



**Umatilla Army Depot Re-Use Authority
BRAC LRA Workshop #2: UMCD
Meeting Minutes: August 27, 2009**

LRA Members

Terry Tallman: Vice Chair, Morrow Co. Judge
Bill Hansell: Chairman: Comm. Umatilla Co.
Rod Skeen: CTUIR: LRA Contract Manager
Gary Neal: Port of Morrow
Kim Puzey: Port of Umatilla
Lisa Mittelsdorf: Port of Morrow
Armand Minthorn: CTUIR
Carl Scheeler: CTUIR: Environmental Spec
Carla McLane: Morrow Co. Planning Dir
Joe Taylor: Port of Morrow

Dana Mission Support Team

Brian Cole: Exec Director
Bill Dana: Contract Manager
Dennis Walters: VM Facilitator
Dick Stone: Communications
Nancy Ness: Homeless Serv.
Spec
Tom Burkhart: Engineer
Steve Heck: Environmental Spec.
Barry Moravek: VP Operations
MSE
Kim Swentik: Exec Admin
Phone: Attempted: Don Chance,
Jay Cornish, Kathy Murray

Others

Col. Rock Chilton: US Army
Phil Ferguson: Base Trans
Coor.
Scott Fairley: ERT: Gov Office
Connie Caplinger: Umatilla
Co. Exec Admin
Jon Jinings: Dept. of Land
Conservation and
Development

9:10 am Meeting Called to Order: Terry Tallman

9:15 am: Round table introductions

Terry T requested a round table introduction for all who were present while Kim Swentik attempted to get the conference line connected.

9:20 am: Brian Cole: Welcome, Mission Updates, Agenda brief

Action Items for the UMADRA:

- 1) Review website at www.missionumatilla.com understanding it is a work in process, but it is up and running. Comments are welcomed and encouraged.
- 2) Reminder: Feedback on Values Mapping Draft report is due back to the Dana Mission Team by Sept. 04, 2009
 - a. Kim to re-send Draft Report to: Carla McLane; Rod Skeen; and Barry Moravek

Dennis Walters (Dana) summarized additional instruction to feedback on the VM Draft Report, highlighting a suggested rewording on the 2nd Session: Characteristics of a Outstanding Land Re-use. Mentioned Kristin Orr had suggested and Dennis included the suggestion in the Draft for LRA members to consider. Rod Skeen stated concerns that the Dana Team may be giving more weight to OEA directives than those of the LRA, he strongly cautioned the Team to make sure they [LRA] reviews commentary and suggestions given by the OEA prior to implementation. Kim Puzey states the LRA needs to make sure to communicate with the OEA directly on any concerns they [LRA] may have. Dennis Walters clarified the comment was proposed to be changed with a yes or no so the LRA could answer on feedback response. Terry Tallman suggested voting on it now. The Board voted against changing the characteristic and to let it stand for now. It could be revisited at a later time if necessary.

Back to Brian Cole. Coming events to pencil in to your [LRA] calendars:

Sept. 22: Public Outreach Workshop #1: Requirement to the Homeless Service Providers. Letters have been sent. Participants will learn about the NOI process and the site. Public Benefit Conveyances are encouraged to attend as well. The LRA is invited to attend, but it is not required. Registration is due to Kim Swentik by Sept. 17. Terry T. clarified this workshop is geared to PBCs and Homeless Service Providers.



October 21 or 22: Public Outreach Workshop #2 for General Public and other interested parties.

(Commissioner Hansell arrives: 9:33 am takes leadership of meeting)

November 03: LRA NOI Workshop: How to determine a qualified NOI (Time and location TBD)

Kim Swentik suggested a schedule discussion for Monthly LRA meetings. The topic was revisited before adjourning.

9:35 am: Introduction of Tim McAnarney, BRAC Specialist Resume Highlights include:

- Creighton University, BA Political Science/Journalism
- University of Illinois, Springfield, IL, MA Public Administration
- University of Illinois, Springfield, IL, MA Community Development
- 8 years Illinois State Government
- 8 years U.S. Senate, Alan J. Dixon, Illinois
- 21 years Government Relations Consultant
- Clients have included Philip Morris, Wal-Mart, Ameren Utility, numerous municipalities and associations such as the Illinois Housing Authority Association.
- Multiple BRAC experiences include:

1990 – Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois.

