



---

**Umatilla Army Depot Re-Use Authority  
LRA Meeting: Hosted by CTUIR at UEC  
Meeting Minutes: April 15, 2010**

---

**LRA Members**

Bill Hansell: Chairman, Umatilla Co.  
Terry Tallman: Vice Chair, Morrow Co.  
Rosenda Shippentower: CTUIR  
Carl Scheeler: CTUIR  
Carla McLane: Absent  
Lisa Mittelsdorf: Port of Morrow  
Gary Neal: Absent  
George Anderson: Absent  
Joe Taylor: Port of Morrow  
John Turner: Absent  
Kim Puzey: Port of Umatilla  
Rod Skeen: CTUIR  
Scott Fairley: State of Oregon  
LTC. Christian Rees: Oregon National Guard

**Dana Mission Support Team**

Don Chance: Exec Director  
Bill Dana: Absent  
Kim Swentik: Exec Admin  
Brian Cole: Planning Expert  
Dennis Walters: Facilitation Support

**Others**

Phil Ferguson: Base Trans Coordinator  
Connie Caplinger: Umatilla Co  
Gerald Breazeale: City of Irrigon  
Dean Brickey: EO  
Nate Rivera: UEC  
Kathy Spoon: Army Outreach Office  
Kathy Eldrige: Army Outreach Office  
Larry Klimek: USFWS  
Matt Bartley: UMCDF  
James Ray City of Irrigon  
Grant Young DLCD  
Jon Jinings DLCD  
Mike Strong: UMCDF  
Bryan Strad: UMCDF  
Mike Daniels: UMCDF  
Don Gillis: UMCDF  
Lisa Bunch: UMCDF  
LTC. Perkins: UMCD  
Janet Greenup: Morrow SWCD

**1:05 pm: Roll Call and Housekeeping:** Identify all LRA members, DMST members and visitors.

Hansell	Chance	Cole
Puzey	Swentik	Spoon
Quaempts	Bartley	Eldridge
Scheeler	Daniels	Jinings
Fairley	Strong	
Caplinger	Stroud	
Mittelsdorf	Stuckey	
Taylor	Ferguson	
Shippentower	Perkins	
Skeen	Gillis	
Tallman	Klimeck	
Rees	Walters	



### Housekeeping:

- LRA vote to accept or deny meeting minutes for March. **Approved as submitted**
- Confirm date of May 20, 1 – 5pm for LRA Meeting at the Stafford Hansell Building.
- Rod Skeen: *Update on UMCDF Salvage information requested from March meeting:* Question was what could be saved and where were the site contracting activities on the closure. What facilities could the LRA or an Implementation LRA take control of to either salvage or reuse in some fashion? Mike Strong, do you want to go over our discussions?

Strong: I'd also like to introduce Mike Daniels, he's the closure manager. First of all I'd like to bring you up to where we are as far as contracting on the demolition side. Daniels: Currently, we have gone out for one bid and that is on the demolition of the BRA pollution abatement system. That would be the bag houses, ductwork, the [] that sit just south of hub building. We've got the bids back, we've reviewed those bids, but we have not awarded yet. That is the only subcontract scope of work we have developed up to this point. We have demolition packages ready to issue to self-perform of the drum dryers and BRA evaporator system inside the pollution abatement system. To-date, which is really all we have as far as demolition. Hansell: If I can ask Chris, he has a little map, could we use it? And if you could Mike point the items or area you are talking about so we have a bit of a visual? Daniels: [Exact locations of items detailed in discussions have been omitted from this document for site security purposes] You'll see ductwork for the BRA, there's a [] that sits outside the building, and the ductwork that leads to the baghouse, and an [] pad and stack that sits out there. The sub-contract package we have now is basically to take everything south of the building. So the rest of the pollution abatement system, Then we have more packages to self-perform that to remove the drum dryers, there are three of them, and the evaporator skids. Strong: So the building will be left in tact itself. Daniels: Exactly, the work packages do not address anything with the building, just to remove and dispose of the equipment and tear down the pollution abatement system.

Puzey: Much of the area you are talking about there would be considered economically called contaminated, is this the contaminated area? Daniels: This is outside of our agent boundary, this is the brine reduction area, and I guess the hazardous considerations would be the heavy metals, which would be the constituent of concern. Strong: Essentially the brine is treated there. The brine is a by-product of the incineration. Puzey: So that is what the rotary drum dryers are for. Strong: Exactly. Daniels: So you've got an affluent stream and a solid stream and it ends up at the baghouse. The baghouse is basically, comes off the drum dryer. It is there to collect the dust and the flue that comes off of those drum dryers. The solids come off of each drum dryer through a rotary screw into a drum. So we have the solid salts coming into a drum dryer and because it's basically a hot system the particles that are coming out of the system are captured in the baghouse. The solids are containerized and I guess they are shipped back to WHIPS or something like that. Strong: Yes, they are shipped as hazardous waste then. Rees: I think originally all of these building were required to be disposed of and demolished by a treaty or something. So are you still working towards trying to preserve some these buildings for the LRA, all of them trying to be preserved at this point or? Strong: So far as, I guess, legal requirements, the main processing building itself is required to go. Now there are two associated buildings. Rees: And they are still planning on being demolished? Strong: Yes. Rees: There is no movement by the LRA at this point to try to save that? Puzey: We've had conversations, are we at the part where we can talk to those? Chance: Yes. Puzey: Ok, I met with Bill Dana and Dennis Walters, you guys jump in anytime, about not withstanding, contract. What if we were to look at this in terms of public benefit? How could the public benefit the most in terms of being able to either salvage parts or being able to utilize some of the facility as it exists out there. Is there anything where the contract cuts too deep to the bone and if we were to somehow be able to work with the contractor, the Army, and



convince the public that there would be some benefit to not demolishing it as far, or disposing of it as far, those are the conversations we've been having. We are just trying to say, are we preserving all the assets we can without hastily disposing of some of them. Is there a method by which we can deconstruct or disassemble this facility so that it can be parceled off to other industrial users or similar or dissimilar purchases? Would we say, this pump, this motor, this blower, this drum dryer, you know whatever, has more value than if we just dispose of it? Dennis, is that sort of the jest of the conversation? Walters: Yes, and we are looking for win, win, win; recognizing that companies are in business to make money. If we could find a way to satisfy fiscal needs for you guys [site contractor], greatest benefit to the community, and the best potential for that facility when we try to market it. We were sort of looking for a collaborative approach, to sort of think outside the box of what was originally planned, recognizing that you guys are on a schedule and a budget; if we could figure out a way to move forward successfully for everybody. Puzey: Is there a way for your people to make more money, more people stay employed longer, cause no harm to the public, have what is left be a reasonable asset for the future, and not get sideways with the government. Is there a way to do that? That is what we are trying to determine.

