



**Official - approved**

**Umatilla Army Depot Re-Use Authority  
LRA Meeting: Hosted by CTUIR at UMCD  
Meeting Minutes: Sept 21, 2010**

**LRA Members**

Bill Hansell: Chairman, Umatilla Co.  
Terry Tallman: Vice Chair, Morrow Co.  
Rosenda Shippentower: Absent  
Carl Scheeler: CTUIR  
Carla McLane: Morrow County  
Lisa Mittelsdorf: Port of Morrow  
Gary Neal: Port of Morrow  
George Anderson: Umatilla County  
Joe Taylor: Port of Morrow  
John Turner: Port of Umatilla  
Kim Puzey: Port of Umatilla  
Rod Skeen: CTUIR  
William Quaempts: CTUIR  
Scott Fairley: State of Oregon  
Stan Hutchison: Oregon Military Department

**Dana Mission Support Team**

Don Chance: Exec Director  
Bill Dana: Manager  
Kim Swentik: Exec Admin

**Others**

Phil Ferguson: UMCD  
Rick Solander: OEA  
Bryan Stroud: U.S. Army  
Larry Klimek: USFWS  
Eunice Sigler: UMCD  
Kyle Gorey: UMCD  
Don Wicks: B-F Red Cross  
Bill Peintinger: B-F Red Cross  
Pat Hart: Hermiston Fire District  
Gerald Breazeale: City of Irrigon  
Dean Brickey: East Oregonian  
Brian Cole: Orbis Group  
Kathy Eldrige: UMCD - ORO  
David Gottula: UEC  
Josh Landferd: UEC  
Nate Rivera: UEC  
Kathi Spoon: UMCD - ORO

**1:12 pm: Call to Order by Vice-Chair Terry Tallman** Chair Hansell has been delayed, so I am going to start the meeting and he can take over when he gets here.

**Roll Call:** [See list above.]

**1:20 pm - 10 minutes: Housekeeping:**

Tallman: Is there any public request for comment that you would like to put before us before the meeting gets started? None

- Set up next LRA meeting  
**Date: 11/2/10**  
**Time: 1:00 pm**  
**Host: Morrow Co**  
**Location: Port of Morrow [location confirmed following meeting]**
- Joe Taylor: Carl Scheeler speaking in Joe's absence. Nothing new to report for Personal Property. Would like to discuss continuing monitoring needs through transition into next group. **Skeen: Suggest keeping the same routine with the current sub-committee until the Implementation LRA is defined. Tallman: All agree to keep it the same for now? Table: Agreed.**

**1:30 pm – 45 minutes: US Army, Commander Perkins:** *Commander Perkins will give an update on closure activities at the site and introduce the new site Project Manager, Gary Andersen.*



**Official - approved**

An apology was given by Commander Perkins for the accommodations with promises to host another meeting after the new upgrades are completed at Building 54. A few hundred thousand dollar of improvements are being made to floor, teleconference capabilities, and other various systems.

Commander Perkins introduced the new Site Project Manager, Gary Anderson. Anderson returned to the area on July 4<sup>th</sup>, 2010 from Pueblo, CO.

**Gary Anderson** brief bio: Government work over 27 years as a civilian, with chemical demilitarization program since 1991. Worked at UMCD as Deputy Site Project Manager under Don Barkley for about 3 years. The past seven years have been spent at Pueblo managing the design construction activities for the demil plant they are building in Colorado.

Vice-Chair Tallman: How close are they to having that finished?

When I left they were about 50% of the construction, all the east construction is done, the facilities are up, now all the tedious stuff starts. They have quite a bit of work left to go. Their projection was to finish construction about the spring of 2012. They are not projecting to begin operations until about January of 2015.

Vice-Chair Tallman: What was most of the material they are going to destroy?

In Pueblo it is all mustard. It is all in projectiles.

Vice-Chair Tallman: What is the age on those? Pretty old?

They are probably 40 – 50 years old.

Vice-Chair Tallman: So we have all the Ton Containers down here and they have pretty much all the projectiles there?

Yes, they have about 780,000 units up there.

New schedule outlook for UMCD Closure: Original project schedule (July 4, 2010) was estimated at June of 2012. New projection is at April 2012. Steve Warren the new Project General Manager for URS is confident it is a schedule they can achieve. They have been working on some of the easier Ton Containers, the ones projected to have a fairly low field and grade really well. We are moving along fairly well. Once we begin the more difficult containers progress will slow.

URS and the government are working with the State and looking at other opportunities that might drive the schedule back to the left a little bit more. The collection systems are one of the areas we are working with the State on. What this would allow us to do is to take the water we use to help mobilize the solid peel that is in the ton container and instead of running that through the metal parts we could run it through the liquid incinerator. We have a permit modification that is in front of the State right now that we are working with them on. If we can get all of that pulled together we can have it in place by about January of next year, which will help us pull the schedule back to about December of 2011. It is about a 4-month improvement potentially. That is all work in progress, there is a lot of work to be implemented or executed before we can bring it to fruition. I wanted to make sure to share those two dates with you. We will keep you updated as we make progress. With that I will open for any questions.

Question: B. Dana: Have you established any dismantlement contracts with outside contractors?

As far as I know there are no contracts in place. I know the projection is we will have some subcontracts when we begin demolition. Our closure permit modification is with the State right



## Official - approved

now, we are expecting their comment which comes in the form of a Notice of Efficiency then we will work through that process.