- 2,100 acre facility with airstrip, barracks, massive buildings including the largest federal building after the Pentagon (1.8 million sq. ft. of buildings).
- Involved Phillip Morris to help pay for Economic Development Plan - \$120,000 donation.
- Still working with LRA for funding.

1995 – Represented Illinois and Missouri regarding BRAC:

- Melvin Price Depot, Granite City, Illinois
- Scott Air Force Base, Mascoutah, Illinois
- Ft. Leonard Wood Army Base
- ATCOM, St. Louis, Missouri

1998 – Joliet Arsenal, Joliet, Illinois – 23,000 acres.

- 200 bunkers on forest service property – Midewin Prairie – 19,000 acres
- 1,800 acres sold to Center Point Warehouse
- 1,100 acres still being developed.

2004 – State of Illinois – three (3) bases, Rock Island Arsenal, Peoria Air Guard, Springfield Air Guard.

Detail “Behind the Scene” BRAC realities. Big Picture – successes and challenges.

- Price Depot and Port District
- Scott Air Force Base and O’Hara National Guard.
- Ft. Leonard Wood and additional missions.

Tim McAnarney exemplified the Joliet Arsenal as it was similar in the fact that it had bunkers like the UMCD. The LRA on that activity could not determine what to do with the area so they let it go back to the Forest Service. The Army was instrumental in pushing the Forest Service to take on the property. Carl Scheeler asked if the Forest Service was state or federal operated. Tim responded with federal. Bill H. asked who Tim represented. Tim worked for the Governor’s office at the time, but continues as a consultant to the LRA.



Bill H asked how Tim became part of the Dana Team? Bill D. clarified that the Dana Team had several months of research on the Umatilla project needs. Through the research process and review and interviews of multiple candidates, Tim was recommended by several individuals. The Dana Team interviewed him, felt it was a strong match for the potential work at Umatilla and here he is. Tim reiterated agreement that he also felt the match was good and that he looked forward to assisting the UMADRA LRA and Dana Mission Support Team. He also stated he welcomed the questions from the group and fully intended for the Workshop to be a dialogue between all concerns.

Tim continued with discussion about the overall BRAC process. The planning process does not finish the process. The [UMCD] is a large mission with many complications and multi-jurisdictional concerns. It has many similarities to the Melba Price Army Depot in that respect. Tim explained that the BRAC closures compete for budget from the federal government. Terry T. asked if we [UMADRA] are developing a plan in competition with other BRAC bases, is there a set budget for closures? Tim responded the budget, much like our economy, moves up and down. As the economy fluctuates so does the resources for the BRAC budgets. Gary N. asked how can we [LRA] fund the area with this state of the economy? Tim highly suggested making friends with political representatives. "Think outside the box." Check all resources of funding, not just the DoD. If the LRA can identify "quick cash" resources to fund their project before the project is completed they will be one up on other LRAs. Scott Fairley heard the Army is responsible to care for the land the LRA doesn't take. How would they take care of the facilities if there is no funding? Tim stated agreement, the potential for facilities to sit in neglect until there are funds forcing areas to fall under distress functionally. There will be opportunities to make short-term agreements for long-term funding if the LRA develops an NOI to try to gain funding from other sources. The LRA will need to push back. Push the envelop with the funding resources. Make sure you [LRA] work with the political parties.

Terry T. Another factor is the CTUIR in their sovereignty issues and elements. Have you [Tim] been involved with something like that? Tim stated, no, this is something new and we will have to work together to meet all concerns. It is important to work together as a team. This LRA is different, but not necessarily unique. Brian stated we have had discussions and contacts with Colby Marshall and Cathleen Kathey (Sen. Wyden), but we haven't made contact with Sen. Merkley. Carl S. states he has very good relations with Merkley. Brian stated excellent, we will need to get him on board.