Strong: I believe there is. But in order to really not go after demolition of the building and the direct support structures for it, which would include the pollution abatement system and the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems or HVAC systems, we would have to go through the governor and the Secretary of the Army. It takes those two entities to essentially stop or intervene in a federal statute. Puzey: That was our hunch that that would be correct, but we didn't know at what level the decision would be made. But if it is the Secretary and the Governor, that is where maybe Scott could come in and, we're not trying to be obstructionists at all we aren't trying to do an asset grab or anything like that. Conversations with the LRA have been that that area could potentially become part of the Port of the Umatilla. So as the manager of that entity, I'm just trying say, what can we best do? What are our next steps to have this go as well as possible for the most people possible? I see where there are some benchmarks here of May 2010, so I don't know if maybe Scott could set up a meeting or somebody else who could set up a meeting at that level. Between the governor and the Secretary of the Army have a conversation, I would think there needs to be some engineers there, some operational folks, some people who can explain this maybe, kind of a 101, to guys at that altitude to be able to make an educated decision about what our conversations have consisted of. Strong: Why don't we sit down next week with technical side, Rod Skeen and whoever, sit down with our engineers and closure staff. There are estimates out there as far as how much material is out there and the like. And we can see what is potentially available going that route. Then I think once that's in hand, we can make a better decision. Puzey: Next week is great; I just request we have somebody there who is right-brained thinking enough so we can sort through some of the technical stuff so we can think in that direction too. With all the engineers and the Army, we just need else there who can say "wait a minute...hey, how bout if..." that's all. Strong: The one federal statute I'm talking about is 50 USC 1521 is the one that needs to be discussed. Puzey: That is the item that needs to be discussed. Strong: Yes.

Hansell: Ok, when is Bill going to be back? Chance: Monday. Hansell: So let's have Kim work on that? Chance: You bet. [Skeen, Puzey, Strong, Commander Perkins, Dana, Ferguson] [Kim Action Item: set up meeting. Tentative: 04/21 morning]. Rees: When do you see this larger meeting of the governor and the Secretary taking place? Hansell: Well just as soon as they can. Rees: But it needs to be done before May? Hansell: I think the end of May 2010, Bill would know specifically; he'll be back on Monday. Hansell: I think it would be good to get it going to see what we can do; it would be kind of difficult for us to say to the governor, "hey you gotta meet with the Secretary of the State..." Fairley: Does it have to be done by the end of May? Lisa just brought it up that the governor is on a trade mission and will be out the last two weeks of May.



Skeen: I think the push was this; we want to define what we can do, specifically since our contracting process has to move forward. So I think if we get the other meeting scheduled and determine what we can do, then we can schedule the larger meeting at a later date. Puzey: Should we have the Commander there, would it be useful for him to attend? Commander Perkins: I'll be there. Chance: Ok, great. Hansell: Anything else on this topic? Ok, so let's move on. Don you're up to update us on the DLCD conversations last month.

- Don Chance: *Update on DLCD conversations*

Carla had asked at the last meeting if we would give an update on the conversations with DLCD. There haven't been any significant changes. We did have a meeting last week with Scott's Economic Development Team, all the state agencies were there and the DLCD. I think the thinking remains the same, both counties would end up having to develop some new zoning districts to accommodate the designations that are likely to end up in the final plan. The current zoning codes do not have, in either county, a good descriptive district that is going to accommodate the kind of uses that are people are anticipating out there. We know that's going to be the case with both the Oregon National Guard and also the Wildlife Refuge. So, new zoning districts will have to be prepared. The next component is, the DLCD, once we are done with our draft plan, will have to look at that plan and make a determination if the areas that are so designated as industrial and commercial designations, have in fact in the past, been committed to something similar of that nature. If they come to that conclusion, I don't want to speak on their behalf, but they would see that as simply amendments to the county comprehensive plans. If on the other hand they make a determination that we may be talking about new areas, which have not been committed to those kinds of uses in the past, then the county or counties would have to go through some sort of exceptions process. I know the last conversation I had with Grant Young about this, is the DLCD is still whether they are going to provide written comment back on this current round. I think they are discussing whether to provide written comments that we may receive during the final plan period. Jon is here so maybe he can say something about it. Jinings: We probably will submit written comments, along with the other members of the economic development team; we intend to do that before they are due at the end of the month. They will probably run along the same as our presentations. We'll look at the how the process is and what the landscape looks like in comparison to the planning and zoning process. Chance: That's all I had Mr. Chairman. Hansell: Ok let's move on to the Public Records request. Chance: Mr. Chairman, there is another item, if we can address it before we move on? Hansell: Yes, I should have asked if there were any agenda additions. Scheeler: I have one more housekeeping item. I'd like to update the LRA on the site walk-down with Morrow. Hansell: Ok. Chance: I would like to update the LRA on the Public Information Workshop we had this morning. Hansell: Ok, Carl, why don't you go first?

Scheeler: Site walk-down with Morrow. So the Port of Morrow, at the last meeting, had voiced a concern about this line here. [East-west line along railyard] They wanted more industrial land; their expectation was to move it farther to the north. In reviewing it in the field we went through the entire area and over here as well. [Current industrial boundaries] We talked about their objectives in terms of short- and long-term developments. The railyard, from the fence to the back side of the railroad here is fairly level and then it trails off fairly steep. They are looking to off-load railcars and that would not be suitable, so they also wanted adequate area to develop, to pull in the longer trains. So we agreed that the rail line boundary should be no wider than from the fence to the beginning of the slope on the existing rail yard but that it should extend all the way up as it does here. [To the county line area.] Then the Port would have the ability to develop a rail yard that would be long enough to handle the longer trains. Likewise, this area here [spur running north-south] is ideal for off-loading rail cars. If you look later at the map that has the section lines, the section actually is somewhere over here. So what we propose is to have a strip of land running up