Question: B. Dana: I understand that although the initial permit required the tear-down of everything, that after the current modification request is approved, another modification request is in to reduce the footprint of the area that has to come down. Such as the contaminated portions of the MDB, is that correct?

We are setting everything up right now as if we were going to tear the whole facility down, that would be the worst-case scenario and cause us the most work. It is my understanding that it is the desire of many of the parties to keep some of those facilities. Once we get a better indication of those areas, we will work with the State on the permit modification to keep those in place. My understanding is you all have prepared a proposal that has gone up to EA to try to negotiate what that is. Whatever that decision is, will help implement it from the permit side to do whatever clean-up we need to do to those facilities.

Vice-Chair Tallman: What does URS stand for?

I don't know what URS stands for, but it is the parent company that bought out the Washington Demilitarization Company. I don't know if URS stands for something or if that is just their company name. Moravek: I believe once upon a time it stood for United Resources Services.

**Commander Perkins:** I think everyone understands my/our mission here is going to continue to be safe storage, shipment, security, and support of the demilitarization operation until that last Ton Container goes through the metal parts furnace.

We have numerous opportunities to move forward in transition of some areas.

*Non-chemical storage igloos.* We have about 873 igloos out of the 1001 that have never held agent. We have moved forward with vacuum to send off for sampling, once we receive confirmation that no metal has been detected we seal it up and we consider them as closed. We have accomplished almost 600 of the 873 with none of them coming back positive for metals.

Confirmation: Vice-Chair Tallman: So 600 of the 873?

Yes, we are about at about the 61-62% mark. We are progressing. We were able to take a negative thing and turn it into a positive thing when we were on the ground with ChemOps and weren't shipping. We wanted to ship but we couldn't so we took advantage of that time and dealt with some of the non-chemical igloos that are out there. That has slowed now, because we are able to ship Ton Containers which is what we want to do. It has slowed, but we will continue to move forward with it and make that progress.

*Chemical storage igloos.* 24 out of 128 chemical storage igloos we've received agent free criteria from our State regulators, that is out at I-Block. We have a remainder which we know in J-Block and K-Block of our permitted igloos. What we will have to do is sweep in and clean those out, so we will continue to do that and work with the regulators to get permit closure as we go down the line. We have received requirements from our Headquarters for any facility or equipment, that was potentially contaminated or contaminated; before we can transfer that property to even another government because of future liability, must be monitored to a General Population Limit (GPL). We have started that progress as well, thus far we have about 27% of the typical storage igloos monitored to the GPL. Again, this is not part of RCRA, not part of the permit closure, but it is a requirement before our Headquarters will allow us transfer an igloo over to the LRA or whoever that igloo is going to as part of the Reuse Plan.



## Official - approved

*Personal property.* Everyone in this room is aware of how that is moving forward as we continue to identify according to reuse as our property becomes excess able.

On the 30<sup>th</sup> of September we have a much larger meeting than I originally anticipated with the Oregon National Guard. they have a lot of plans in accordance with the Reuse Plan as they move forward with the ranges, I told them I want to support them all that I can. However, my priority is the mission so I need to know what you want. I suggested a monthly transition meeting. I just wanted to share with you all our progression to support the Reuse Plan, even though it is not approved yet. I think we can be aggressive towards the items we need to do on our side so we can make that a smooth transition.

Chair Hansell: Normally a person in your position has a two year command, correct? Are you going to stay on or will there be someone else? I have submitted an extension that has been approved up to the Department of the Army level. Right now I am here through the summer of 2012.

Vice-Chair Tallman: I think that is a great request, it is good to know you will be with us for a while yet.

Question: B. Dana: At the ADC conference there was at least one site where the base was still active, where they were able to reduce their footprint and allow portions of the redevelopment to begin. Would that be possible out here? Most of your work is either done with the northern igloos or the UMCDF with a majority of the area open for redevelopment, like around the freeways. Would it be possible for the LRA to move towards their economic development in those areas?

In short, yes. That is one of the reasons we are moving forward with the ORNG meetings. Anything we can do to move forward with the effort I support 100%. there are several steps that have to be done to make that happen, the first of course being the approval of the reuse plan. Once that plan is approved then I am willing to sit down at the table and identify exactly that, where can we begin to start transitioning excess real property according to your reuse plan.

Question: D. Chance: We have always had a concern about the Admin Area because the infrastructure, there is a lot that has to be done here year in and year out to keep it up. It sounds like you are working with the National Guard to work out a schedule so, my impression is, where we aren't going to have to cope with the situation that the Admin Area is not going to sit idle for quite some time before someone takes care of it. Am I on the right track?

Yes, that is my intent. Even if we have buildings that are standing empty right now, I will maintain them at a minimum of where they are today. And then again, some of the buildings, if they are for our reuse, I can validate money, for example Building 54. That is going to become a huge transition center for us. So I was able to get the funding to upgrade that building which benefits the Army, then when we close out this mission here, it will benefit whoever takes over that building.

Vice-Chair Tallman: One more alphabet sort of thing, did I here you say GPO? GPL – General Population Limit. There are different levels of agent that we have to detect. GPL is normally what we can do, for example, if I have a property that is going to be used outside of the federal government it needs to meet that level. It isn't as stringent to transfer items within the government say from base to base. Are there any further questions? Thank you very much.