Tim continues with BRAC discussions highlighting 3 bases in the state of Illinois: Rock Island Arsenal, Peoria Air Guard and Springfield Air Guard. He continued on to discuss "Behind the Scene" BRAC realities referencing Price Depot and Port District; Scott Air Force Base and O'Hara National Guard; and Ft. Leonard Wood and additional missions. Again, Tim stressed the need to work together through the challenges. The Dana Team will stick to the proposed schedule as much as possible, however, the LRA has some additional time. Tim cautioned the group not to believe that the mission will be completed at the end of 270 days. It is possible, but highly unlikely. He advised the group that the plan is subject to change at any time depending on the NOIs received. The goal of the military is to get the depot off the books – but best and highest use is the real goal. Terry T. asked what is best and highest use and is there an example? Derbin is a good example, the authority found 3 developers. The property was bid and the best and highest use was agreed upon by the LRA and the DoD. This bid changed the entire original plan of the LRA, but benefitted them in the long run. Carl S. asked what did they do at Joliet with the bunkers? The Army convinced the LRA to turn the bunkers over to the Forest Service. The challenge now is, the LRA is getting a multitude of interested parties who would like to use the bunkers for data storage. Now the Joliet LRA is trying to determine how they can get the bunkers back. So there is a lot of interest in warehousing? Not at the beginning, and the few interests that were submitted were not deemed beneficial re-use at the time.

Phil Ferguson states the UMCD is currently storing documents for a number of agencies including the Red Cross. Terry T stated Casey Beer did get a call from the Red Cross requesting if there would be additional space available?

Action Item for Kim S: make sure Red Cross is aware of the upcoming workshops.



Tim continues BRAC discussions around the Communities vision for entire redevelopment, commitment of all parties to work together, and the realization that this is a dynamic process that will not end in 270 days. The Federal process has been completed and there seems to be no interest other than the National Guard. There is hope from the Army that the Guards' needs will be highly considered.

Discussions moved to the next 3 elements of the process. a) DoD recognized LRA; b) DoD has 180 days to make surplus determination; and c) DoD determines the "Fair Market Value" of the assets.

The Dana Team is tasked with convincing the Army of the Fair Market Value: Much of that will be a very important piece of Brian's task. Phil F. The Army is currently undergoing the NEPA and Environmental Condition of Property Reports. Bill H. When does the 180 day Army deadline end? Phil will check the status. Bill H. If this is a requirement for the LRA how do we get involved? Phil will find out what needs to be done. There is a timeline; however, there is "not a big stick." Tim stated the Army is charge with working with the LRA, but Bill H. does not have a lot of confidence in that statement. Rod S voiced concerns about restart and stops on the deadlines all around. He [Rod] understood the NEPA plan could not start until the LRA was finished with their plan. Gary N. Tim, how do the remediation costs play into the Fair Market Value? All considerations will be reviewed and risk analysis completed on those areas.

Armand M. asked Phil if he could explain the Army NEPA process. It would be good to know where the Army is on their side of the process. Rod S asked was there any resolution on if the Army would do an EIS or EA? Carla suggested a visual between the Army schedule and the LRA schedule. [Action Item for Dana Team] Armand stated there were earlier discussions about EIS or EA. The Tribes would prefer an EIS to an EA. Phil will find out what the Army determined. Col. Chilton believes the EIS will be the final determination due to the complexity of the depot. Phil F states the Army is currently looking at the environmental state of the property. Col. Chilton responds that is what drives the LRA and it should be an EIS. Rod S. discouraged the environmental conversation right now because the Facility is still operational and adding more contaminants to the vicinity.

Tim continues BRAC discussions with "Property is offered to other entities as follows:" Other DoD needs, Other Federal agencies; Public Benefit Conveyances (e.g. education, health, recreation, law enforcement, emergency management, ports, wildlife conservations.) The LRA is currently in undergoing this step. This is a good thing. We want to encourage some groups to complete NOIs. Alternative funding could come through them. Dick Stone asked where the Homeless Service Providers fall under the PBCs. The Homeless Service Providers are given priority since the McKinney Act. Currently the UMADRA has had to revisit the previous efforts towards the Homeless Service Providers. HUD has negated the previous actions and has issued a 90 day extension. The time clock has restarted on this effort. Bill H believes it was a negative demonstration by the Feds. The LRA complied, everything seemed to be cleared and then it was determined it was incorrect.

