



---

**Umatilla Army Depot Re-Use Authority  
LRA Meeting: CTUIR hosted  
Meeting Minutes: October 22, 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  
Lisa Mittelsdorf: Port of Morrow  
Armand Minthorn: CTUIR  
Carl Scheeler: CTUIR: Environmental Spec  
Joe Taylor:  
Carla McLane: Morrow Co. Planning Dir  
Scott Fairley: State of Oregon: EDT  
Col. Rock Chilton: US Army

**Dana Mission Support Team**

Brian Cole: Exec Director  
Bill Dana: Contract Manager  
Kim Swentik: Exec Admin  
Bernard Fineberg: EE  
Ross Dunfee: EE  
Dick Stone: Communications  
Kevin Bradford: Building Communities Support

**Others**

Phil Ferguson: Base Trans Coordinator  
Connie Caplinger: Umatilla Co. Exec Admin  
Rick Solander: OEA  
Gerald Breazeale: City of Irrigon  
Rick Minster: Oregon Businessman  
Nate Riviera: Umatilla Electric  
Debbie Watson: Umatilla Electric  
Casey Beard: Morrow County  
Carolyn Jones: Army BRAC  
Karen Wilson Army BRAC  
Patricia Kingcade: Army Law  
Tom Lederle: Army BRAC  
Nick Levett: US Army  
Deborah Hayward: CAPECO  
Fred McLaren: HQ Army Material Command  
Teresa Penninger: ODOT  
Neal Robison: USACE NEPA  
Karl Garton: Garton & Associates  
Samantha Bates: East Oregonian Reporter  
Don Horneck: OSU  
Skip Nichols: East Oregonian Reporter

**1:00 pm Meeting Called to Order: Chairman Hansell**

**1:10 pm: Round table introductions**

Attendees identified through sign up sheet

**1: 20 pm: Neal Robison, *US Army Corps of Engineers NEPA Specialist***

Neal Robison is the guest speaker from the USACE invited by the Army to discuss the differences and procedures the Army BRAC requires for Environmental Assessments and Environmental Impact Statements.

Mr. Robison referenced the 32 CFR 651 within his discussion. Within the NEPA system there is a hierarchy of conditions. An *Environmental Assessment* (EA) is generally the first step.

*(The following information is provided to the LRA and other interested party for their information and a link to this reference is provided by Kim Swentik – DMST, Executive Administrator. Elements of the regulation were spoken to during Mr. Robison’s discussion which is continued after this insertion.)*

[Per 32 CFR 651, Subpart B (651.11 Environmental Review Categories) <http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov> (main page, search 651, e-CFR Data is current as of October 27, 2009) or direct link to ([http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title32/32cfr651\\_main\\_02.tpl](http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title32/32cfr651_main_02.tpl))



§ 651.11(d) *Environmental Assessment* Proposed Army actions not covered in the first three categories (paragraphs (a) through (c) of this section) must be analyzed to determine if they could cause significant impacts to the human or natural environment (see §651.39). The EA determines whether possible impacts are significant, thereby warranting an EIS. This requires a “hard look” at the magnitude of potential impacts, evaluation of their significance, and documentation in the form of either an NOI to prepare an EIS or a FNSI. The format (§651.34) and requirements for this analysis are addressed in subpart E of this part (see §651.33 for actions normally requiring an EA). The EA is a valuable planning tool to discuss and document environmental impacts, alternatives, and controversial actions, providing public and agency participation, and identifying mitigation measures.

§ 651.11(e) *Environmental Impact Statement* When an action clearly has significant impacts or when an EA cannot be concluded by a FNSI, an EIS must be prepared. An EIS is initiated by the NOI (§651.22), and will examine the significant environmental effects of the proposed action as well as accompanying measures to mitigate those impacts. This process requires formal interaction with the public, a formal “scoping” process, and specified timelines for public review of the documentation and the incorporation of public comments. The format and requirements for the EIS are addressed in subpart F of this part (see §651.42 for actions normally requiring an EIS).]

