



**Umatilla Army Depot Re-Use Authority
LRA Meeting: Hosted by Port of Umatilla
Meeting Minutes: May 20, 2010**

LRA Members

Bill Hansell: Chairman, Umatilla Co.
Terry Tallman: Vice Chair, Morrow Co.
Rosenda Shippentower: CTUIR
Carl Scheeler: CTUIR
Carla McLane: Morrow County
Lisa Mittelsdorf: Port of Morrow
Gary Neal: Absent
George Anderson: Umatilla County
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

Others

Phil Ferguson: Base Trans Coordinator
Dean Brickey: EO
Kathy Spoon: Army Outreach Office
Larry Klimek: USFWS
Jon Jinings DLCD
David Gottula: UEC
Don Wicks: BFARC-Kennewick
Leann Rea: Morrow County
Janet Greenup: Morrow SWCD
Teresa Penninger: ODOT-R5
Dean Brickey: EO
Bill Pentinger: Red Cross
Jerry Simpson: Port of Umatilla
Stan Hutchinson: OMD
Pat Hart: Hermiston Fire
Lisa Bunch: URS
Jeanette Lostracco: Marstel-Day
Deborah Hayward: CAPECO
Robert Baker: UMCDF

1:05 pm: Roll Call and Housekeeping: Hansell: Welcome everyone; we have several folks who need to leave early today, so let's see if we can get through the agenda quickly. First let's do our roundtable introductions.

Puzey
LTC Rees
Simpson
Skeen
Taylor
Scheeler
Mittelsdorf
Shippentower
McLane
Tallman
Anderson

Chance
Cole
Swentik
Solander
Ferguson
Klimeck
Brickey
Hart
Spoon
Baker
Hayward

Janet
Hutchenson
Rea



Housekeeping:

- Changes to agenda?
 - Skeen: Extension of project – We voted last time for extension through the month of September to complete the planning process. We've had a number of back and forth discussions on budget and scope, but it is completed and in the signatory process now. So, the Dana Team will be staying with us through the month of September. Remember there is a cost share associated with that. Our match is \$12,571.00 so \$2,514.20 per organization.

Hansell: While we are project topic, the DMST has brought to my attention a need to change the July LRA meeting. We currently have it scheduled for the 8th. DMST will not be able to have the material for that meeting that early in the month, and it has been requested that we change it to the 29th. Chance: We cannot jam the final preparation of the submittal that is going to go to the Department of Defense and give you all enough time to review it by the 8th. We wanted to make sure you had enough time, about 2 weeks, to review it. So by moving the July meeting to the 29th, we can give you that 2 week time period. McLane: June or July? Swentik: July. McLane: What is the meeting date in June? Swentik: The 17th. Hansell: It is on the 17th at UEC. Taylor: If we move the July meeting date will it affect the submittal date in August also? Swentik: It will affect it by about 3 days or so. The current scheduled submittal date is August 02, the delay would move submittal to somewhere between the 4th and the 6th depending on any final adjustments that need to be made during quality/print checks. Skeen: That is pending final approval by the LRA on the 29th? Swentik: Correct. Tallman: We don't have a meeting scheduled for August right? Hansell: Not at this time, but we may want to pencil a date now, we can always cancel it if we don't need it. But first, is everyone ok with the 29th? I have Port of Morrow hosting at their facility in Boardman. Ok, so barring no objections the July meeting is:

July 29th
1:00 – 5:00 pm
Port of Morrow

Tallman: I have a question on the cost share? Is there a date that is due by? Skeen: I will send you guys out a note, but certainly it will be needed by the end of the contract. Tallman: Ok. Hansell: For some of us, Fiscal Year is July 01 so we would put it in the FY budget.