**2:15 pm – 30 minutes: ADC Conference Discussion, Chairman Hansell:** Chairman Hansell, Phil Ferguson, Bill Dana and Barry Moravek attended the ADC Conference in San Francisco in August. Discussion around what they learned during the conference.



## Official - approved

Chairman Hansell: Phil, Bill and I attended the ADC conference last month. I found it very beneficial, particularly the meeting we had with Pentagon officials. They had not received our plan yet, it had just been sent off the Friday before, and no one had received it yet. I thinking generally, there was an overall feeling of we are moving in the right direction. There were two items I wanted to bring up and then I will turn it over to Bill and Phil for their observations. The first item; the Pentagon people definitely want to have a letter of support for the plan from the Oregon National Guard. Even though they have been a part of the planning process, it is something important to them.

Vice-Chair Tallman, they want a letter of support from the Oregon National Guard? Correct. Subsequent to that, I met with General Caldwell and Chris Rees at the Oregon headquarters, expressing the need to obtain that letter. I also spoke with General Rees who is a long time friend. There was no problem in gaining their support and they agreed to get a letter, although I have not seen it yet. I'm going back to Washington DC next week. It is my understanding the ORNG is preparing for another massive deployment and it is important that I get that letter to take back with me.

Vice-Chair Tallman: Is there a specific reason they want the letter?  
I think it is just an added confirmation that the ORNG is on board fully and they completely agree with the reuse plan. You know early on there were some discussions and negotiations, primarily with the Admin Area and I think the Army just wants to confirm the ORNG is good with the final decisions.

Another item I wanted to bring from our discussion with the Pentagon officials is they want a confirmation letter from USFW. I've contacted Carl and Rod. Undoubtedly, in other projects [involving the USFW] when it went up the food chain from the local to the top it didn't happen. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think they were more concerned about that. The local guys are all over it, but the higher levels may not have the funding or commitment that the locals do. Those were the two big items at the front that will help the review. For me, that information alone was worth the entire trip. All the reviewers of our plan were there at the table. Bill? Phil? Additional items to share?

Phil Ferguson: From my understanding, the USFW area is the only area where they have some misgivings. When we began this project, the federal government agencies had the first option of taking on some or all of the property. The Department of the Interior turned it down. Now, for us to transfer that property, we have to remove the identified section of land from the public notice and re post it to the federal government. It is quite an undertaking. It can be done, but if we do that, and then the Department of Interior turns it down again, it would not be a pretty thing. This is the number one concern. The Army wants a strong commitment from them before this process is begun. It is my understanding that the USFW has submitted a project proposal, which is part of their process, to the DOI. I have not heard where they are at in the approval process.

On the National Guard side, they understand there are problems with the laws. They are working and have contacted the senators to work out language modifications. Again they want to make sure there is a level of commitment. The Pentagon last heard the ORNG wanted the demil site and we did not submit that so they want to make sure the commitment. Chair Hansell: We did discuss a potential fed to fed transfer for the ORNG, but that will not happen.

Question: C. Caplinger: If we pull the announcement will we have to go through the HUD process again?





## Official - approved

I don't believe so, the only way that would happen is if the fed to fed transfer fell through and that section of property went back up for public, then we might have to do something.

Question: D. Chance: Carl [Scheeler], have you heard anything form Larry [Klimek, USFW]?

C. Scheeler: I tried to call him today but he is on vacation, but he was working with people further up the chain of command. I'll have to wait until he gets back to find out any progress.

P. Ferguson: One of the things I brought from the conference was the group of people they had in attendance. I spoke for some time with the Newport LRA. It has made great progress in its redevelopment effort. You have been invited to go to meet some of the various sites.

Chair Hansell: We were trying to identify other bases that are similar to ours that are further along in the process.

Bill Dana: For my observations, I put several items of interest down. I have handed out a couple of pages of my notes. (B. Dana – ADC Note attachment) My primary focus was how to leverage dollars for the plan and projects.

*Recovery of Rail:* One of the areas we have spoken about in the past is the recovery of rail. I would like stress that as you go through negotiations with the Fish and Wildlife, to make sure you include in the agreement that you are able to keep the rail as part of the conveyance. Once the feds gain that property, it [rail] will no longer be available to the LRA, but rather will be considered USFW property.

*Utility Right of Way:* Under I-82, there has been talk about bringing water in from the Port of Umatilla side, if the Department of Transportation owns the land under the freeway's they may be less willing to grant the boring to bring piping in under the freeway. I do have an engineer who is an expert in this area and has done it before.

Clarification: George Anderson: That would be for like the regional water supply to get to the Umatilla property?

Right, because otherwise you are limited by wells and the capacity is pretty low. I heard this over and over again. Some of the highlights I've addressed in my notes are available as downloads: the links are on the website and you can download the slides.

[\[www.defensecommunities.org/annualconference/downloads.html.\]](http://www.defensecommunities.org/annualconference/downloads.html)

In terms of grants – to be successful you need renewable energy in your request. Also, there was a paper on liability for environmental cleanup. I think it is important that the LRA emphasizes during negotiations, that the Army maintains the environmental liability during and after transfers.

Question: George Anderson: Will the Army take that responsibility?

Yes, there is a precedent for them to do that.

Observation: Carla McLane: There were several speakers about that when we went last year.

