had approximately 23 lane miles of streets that were gravel roads. The gravel roads serve primarily residential areas; some were heavily traveled and served several neighborhoods. Other gravel roads served only small isolated neighborhoods (road was not a through way/served only as access to homes in a single neighborhood). The existing gravel roads did not meet current City of Coos Bay street standards. Current standards for a residential road required 36' of pavement which included two 10' travel lanes plus 16' of pavement to accommodate parking on each side of the street. Curb and 5' sidewalk was also required on each side of the street. The standards also allowed for a 28' wide pavement section where parking was restricted to one side of the street.

Councilor Leahy exited the meeting at 7:59 p.m.

Mr. Hossley stated the City's funding for road maintenance and reconstruction was very limited and had been for several decades. In the foreseeable future, it was unlikely the City would have funds to pave the City's existing gravel roads. One alternative was for property owners to form a local improvement district (LID) to pay for paving their gravel roads. The main challenge facing owners wanting to form an LID was the cost to reconstruct a road to meet current City standards. In most cases, the proportional cost share per property owner was too high and interest in forming the LID quickly faded. Another challenge was the limited funds the City had available to front the cost for the improvements. Mr. Hossley noted, due to the high cost of meeting existing city standards, the City Council directed staff to explore reduced standards for street improvements associated with a Local Improvement District (LID).

Staff reviewed the Neighborhood Street Design Guidelines, An Oregon Guide to Reducing Street Widths. The document provided local governments with guidelines when considering street widths. The minimum recommended paved street width was 20', the Uniform Fire Code called out 20-foot wide clear passage. Street width affected the ability of emergency service vehicles to quickly reach a fire or medical emergency. Response times can be slowed depending upon the amount of on-street parking and traffic encountered. Narrow streets lined with parked cars may not provide adequate space for firefighters to access and use their equipment once they reach the scene of an emergency. Staff also had conversations with ECONorthwest about their work with the City of Portland on LID Standards and also spoke with

## City Council Minutes – March 1, 2016

City of Portland LID administrator. The latter said in Portland, the cost per property owner was more than the amount calculated for the Nutwood LID property owners; suggested for the City's LID's to be successful, even with reduced standards, required the City to subsidize a large portion of the total project cost.

Councilor Leahy re-entered the meeting at 8:02 p.m.

Mr. Hossley provided an example of the Nutwood LID which showed how much money could be saved if reduced standards were implemented (that still met emergency response needs). Mr. Hossley reviewed three of the four cost estimates the Engineer (The Dyer Partnership) prepared for the Nutwood LID and noted the lowest cost alternative (D) was still too high for the interested property owners to accept. Staff explored another alternative which resulted in an approximate savings of \$35,000 (as much as 20%) over Alternative D; but noted it was unlikely enough savings to incentivize property owners to support the LID.

Mr. Hossley provided the Council with a "Local Improvement Districts to Upgrade Substandard Roads, Consideration for Alternative Standards" proposal for consideration; noted the standards recommend consideration of reduced standards only for gravel roads serving small, isolated neighborhoods on a case-by-case basis. The standards would not apply to heavily traveled gravel roads serving two or more neighborhoods. Mayor Shoji suggested the current proposal for the Nutwood LID was not viable without support of City funds but noted the City was not in position to provide such support. Craig Main, Coos Bay: stated he owned home on Nutwood; thanked Council and staff for developing alternative standards. Councilor Vaughan suggested implementing a compacted gravel base over a period of years.

Councilor Groth moved to adopt Resolution 16-04 adopting local improvement districts to upgrade substandard roads, consideration for alternative standards. Councilor Kramer seconded the motion. Councilor Daily inquired if there was a way for the city to provide a long-term loan to support LID's i.e. a 20-year bond. Finance Director Susanne Baker stated the City paid the upfront the costs for LID projects; noted the City currently held over \$300,000 in property liens/LID's of which the majority were delinquent/unpaid. Councilor Daily inquired if the properties could be foreclosed whereby City Attorney Nate McClintock affirmed the City could foreclose on unpaid properties. A call for the question was made which carried with Mayor Shoji and Councilors Brick, Daily, Groth, Kramer, Leahy, and Vaughan voting aye.