Hansell: Let's continue on. Are there any corrections or additions to the April Minutes? If not, they will stand as submitted. **Approved**

Hansell: We'll turn it over to Don on the Irrigon request. Chance: It's actually just a quick report. I think everyone on the LRA knows there have been several exchanges of emails and letters regarding Irrigon's concerns. At this point in time, I think we have got it all cleared. I think things have been ironed out nicely, and I think that all the decisions that are anticipated to be made today are supported by Irrigon. We've been talking to the Port of Morrow and Morrow County about this also, and we are in good shape. I just wanted to give a quick report and let you know "we're there". Hansell: Any questions? Mittlesdorf: There was a City Council meeting on Tuesday night, Morrow County Commissioner Leanne Ray attended; she may have some more information. Tallman: I think it would be good there are some clarifications apparently that needs to take place. We learned some things at that meeting. Leanne Ray: I can tell you, as stated, I was at the meeting. The letter from Chairman Hansell was presented. The Mayor at that time stated the letter pretty well assures us (City of Irrigon) that we will have a seat at the table and we will have property to



lease. We can't buy it, but we can lease it. And we can do our mushroom project. That is what was said. That is how they have interpreted it; they are part of the group. Chance: Unfortunately, Jerry Breazeale can't be here today, I know he is out of town. The last conversation I had with the City Manager, we talked about these things. There was a complete understanding; he said that I was authorized to speak on his behalf that they understood there could be no guarantees provided regarding a seat at the table for the implementation LRA. Because, that process, which is not a specific process, there is no way that the planning LRA can guarantee anybody, any seat on an Implementation LRA. They [Irrigon] understood that. Jerry wanted me to reiterate that, and the same was reiterated in the response back from Irrigon. All I can say is, maybe we are getting mixed messages from the City of Irrigon. We thought we had a good understanding with the City Manager about what assurances or non-assurances we were providing. LTC Rees: Is there a sense of a specific area where the mushrooms would be grown? The warehousing area or the ADA area? Tallman: So, what we're saying is that, that was the last message that was left by the Mayor before he resigned and so in the community, there is the idea that all the things that he stated will happen and that isn't our understanding. Hansell: Was Jerry at the meeting? I know he's been on vacation. Ray: No he wasn't present. Hansell: I would suggest Don and Brian, given your good working relationships with them, talk to them. Let's keep that dialogue open when Jerry gets back because I think we are getting mixed messages. So let's solidify it up. Basically it sounds like what the Mayor said at the meeting was not the same thing Jerry sent us in the email. Chance: Right, it's not consistent. Understanding the email we got from Jerry and conversations we've had with Jerry, they understand the intention at this point is to zone and designate areas for industrial purposes. They've indicated to us they have no preferences in terms of the ownership they are primarily concerned about having that developed for job generation purposes. Nothing that we have discussed with Jerry indicates the understanding the area will be used specifically for mushroom production. The question about the potential seat on an Implementation LRA, as I discussed earlier, was that no guarantees could be provided. They understood that, we understood that, but there was a general support that it probably made some sense depending on what came up and the decisions that are made today. Puzey: I saw the letter, and I think it would be easy for the Irrigon people to get confused given some of the language of what their role might be in the future. So I just wanted to say, I'm not sure the letter accurately expressed the sentiments of all of the members of the LRA. Chance: We went back and had several conversations as a result of that. There was an unfortunate one sentence in the letter, which we went back and made sure there was an understanding. Puzey: Ok. Hansell: Anybody else? Rees: Is there a general sense of ok to move forward in the direction we're headed? Chance: The sense we had, minus what I just heard about this City Meeting, is that the City of Irrigon was on board and they were ok with the preferred plan. And that the threat of legal action had been taken off the table as a result of this exchange of understandings. Skeen: I would even say that statements given this morning and at the City Meeting are still ok, given the actions we are positioned to take today open the way for the possibility of those statements to become in effect. There is certainly nothing we are doing that will stop the potential. Chance: That is correct. Skeen: And their desire and need for the type of activities they are proposing could be considered in the future. Chance: That is correct. Skeen: That may be what the interpretation was, as opposed to they "will". Tallman: Let me just say that does create major problems on a planning viewpoint for Morrow County. Just from conversations that we've had with the State of Oregon and what would take place, we just want it understood, the language "No Guarantees" is the most important thing to take away from our understanding with what the Dana group has been trying to communicate with the City of Irrigon. Puzey: So there is no guarantee of a membership on a future Implementation LRA, no guarantees of a specific use going in... Skeen: We can't make those guarantees; all we are doing is making the recommendations. Puzey: I just think it is important we be very clear for the City of Irrigon, so there are no expectations that have to be addressed later. Tallman: And I agree, that is why it is so important to