to here [north line on section map] including 200 feet off the existing rail road so they can develop an off-loading area. So what we thought, in the spirit of not messing up the LCD, is if we went straight up to the section line and back across to the current Morrow industrial boundary. This entire area would be zoned industrial, but, as a caveat, within the additional polygon, there would be no further development. They could use the roadways and the bunkers but it would be managed consistent with the rest of the wildlife area in terms of the habitat preservation. Is that a fair representation? Mittlesdorf: Yes. Scheeler: But this area here [currently identified in preferred alternative as industrial] would still be available for development. Hansell: I'm not exactly sure how we do this, but I would like a concurrence to amend the Alternative 1 to include the Morrow county adjustment that has just been discussed. So we can put it on the map as we go forth. Puzey: With no further input? Hansell: Well I think that if they have come to an agreement, that we need to have a motion or something to add it to the map. We want to make sure that it becomes part of the currently preferred plan. Quaempts: I guess I'd like to hear is there any input from the Fish and Wildlife? Klimek: I guess, initially it didn't seem like a good idea. But it looks like Carl has done a pretty good job of negotiating so that the habitat that is there will be preserved and consistent with the remainder of the area. We like to make sure there is a consistency and that the property is not broken up, but this looks perhaps to be a good compromise. Taylor: I think the line will probably go south a bit. Mittelsdorf: And there would be conservation in line as well. Puzey: We had similar conversations on the Umatilla line. The conversations we had were there is pristine habitat and wildlife between the igloos. How would we handle that? Scheeler: When we had our discussions we did not discuss that. We did not agree to anything so I think you would have no constraints on that. But, when I think about our partnership with the Fish and Wildlife Service on this, the importance of this habitat, I don't want them to walk away because we've whittled the property down to where it is no longer attractive to them. I was very concerned that this thing with the Port [Morrow] was going to do that. We still haven't taken this up the chain to see what effect it will have. Puzey: I bring it up because of that. We talked about what value it has in terms of mitigation. If you look at the developable acres for the Port of Morrow area they've got thousands of acres, we've got hundreds of acres, we talked a lot about how much ground is developable and then we talked about the asset there is there if we have that for mitigation? I'm wondering if you ate your Wheaties that morning, because you really worked us over on the day that we were there. From the looks of it they [Morrow] did a really good job. Scheeler: This just made sense in terms of the objectives and in terms of being able to use the railyard, which is an important asset. But to have a finger of industrial up into wildlife area, it isn't proper from a zoning standpoint. So how could we get that in there, have the zoning make sense, and not compromise the habitat; this is the solution we came up with. This is what drove the decision, now having said that, we did the same thing here. Tallman: Carl, I have a question, why the finger of land in the middle for the development of the railcars as opposed to the west end? Scheeler: The rail is already there. The facilities, off-loading facilities are already there. Tallman: The operational facility isn't. Scheeler: The docks are there, so essentially they would just need to upgrade. Puzey: It makes sense to do what we're proposing, it's just that the wildlife, you know, as we've been discussing. Is not only the value of the habitat, but also the value of the mitigation because its habitat. I'm not sure how that finger works based on what I've heard from the biologist. So you just run it up there and leave everything alone except you have trains there? Is that what's going to happen? You'll have trains parked up in there and that is that? Rees: You could do some kind of MOA with the Fish and Wildlife Service on that parcel so it ends up being treated like a refuge parcel where they don't plan any developing. Scheeler: That is basically what we are talking about. The Fish and Wildlife Service will manage that consistent with the other wildlife property under some kind of agreement. Chance: You have slightly different, as far as development is concerned, than what you guys are doing on the Umatilla County side, but maybe I'm wrong. Scheeler: The other thing is we didn't have any available bunkers in Morrow County either. So again, you go, how far do you draw that line up?



Mittelsdorf: When we went out there it was with the intention of keeping that in mind. We knew we needed some bunkers. After we went out and assessed the property a little bit, it just made sense to request the section on the west side. The line will actually move south a little, so we will be leaving more bare land and taking more industrial use. Chance: One of the concepts, you have talked about and I think this plan is capturing, is having a mixture of habitat preservation tools available to you. So you are using the refuge for the large block, but you are also going to end up with this overlay with the Oregon National Guard which we had some pretty good discussions here this morning as to what the Guard is capable of doing. And what they are obligated to do, so you are still going to have a significant amount of property that is going to be tied to the refuge. And now with the conservation efforts in some of these newly identified industrial areas, it really is a mixture of tools you are using. You will still have a very large block of habitat. Some of it protected through the refuge, some of it protected by the Guard, and some of it protected through conservation easements. I'm really pleased with what you all have generated at this point. I think you are accomplishing several objectives at once here. Fairley: Jon [Jinings], from a planning perspective is it easier to zone a larger plot for industrial than a smaller parcel for industrial? What is the easiest? Jinings: It makes sense to portion within the section and I think we can work through it. Klimek: From our perspective too, I've been asked if we have submitted an application yet. The answer is no, for this exact reason. You know, it will be easier to describe a section instead of saying, "we have 7000 acres of contiguous habitat" and then coming back and saying, "no, wait, now we have 3000 acres in this section and 500 acres in this section, but there is a road network through that section..." I wanted to wait until we had more firm plan in place. Is a rail line through the middle of it good from a natural resource standpoint? No. But sometimes you have to figure out the best compromise. Scheeler: This is not a typical rail line, it's just a spur so there is not going to be daily traffic on it. And I think there are some mitigating circumstances. Klimek: Sure, the whole 20,000 acres has mitigating circumstances. Skeen: Is it just a spur or is it a loop? Scheeler: Just a spur. Klimek: What about roads? Mittelsdorf: There is a road right by it and there are power lines. Scheeler: There is road, rail and power and then the 200 ft of developable property. Klimek: So associated traffic only? Scheeler: Yes. Hansell: Any other discussions? Puzey: While we are talking about lines. I saw recently that there is some work being done to more certainly identify the Oregon Trail across the southeast corner. The southeast corner is an area we have talked about briefly. Does anyone here know where that might be? I'd like to have discussions regarding what our requirements would be. Hansell: I don't mind having that discussion, but I don't want to get too far afield from this other topic. Scheeler: So the Oregon Trail would cross into this? [Industrial corner] Puzey: Yes. Ferguson: The trail is on the entitlement map. What you will find is it is in a couple of places. Basically it runs from the south east corner and runs through here, and then we know it comes through the admin area. Then, there is another one here, [Northeast section] that runs out this way, towards Morrow. Puzey: What does that mean Phil? Ferguson: There is what appears to be old wagon ruts, is all we know. We don't know if it is part of the Oregon Trail or not. Puzey: What I mean is what if it is? Rees: Obligations incurred and such. Ferguson: We've got a letter from the state Oregon Trail Historical Society asking us to preserve it. We informed SHPO about it, they are supposed to come out and take a look at it at some point. Other than that, other than us noting it on our Environmental Condition report that's all the Army said to do with it. Note it and let you know about it so if you think there is a concern there, then they will go from there. Gillis: You can see here off of I-84 where it comes off. There by the off-ramp, right where it says Westland Road. If you look to the right, you can see where it cuts across and comes out over by the potato shed. Then on the other side of the freeway, when you are coming on to it, if you look down towards the old airport you can see it really well, and then it cuts north and goes towards the admin area. Perkins: The one in the NE that you pointed out, my understanding is that would possibly connect to the kiosk for the one they have in Irrigon. That was their solution, they had wanted to use that property for industrial, but they ended up creating that