Continued discussion by Neal Robison – The preferred method to begin is to perform an EA. An EA reviews the status conditions of such items as Air/Water, Natural conditions, and Socio-Economic conditions. Upon completion of an EA the principal investigator or assessor will determine one of two things; 1) Finding of No Significant Impact or 2) Finding of Significant Impact. If the later is determined, a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS is sent to the Federal Regulations. The primary difference between the two [EA/EIS] is the number of public comments received.

Per BRAC requirements and the current permit for the depot, the Army will provide an Environmental Condition of Property (ECP) to the LRA. The ECP includes RCLA and CERCLA determinations as well as NEPA regulatory items as required by the state permit. Discussions at the table surrounded the immediate need of the LRA and the DMST to have this document as soon as possible to continue assessments identified in the contract. Army officials stated the ECP is currently being worked. The Army does not normally provide a draft; however, they will give a draft to the LRA Team. Estimated timing is December to March.

The initial path forward is determined by the LRA’s Action Plan. The Army uses this plan to determine the potential reuse for the property. For example, an industrial area may not need the same level of EA as a housing area. The majority of BRAC listed closures only need EAs to complete the transfer. A couple of exceptions would include: Ft. Monroe and McPhearson both of these went to EIS. Generally, Armament Material Commands (AMCs) such as the UMCD are able to conclude environmental stability with EAs. Examples include: Riverbank, CA; Kansas, KS; and Lone Star, TX. AMCs.

Q: Will the demolition of buildings be included in an EA? A: If the LRA determines a building needs to be demolished, then yes, an EA would be completed on that area. Q: So, unless the LRA requests it or it is included in the plan it will not be included in an EA? A: Correct.

Pat K: An Environmental Assessment per NEPA requirements speaks more to the Environmental Condition of Property report. Bill H: That includes RCRA requirements? Pat K: Yes, and it also includes CRCLA as required under the current permit. Bill H: When will the ECP be released? Pat K: It is currently underway; we expect a draft in late December, and the final to be completed in March.

Terry T: So the EA or EIS decision will depend on the LRA plan and what we intend to do with the property? Neal R: The final NEPA document will show what has been agreed upon by the LRA and the



Army. The NEPA requirements are really an umbrella regulation. The NEPA requires environmental assessments to ascertain if Archeological and Cultural documentation is required as well as RCRA, CRCLA, etc. Terry T: Is there someplace we can go that lays out the process? Rod S: Is there someplace on line where we could find it? Neal R: There really isn't a diagram for NEPA. We could provide a Table of Contents. When an EA goes to the Army, it is posted public for a 30 day review period. The review period for an EIS is 45 days and then another 30 days. Terry T: So the ECP is an entirely different document than the NEPA documents? Pat K: Yes, the ECP is a requirement of the Army's closure plan. Bill H: So, what I'm hearing is the ECP is part of Clean up. If the NEPA assessments don't start until the LRA plan is submitted, we are looking at late next year at the earliest for environmental determination? Neal R: We can be working on elements of the NEPA requirements prior to the Plan submittal. If various areas come available, we can draft documents and begin EAs. They just would not be finalized until the plan comes through. The final report could be essentially complete.

Q: How will the LRA determine what we want done with the property if we don't know the environmental liabilities?

Pat K: When you see the ECP, you'll see the current environmental status of each area. You should be able to determine your plan or path forward. Terry T: The ECP and environmental documents are a critical piece of the plan. It seems many items have parallel lines to the planning. Rod S: Neal, can you summarize for us? Finish the sentence "The end result of a NEPA document is...?" The estimated final clean up of the facility is in 2015. There is a draft DEQ plan on the website. Many areas will not be covered under that plan. The LRA needs to look at it and be prepared to ask questions.

Q: How is the ECP different than the NEPA documentation? Tom L: The ECP will report the condition of the property as we currently know it. Rod S: Will there be updates to the ECP later? If you don't complete the final incineration until 2015, how much of the ECP will be out dated? Tom L: The RCRA permit will cover the facility. Neal R: The NEPA Law was originally passed with 2 goals in mind; 1) to make the public aware of actions and consequences and 2) to inform the decision makers of the potential consequences of action or inaction. Rick S: So it helps determine the seriousness of the actions needed. Neal R: The NEPA documentation will be a guide. The sole action of the Army is the demilitarization. Col. Chilton: How long would a "Notice of Intent" lengthen the process? Neal R: I can't really predict. Generally about 6 – 8 months. There is a 30 day review of the intent. An EIS generally takes 12 – 18 months to complete.