### **Approval of a Contract for Information Technology Services**

Finance Director Susanne Baker provided a brief history on the City of Coos Bay's use of information technology (IT) support. Ms. Baker stated technology was necessary to provide efficient delivery of the services requested by the public; noted the City's technology network was complex and needed consistent maintenance in order to keep the asset viable. The health and vulnerability of the network was of the highest concern and prompts action. Ms. Baker stated the required maintenance was performed in a manner which was consistent and proactive with a long term approach but the short term method resulted in a disheveled network in need of immediate attention. The ongoing and increasing technology problems required more time each day by the provider, and the frequency of downtime had increased and had become an unacceptable regularity. The current provider's response time to immediate problems had increased with old problems complicating new problems which created compound issues. Ms.

## City Council Minutes – March 1, 2016

Baker stated the City had an internal IT Committee which met each month with the provider to discuss IT issues, budget, prioritize projects, and to work together for the benefit of the City as a whole; noted the IT provider was an integral part of the meeting which provided an opportunity to discuss in person any obstacles and resolve issues.

For quite some time, outside of the monthly meetings, the IT Committee had been discussing options to address the issues for improved technology services. Due to the complexity of the City's network and security protocols, the consensus was the needs of a technology provider with access to a 24/7 team of experienced high level network engineers that were proactive and could recommend decisions that would not hamper future operations, with timely follow through. The IT Committee considered whether it would be cost effective to hire an employee or look towards a local firm. After looking into the cost of an employee and comparing with other entities along the coast, the salary plus benefits would be cost prohibitive. Over the years, the City has seen the difficulties of the technology providers trying to find qualified employees to meet the local needs and resolved this would not be a solution. The City's 24/7 operation, overtime costs, and reliance on one individual would be burdensome for both the City and an employee. This brought the focus to a larger technology firm with depth in which to draw upon experience and a multitude of highly skilled employees. An additional benefit with such a firm was the professional peer review of projects within the firm to streamline projects. With this quality review, the focus of projects and work would be proactive with a long term, efficient approach. Ms. Baker highlighted the severity of some of the current and on-going IT issues and response by the by the current provider; noted when issues are discovered, the network provider offers a conceptual solution with promise of future quote for the City's approval to purchase the needed equipment. However, quotes were not obtained, and the issues continued and/or caused network failure.

The most viable solution to the City's technology issues that staff explored was the use of a broad based technology firm, Executech, which performed the system engineering and upgrades for the City's financial software vendor, Caselle. During the upgrade of financial software Executech performed the upgrade remotely and from the knowledge of that experience they were easily able to implement the offsite backup services requested. Ms. Baker noted Caselle utilized Executech to perform all of their financial software upgrades for cities and other clients. Because of the City's past experience with Executech, the City approached Executech to provide an assessment of the City's network. Executech provided an assessment which was not entirely surprising considering the on-going IT issues. The status of the City's network was such that it required reconfiguration to resolve the issues. During the reconfiguration, the network must remain fully operational. Executech was asked to provide a proposal to bring the City's network up to a fully operational and efficiently operating network. The City's current network comprised many different functions which had become co-mingled over time; and as part of this process, they would be separated. One of these functions was the phone system which would be addressed through a separate process. To solve the business continuity issue, there were two approaches. The first approach involved expending funds to integrate new servers into the network and separate out the known issues. This process would be a long term approach which would extend the life of the network into the future and maintain the needed business continuity. A second approach would accomplish the same task; but it would instead invest funds in labor without the benefit of new assets and extended the life of the network in a long term approach. Executech proposed the first approach at the onset, and the second approach was not considered optimum for the City or efficient.

## City Council Minutes – March 1, 2016

Ms. Baker advised Executech was aware of and would help the City comply with the “Red Flag Compliance” requirements which were regulations created by the Federal Trade Commission to help prevent identity theft, and were federally mandated. The current provider was not able to evidence network compliance with Red Flag Compliance regulations. Ms. Baker noted Executech’s standard use of the federally mandated compliance regulations testifies to the depth and breadth of their technology knowledge, and the best practices the City desired. The security protocols were required of businesses utilizing online sales with the use of credit cards to secure private information held by the City on the network.