kiosk and explaining some of the history and that gives it recognition. [Speaker?] What is the depth of the rut? Ferguson: It's on the title report, it shows it is all part of the old depot road. Skeen: Does that diminish Umatilla's prospect to develop? Puzey: I think that it might, if it makes more sense to have areas affected by the Oregon Trail be part of the contiguous habitat, then that is a discussion I would like to open back up. If the section is reserved for habitat and we have to give recognition for the Oregon Trail in the areas where people may want to develop industrially; I think that most people would prefer to just avoid the issue. Rather than set it aside, I'd rather just set it aside ahead of time. Hansell: So at this point, correct me if needed. Nothing has been formally designated as Oregon Trail, you have some immigrant wagon trails that may or may not have been part of the Oregon Trail, or they may have just been ruts from others passing through to the gold or something. So there is probably some more research that needs to be done on that. Gillis: The ones to the southeast, there has been quite a bit of research done. In the Whitman College Journal it says that Marcus Whitman warned the pioneers to cut the corner at Echo because the Cayuse were at Umatilla and were not happy. That's when that spur came from Echo to the Columbia River. Ferguson: SHPO has not designated or confirmed that this is part of the Oregon Trail. At this point all we have is that letter, and I provided a copy of that later to you guys. Swentik: It is online under the historical documents. Puzey: The northeast corner that has been identified, you say that is tied into the one at the kiosk in Irrigon, but the one in the southeast which needs more research has not been tied in with any other designations. Gillis: Right, it just goes to the Columbia River in a different direction. They didn't normally go through where the depot is now, but with the warning of the Cayuse they went around this other way. Puzey: So what is the best thing to do here? Gillis: I don't know. If it becomes private property you can do what you want. Puzey: Right. Gillis: But you know, I've been trying to get SHPO out here for 14 years. Skeen: Do we want SHPO to come out... I'm hoping they will come out. Rees: I don't see this as a big stumbling block, it is only one wagon wheel wide, and it is a fairly small strip. If we don't touch it, it's not going to have a serious impact.

Gillis: We've got the COE and a contractor. The SHPO wants a large area with pinpoint identifier. A better study of the trails is needed. Perkins: I'll just let you all know what the Army's stance on this is for right now. I understand there is a lot of research, but in my mind there is nothing validated. As the Army point of view, we will do nothing, as the Army, that will disturb the area they are researching right now. But, we are not going to do anything to preserve it, or mark it, at this point either until something comes back from the State Historical Society that tells me it has been validated or confirmed or whatever. At this point I understand it is being researched, but I'm not going to recognize it other than I won't have our folks tracking back and forth across it. Puzey: What will that do to the National Guard? Rees: Well, if it's running right through the middle of that maneuver area we could have a significant issue. If we cross it again, we may need to have some crossing points identified. If it runs across the part that is already a road area, in my mind, it has already been destroyed. If there are identifiable areas out in the maneuver area, we would certainly do our best to mark it and work around it. Chance: If you visit the Oregon Trail Interpretive Center in Baker City, the Oregon Trail runs right through there, and the BLM manages its facility. They have several hundred thousand tourists that walk directly down the trail every year. Gillis: Hansell: Ok why don't we wrap this particular part up? I still think it would be valuable to include the discussions from Morrow on the map. I would like to replace the current map with the one discuss. Taylor: I'll move we move the boundaries according to the meetings of the Port of Morrow. Skeen: Since you already have a document out there showing alternatives, can we really change it at this point? Multiple Speakers: It's just a draft. Chance: Absolutely it can be changed. This thing is still a fluid document. I expect the LRA may make modifications to it several times. Scheeler: I guess my question is, we are currently in an open comment period, if we change it now, they will not have time to review and comment on it will they? Chance: My response to that is there will be another open public comment period and a public forum for them to react to whatever the final



draft plan is. We need to have the fluidity to be able to modify as we approach the committees final vote on a final draft plan. Skeen: The document that is out for comment is not the reuse plan, it is just our alternatives. Chance: Correct. Skeen: And we are not *required* to make that available for public comment, right? Chance: The only requirement we had, was to have a public forum. The 30 day comment period was something we went above and beyond the call of duty here, to try to give the public even more of an opportunity to provide us input. Skeen: Right. And we discussed this change at the public forum. Chance: Yes. Skeen: So legally we are not producing something that is not in the required format. Chance: Correct. Hansell: That's a good point. Puzey: I think we need to make sure that the Fish and Wildlife don't go away on us. What's 'plan B' if that happens? If by moving these lines around there is not enough interest for them, then what do we do? Do you have an alternative plan Carl? Scheeler: Well, I think at that point the Guard would give us some of their land...Rees: I was just going to say, and then he would ask the Guard to take up more land. Hansell: Alright. Puzey: So it sounds as if the lines are pretty fluid still huh? Hansell: Well, all I wanted to do is make sure we are reflecting our most recent conversations towards our preferences on the map. We haven't even decided yet if this the way we want to go. It might change even more. Scheeler: That's why I brought it forward today. This was the discussion we had in the field the other day and we wanted to get the impression of the rest of the LRA members. Talking with Larry of the Fish and Wildlife Service, he is obviously very concerned about it. That needs to be part of our thought process as we decide whether or not to approve that recommendation. Rees: If I could make just a couple of comments, we went out and made a preliminary analysis on the administrative area the other day and there are just a couple of very minor things I want to point out on the map. Since we are talking about amending to make some adjustments to the lines, this might be a good time to include these items as well. Hansell: Let's just do it one at a time. Is there any further discussion on the Morrow area lines? **There has been a motion by Joe Taylor to move the Morrow area lines as discussed and it was seconded by Rod Skeen. All those in favor say I. All Opposed? Motion Carries- none opposed.**

Rees: Ok, very quickly I just want to point out three things for map adjustments. Just outside of the chain link area, there is a small building that is a phone hub. If we are going to manage that area, we will need to include that building. It's just to the right of the main gate as you come in. Scheeler: At some point we will have to go out with GIS and pinpoint the corners and get this into a mapping program. Rees: Ok, and along those same thoughts, the NE easement will need to be adjusted. 3<sup>rd</sup> point was right in the middle of the property there is a jog, if we stay to the existing road it will be easier and it leads right to the well-head 3 that feeds K block. These are the 3 minor things we saw as we were out looking at the sight and surveying the admin area.