have these meetings recorded. Skeen: We don't have any authority to make those decisions. Hansell: I think Jerry understands. Chance: I agree Jerry understands that these are areas we have no real control over. LTC Rees: For the record I just want to make sure that the City of Irrigon is aware we are interested in partnering to work through the issues.

Hansell: Ok, let's move forward with an update on Personal Property from Joe Taylor. Taylor: We submitted a list to the Base Commander for unapproved property. Since Cmd. Perkins has rejected these items, we want to submit an appeal to the Pentagon. We have drafted a letter and Phil has reviewed it. He recommended we justify each item before it goes to DC. If we can get an approval of this letter and we will go through this list and justify each item. Item #4768 is unserviceable so we will strike it from the request. We would be looking for input from Umatilla and Morrow. Puzey: The justification has not changed from the original justification of the reason for purchase so we can use them to continue to maintain the property. Tallman: In the general scheme of things when another entity has asked for an item is there a higher priority? McLane: The other request is from the HSP for the equipment they needed. Solander: It is my understanding is that if it is a mission related item it should go to the DoD requestor. LTC Rees: As far as the Army is concerned other bases take priority. Ferguson: I suggested in my email you make a clear justification for the items. [Ferguson quote email from 5/20: "...I spoke with the BRAC people and what they need is a detailed justification for each item requested. I suggest that for say, the fire engines you add information on a justification sheet that states UMCD is not in a fire district and that fires occur every year on the depot. Last year over 3000 acres burned causing approximately \$460,000 in damage. Something to that effect for all of the items requested. The more detail the better. Also state that the full requirement for these items will be listed in the reuse plan that is still in development."] Puzey: So the justification would be that at this base there is a certain amount of something and there will be further need. McLane: Just a couple paragraphs. Ferguson: Right and it will go into the plan. LTC Rees: Most of the equipment requested is sort of for the Administrative Area, we could speak with the Commander on why these items are important. I can help the subcommittee. Hansell: That would be excellent. Scheeler: Motion to accept letter with appendix for justifications. Puzey: Second. Hansell: What is the timeline? Ferguson: The Commander said we would not touch those items until there is resolution. Hansell: Ok Motion to accept letter on the floor with appendix for justification. All in favor: **Motion carries.**

2:45 pm Alternatives Public Comment Summary, B. Cole: *Overview and package handout of comments received during the Open Public Comment period for the Land Use Alternatives.*

Chance: As Brian warms up, we wanted to make sure you received a review of the comments before we moved on with the plan discussion. Cole: On April 15, 2010 we held a Public Information Forum that coordinated with our Open Public Comment period on the Land Use Alternatives report that ran from April 1 through the end of April. [Presentation Attached]

Puzey: The word "section" does not mean 640 acres...Cole: No, it is just a portion of land. McLane: In the plan you are working on, I'm thinking there are a number of things that will need to come out. What is that going to look like? Cole: There will be a number of areas addressed. CM: I guess where I'm heading, is there will be a number of changes the counties will have to make. BC: They will be addressed.