Terry T: So then the 2<sup>nd</sup> part of the process in the information for decision makers to support. Neal R: Yes, we look at the Plan and determine the level of assessment needed. Terry T: So the EA will state whether further information is needed, or if an EIS is needed. Neal R: Don't misunderstand; the Army uses the LRA Plan to complete the EA, unless we find an EIS is required. If the Plan uses the property for primarily industrial, an EIS would most likely not be determined necessary. However, if the LRA determines the majority of the property will be environmental areas such as wildlife reservations or human habitat then the documentation requirement would be pushed to an EIS.

Bill D: We [DMST] really need the ECP to complete our personal property and environmental assessments per our contract. Pat K: We have a lot of records we have to go through, we are working on it as quickly as possible.

Terry T: So the NEPA documentation includes National Historic Preservation Act criteria? Neal R: Yes, as well as CERCLA.

Rod S: The LRA would like a copy of the draft ECP for our planning purposes – so we can work areas into our plan. Pat K: We will do our best to get you a copy of the draft. Mark D: There are also docs in the Administrative area the LRA can review.

Rick S: Would it be possible for the Army to work up a timeline or process chart similar to the one DMST provided for this discussion? Tom L: Yes, I believe we could provide a path forward.



Carla M: The BRAC Requirements Kristen provided to us shows what we can expect in Chapter 8. Rod S: Speaking for William Quaempts since he could not be present. For our part [Tribal] as the Treaty resources come into affect, the reality of an EIS for the Tribes is essential. Neal R: Please contact me directly.

**1:45 pm: Revisit of determination to transfer electrical grid to UEC  
Introduction of Debbie Watson, Manager Commercial Services UEC**

Ms. Watson introduced herself and presented a letter of request to the LRA from M. Steven Eldrige, General Manager & CEO of UEC (letter attached). UEC is prepared to take over the grid at the site. UEC currently has access to substations and various elements at the site. Chairman Hansell requested to see DMST Electrical Assessment Presentation prior to continuing conversation with Ms. Watson.

Bernard Fineberg of DMST gave a brief presentation of the findings of the electrical portion of the assessment the Dana Team is tasked to do. (Presentation attached) Bernard F: First and foremost, I want to impress to the LRA there is a significant lack of documentation regarding the electrical grid at the Depot. After the presentation, Bill H asked, "Do you have a recommendation for the LRA regarding this transfer?" Bill D: Our information is provided so the LRA can make such a determination. Our primary concern for the LRA would be "Who would maintain the risks involved if a transfer does not take place?" Gary N: There have been concerns/risks mentioned before. As long as the UEC is aware with eyes wide-open I would be prepared to allow transfer. Terry T: How does this transfer fit in our process and potential uses where the LRA to allow the UEC to take over the grid? Bill H: My understanding is the army's grid is held by the Army w/exception of the Burn Facility. They would like to transfer this to the Private Sector (UEC.) Col. Chilton: [to DMST] It is not part of your scope to provide drawings? Bill D: No Sir, drawings should have been provided for our assessment. Col. Chilton: [to UEC] Would you provide survey and drawings free of charge to the LRA? Debbie Watson: I don't see why we wouldn't be able to do that. Col. Chilton: Would you upgrade electrical systems on facilities? Debbie W: we would have to bring them to code. Col. Chilton: Under UEC, would the upgrades be only for the systems up to the building, but not the buildings themselves? Gary N: I understand the LRA would be responsible for the upgrades of the buildings electrical systems. Carla M: Debbie/Nate, now that you have seen the presentation from the DMST. Do you still want to move forward with the transfer negotiations? What happens with the buildings that are not to code? What would be our role to bring them to code? Phil F: The Army personnel could provide the knowledge to the LRA for the buildings. Bill H: Regardless of who owns the grid the buildings will be a concern. Bill D: As I understand it, UEC will upgrade the grid, but the buildings would remain outdated. Rod S: The DMST will provide assessments on those buildings correct? Bill D: Yes.