Chance: This might be a good time to discuss what we envision as the process as we move forward. At the next LRA meeting, given the time we are working with, we need to come to a conclusion, the committee needs to come to a conclusion in terms of the adoption of a final draft plan. Once that occurs, and we know the basic layout the committee wants to adopt, a final map will be prepared. That map will go with the adopted land use plan. At that time, we will seek assistance from the Tribes and ORNG for GIS support to develop a much more detailed map, with lines that can be used for zoning purposes in the future. So the comments that are coming up, moving lines a little bit this way or that way, because we are dealing with broad generalities at this point. It is at that point that we are anticipating the final map be prepared for the final task. Klimek: I would like to be included in that discussion. Chance: You bet. This process is like a funnel. The last two meetings we've started out with broad discussions and we've worked our way down to something that is pretty close at this point. Klimek: On the far northeast corner, where the boundary line goes out into that circle, does the boundary line actually go out there? Ferguson: No, that is an easement. The easement protected restricted use of the property many years ago.



Scheeler: So I need to straighten that line out then? Ferguson: Yes. Puzey: I recognize we are coming down through this funnel and so forth, but I wonder if we can we keep the lines white for the next 5 years or so. Because, I don't know how many of us are going to go out there and go through every single line. If we discover things in the next 5 years, do we want to be able to have this conversation or do we just say 'nope' the line is what it is. Hansell: Phil, tell us what the survey your folks are doing, we were talking about before the meeting. Kim is asking about that, who's going to do the survey and all that stuff. Chance: Phil before you answer let me, because there is another piece to this that will maybe define the answer. Both planning departments, as the plan is finished and we ship it off to the Army, both county planning departments are going to have to amend their zoning codes and zoning maps. When they do that, we planners like a nice boundary. We want a road, we want a section line, and we want something that is easily identified later on. Where we can make a distinction between where the refuge is and where does the industrial zoning start. This final map that needs to be prepared, in task 10, as close as we can accomplish that, needs to try to identify logical break-points for those zoning districts. Do they necessarily need to be surveyed? No, because in a lot of cases we can use something on the ground, a road or a power line, something along those lines. That's what I had to say, sorry Phil? Ferguson: That is exactly right. The Seattle District Corps of Engineers is our real-estate office. They are the people who are going to have to, once you guys finish the plan and the Army signs off on it and stuff; they are the ones who are going to create the deeds. So they are going to be the ones who do the final surveys. They asked me to request to you guys to keep the lines as simple as you can. You know it gets more difficult when you guys start cutting across section lines and such. Scheeler: This is what we are going to have to do. Ferguson: I was telling Bill earlier, they asked me to tell you guys this, but I already knew what the answer was going to be, so I'm just passing on the message. Hansell: That's interesting, we're going to have, besides planning for the deeds, we are going to have to meet some bounds here too. So I'm assuming the northwest corner igloo in deep 700 and big sage brush near the highway isn't going to work. Hansell: Some of our records in the county are similar to that. Ok, anything else on any of these subjects.

Chance: *Update on Public Information Forum:* [See attachment, Public Forum Transcripts] We held our Public Information Forum this morning from ten to twelve o'clock. We had about 15 or 20 people or so, I haven't taken a formal headcount. The format we followed was that we described each of the alternatives, told folks there were fliers and brochures with maps on the back tables for each of those alternatives, and I recommend you pick up a copy of each of alternatives as you leave the meeting today. So you can see the information that was provided to the public. I would say we had some questions regarding job replacement. We had some questions regarding property tax and the creation of new property tax option. There were some good discussions related to Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. We had some excellent input that came from the City of Irrigon and an Alternative that was presented by them. There were a lot of questions and answers provided as to what their [City of Irrigon] primary interests are. And what we need to do in terms of amendments or changes to accomplish that. Overall I think it was a very good session. We didn't hear a lot of people expressing unhappiness with Alternative 1. We had mostly people asking questions and verifications. Rees: We had a few comments on agriculture. Scheeler: They asked about if we had considered the agricultural aspects of the community and requested clarifications on why we didn't show any agriculture market in an agricultural community. Chance: I think the most substantive of the input we received was from the City of Irrigon. I don't want to speak on the City's behalf, but I will brief you and Jerry can correct me. They had to principle concerns. They submitted an alternative map, which essentially flipped where the National Guard and the Refuge are at. But it became clear in talking with the city representatives that they had two over-riding interests at this point. One was, they were interested in trying to expand the capabilities of the rail line down here. [Southwest section] It just so happened that the Confederated Tribes and Morrow



folks had just done their walk through. So I think much of what the City of Irrigon's concerns were will be eliminated by this new mapping the committee just voted on. One of the other areas they've expressed. They aren't particularly concerned about who owns this industrial zoning. They don't really care if it is the County, the Port, or their own City that acquires ownership. Their primary interest is working cooperatively to see that this area is developed as rapidly as possible. If clients come forth that have a particular interest in that area. I think part of what came out of that conversation was it might make sense to have some direct discussions with the city, the county, the port district, and maybe even other cities in Morrow and maybe develop some sort of guideline or memorandum of understanding towards the development of that industrial section. I was highly encouraged regarding Irrigon's concerns, I think particularly with discussions on the amendment today, we are going to get there. I'm kind of speaking for the city here. Breazeale: No, I think you did a great job summarizing it. Hansell: Anything else? Gillis: Just real quick, the drinking water records are on-line. You go into Oregon Drinking Water on-line and Google 'Army' and you'll get the north system and the admin area. They've got all the information there and the repairs we've made over the years. Rees: Bill that comment brings up a good point about utilities on the site. If we are going to be taking over the administration and management of the AA, at some point we are going to need to have a good understanding of the water that is coming to it, the sewer, the Imhoff system. We will need some clarity before this is all said and done. Breazeale: That was one of the other things we had, we think of it all as a system. The water, the sewer, all of those piping areas are all connected, or should be. We need to make sure that as we parcel off land that we are thinking about these items and plan for right-of-ways and easements and such. As you think about the planning, please consider thinking it through that way.