Cole: In the text, Complex is the US Fish and Wildlife. CM: In earlier conversations we discussed long term protections on developing lands. Chance: We are addressing that language and will acknowledge a specific amount will belong to the refuge. We are trying to acknowledge and document for the ports. Tallman: It is important to say, often times in certain situations that end up



getting a special name like shrub-steppe, it only includes those areas, and it does not stretch beyond the boundaries of that area. For example in 20 years they go to Puzey to say you are impacting our area and we want more. That is a concern right now in Harney County and a concern for me. I think we need to make sure there is language that will protect the ports. I want to make sure there is consideration inside as well as outside. Cole: There are elements that we could send out as a draft; however there are some potentially sensitive areas. Chance: We are trying to make sure the language is right. Tallman: I recognize that, I want to make sure there is no elephant left in the room. Scheeler: I think it is important to note there is one area on the map that is clearly identified as no development. Chance: Right we will articulate the principle and the intention for the planning and the zoning.

Scheeler: Can you please interpret the DLCDC QS. Tallman: It just means that the DLCDC will work very closely with us to make all areas work. McLane: I think both counties will have a few challenges under the Oregon system on this undeveloped unclaimed land. When you get into the areas that are not so developed, when you sit down with the state, it is going to be harder to classify those areas commercial/industrial. Jon Jinings: We believe and agree there is a place for the military, complete habitat, we believe there are areas that are strong candidates for industrial, some commercial; we will just need to see the justification. Puzey: Why can't we talk a little more about the DLCDC ability to use the administrative area now? Tallman: Won't these be planning commission actions? Anderson: With overrule by the DLCDC. Tallman: We are going to go through a process. Anderson: I say we hire the best land use attorneys we can. Jinings: The DLCDC does not have a part in this process. We are not looking to appeal; we want to work with everyone. Chance: I think part of the assurance is that the LRA has gone through a rigorous planning process. Good arguments can be made for the designations that have been made. Hansell: I want to say too, Jon has been to all of our meetings. He has offered his support and tried to make us a priority. Anderson: This is true, but we should still have a good attorney. Scheeler: I would support that. When we were talking about trading off the refuge areas, if that is not approved for industrial/commercial development it needs to go back to refuge. Puzey: We need to resolve this or start over. Tallman: I think what George said and the perspective that Carl said was the balancer, we've basically said we know we have to do these processes. We aren't anticipating any problems; we have good justifications, when we talk to the DLCDC. I think we have a strong basis to proceed. Cole: This conversation is very valuable. The past understandings, this is a real reminder of how hard you all have worked to come to this point. McLane: I would add that Jon has been here and others. If any of them had extreme heartburn we would have heard it by now. All they are saying is that we will need to make sure we do our jobs as planners. I have to believe that if Jon had problems we would have heard about it and this plan supports our desires. Jinings: We hope to be able to support the LRA and most of their justifications. We are working hard to hear what you have to say and we have benefitted greatly to be engaged. Mittlesdorf: If you had problems would we know that now? Jinings: We would have let you know if we didn't believe this particular area was an industrial candidate at this time. Tallman: I think what we do need to make sure is that documentation of these conversations are recorded, they are critical. So that future political leaders can look back and see we have worked very hard to make sure we are doing the best thing.

Mittlesdorf: Both counties have opportunities on the horizon for potential preferential tax treatment.

Tallman: Conversations I've had with the groundwater recharge system, I have been told that this area is a prime recharge area. That all the recharge we are doing may move to this area. Scheeler: We may have some contaminant transfer issues that aren't in other areas. McLane: I don't think it is a bad thing for you to comment in your response that given consideration for the potential



contamination. Skeen: You also have vadose zone contaminations; you have landfill zones that the recharge system could potentially move them. Tallman: Despite the fact that we are not planning. McLane: We've already addressed the agricultural use.

3:00 pm – 90 minutes: LRA Conveyance Preferences for Recommendations to Army, D.

Chance: *Don will provide an overview of 32 CFR 174.9 Economic Development Conveyance, discuss LRA preferences towards conveyance recommendations, and discuss Redevelopment Plan criteria to include an Action Plan that identifies specific actions needed to implement the recommended redevelopment plan: including zoning, transportation, and utility actions as defined by the DMST Scope of Work (Task 10)*

Chance: Ok, since time is short, I'm going to save the presentation until next month. But last month I gave you guys some homework. That was for each of you to get with your people and decide what your individual recommendations are for conveyance. I need those answers so we can finalize our draft redevelopment plan. I'll start with LTC Rees with the Oregon National Guard training area. LTC Rees: Our first choice is legislature; our second would be a PBC through FEMA. Hansell: Any of the jurisdictions in this group would be happy to give you letters of support if you need them. Tallman: We would offer support as well.