Tim continues, the Army will take into consideration Public Benefit Conveyances the LRA objects to. Dick S. asked if the Army makes the final decision. Response from Tim was yes, they [Army] want to work with the LRA, but they have the final decision. If the LRA has a good plan and there is a NOI that comes in that is clearly NOT part of the LRA plan, the Army will not entertain it. Brian read a quote from "Base Redevelopment Planning, pg. 15" [download book from <http://oea.gov/OEAWeb.nsf/BRACLib?readform>] Carla McLane stated Ports are listed under the PBCs. Regarding the rail line, if the Ports wanted a portion of that and who would be responsible and would the Ports need to submit an NOI? Tim responded that would be a determination of the LRA. the LRA needs to determine when the Ports should submit interest. It may be better for the Ports to wait for the good of the group plan. But will we lose PBC status if we wait? Not really, the LRA will receive NOIs for years. Col. Chilton stated the BRACs he has been involved in were just the opposite. If a PBC missed a deadline, that's it. Tim states that has been true in the past, but with the state of the nation, those lines are weaving. Col. Chilton stated he is not sure the question was understood. Tim, the PBCs will not be approved until all assessments have been completed. If a PBC misses a deadline they lose the exclusivity right and then it goes to the next level. If



the land is still available, the PBC can come back with another NOI. Carl S asked if it is a no cost transfer if it is a public development. Bill H asked PBC in your experience do they have a no cot transfer? Tim states it depends on the value of the property. The Army will get as much as they can for it.

11:00 am 10 minute break

At reconvene Bill H. requested we continue through the scheduled lunch break and have lunch afterwards. All conceded.

Brian Cole requested Nancy Ness to go over the new NOI deadline. Nancy N stated that the clock restarted on the NOIs at the date of the letter sent to the Homeless Service Providers which was August 25 making the new NOI deadline November 23. The planning clock (270 days) restarts as of November 23. Bill H asked if the LRA has a requirement during the scheduled outreach. Dick S states there is not a requirement, but the LRA is certainly invited to attend and participate if they like. The requirements state we will conduct open meetings and the notes generated from those meetings will become part of the plan. We [Dana Mission Support on behalf of the LRA] encourage as many individuals and participants as possible to attend. Keep in mind we will also be conducting Focus groups from various socio/economic categories. We will depend on the LRA for suggested cross representative samplings of the community.

Tim continues Workshop discussions with: LRA conducts outreach to homeless providers as required by the McKinney Act working with HUD; LRA advertises and conducts open meetings regarding availability of assets (solicits Notice of Interest); LRA submits Redevelopment Plan to HUD and DoD (270 days)

The Dana Mission Support Team is moving forward on the tasked assessments. Tim believes the LRA will be impressed with the quality of work.

Armand M asked if the economic development plan was different from the re-use plan. No they are the same. Keep in mind the DoD can say no, used Maharisi University as example. He then spoke about Economic Development Conveyance. Tim requested Brian to speak to Building Communities. The Economic Development Conveyance is the Building Communities portion of the Dana proposal/contract. 25 areas will be investigated. The LRA will be invited to attend the workshops and we also suggest some Subject Matter Experts for various areas to help the LRA determine functional areas. We [Dana Team] don't want to begin this process until most of the assessments are complete. This way we can talk to the current condition of the properties. The Building Communities process will identify all the key areas and elements for the best use of the property. Tim responded if you can break the projects into priority areas with specific functions it will help with gathering funding. You can request smaller pieces to start with. Bill D. commented that Tim had mentioned perhaps identifying an early funding generator will help fund the LRA on the rest of the properties. Tim stated this is correct. the Army looks favorably at quick turn-around funding. Brian said there will be approximately 1000 jobs lost as a result of the closure. Additional funding and quick turn-around will help to support them. Armand M states that yes, we have a wealth of resources, but we need to be considerate of the local environment. Tim agreed. We encourage you to keep outreach going and looking outside of the LRA for ideas. You [LRA] will eventually have to break down, after the mission is completed. Tim strongly suggested an economic plan be developed and to use it as a tool to encourage development.

Tim continued with Workshop discussions: Direct sale to private developer and development specifics of the Economic Development Plan.

The plan must include:

- 1) Must address homeless needs in addition to local economic and community requirements.
- 2) Must show "Highest and Best Use".
- 3) Inventory assets.
- 4) Environmental problems and remediation costs.
- 5) LRA vision for land use and zoning:
 - a. Analysis of infrastructure



- b. Redevelopment schedule
- c. Capital Improvement Program
- 6) Document economic hardship as a result of base closure.
- 7) Demographic characteristics of area
- 8) Business climate – complete market analysis.

Break the Redevelopment Plan into stages that will allow for potential NOIs to be developed first.