An Economic Development Conveyance Update was a presentation that was given. You can get the full presentation off the website, but I have included 4-pages of it in your notes. It is a very important sector for the LRA as it moves through transition. They deleted the requirement to seek and obtain fair-market value. These are the changes to the BRAC law at congress. Consideration can be considered at or below fair-market value or no consideration. They can accept a share of property sales or leases as consideration. They can accept in-kind consideration including goods and services, real property, and property improvements. There was another conference in



## Official - approved

Albuquerque about 9 months ago and these bullets are they areas they went over. It's fairly enlightening as to assisting you with your negotiations with the Army. As you move forward and start talking about what it is going to take to make the transfer. These are just four out of maybe 25 pages in that presentation, but I felt these were the important items for this LRA. Again, you can find these presentations on the website.

- How to pay for the project;
- From dull to dollars projects;
  - Double dipping is allowed for multiple grants on the same project area;

Here was an interesting idea. Developers came in who were interested in developing a section of land for multiple tenants. At Ft. Ord, what they did was, required the developers for each parcel of land to put down about 200k. That money went into a management fund so that a project manager then worked with all of the developers and prospective tenants. This helped them to streamline the process, aided in decision making and ultimately saved them money. The Economic Development Administration is one branch of the DoD who administers grants. I know Don is already familiar with them.

- 6 regional offices of federal grant;
- Infrastructure grants for public works

There were four infrastructure upgrade presentations I also listened too. One from Ft. Monroe, VA; Red River LRA; Seneca Industrial Development; and the Kansas Ammunition Plant.

Chair Hansell: One of the items Bill mentioned – the current administration's emphasis on renewable energy is very important. The whole military is trying to become "green". So the fact that renewable energy will be a factor that we'll want to use to help us gain funding. There were areas of discussion on how to do that without putting in huge systems, for example metering buildings on energy uses, etc. There are some creative ways to get around it.

Vice-Chair Tallman: To incentivize and have a sustainability aspect to your grant proposal.

Question: George Anderson: Reality out here, if this plan is approved. There is a lot of bare ground already and theoretically the Port of Morrow and the Port of Umatilla would end up developing it. It's not like we have people knocking down our doors to locate there. We have ready set infrastructure ready to go for those folks.

Sometimes we have what is not really transferrable comment to what we have at Umatilla.

George Anderson: What I mean is; what is the likely hood if we can't develop the property that the property ends up being conveyed to the two Ports and everyone just goes home? My understanding is everything has value and it's how you establish that value. If you can establish a negative value than it works to your advantage. Like the environmental clean up aspects, that can work to your advantage. Or if there is something that has to be done before the land can be used.

Comment: D. Chance: I think, if I'm interpreting this right. The lag time in terms of when you have new business moving in can be substantial. People should modify their expectations here. This is not something that is going to happen overnight. We already have substantial acreage in both districts serviced by utilities, there are some certain advantages that exist on the base that don't exist in the port districts. It may be a location or something. We need to make sure as we move forward that we manage the public expectation so they do not expect that this is going to happen over night. It is a very long process.

Comment: P. Ferguson: Nate Rivera [UEC] called last week. Undoubtedly there is someone interested in some areas on the depot for energy development. I sent them to the LRA. So there are people looking at the area. Chance: I think on the energy front,



## Official - approved

especially with wind generators, there are a lot of incentives in place. If, I'll tell you, if the Dana group gets involved phase II, we have people lined up to investigate, it is their area of expertise to judge the economic viability of some of these items on the base. We know you have generated some of that information in the past, but with the new, substantial government subsidies, there may be areas not considered in the past. This is something that could happen fairly quickly if the resources are there to make it viable.

I'd like to mention one last thing on the EDA grants, in order to obtain those grants, they are justified in terms of saving jobs. You need to do the grant before the job loss occurs not afterwards.

Vice-Chair Tallman: So what kind of jobs are you talking about saving?

For example you have hundreds of people at UMCDF.

Vice-Chair Tallman: They would be in that category.

Right, or those who are working in the Admin Area now.

Vice-Chair Tallman: Is that for the existing LRA or the implementing LRA?

I believe this would be implementing LRA. Barry? Barry was also at the meeting with us.

Barry Moravek [DMST-MSE]: Phil, Bill, and Bill have covered it pretty well. There a couple of other items that were interesting although you really had to dig some of the nuggets of information. Most of what we saw was base realignment rather than closure. There were two 3-star and 3-two star generals, and 3 assistant secretaries, in attendance – so this was a very important meeting. The administration was very big on the renewables discussions. The discussions on closures were minimal with the exception of National Guard units there are more than 220 Guard units on the list, but overall, BRAC is closing down. While we were there, the staff got a call from Washington D.C. and Secretary Gates had indicated to the group that he had just requested another round of BRAC. He has asked Congress to review his request. What is good for Umatilla is “if” you are in the pipeline, you are more secure.

Chair Hansell: Stan [Hutchison, ORNG] just arrived. He was in another meeting in Ontario. He was at the meeting I had with the General and Chris Rees. Maybe you can bring us up to date Stan on the status of the letter of support?

Response: S. Hutchison: We understand you are leaving next week. We will have the letter completed this week and should be signed by Thursday and I will email it to you.

Chair Hansell: That is good to hear, in fact, Thursday I am in Salem, I could just swing by and pick it up.