Debbie W: Mr. Chairman, UEC has provided stations and substations at the Depot for a number of years. The distribution system is what we do. We are fully aware of the status. We [UEC] may be able to work through the panel situation during our negotiations.

Terry T: Were the updates in the 30's and 50's completed by contractors or the Army? Phil F: To the best of my knowledge, the work would have been completed by contractors. Bill D: Most of the items we have seen have been substandard at best. Col. Chilton: Our assumption is the Army will pay the UEC for power. What would other cost benefits be to the LRA for allowing this transfer? Debbie W: Primarily the cost of maintenance. UEC would maintain all of the areas and the LRA would no longer have a concern once they receive transfer of property. Rod S: I move we approve the request submitted by UEC for negotiations to begin with the Army for transfer of the electrical grid. Bill H: Second Rod S: I would like UEC to give regular updates to the LRA for our planning purposes. Debbie W: Yes, we will provide those. Bill H: All in favor? **Motion Carries**

**2:10 pm – Brian Cole, *Building Communities***

Results Overview w/notes from session are attached. Due to the active participation from the LRA and others during this session, it was determined the *Building Communities* activity would be continued at the November LRA meeting.



#### **4:45 pm – Parking Lot Item discussions:**

Trips to Orlando and Ft. Ord. Chairman Hansell will be attending a Ft. Ord tour on November 3<sup>rd</sup>. Rick S: Does the LRA still want the representative from Ft. Ord to visit Umatilla? Bill H: Let's wait until I get back from my visit. After my report we can determine if the rest of the group would still like a visit.

Have we confirmed attendance to Orlando? Connie, Carla, Phil, and Brian (DMST) will be attending. We have decided to hold funding the Tribal representative would have used for another trip later on.

Phil F: Regarding the Personal Property listing – The Army's listing is currently under review. However, the Army only tracks those items that fall within a certain pricing category. There are many items that fall under the threshold. We need a contractor to come in and do an inventory of those items. Preferably before our discussion in November. Bill D: So the Army will not provide a complete listing of items for our assessment? Phil F: Only those items that are greater than the lowest dollar value. Bill D: This needs to be discussed further off record.

Building Permit Modification: Phil F: The Army is holding back contractors from proceeding with some of the demolition that could be done. We need a determination from the LRA on what buildings they want to keep. (missed speaker) I thought we had determined to keep all structures? Bill H: I don't remember this determination. Kim S: It has not been recorded to the best of my recollection. Phil F: The contractor has a presentation they would like to share with the LRA. Gary N: I'm sure we already determined this. I move to keep all structures. Carla M: Is this all buildings or only the facility? Phil F: Facility area for now. Carl S: Are there any structures worth saving? Rod S: By the time the incineration is complete very little will be able to be remediated. Brian C: Rod, what percentage do you think we could salvage? Rod S: Probably less than 50%. Bill H: What [Phil] do you need from us? Phil F: A letter stating your desires to keep the structures. Bill H: Could you draft a letter for us? Phil F: Yes I could do that. Bill H: Motion to keep structures? Carl S: Could we vote on it now with the assumption that we could change our mind after the UMCDF Presentation? (Missed speaker) I second to keep the structures. Bill H: All for? **Motion Carried.**

***Note from Kim S: It was not determined if the LRA wanted to see the presentation. It was not determined if the LRA would be able to retract motion after seeing a presentation.***

#### **Roundtable:**

Scott F: nothing

Rick S: The Ft. Ord representative is still willing to come out, please let me know what your decision is as soon as possible.

Carla M: We have not seen minutes to vote on them. They need to be more timely.

[Note to LRA: until this meeting, it was unknown to DMST that the LRA voted on acceptance of minutes. Minutes have been provided to Chairman Hansell for his review for the BRAC Workshop, Values Mapping Workshop, and to all for the first official LRA meeting since we took over contract (September). I have now made note to send to all in time for their review in anticipation of vote at next LRA Meeting. – Kim Swentik, DMST]

Jerry Breazeale: The City of Irrigon intends to submit an NOI and would like to make a presentation to the LRA at their convenience. Bill H: Let's put it on the December 17 agenda.