**2:00 pm: Public Record Request Discussion, B. Hansell:** *The City of Irrigon has requested a copy of each Notice of Interest received for PBC, copy of all records of the meeting of the NOI review committee doing the evaluation of the NOIs received, copies of any evaluation criteria used by the review committee, a copy of the list of the members of the ranking committee, and copies of documents reflecting the scoring of NOIs by each committee member.*

Hansell: I asked for this to be put on the docket today. It included all of us and will allow Jerry to express exactly what documents he is requesting. The only legal advice on this is that I have received, is that in the original NOI package there was confidential financial information that was designated that. And our lawyer said that that would have to be redacted or removed before that could be released. So that would be one of the things. The other thing is Connie informs me that there are literally boxes of information. If you want to pay for all that information, it is certainly available to you. I wanted to make sure, 1) that you still wanted those documents and 2) that you were aware of the volume of what you are requesting. I just wanted to have that discussion.

Chance: We have gone through the material, and I think Kim has some indication of the volume we are talking about here. In fact, I think she has a set here today, minus the finance information. As you can see, without the finance information, this is what we are dealing with. Hansell: Well, that's not really that much. Swentik: No, really the bulk of the information is the financial records of the company and what they've done over the last couple – three years. That is where a lot of the bulk of the county, in which I wanted to bring forward also, the county [Umatilla] has retracted their NOI. So I didn't include the county's NOI in the information. As well as the Homeless Service Providers their information isn't in there. Neither is the Private Interest. It didn't qualify as a public benefit conveyance and it wasn't reviewed as a public benefit conveyance so I didn't include it. So basically I have the NOI information that was submitted, ready for delivery today upon approval. Mittelsdorf: Can you specifically tell me what financial information is not open to the public? All of ours are, and all of the public agencies are submitted on line. So anything that is submitted by a



public agency is considered public documents. Swentik: And that's fine, but within *our* requirements we have certain areas as guided by the BRAC we have to be careful of. We answer to Oregon, but we also answer to the federal requirements and security operations and such. That's where we needed to come before you guys and say, ok, if you guys wanted your financials released, that's not a problem. But it will take me a couple of days to get all of that printed out. Hansell: In the NOI documents that went out, in this application, this material is confidential. Chance: The financial information. Hansell: Yes, the financials. Skeen: So we are required to keep it confidential, so if someone wanted to go get it from another place, they can. Hansell: Yes. Our lawyer was very clear on that. If those applications were submitted under those guidelines you are not allowed by law to distribute it.

Jerry Breazeale: For clarifications on that, if the agencies don't care if it is released, financials that are web submitted are public. Any documents you generate or receive are public documents. Newspapers went around here a while back to public agencies and gave them a lesson in what is public record. Essentially, everything that we have is public record. The only things that would not be covered under ORS would be personnel records etc. Caplinger: I think my biggest concern is that we are working with federal programs and federal funding programs. When you don't follow their directive you open yourself up for further complications. When the federal application said do not disclose I find concern to disclose it. Hansell: That's what Doug Olsen, our lawyer, said. [Speaker] It did say, on the application that that information was proprietary and all those who submitted submitted with that expectation that their financial information would remain confidential. Hansell: I agree with that. Swentik: That language was on all the NOI applications. [Speaker] That's between the LRA and the applicant; I don't think it is a federal requirement.

Chance: Can I suggest this, many of the NOI applicants are sitting at the table. Maybe if we go around the table, you could give us your determination on whether or not you want that information released. Skeen: I think we made the agreement with the applicants that the LRA would keep their financial documents confidential. If the applicants sitting at the table want to release their information directly to the requestor then that is fine. But we as an LRA need to respect what was submitted under good faith. Puzey: I think they were also looking for how the review team came to the determination of their recommendations. Swentik: That is in the package as well. **Skeen: I would move to provide everything except the financial documents that are protected under the privacy clause. Individuals can provide if requested directly. Scheeler: Second Hansell: Motioned and second to give the City of Irrigon the package minus the financials.** Taylor: Is the Port of Morrow financials in the package? Swentik: No financial information is prepared for release. Hansell: I wanted to make sure we understood. Mittelsdorf: What is Jerry's expectation? Jerry: I would be agreeable to the package Kim has prepared.

### **Motion Approved: All in favor**

**2:30 pm: Be thinking about conveyance..., D. Chance:** *Don will have a brief discussion reminding the LRA to think about what needs to be done to convey property. Highlights of conveyances and sponsorships will be included...*

Packet: Notes on conveyance mechanisms

Chance: The information in your packet, called 'Notes on conveyance mechanisms' is the same information we discussed a couple of months ago. I wanted you to have a written explanation of each of the items. There are some eight different mechanisms. At the next LRA meeting, because it's what we need to have happen here in terms of timing, we're going need you guys to pass a motion on what the final land use plan is going to look like. Also at that meeting, we need to have



you come forth as separate entities and as a body, as to what your recommendations are for conveyances. We have to have both of those to prepare and complete Task 10. So what is included in this handout, for you to review between now and next month, is the summary on the first couple of pages. And then the language for each conveyance that came out of one of the manuals that describes each of the public conveyances, the standards that are required, and the agencies you would apply them to. Some of the key points here quickly.

- [see Attachment: Notes on conveyance mechanisms]

The sponsored public benefit conveyance is the one that will most likely most directly pertain to this group.

The two ports, if they choose to go the public benefit conveyance approach, will have to have conversations with the Maritime Administration. You will have to prepare a detailed application back to the Maritime Administration. In that application you will have to make the argument in the case that you fit within this language. (See attachment for specific language on conveyance.)

Caplinger: Does the entire property need to be transferred under one conveyance? Or can you divide it up between multiple conveyances. Chance: Yes, you can use multiple conveyances. For example at the depot you could say this portion is for public benefit conveyance, this one is for private sale, this one is under federal...however it best suits your plan.

The second area that you guys may be considering here is economic development conveyances. I just want to make sure it is clear in everyone's mind that **only** an implementation LRA is eligible for EDC. This body would have to decide in its recommendations that it would want to create an implementation LRA for us to use the EDC process. It would have to demonstrate, if that were the case, that the EDC would create jobs. This whole mechanism was created for job creation. Puzey: This was the mechanism you were speaking about earlier in reference to the demolition facility, an economic development conveyance? Chance: That is certainly a possibility. You can't have more than one implementation LRA per base or depot. You couldn't have a situation where one group gets together for one part of the depot and another group gets together for another part of the depot. Another caveat that I think it is important for you guys to understand is you can't create an implementation LRA if you don't have economic development conveyance. So in other words, we couldn't create an implementation LRA to handle questions or management of the salvage of rail lines. Finally, the Army is obligated to seek fair market value, but they may grant considerations. Up to no compensation what-so-ever depending on what the circumstances are.