Chance: Ok for the 640 acre parcel? The first choice would be EDC? McLane: The hope is that the port will work with the farmer to get the industrial area for Irrigon.

Chance: The industrial/commercial area in Umatilla County? Puzey: No cost EDC. Chance: Morrow side? No cost EDC.

Chance: Ok, so given your decision for EDC, an implementation LRA would need to be created. The I-LRA would have management control of the industrial and commercial areas across the site. Rick Solander: You will want to make sure the trades fall in your EDC plan.

Another area we have never been real clear on is the Admin Area. We've mentioned state agencies, the Guard, but never really pinned the preference. LTC Rees: We have worked with other county/state folks in other areas in the forms of MOU under legislature. Hansell: If the state owns it, it will be all good. Chance: Ok, so that covers that.

Chance: OK, so one primary recommendation: no-cost EDC.

Solander: Normally what happens: you figure out what the joint powers will be. That entity would submit a grant application.

Hansell: Ok, so is there a motion for the planning LRA's intention for the development of an EDC and an Implementation LRA. Puzey moved. McLane: Second. Hansell: All in favor **Motion approved**

3:15 pm Roundtable New business –

Hansell: The next ADC conference in San Francisco is scheduled in August: Does the LRA wish to send anyone and if so who should it be? This year's conference could be important for us to maintain our membership in the association. Any opposition? No. Solander: I think this focus will be on EDCs. Hansell: I believe it is from August 8 – 11. We should still have funding for three individuals. Who do we want to send? Tallman: Someone from Morrow, but not sure who it will be



just yet. Skeen: The same for Tribe. Hansell will go for Umatilla. Anderson: Move to send 3 individuals to ADC conference in August. Scheeler: Second. Hansell: All in favor? **Motion Carries.**

Skeen: We need to start working on the I-LRA and so forth.

Ferguson: I will not be at the next meeting, but Commander Perkins will be here to field questions.

Agenda for next meeting: EDC discussions moved to June.

Hansell: Public? Any comments, questions or concerns? No.

3:39 pm: Adjourn

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 052010_Meeting Minutes)
Redevelopment Alternatives Public Comment Summary
Sign in sheet

Note: DMST Task reports, draft plan assessments, and DMST Team Presentation are posted on the website at www.missionumatilla.com

Cc: LRA Members



Attachments



Table 1: Comment Summary

* The general nature of the comment is categorized into one of four categories: TS = Total Support; QS = Qualified Support; QC = Qualified Concern; O = Opposition						
Comments and Recommended Responses to Task 9 Alternatives Report						
Commenter	General Nature of Support/Concern*				Comment	Recommended Response
	TS	QS	QC	O		
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)	TS				<p>Satisfied that the Preferred Alternative meets ODOT’s request for a property transfer of a section of I-82 currently owned by the US Army.</p> <p>Contact the Oregon Department of Transportation prior to development near interchanges in order to develop an Interchange Area Management Plan to achieve the desired level of certainty for interchange areas.</p>	Include acknowledgement of future need for an Interchange Area Management Plan in the Final Plan
Northeast Oregon Economic Revitalization Team	TS				While it is too early for most Economic Revitalization Team (ERT) agencies to comment on specific Reuse Alternatives, we look forward to offering comments and assistance as reuse proposals are further developed.	Continue to include and inform the Economic Revitalization Team of LRA activities.
Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society (LCBAS)	TS				LCBAS provides several reasons why the Preferred Alternative satisfactorily addresses the Shrub Steppe, burrowing owls, and other environmentally sensitive species.	No alterations needed to report.
Mid-Columbia River National Wildlife Refuge Complex (Complex)	TS				<p>The Complex supports the Preferred Alternative and notes that additional lands beyond those identified in the Preferred Alternative are in need of protection, therefore the Complex supports “Special Considerations: Shrub Steppe Policy” Options #1 and #2.</p> <p>The Complex would also encourage the LRA to consider stipulations in its recommendations to the Army that the ongoing research and management related to burrowing owls and long-billed curlews continue as necessary into the future.</p>	LRA should consider the recommendation by the Complex that ongoing research and management related to burrowing owls and long-billed curlews continue.