S. Hutchison: Ok, if there is an issue with the TAG (The Adjutant General) I'll call you, but I don't see a problem.

**2:45 pm – 30 minutes: Business Plan Subcommittee status update, Rod Skeen:** During the July LRA meeting Rod Skeen, Kim Puzey, Connie Caplinger, Lisa Mittelsdorf, and Carla McLane were selected to develop the next phase of needs during the transition from planning LRA to implementation. They have been working towards developing a scope of work for the Operating and Infrastructure Analysis and Business and Operations Plan that will need to be developed prior to the implementation LRA developing the EDC application.

Rod Skeen: I sent out a draft to the subcommittee. I went through the examples of the transitional implementing proposals that Rick sent me. I pulled a couple of those together into one proposal and sent it out for review.





## Official - approved

Vice-Chair Tallman: That's Rick Solander [OEA]?

Right. I've got some sections that I still need response that I particularly wanted the ports to look at. I'm waiting for comments back from a few of the subcommittee members. So that is kind of where it sits. As soon as I get comments back, then I can finish the final draft and then we can set up to meet and go over it.

Vice-Chair Tallman: So you are wanting comment back from all of us?

No, the subcommittee. I have comment back from Umatilla County, but nothing from the rest of them. The big issue is "What do we want to do with the Executive Director?" Previously we went out with the RFP to subcontract everything.

Interruption: Carla McLane: I'm sorry, Terry. The Dana Group is in the room. Do we want to have this discussion now?

I don't want to discuss it right now, just the topic, and then we will have to discuss later. We decided for the first phase to lump it all together. But we need to decide how to handle it this go around. All of the other facilities hire their Executive Director directly. This is something we have to decide because it will set the scope of the RFP. Everything else will depend on that.

Chair Hansell: Is that what they said would be best or?

That is the example of all the other sites. There are some reasons to do that, we've had those discussions. One of the reasons that we have to coordinate the proposal is because we don't have the Director to do that. Dana can't do it because it puts them in conflict. There are certain components that are advantageous to us. It is the agreement of our group that this person is working for us and they represent only our interests. They would write the proposals and such.

Question: Kim Puzey: Are there groups that have moved there planning support group through the transition and forward?

The potential is there to sole source the tasks. I don't know if it has actually happened with an LRA, but the answer is yes, there is potential.

Chair Hansell: I believe the possibility is there, I don't know if anyone has done it.

Correct. But, we are unique. We have a unique structure, with hiring the contractor to begin with. Generally, you hire staff and subcontract out little pieces.

Question: K. Puzey: Why did we do it the way we did it? Was that what was recommended?

No, they fought us tooth and nail. We chose to structure it this way because nobody wanted to take on the responsibility of hiring the Executive Director and Administrative Assistant within their organization. Because of the liabilities of hiring those employees, the benefits and perks and such. And when this group was at that stage, nobody in this group wanted the appearance of having additional control because those employees were in their offices. Everyone wanted to keep above board and on an even playing field.

Question: Has something changed then? We don't even know who the implementing LRA is yet?

The planning LRA is taking on this proposal. This is work for the planning LRA and while this is going on, subsequent work will have to be going on at the same time developing the implementing LRA. So at some point we can do the hand-off, but this work is for us. It's 11 – 12 months worth of work to keep us going. This group is the one who will have to make that decision. Our subcommittee and our group need to have those discussion in private.

Vice-Chair Tallman: There was an element of trust we didn't really know how much we could trust each other as we were developing our relationship. We didn't know where this was all going to end up, so we made the previous decision based on that. We were asserting our uniqueness then and we went on about our business.

Chair Hansell: Rod, do you think between now and the next meeting we need to meet?



## Official - approved

Honestly, I think we need to have the RFP out the door before the next meeting. I was really hoping to get comments back a week ago. I would like in the next two weeks to finalize this. I think we are very far along with it, except for this decision. I think the subcommittee should come in and be able to discuss this point.

Vice-Chair Tallman: Who needs to turn in their comments?

Everyone except Umatilla County.

Comment: K. Puzey: I would like to propose that the subcommittee stay a few minutes after this meeting to discuss this. I think everyone on the subcommittee is here.

Chair Hansell: Here is my concern. I am not comfortable with an RFP going out without the official action of the LRA.

The RFP wouldn't go out without the consensus of the group. The purpose of the subcommittee to meet would be to discuss the scope and pricing and all of that business.

Question: C. Scheeler: Is there a way we could have an Executive Session?

That could work.

Question: K. Puzey: I would like to have the whole group meet can we do that today?

We could finish today's agenda then move to an executive session.

Question: Connie Caplinger: Could Tamra Mabbott, planner for Umatilla be in attendance?

Chair Hansell: So the purpose of the executive session would be?

The subcommittee would discuss what are we going to send out in the RFP. What are we going to keep in house, which basically comes back to that staffing question.

Chair Hansell: So it is the personnel decision that would need to be discussed.

Comment: K. Puzey: I think anybody on the LRA staff should be invited to stay and anyone who could be considered potential contractors be asked to leave.

Chair Hansell: So the Executive Session would include LRA and staff that wants to stay and the public and Dana would be requested to adjourn.

Vice-Chair Tallman: Any objections? [None] Ok we will go forward with that thought. Ok, Bill should we do round table?

### **3:15 pm – 15 minutes: Round Table: New business**

Chair Hansell: I want to open the floor up right now for public input. Is there anybody from the public who would like to address the LRA? Jerry Breazeale [City of Irrigon].

J. Breazeale: Yes, I would like to address being able to receive minutes, draft minutes when they are sent to the LRA members. I have asked for them but my request was denied. So, I'm making a formal request that I receive the draft minutes at the same time the LRA does.