Chance: So what I need to ask of all the parties at this table is to research your mechanisms for conveyances and be prepared to provide the DMST with some recommendations on your preferences next month. Scheeler: Just to clarify, you can have multiple conveyances on the property. Chance: Yes. Skeen: So you could have all of it public benefit except for the facility.

Chance: Yes. If that makes the most sense, you would have to have an implementing LRA for the facility EDC. Skeen: Does the planning LRA need to be the same members as the planning LRA?

Scheeler: So for example, would the Port of Morrow need to be in an implementation LRA if the EDC was in Umatilla? Chance: My understanding is you will be starting from scratch on the make up of an implementation LRA. Cole: At the conference several of us attended last year, they said that it is common for some members of the planning LRA to move to the implementation LRA, but they indeed can be different. Rees: So the Ports could do a public benefit conveyance or an economic development conveyance, those are the two strongest ideas? Chance: Yes. But there could be a third option where you plan and zone those areas as industrial/commercial and then recommend to the Army that they be public sales. Puzey: Would you guys have some



recommendations? In terms of knowledge and understanding of these mechanisms you guys are way ahead of me, and I would like some recommendations.

Chance: I will give you some with caveats. I would highly suggest the Ports speak with MORAD to determine if the reuse plans you have for those areas will fit within the boundaries of their planning. Keep in mind, if you decide to go with public benefit conveyance, you will own the property in perpetuity. The other 'best' option, so to speak, would probably be the EDC. Benefits of the EDC would include a shorter duration of ownership, potential ability to gain outside funding resources, and potential marketing support. However, you have to have the agreement of the LRA and the commitment to become an implementation LRA. Rivera: Did I hear correctly, the ports would have to own that property forever? Chance: Yes, or if it isn't used for the public benefit it would go back to the Army. Mittelsdorf: What about negotiated public sale? Wouldn't that be a viable option? Chance: Yes, but there are some caveats with negotiated public sale; there are often funding issues or the property may sit for a very long time before it is sold. The entity purchasing the property may or may not be able to negotiate the environmental concerns appropriately.

Puzey: If we had an implementing LRA and it didn't have to be the same members we could bring in other like the Guard. Chance: I'm not sure; we would have to find out. Skeen: So if we had an implementing LRA it could phase out over time. Mittelsdorf: But the 7 years is the magic number? Chance: To some degree, it would depend on the negotiations with the Army, but 7 years seems to be the standard. Skeen: Talking about removing hand-cuffs, if we did an implementing LRA we could respectively work through transition and turn it over to another body. We would also be able to sell pieces at some point.

Fairley: So is the Guard is looking at using the AA? Rees: We are looking to go through the AA and try to use the area on the request of the LRA. Fairley: But if the Guard doesn't take it, what happens to it? Hansell: It would go back to the Army. Chance: I asked Scott last week about maybe making that area a state agency complex. Hansell: Scott and I met with a key man in the governor's office. They thought we were on the right track.

Tallman: If I can ask Don again to repeat his expectations for next month.

Chance: Be prepared to come back at next month's LRA meeting with your specific recommendations and ultimately pass a motion as to what those recommendations are for the conveyance mechanisms. The Dana Mission Support Team, on order to stay on schedule, we have to have that. [And the vote on the land use preference.] Hansell: Any other questions for Don?

**3:00 pm Planning Agenda...**, **K. Swentik:** *Kim will provide a briefing on upcoming phases in the planning effort. What to look forward to from now until August.*

Swentik: Just real quick, Don has already gone over the majority of the items. Last month we gave you guys an amended schedule with our extension. I just wanted to go over what that does to the plan. So this is how it is going to look:

As of April 27<sup>th</sup> the public comment period will be over. We will gather those and give them to you for your review as Don mentioned earlier.

May 20: Is the next LRA meeting at the Stafford-Hansell bldg. from 1 – 5 unless you want to make changes? Hansell: I have the Port of Umatilla to host. Puzey: You do not, but that's ok.

Swentik: Now, the reason we need those decisions from you that Don spoke about by the next meeting, is because our schedule, we are going to have the draft plan *posted* for public review on June 1<sup>st</sup>. So we have a very short turn around to implement any changes, input, and public



comment, as well as your preferences and recommendations. This will develop the final Draft Plan basically, then the Draft Plan goes up for public review for 30 days and this one is a BRAC requirement. We will gather those comments received during this comment period and hope to have a Draft Final Package to you by July 14 for your final input and comments. You will have nearly 2 weeks to get them back to us and we will implement them into the final package. You will then receive the final package for your final vote. So this gives you a real brief picture of what is going to happen over the next several months. Skeen: So we need to decide by the next meeting our recommended conveyances. Chance: Yes and we also need to leave that meeting with your recommendation on the final land use plan, what the final map is going to look like. Puzey: That's why I suggested we talk a little about these items today.