Bill D: The DMST is working hard on reports on our assessments. So far we are on track.

Kim S: I have provided all LRA members with a summary of the Public and Private Interests Tour and Workshop we held on Tuesday [Oct. 20]

Col. Chilton: Is there going to be a meeting on how the LRA intends to evaluate the NOIs? KS: The DMST had a meeting scheduled to assist the LRA in what requirements they would be looking for on Nov. 03 tentatively. Due to the trips, this meeting/workshop has been delayed.

Table discussion: Do we really need that? Can't we just review them as they come in and compare to our 40/40/20 determinations?



Col. Chilton: It would be very nice if those submitting an NOI knew what/how the LRA planned to make determinations. On what criteria the submitter would be judged.

Joe T: Brian, when are we going to start making the plan? Brian C: we are moving through tasks 1-6 and tasks 7-8 are beginning. We can't begin to put the plan to paper until all the assessments are complete. So far we are on task. We hope to start putting pen to paper so to speak in December/January.

Armand M: EA/EIS discussion has been broached and closed for now. We would like to see the Army's closure plan, the base closure plan. The critical part is the clean up part.

Next meeting Agenda Topics:

Team reports from Orlando and Ft. Ord

Personal Property information

Building Communities Part II

Meeting will be held at 1:00 pm at the Stafford Hansell building in Hermiston

**5:10 pm: Meeting Adjourned**

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  
UEC request  
Building Communities Overview w/notes

Cc: LRA Members



October 22, 2009

Umatilla Army Depot Re-Use Authority  
Dana Mission Support Team-Project Site Office  
PO Box 1059  
Umatilla, Or 97882

RE: Request for Privatization of Ownership of Army Owned Electric Facilities  
Located Within the Boundaries of the Umatilla Chemical Depot

Please find attached Umatilla Electric Cooperative's request for consideration of the  
above referenced item.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "M. Steven Eldrige" with a small flourish at the end.

M. Steven Eldrige  
General Manager & CEO

MSE/dkw

Encl.

**Umatilla Army Depot Reuse Authority  
Social and Economic Analysis  
Use of Building Communities Strategy Selector Tool to Priority Reuse Strategies  
October 22, 2009**

**Question: Would you like your community to engage in this strategy?**

Name	LRA Members		Non-LRA Members		Total	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Energy Development	10	0	7	0	17	0
Transportation Distribution Center	10	0	7	0	17	0
Business Recruitment	8	2	7	0	15	2
Environmental Restoration	10	0	5	2	15	2
Attracting Government Funding	9	0	6	0	15	0
Telecommunications Businesses	9	1	5	0	14	1
Attracting Government Jobs	9	1	5	2	14	3
Business Cultivation	7	3	6	0	13	3
Value-Added Agriculture	7	0	6	0	13	0
Business Retention and Expansion	7	3	4	1	11	4
Entrepreneurial Development	4	3	6	0	10	3
Education Development	5	2	5	1	10	3
Local/Regional Tourism	6	4	3	3	9	7
Value-Added Forest Products	3	6	5	2	8	8
Cultural Tourism	5	4	3	3	8	7
Pass-Through Visitor Services	4	5	2	2	6	7
Value-Added Mining	2	8	1	3	3	11
Value-Added Fisheries	1	9	1	4	2	13
Destination Tourism	1	8	1	6	2	14
Downtown Development	0	10	1	6	1	16
Attracting Retirees	0	10	1	6	1	16
Attracting Lone Eagles	0	10	1	5	1	15

**Umatilla Army Depot Reuse Authority**  
**Social and Economic Analysis**  
**Use of Building Communities Strategy Selector Tool to Priority Reuse Strategies**  
**October 22, 2009**