Chair Hansell: You want the draft minutes before they are approved?

Correct.

Chair Hansell: The reason?

To see what went on at the meeting before the next meeting.

Chair Hansell: Those are made public and posted once they are corrected.

Well, it gives the public the opportunity to review what went on at the meeting and be able to respond or prepare for the next meeting.

Chair Hansell: Are the draft minutes different from what has been posted?

Response: Kim Swentik: Not generally. Unless there are corrections that need to be made to the LRAs statements or typographical errors. It is pretty much a direct transcript of the meeting that I put out.



## Official - approved

Generally, when you make corrections you don't change them directly, you mention the changes in the next meeting. But it gives people the opportunity to review what was stated during the meetings, especially if they didn't get to attend.

Clarification: C. Scheeler: Mr. Chairman, I think the suggestion is to post those minutes prior to our approval of them? On the website so they are available to all the public?

Statement: D. Chance: We've been uncomfortable doing that when they have not been reviewed and approved by the LRA. So as soon as they have been approved we post them.

Chair Hansell: Mr. Lawyer? Your opinion.

George Anderson: First off the public is entitled to that information, the minutes of our meetings. The question is, do we have an obligation to hand that out before we have approved the minutes. Theoretically, we could approve the minutes, then send Mr. Breazeale the minutes and the draft minutes so he could compare the two. I don't know that it would make a difference. I think my inclination would be to email them to him and he could comment as much as he would like to. And we would do what we do to approve them. I don't have a problem and the public is entitled so I don't think it needs to be a big issue.

Comment: K. Puzey: I think the public is entitled to the minutes, but I don't think it is fair to Kim who is transcribing from this recording device, what she thinks she heard when there is some potential for that to be incorrect. Before the body has had a chance to review. I think the public should have the minutes, but to put out a draft that has the potential for that much error, I think it is unsafe. I think anyone should have the minutes once they are approved by this body. I'm not even sure if there is such a thing as "draft" minutes.

George Anderson: They are still a record of our meetings and the public would be entitled to them at some point. It's not that we have to turn them over pre approval, we can give them the drafts after they are approved along with the approved copy. Unless we were to get an official public records request requesting the minutes before they are approved.

K. Puzey: I don't even think minutes exist before they are approved.

George Anderson: They are still records of the body Kim.

K. Puzey: Well, I'm not a lawyer George, but up until they are approved they are just someone's notes. You look at them and say, you know I don't agree with that, or I agree with the record.

Lisa Mittelsdorf: I would have to agree with Kim on this one. I don't know of a public body who releases the record until they have had a chance to review it.

George Anderson: I haven't either, to me it is a highly unusual and odd request.

Vice-Chair Tallman: Ok, so the question is do we allow a draft set of minutes to be sent, per the request of Jerry Breazeale, City of Irrigon. Rod, you look like you wanted to say something.

Comment: R. Skeen: My initial reaction is that I agree with Kim. We do post them and send them out on approval. Dana has been doing an excellent job with the minutes. There have been times when, at least once or twice, the jest of what was said was a little bit lost in the translation, but minutes are minutes and they are approved and posted.

Comment: B. Dana: I also review those minutes before they go out to the LRA.

Question: Scott Fairley: How long does it take to go from draft to approved minutes?

Response: K. Swentik: It really depends on the meeting. Last month I had 5 tapes I transcribed plus my own notes and all of the presentations. If there is a lot of table talk it may take me longer to weed out the conversations. So then once I think I have them all in order, I send a draft to the LRA to review before the next meeting. At that meeting they approve or deny, and on approval they get posted on line for public viewing.



## Official - approved

Vice-Chair Tallman: Jerry, do you feel that the minutes are being changed between the draft and final?

No that is not the point at all. The point is, say I was not able to make this meeting. I would have to wait until after the next meeting to see what happened at this one. I would not be able to review and perhaps respond accordingly during the next meeting to previous issues. When they are sent to the LRA, I'm sure it is an email. I'm just asking to be included on that list so that I can review the happenings from the most current meeting. I really don't see any reason not provide them.

Chair Hansell: Jerry, on your City Council what is your procedure?

If anybody asks for them we give it too them.

Chair Hansell: Draft minutes?

As soon as they are prepared, we will give them a copy.

Chair Hansell: Has anyone ever done that?

Yes, there have been a couple.

Question: R. Skeen: Can we mark ours with something like draft unapproved?

Comment: D. Chance: Yes, you can do that.

Comment: C. Scheeler: Our procedure is, we receive the draft minutes, we make comments to them, then we approve them after the next meeting. I don't have any problems with, as soon as the comments have come back and they are ready for final approval sending them out. But I am very uncomfortable with them going out before we've even had a chance to look at them. But in order to have them out a little quicker so you can review them before the next meeting, that makes some sense. Other than that, I don't see any strategic advantage to try to get them out before approval.

Comment: K. Puzey: The reason for this procedure is to allow us to review the accuracy of our own statements, the perception of the issues have been addressed accurately, whether or not it was accurately recorded. That's what we do when we say we approve the minutes. We approve them to how they were written, edited, transcribed.

Chair Hansell: We have a request before us, is there a motion to approve or deny the request to send out the minutes prior to approval?