Swentik: June 17 is the next LRA meeting, but we haven't planned out July or August yet. Chance: We did. Swentik: No, we had set some tentative dates in our schedule. Hansell: July and August we do not have dates. Tallman: What was the date for June? Hansell: The 17<sup>th</sup>. Puzey: What day of the week is that? Hansell: It is Thursday, the third Thursday of the month. Swentik: And during that meeting we need to talk about the Action Plan, what's going to happen once the plan goes in. We have to include that as part of our Plan submittal. Tallman: Would you mind writing this down and sending it to all of us? Swentik: I will. I'll send out the DMST schedule and maybe at the next meeting we can schedule the last two meetings before submittal. Hansell: When we get to July, I don't know about Morrow County, but this year's National Association of Counties is in the West, it's in Reno. It is that third week of July, the 15<sup>th</sup> through the 21<sup>st</sup>. Chance: Can we push the meeting back a week? Swentik: We wouldn't have the review time needed. Hansell: Is the 8<sup>th</sup> too early? To have the public meeting? Swentik: No it's not too early to have the public meeting, as long as we give them 30 days to comment. Hansell: That would be an LRA meeting for the Public? Chance: Yes. Swentik: Yes, it would be just like it is today. Hansell: Would those of you who have your calendars see if the 8<sup>th</sup> of July would be ok? Swentik: Are we talking July or June? Chance: July. Hansell: I say we leave the June meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup>. Tallman: Is that starting the 30 day period? Swentik: June 1 to June 30 is the comment period. Chance: The Public Forum is scheduled for the June meeting. July there is no public meeting, no forum or hearing rather. By that time, you will already have made a decision. Swentik: I have you tentatively for July 22 and to vote on the submittal package. Connie: We got confused in our offices between public hearing and/or public forum. Because public hearing means we have to notice. Chance: Yes, and we provided a legal public notice for today to cover ourselves, in addition to the ads. And we will do the same thing again for the next public comment meeting. Rees: So if we have that June 17 meeting, it will be essentially the same as what you had today, and July should be the date it is all wrapped up then. Hansell: So does July 8<sup>th</sup> work for everybody? Lisa? Mittelsdorf: Yes, that's fine. I just think that we, especially the ports, are going to have to go back and have some serious reviews on conveyance mechanisms if we are going to have some decisions by the next meeting. Puzey: I agree. Mittelsdorf: And if we want a subcommittee with every agency that's great, or if we want the ports to work with the Dana Team. Our two ports have a lot of decisions to make. Hansell: Excellent. Ok, let's mark down the 8<sup>th</sup>, and would one of our Morrow county partners like to host that? We are back into that cycle. Mittelsdorf: Sure, Hansell: So Port of Morrow? On the 8<sup>th</sup> of July. Skeen [?]: If we are going to make decisions by next month, we need to have the support of the whole LRA on those items. Puzey: I agree we need this group to have a discussion, at least a little bit today, so we have something to think about over the next couple of weeks. We need to get our concerns and interests on the table. Hansell: For either one of the ports, if they have interest in economic development conveyance, there has to be an implementing LRA. It doesn't require all of us to be on it, but it does require for there to be one. McLane: I think that would be a big decision, for us in particular, but it might not make any difference...Hansell: To not be part of it. McLane:...to like the, Fish and Wildlife. It definitely changes the way we would look at the property. Hansell: If



you have an economic development conveyance, you can do the same thing that you could with a benefit conveyance, but you can't do the same thing if you have the reverse. Mittelsdorf: I see some benefit to that. Rees: If we are talking conveyance for a minute, for the Guard it is pretty cut and dried. We only have two options. One is to go through FEMA for an emergency management conveyance or get Congressional language. Puzey: Get Congressional what? Rees: Language, legislation that states we can have the property. Puzey: But you could be part of an implementing LRA? Rees: Absolutely, Puzey: Because that would lubricate the Army's decisions. Rees: We would be more than happy to participate if that's the way it goes.

Hansell: Ok, July 8<sup>th</sup> from 1 – 5, Swentik: at the Port of Morrow. Hansell: May is at the Stafford-Hansell and June is at the Safford-Hansell, but I really like this location. Nate, can we do the next public forum here as well? Swentik: Ok, June 17<sup>th</sup> meeting is here. Fairley: Just for clarification, this group doesn't necessarily have to sign off on who is on the implementation LRA do they? Hansell: No, I don't believe so. Plus you are going to have matches for grants; we are going to have a multitude of things before that happens. Remember also, that we can't have more than one implementing LRA. Fairley: So it has to be one for the whole site. Hansell: It has to be one for the whole site, but not everyone has to be on it. Chance: And, not all land areas in the site, have to be in the economic development conveyance. Hansell: So that is an important decision too. Say if the Port of Umatilla wants to do this kind of conveyance and the Morrow side decides to go a different route, then the implementing LRA would just deal with those items on the Umatilla side, or visa-versa. Ok, Kim, have we got anything else on the schedule? Swentik: No, I think we covered it all. I just wanted to remind you that it looks like it is going to be a very busy summer. Tallman: What was your planned submittal date? Swentik: We are looking at August 02, if we can get through these other items. Tallman: Wouldn't that be something to have the plan done this summer?

Ferguson: I have two items. The first thing is because you are looking at a fed to fed transfer, we'll need to make sure we have the lines. We will need to see about changing the status of the availability of the property. I'm not sure if we have to go through the state governor's office or wherever, I'm not sure, maybe the Attorney General's office. But we will have to take care of that so that is an issue that needs to be raised. The other thing is, when you need anything or site visits at the site, please route all communications through me. I'm your one point stop for all communications at the depot.

**3:20 pm Open Public Comment:** *Discussions will revolve around the Public Information Forum*

Hansell: Ok, next thing on the agenda, we'll move into the open public comment discussion. We will entertain any one from the public sector if they have any comments or questions on any of the subjects.

Klimek: Looking at the map, as we go forward; I would like to maybe suggest to the Guard, based on some of these variables. Our original NOI included the entire habitat. We've been looking at it to see what makes the most sense. After the Morrow chunk started looking like it was going to be pulled out, I started looking at the upper north section where there are a lot of owl nests, and potentially the Oregon Trail issues. I would through out if this would meet the Guards needs for maneuvering, then we could manage that upper section. I am getting some push back on the owl nesting areas. I think if we could discuss these items, it is very important that we protect the migratory fowl. That is our primary concern, it is what we do. If we can make some concessions, I think this would be a favorable area change for all concerns. I think this would allow for some on-site mitigation. We've talked a lot about off-site mitigations, but this could be a big help. I need to take a map back to my superiors and say look, this is what is most beneficial to us. Rees: I think I understand what you are saying. I think there may be some good sensibility in that we have been



trying to maintain or obtain contiguous property. If you are sort of talking about the Fish & Wildlife Service sort of taking that whole parcel there, and the Guard taking this acreage through here to use as maneuver, I think that would work pretty well. [Remainder of meeting revolved around multiple discussions and line changes regarding the potential lines, most LRA members wrapped around map with pencils in hand. The resulting map is attached as April 15 draft alternative map.]

**3:49 pm: Adjourn**

**Items scheduled for May meeting:**

**LRA recommendations for conveyance preferences**

**LRA recommendation and vote for final preference of land-use**

Respectfully submitted to the UMADRA and other interested parties,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Kim Swentik'.

Kim Swentik  
Executive Administrator  
Dana Mission Support Team

Enc: (to be posted to website along with 041510\_Meeting Minutes)  
Public Forum Transcripts  
Notes on conveyance mechanisms  
April 15 draft alternative map  
Sign in sheet

Note: DMST Task reports, draft plan assessments, and DMST Team Presentation are posted on the website at [www.missionumatilla.com](http://www.missionumatilla.com)

Cc: LRA Members



# Attachments

---