* The general nature of the comment is categorized into one of four categories:
TS = Total Support; **QS** = Qualified Support; **QC** = Qualified Concern; **O** = Opposition

Comments and Recommended Responses to Task 9 Alternatives Report

Commenter	General Nature of Support/Concern*				Comment	Recommended Response
	TS	QS	QC	O		
Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)		QS			DLCD believes the Depot presents opportunities to achieve multiple win-win outcomes that advance the economic, social, and environmental well being of the region and its communities. The Department supports dedicating a portion the Depot property for use by the Oregon National Guard and other areas to be managed by the US Fish and Wildlife Services. The Department is less certain that currently undeveloped areas of the Depot property could qualify for exceptions to allow urban or rural industrial or commercial uses. It does not appear that any portion of the Depot property is eligible for inclusion of an urban growth boundary at this time. The DLCD letter then references several Statewide Planning Goals such as Goal 5, Goal 11 and Goal 14.	Continue to include participation from DLCD in future LRA activities.
Penny Moore		QS			The reuse of UMCD is vital to the City of Irrigon and its people. The LRA should consider all of the priorities of Irrigon.	Given recent dialogue between the LRA and the Irrigon City Manager, it is believed that these concerns are being addressed.
Ken Thompson, Radio-Controlled Model Aircraft group			QC		Consider support for radio-controlled model aircraft and high-performance model car activities at UMCD.	This specific activity could be considered by the Implementation LRA at a future date.
Local Citizen			QC		The commenter has several significant concerns with the Preferred Alternative. These concerns include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In general, prefers Alternative #2 with some features of Alternative #4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add analysis of NEO-HUB in the Alternatives Report. ▪ Include additional information in Final Report outlining specific



* The general nature of the comment is categorized into one of four categories:
TS = Total Support; **QS** = Qualified Support; **QC** = Qualified Concern; **O** = Opposition

Comments and Recommended Responses to Task 9 Alternatives Report

Commenter	General Nature of Support/Concern*				Comment	Recommended Response
	TS	QS	QC	O		
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Failure to note large-scale regional transmission planning and recent difficulty in routing large 500KV transmission lines ▪ Failure to recognize potential Northeast Oregon Electric Hub (NEO-HUB) in planning documents ▪ Concern that the Oregon National Guard facility will be of “low economic value with minimal lower-wage jobs” ▪ Consider establishing preferential tax treatments for economic development throughout UMCD 	<p>economic benefits of Oregon National Guard development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The LRA believes the needs of the Oregon National Guard are of high priority because of the importance of its mission in the State and national security more so than its economic contribution to the local economy. ▪ LRA should briefly discuss the proposal for UMCD-wide “Preferential Tax Treatment” policy supported at state level
Anonymous Citizen			QC		<p>The commenter had several comments including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Put UMCD back on the tax roles ▪ Use the facilities for business and administrative activities ▪ Support the City of Irrigon proposal ▪ Focus on short term and long term job creation ▪ Recreational activities could hamper the environment for animal species 	<p>The LRA is addressing all of these comments in its comprehensive planning efforts.</p>



* The general nature of the comment is categorized into one of four categories:
TS = Total Support; **QS** = Qualified Support; **QC** = Qualified Concern; **O** = Opposition