**Motion: George Anderson: I move that we provide draft minutes to Mr. Breazeale and anyone else who requests them.**

**Chair Hansell: Is there a second? I will second the motion.** Further discussion?

Comment: R. Skeen: I think Carl's suggestion is a good one. That this group be able to see the draft and comment on it. Basically, so the document that will be presented to the group at the meeting for the approval be the one that is released on request. And it is marked "draft-unapproved" before it is sent out.

Chair Hansell: So is that a friendly amendment? Because that is not the motion.

R. Skeen: Yes, that is a request for a friendly amendment.

Chair Hansell: So the minutes that go out before a meeting are marked draft-unapproved.

Clarification: C. Scheeler: Chairman, I think what was said is the minutes come out to us for comment, and then once we have made comments back those would be posted as "draft-unapproved".

R. Skeen: So the *draft* document is the one that has been commented on by us prior to formal approval.

Chair Hansell: I think the ones that come out initially would have to be marked draft unapproved also.

R. Skeen: Right, but the ones that are to be posted to the public, we would at least have the opportunity to comment before they are posted.



## Official - approved

C. McLane: So maybe they would be “draft-unapproved” and then “reviewed – unapproved”.

S. Fairley: It sounds like you all want a chance to review the minutes before they get sent out to the public. No matter what you call them.

**Chair Hansell: Ok, this is not the motion. Let’s get this one done then we’ll move on. All for sending the draft minutes out to the public sector prior to approval signify by saying Aye? Ayes: 2 Nays: remaining. Motion denied.**

**Motion: K. Puzey: I move we make available to the public “the minutes”.**

**C. McLane: As in final approved. I would second that.**

**Chair Hansell: It has been placed in motion and seconded that minutes be made available on request. Further discussion?**

Clarification: C. Scheeler: I think we need to determine what the “minutes” are.

**K. Puzey: Let me amend my motion. I move we make available to anyone who requests it, the approved minutes.**

Chair Hansell: We do that now.

K. Puzey: That is what my motion is.

Chair Hansell: Ok.

**C. McLane: I second the amended motion.**

**Chair Hansell: Any further discussion? Ok. All those in favor signify by saying I. Ayes: All. Motion carries.**

Chair Hansell: Ok, we are still in public comment are there any further public comments? None. Let’s go around the table does anyone have anything for further discussion?

Bill Dana: I wanted to mention that our contract ends on September 30<sup>th</sup>, subject to the approval of the Port of Umatilla, we are going to maintain the Umatilla office for a short time at our own expense to ensure we are able to respond to those questions that come in from the public or LRA through October at no cost to the LRA.

Comment: R. Skeen: You aren’t obligated to do that contractually. Understood.

Comment: R. Skeen: You aren’t allowed by contract to represent the LRA so we would need to place some kind of motion here to allow you to do that at no cost to the LRA. Would you agree Mr. Chairman?

Chair Hansell: Yes, I think that would be the right thing to do.

**Motion: R. Skeen: So I would put in a motion that the Dana Team be allowed to continue the services within their scope as much as they would like to do at no cost to the LRA through the month of October.**

**Second: K. Puzey.**

Chair Hansell: Further discussion?

Comment: C. Scheeler: Without a formal contract guiding that or an amendment to the current contract that seems like a pretty high level of risk.

Comment: R. Skeen: We could do a no cost extension.

Comment: B. Dana: Interestingly enough, now that you bring that up, the contract we received goes through October 30<sup>th</sup>, but the actual reimbursement goes through September 30<sup>th</sup>.

Comment: R. Skeen: You’re right. I think I put that extra time in just in case. So you are covered, never mind then.





**Official - approved**

**Chair Hansell: Ok motion has been removed. Moving on.**

K. Puzey: I received a telephone call from Ed Brookshire, the City Manager. He indicated he had been invited to a meeting of city manager's to determine if the cities that surround the depot had interest in the LRA and so forth. He wanted me to know that officially for the city, they had no interest and that they felt they were represented well by the Port of Umatilla.

Ok we are going to take a break and dismiss the public and Dana Team. We will reconvene under Executive Session in 5 minutes or so.

**3:30 pm: Adjourn public**

**3:40 pm: Executive Session [notes received from C. Caplinger]**

Chair Hansell called an executive session under ORS 192.660(2)(g)

Chair Hansell outlined what the sub-committee needed from the Board. There needed to be a decision on whether to hire an executive director or contract for the service. Rod Skeen moved that the sub-committee move forward with the scope of work using the model to hire an executive director and administrative assistant. Vice-Chair Terry Tallman seconded. Carl Scheeler called for the question. The ayes carried unanimously. Motion Passed

Kim Puzey expressed his thanks to the RFP sub-committee for their work.  
Terry Tallman expressed thanks to the CTUIR for being the fiscal agent.

