

Submitter: Steve Miller
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Joint Committee On Transportation
Measure: HB3382

Thank you for receiving my testimony as a citizen of Coos Bay.

With a variety of personal responsibilities, including operation of a small business, I have tried to keep up with the rushed process to introduce and rapidly seek approval of the bill out of the Joint Committee on Transportation by the proponents and developers of a proposed shipping container terminal on Coos Bay. The NorthPoint/Oregon International Port of Coos Bay development became the clear impetus of HB 3382 as its consideration went on in the Joint Committee and the project that has been proposed was the single purpose focus from the start. This particular form of a container terminal concept has been floated for several years. It has been examined by concerned residents and numerous serious issues have emerged from evaluating the details made public, including many noted in an overall 20-yr. study of the Oregon International Port of Coos, its general operations, and proposed projects and other well-researched documents published on the League of Women Voters of Coos County website. <https://my.lwv.org/oregon/coos-county>.

Two studies have been commissioned by the Port within the last 20-years to determine the feasibility of various types of cargo terminals with a Coos Bay location. Both studies found Coos Bay was too far from significant markets able to absorb any large level of imported cargo or similarly, generate significant local or regional levels of cargo for export, giving any of the cargo designs very little chance of success, but a high business risk of success. Those conditions remain today and would not be erased by the nearly \$900 Million dollars being sought for a Mega Grant application to the U.S. Dept. of Transportation. In addition to these costs, the rail line has a current allowable average speed of 10-15 miles per hour over the 121 mile run from Coos Bay to Eugene to connect with the one (an only) Class 1 freight carrier (Union Pacific). Nearly all U.S.. terminals have the flexibility of choosing from two or more Class 1 carriers. Over the 6+ hour slow curving route, where 9 tunnels that are even remodeled for double-stack container cars have a history of collapse, most of the total 120 bridges over the route are wooden, and the nearly 30 corroded steel bridges need major repairs. There are over 240 rail line crossing over the route (only 13 signalized) that serve private driveways to one or several homes, businesses, farm and forrest lands. and only a few are signalized. By contrast, the Ports of LA and Long Beach, which the Port of Coos Bay claims to compete with has lots of options to ship containers from their ports and has access to at least two Class 1 rail carriers just 20 miles away via the dedicated 45 mph multiple track Alameda Corridor.

The small (for container terminals), almost 300 acre container terminal site is to be

located in a heavily-used area for recreation. It is constrained from expansion by a large private lumber mill, federal and state land ownership on the north, west, and south. It is located on sand, where a subduction zone earthquake predicted likely within the next 40-50 year predicts complete inundation of the location by a massive tsunami that could cost up to several thousand lives and the virtually complete destruction of the infrastructure.

The channel modification would require extensive blasting, dredging of many millions of cubic yards and the near doubling of the shipping channel, which would produce great permanent ecological damage to the Coos Bay estuary----and all the economic and personal values it contributes to the people living in our region.

This is a very bad project idea for Coos Bay and an extremely bad legislative approach for assuring the well-being and an economic future for Coos Bay.

Thank you for your consideration.