Comments and Recommended Responses to Task 9 Alternatives Report

Commenter	General Nature of Support/Concern*				Comment	Recommended Response
	TS	QS	QC	O		
Jerry Breazeale, City Manager, City of Irrigon			QC		Prior to May 7, 2010 the City of Irrigon expressed a series of concerns that priorities of the City of Irrigon were not being included in the Preferred Alternative. The overarching concerns include the priority of redeveloping industrial land at the Southwest corner of UMCD, ensuring the development of a road network throughout UMCD, the availability of industrially-zoned property in or near the existing City of Irrigon city limits, and plans for the improvement and development of the sewer and water systems.	Chairman Hansell sent a letter dated May 11, 2010 to Irrigon City Manager Jerry Breazeale addressing all of the concerns of the City of Irrigon. The LRA understands that the City's concerns are now satisfactorily addressed by the Preferred Alternative and the prospect of continued work by area leaders to implement it.
Sam Nobles			QC		The commenter had several comments including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leaning towards Alternative 2 ▪ Work the Army and Wildlife areas together ▪ Leave options open for further development ▪ Alternative #1 seems to lock in, prefer to leave options open ▪ Create regional airport ▪ Draw on Pacific Northwest outdoors tourism 	Note comment in Final Plan
Don Rice			QC		The commenter had minimal comment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern about the LRA seemingly not taking agricultural community into much consideration ▪ Potential for ground water re-charge system could solve some of the water issues 	The region is in a critical groundwater area, thus limiting agricultural opportunities



UMADRA-LRA
 May 20, 2010
 Monthly Meeting

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

Name	Association/Company	Email	Phone	Signature
DAVID GOTTLER	VEC	david.gottler@umichillielectronics.com		[Signature]
Don Wicks	BFARC - KENNEDICK	djwicks@3-cities.com	509 551-1369	[Signature]
Dann Ren	Morrow Co.		541-481-5922	[Signature]
Jon Inings	DLCD	jon.jinings@state.or.us	541-325-6928	[Signature]
Larry Klinck	US FWS	Larry - Klinck @fws.gov	509-546-8311	[Signature]
KATHI SPAHN	UMCPF	Kathi.Spahn@umcwf.org		[Signature]
Uwe Mittelsdorf	Port of Morrow	Uwe.Mittelsdorf@portofmorrow.com		[Signature]
Janet Greenup	UMOTRANSWCD		541-963-1344	[Signature]
Teresc Penning	ODOT-R5	teresca.penning@odot.state.or.us		[Signature]
Dean Brickey	EO	dbrickey@eagston.com	541-564-4530	[Signature]



UMADRA-LRA
 May 20, 2010
 Monthly Meeting

Sign-in Sheet for Guests of the LRA

Name	Association/Company	Email	Phone	Signature
Bill Pennington	Red Cross	B.Pennington@charter.net	(509) 628-2484	<i>[Signature]</i>
Jerry G Simpson	Point of Umstick		(509) 565-8148	<i>[Signature]</i>
Stan Hutchison	Oregon Military Department	Stanley.a.hutchison@us.army.mil	(503) 584-3637	<i>[Signature]</i>
CHRISTIAN REES	OR. MIL DEPT.	CHRISTIAN.R.EES@US.ARMY.MIL	(503) 564-3871	<i>[Signature]</i>
PAT HART	Hermiston Fire	pathart@hermiston.or.us	541-567-8822	<i>[Signature]</i>
LISA BUNCH	URS	lisa.bunch@ursint.com	541-564-7197	<i>[Signature]</i>
BRIAN COLE	DMIT			
DW CHANE	DMIT			
Phillip Ferguson	UUCD	phillip.m.ferguson@urs-int.com	541-564-5350	<i>[Signature]</i>
Jeanette Lostracco	Marstel-Brig	J.Lostracco@marstel-dair.com	703-389-5551	<i>[Signature]</i>
Dibbern-Hayward	CAPE CO	DibbernHayward@cape-co-lanes.org	778-564-7111	<i>[Signature]</i>
Robert Barker	UUCDF		541-564-7098	<i>[Signature]</i>