Executive Session was adjourned at 3:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted to the UMADRA and other interested parties,

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

Kim Swentik  
Executive Administrator  
Dana Mission Support Team

Enc: (to be posted to website along with 092110\_Meeting Minutes)  
Bill Dana – ADC Notes  
Attendance Sign-in Sheets

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



Dana Mission Support Team - Project Site Office

500 Willamette Ave - PO Box 1059, Umatilla, OR 97882

**Official - approved**

Attachments

ASSOCIATION OF DEFENSE COMMUNITIES CONFERENCE IN SAN FRANCISCO, CA  
AUGUST 8-11, 2010  
NOTES AND COMMENTS BY BILL DANA

1. Designate "recovery of rail" with the Fish and Wildlife land as part of the transfer agreement.
2. Designate "utilities right of way underneath I-82" with the OR Dept of Transportation, before transferring this property per the NOI.
3. For success in receiving grants, "renewable energy" was emphasized over and over again in the educational sessions.
  - a. Successful approaches have not only involved windmills and solar, LEED buildings, conservation, landfill gas projects, and also "monitoring energy use of buildings" where tenants have to pay excess energy used, etc. You have got to have something in this mix to normally be successful with grants.
  - b. Ensure that "Liability for environmental cleanup" remains with the Army in perpetuity, even after the land is transferred: Asbestos, Ordnance, Lead paint, Asbestos, Falling structures, PPB's, Bird droppings
4. EDC Update: See handout for tips for negotiating with the Army. Big changes to the BRAC law are coming (2010), such as the Army savings avoiding cost of cleanup by zoning Light Industrial etc.; Kansas example discussed.
5. "How to Pay for the Project"- See handout- Several examples in session: such as: negotiating with the Army for a "debt deal" due to Army Military Housing savings on elimination of maintenance spending due to upcoming privatization. Also discussed REITS, relationships with banks, etc. Also discussed was how to propose your financial plan up front to the Army. Show stoppers→ A. "Can you do it? B. Where are the dollars? C. Why this is a deal?
6. "From Dole to Dollars" Projects: Concord CA, Riverbank, CA; Fort Ord, CA
  - a. Best approach to receive grants; "double dipping" for grant \$ is allowed using different grants.
  - b. Sustainable pieces= mandatory for success; Ask developers for "venture capital" so they can sell their land to users: (example \$200,000 per developer at Fort Ord). The "one stop shop to get all your needs" requires a dedicated project manager, handle permits, stream line decision making, save time.
  - c. Economic Development Administration (EDA) ..partnered with DOD...– 6 regional offices...Grants- you MUST do the grant BEFORE the job losses occur. ie, job losses at UMCDF come to mind....
  - d. Infrastructure grants for public works...\$50 K to \$250K
7. Four Infrastructure Upgrades Presentations: Fort Monroe, VA; Red River LRA, Seneca Industrial Development; Kansas Army Ammunition Plant
  - a. At Ft Monroe, the OEA paid for a comprehensive infrastructure plan before the implementation LRA was formed (similar to UMCD plans). This also included TV camera inspection of their sewer systems as part of the infrastructure assessment.
  - b. At Red River, TX they established a "right of entry" with the Army BEFORE the Army vacated the property. Presenter encouraged sites to build positive relationships with the Army, and to develop "phasing plans". Also working with utilities and regulators before transfer.
  - c. At Red River they got hit with capital gains taxes of aprox 38% of the transferred value. Therefore if established value is low due to non-compliance of codes and cleanup, this reduces potential amounts for the capital gains tax.
  - d. At Seneca Army Depot they negotiated no-cost EDC by tradeoff with environmental cleanup costs. (1995 BRAC applied). Methodology was described for establishing those costs.
  - e. At Kansas Army Ammunition Plant advice (Ann Charles)- now successful in the Implementation LRA phase. Her advice:

- i. Start with State Regulator
- ii. Know the State Statutes
- iii. Coordinate with the Utility companies
- iv. Prioritize utility upgrades
- v. Meet State water specs
- vi. Training & certifications of employees
- vii. Emergency response- chemical spills, etc.
- viii. Work with the regulators
- ix. Disposal costs of PPB's in transformers
- x. "The Railroad Easement was a nightmare"
- xi. Keep the "old timers" from the base- hire them.

Note: Bill Dana met with all members of the Kansas Army Plant contingent. Bill was invited to visit the Kansas Munitions Plant for a comprehensive debrief and show and tell.







**UMADRA-LRA**  
**September 21, 2010**  
**Monthly Meeting**

**Sign-in Sheet for Guests of the LRA -pg 2-**

Name	Association/Company	Email	Phone	Signature
PAT HAVET	Henriksen Fire	pat.havet@henriksen.or.us	567-8822	<i>[Signature]</i>
Deborah Hayward	CAPECO	dhayward@capco-wmss.or.us	278-5467	<i>[Signature]</i>
Kathy Eldrige	Outreach Office	kathy.eldrige@uncdf- <del>state</del> fo.org	541.564.9339	<i>[Signature]</i>
Sarahelle Breazeale	City of Irrigon	irrigon@oregontrail.net	541-922-3047	<i>[Signature]</i>
Stan Hutchison	OMD	Stanley.a.hutchison@usarmy.mil	603 584-3637	<i>[Signature]</i>
Tamra Mabbott	Umatilla County	tamra@co.umathl.or.us	541-278-6246	<i>[Signature]</i>



UMADRA-LRA  
 September 21, 2010  
 Monthly Meeting

Sign-in Sheet for Guests of the LRA -pg 3-

Name	Association/Company	Email	Phone	Signature
TERRY K. TALAMAN	Monrow Co.	tkallman@co.monrow.or.us		<i>[Signature]</i>
Kim B. Bray	Part of Vivatila		1.541.922.3224	<i>[Signature]</i>
William Dana	Dana Mission Support Dana Engineering	bdana@ DanaEngineering.com		<i>[Signature]</i>
Jitha Mose	CTUIC/DOSE	tittamosa@ctuir.org	541-429-7427	<i>[Signature]</i>