Ms. Baker stated Executech’s proposal had two components. The first was reconfiguration of the network; deployment of a team of technicians would be on site at the City to correct the City’s network functionality in an expedient manner while keeping the network operational. Additionally, Executech would have a full-time tech onsite during the first month to resolve remaining issues. To implement the reconfiguration based on a preliminary review of the current hardware/software implementation cost with a contingency was estimated at approximately \$91,000. Because of the unknown nature of the work required, Executech estimated the work to the best of their knowledge at this point in time. Staff recommended a contingency to cover likely unanticipated costs. Executech advised they would bill less if the actual costs were less.

The second component was monthly IT support by remote access of an estimated 10 hours per week which would include a quarterly onsite visit. The proposal would utilize a cloud solution for email and provided network software needed for efficiency and security. Currently, the City spent \$2,874 per month for IT labor for the City’s network (phone system is separate). This figure would increase to \$4,550 per month which was an increase of approximately \$1,676 from the current contracted price. The proposal also included monthly software subscriptions to ensure up to date and consistent spam, anti-virus, Office 365, and backup services. Additionally at no charge, Executech would provide a software program to monitor the condition of the network and alert their staff to any issues with the essential processes and services to proactively correct issues.

Ms. Baker stated after review of the Executech proposal, City staff contacted School District 9 (District) based upon the City’s good working relationship with the District’s Technology Department and requested assistance for an unbiased third-party review of the initial proposal and the current condition of the City’s network. After the third-party review and the District’s site visit to the City’s server room and assessment of the network, the Technology Department Manager advised: “As we indicated in our last meeting with you, Kevin and I believe the city will need a consulting firm like Executech with considerable depth and experience to bring your technology up to date. We did not feel that the proposal for services was overpriced, but seemed reasonable based on the scope of work.”

Ms. Baker stated the current budget did not anticipate a mid-year change in IT services, and a supplemental budget appropriating carryover would be necessary. Additionally, to ease the cash flow, Executech offered an interest free loan for 30 months for the hardware portion of the proposal which staff would advise accepting with the anticipation of prepaying depending upon cash flow. City contracting rules provided exception for going out to bid. Ms. Baker stated the proposed contract would be month to month. Councilor Daily expressed concern about the

## **City Council Minutes – March 1, 2016**

extra expense. Ms. Baker stated the technology fund was funded each year with a \$75,000 transfer out of the major capital fund; staff extended computer/technology replacement plan from five to six years as a cost savings measure. Mayor Shoji inquired why the City did not have to go out for bid. Ms. Baker stated the City of Coos Bay contracting rules section 6(o) did not require going out to bid for specialty services which included equipment maintenance.

Councilor Leahy moved to direct the City Manager to execute the proposed 30 month interest free loan for the hardware with Executech, approve the technology implementation estimate of \$91,000 using Executech as the technology provider, and approve ongoing monthly IT services with Executech. Mayor Shoji seconded the motion. Councilor Daily expressed concern about using carryover to fund the excess costs; suggested carryover was not a long-term solution; inquired where the additional costs would be offset. Ms. Baker suggested implementing a technology fee to help offset the additional technology costs. A call for the question was made which carried with Mayor Shoji and Councilors Brick, Groth, Kramer, Leahy, and Vaughan voting aye and Councilor Daily voting nay.

### **Review of Development Code Impacts of Marijuana Dispensaries**

Community Development Director Eric Day stated based on Council direction the current business license requirements prohibiting marijuana dispensaries would be put to a public vote during the general election this upcoming November. In preparation, staff noted there were land decisions that would need to be made should the voters approve business licenses for marijuana dispensaries thereby allowing dispensaries within the city limits of Coos Bay. Mr. Day noted cities within Oregon were taking a variety of different land use approaches to address the marijuana dispensary issue; reviewed a spreadsheet which showed a cross section of the various approaches; noted cities were required to use the State standards at a minimum, but could further restrict the use by increasing other time, manner, and place restrictions.