Involve state and federal elected officials. These guys can help finance the LRA. Make sure you have continued conversations with the political elements. Even if they said no upfront, the economic environment is changing daily.

“Buyer Beware” Tim used Champaign as an example: Be aware that the LRA will most likely need to battle on the environmental and perhaps other areas of responsibility with the Army. Bill H states Chenute has won awards and is considered successful. Tim replied yes, but the problems they are facing are not unique. They are still battling the environmental responsibility. Overall they are very successful, but they are still facing challenges. Carl S asked what happens to the maintenance of the facilities during the absence of presence. The Army is responsible, but remember, they may not have funding to maintain them.

“Record of Decision” (ROD) – it may not be final. The LRA is working toward the ROD that is agreed upon by the government. RODs can change...they are not final. The 1st ROD will most likely not be the last. Tim believes the UMADRA LRA is a great group that is used to working together. Tim stated let me leave you with some encouragement of creative ideas for economic development:

The current administration loves “Green”:

Windfarm production. Noticing the local wind farms, this would be a good place to produce the windmills and potentially store power.

Landfill: This could be a very good financial turn-around area. There is already a landfill on site. Landfills create tipping fees that would go to the LRA. This could fund the LRA for some time. These are just a couple of suggestions to gain financial strength.

Tim’s closing remarks. Remember the Feds love “Green” Establish a Washington D.C presence. I encourage you to work with the EPA and DoT. If you work with them now, they may help find funding for larger projects later.

Q & A's:

Rod S: Regarding NOIs: There may be a reason the Ports would like to submit an NOI. I would like to see NOIs from the Port to help with the decision and planning process to come.

Carla M: Again Parks and Recs

Terry T: I would like to see the Tribes submit NOIs for their ideas and designs for the property.

Carl S: I believe that is the best way to determine some of the parameters and how we can work together for the environment.

Rod S: I don’t want to see the Ports miss an opportunity to have their desires put forth because the process keeps changing.

Carl S: Should the interests be submitting NOIs so they can have a place holder?

Tim: That would be a good idea

Carl S: This would give us [LRA] an opportunity to weave all the interests together

Bill H: Not game to the idea that the LRA will still be acting in another 20 years. Why develop a plan if everything could change?

Tim: BRAC requires the acceptance of NOIs and reviews. That doesn’t mean you have to approve them for the plan.



Rod S: Showed a hand scratched example of NOI process to the LRA. Each individual interest in the LRA should submit NOIs so the LRA can review them and work them into the planning process.

Gary N: We can move towards the individual entities with the LRA moving out of responsibility.

Carla M: When we write the plan if we don't have specific NOIs, the plan will be rather generic.

Tim: Generally a planning LRA moves to an implementation LRA by taking control of some of the opportunities or facilities available.

Bill H: Does anyone have a problem with individuals in the LRA submitting NOIs?

Carl S: Not a problem, however, we may need to place some restraints on the environmental impact.

Bill H: That's the point Rod S was making. If we review the NOIs, we can work towards the working function.

Rod S: Yes, if we can see what the intentions of the people are then we can make determinations to environmental issues.

Terry T: I would like to see this happen if the tribes will agree.

Brian C: This discussion is extremely helpful to the Dana Mission Support Team

All agreed

Bill H requests round table for final remarks or questions

Joe Taylor: That is what he thought these last two meetings were about.

Bill D: We are hearing a lot of ideas from various areas and individuals. In parallel the LRA will enter their NOIs as well as all the others. All ideas will be reviewed and submitted as part of our report.

Gary N: Just want to make sure we move forward.

No other comments

Bill H: Let's revisit the LRA Monthly Meeting Schedule Kim requested:

Suggested last Tuesday, but that was not a good day. Board determined Thursdays are better. Penciled following meetings:

September 24 1:00 pm; hosted by Port of Morrow

October 24 9:00 am; hosted by CTUIR

November 12 9:00 am; hosted by Umatilla County

December 17 9:00 am; hosted by (tbd)

January 28 9:00 am; hosted by (tbd)

February 25 9:00 am; hosted by (tbd)

March 25 9:00 am; hosted by (tbd)

3:15 pm: Workshop Adjourned

Submitted to the UMADRA and other interested parties,

Kim Swentik
Executive Administrator
Dana Mission Support Team