Mr. Day stated should the public vote recommend for the Council to remove the business license restriction, the Council may want to have the required land use text amendment to the development code in place. Staff would need to work with the Planning Commission and Council on the amendments to the code well in advance of the vote. Additionally, staff recommended a City wide notice be sent on the land use action. The notice would cost about \$3,000 to print and send. Mr. Day expressed concern about wasting staff and committee time, and money should the vote not pass. If the Council elected to wait until after the vote to begin working on possible land use amendments, the changes would not be effective for around six months allowing staff time to work with the Planning Commission, City Council and to have the required DLCD noticing time period. Mayor Shoji suggested if the public votes in support of allowing the dispensaries, the City should provide reasonable guidelines.

Councilor Daily moved to have staff wait to devote staff time and city money to the matter until after the vote was decided. Councilor Kramer seconded the motion. Councilor Vaughan suggested the City could benefit from additional revenue if the guidelines were in place should the voters elect to allow marijuana dispensaries. City Attorney Nate McClintock stated the voters would have to approve the sales of recreational marijuana and vote on implementing the proposed local tax; proportional share of State revenue tax would be contingent on allowing recreational marijuana sales in Coos Bay; if approved taxes would not be collected during the six month period of time in which land use changes were being updated. A call for the question



## **City Council Minutes – March 1, 2016**

was made which carried with Mayor Shoji and Councilors Brick, Daily, Groth, Kramer, and Leahy voting aye and Councilor Vaughan voting nay.

### **Approval of a Work Order for Engineering Design and Construction Services for Repair of West Park Road**

Councilor Kramer exited the meeting at 9:08 p.m.

The scope of work for the City of Coos Bay's West Park Road repair project included the engineering design and development of construction plans, technical specifications, and construction support services for the slide repair, sanitary sewer line replacement, and storm water drainage improvements. The scope of work also included construction management. Staff requested a fee proposal and scope of work from engineering firms approved to do work for the City under the City's existing Miscellaneous Engineering Services Contract. The work order for the West Park Road engineering services would be under the existing contract. As time is of the essence, staff is seeking Council approval for the City Manager to sign the work order with the successful firm for an amount not to exceed \$40,000. Mr. Hossley advised the project was submitted to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for consideration to fund. If funded by FEMA, the City will be responsible for 25% of the cost; noted President Obama did approve the disaster declaration for Coos County, qualifying damage attributable to the December 2015 storm for federal disaster assistance funding. Mr. Hossley stated due to the complexity in the geotechnical and drainage issues estimated overall construction costs would be \$250,000 to \$400,000. Councilor Vaughan inquired proposed work included soil analysis with boring samples and underlying clay deposits. Ms. Hossley stated the geotechnical engineering would be involved in the process. Councilor Vaughan stated he had been working on a site in the vicinity of the repair and offered to share sample analysis.

Councilor Kramer re-entered the meeting at 9:11 p.m.

Councilor Brick moved to approve the work order for engineering design and construction services for a fee not to exceed \$40,000. Councilor Vaughan seconded the motion which carried with Mayor Shoji and Councilors Brick, Daily, Groth, Kramer, Leahy, and Vaughan voting aye.

### **City Attorney's Report**

No comments were given.

### **City Manager's Report**

City Manager Rodger Craddock was absent; in his place, Public Works Director Jim Hossley advised at the next Council meeting Council would be discussing conditions of the state revolving fund (SRF) loan application for construction of wastewater treatment plant #2 (WWPT#2) as well as the Construction Management General Contractor (CMGC) contract for construction of WWTP#2; brush was cleared at Nutwood at Coos Bay Boulevard to approve site visibility; noted the Police Chief found no traffic accidents had occurred at site in the past five years; cost estimate to bring the intersection up to grade was \$400,000 in addition another \$100,000 for engineering design services.

**City Council Minutes – March 1, 2016**

**Council Comments**

No comments were given.

**Adjourn**

There being no further business to come before the Council, Mayor Shoji adjourned the meeting. The next regular Council meeting was scheduled for March 15, 2016 in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Crystal Shoji, Mayor

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_  
Susanne Baker, City Recorder