**Question: Do you believe your community can successfully implement this strategy?**

Name	LRA Members		Non-LRA Members		Total	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Transportation Distribution Center	10	0	7	0	17	0
Business Recruitment	9	1	7	0	16	1
Energy Development	8	1	6	1	14	2
Attracting Government Jobs	10	0	4	2	14	2
Attracting Government Funding	9	0	5	0	14	0
Business Cultivation	8	2	5	0	13	2
Environmental Restoration	9	0	4	1	13	1
Telecommunications Businesses	7	1	6	0	13	1
Business Retention and Expansion	6	3	5	0	11	3
Entrepreneurial Development	5	1	5	1	10	2
Value-Added Agriculture	2	5	6	0	8	5
Cultural Tourism	5	4	2	4	7	8
Local/Regional Tourism	5	5	2	3	7	8
Education Development	4	2	3	1	7	3
Value-Added Forest Products	2	7	3	2	5	9
Pass-Through Visitor Services	4	5	1	1	5	6
Value-Added Mining	1	9	2	3	3	12
Destination Tourism	2	7	1	5	3	12
Value-Added Fisheries	1	8	1	4	2	12
Attracting Lone Eagles	0	10	1	4	1	14
Downtown Development	0	10	0	6	0	16
Attracting Retirees	0	10	0	6	0	16

**Umatilla Army Depot Reuse Authority**  
**Brainstorming Reuse Opportunities by Strategy**  
**October 22, 2009**

Notes prior to brainstorming:

Brian: The DMST has been involved throughout this project in identifying and coordinating several pieces of the overall plan. I think you will find that the Building Communities process will bring those ideas together. First of all, I want to talk a little about the process. During this session, I will bring to your attention 25 strategies that cover the entire arena of planning. These 25 strategies encompass 2 primary goals I think you will find sound familiar: 1) economic development and 2) environmental control.

Then comes your part, I will ask you to complete the form before you. The form identifies 3 areas:

- 1) Does the strategy make sense for the UMCD? yes or no
- 2) Do you think the strategy could work for the UMCD?
- 3) What should be done to implement that strategy?

We encourage everyone to participate. Please put your name on the form. We especially encourage those who have specific subject matter expertise to a particular area to provide their input.

Carl S: There are some things we may like to see, but not for maybe 10-15 years would it become a viable strategy, how do we answer?

Anytime on these strategies you have a desire to discuss further, please circle the strategy on your form. I will make it a point to contact you later to discuss your ideas, concerns, and hopes for that strategy.

Bill H: What is a Lone Eagle?

If you are already answering the questions you are ahead of me. I will explain each strategy as we go.

Strategy	Activity	Notes
<p>Value Added Agriculture: These are areas of development that depend on agricultural products. ie. production, manufacturing, farmers-markets, etc.</p>	<p>Facility can't handle processing plants – lack of water for volume Area doesn't have industrial parks Have storage in igloos Develop shrub steppe Commodities in sufficient quantity to make value added industries Rail and Road facilities, refrigerated products, Develop ethanol from poplar waste Biocarbon reduces carbon footprint Intersection of interstates, River, rail, roads contribute to transportation Igloos have potential to store – FEMA food; Wine storage areas: igloos Growing Mushrooms in igloos If we take out the “value-added” many areas of Ag/Forestry could be a viable option. Tons of potential for storage of ag products</p>	<p>Keep in mind that some of these industries may be in direct competition with the Port activities and goals.</p> <p>With food processing you have to have land applications as well. ie. plots of land for planting, etc.</p> <p>Even with the lack of water, the strategy needs to be left on the table.</p> <p>SME: There are many options that are low water usage: bagging facilities for potatoes, onions, etc. Waste from Poplar trees, the sky is the limit.</p>
<p>Value Added Forest Products</p>	<p>Opportunities for value added forest products seem limited Biomass CO2 credit from poplar plantings There is already a mill on the Morrow side Opportunities for companies such as Brightwood for wood products such as moldings, trims, cabinetry, etc.</p>	
<p>Value Added Mining</p>	<p>Opportunity for aggregate LRA needs mineral rights Sand/gravel Natural gas</p>	<p>BLM currently holds all subsurface rights – Action Item for Phil to verify.</p> <p>Draft land report by DMST s/be completed by Tuesday next week for LRA review. It will contain many answers to some of the questions.</p> <p>Need to beware of owner conflicts between surface and subsurface rights</p> <p>Action Item for Rick Solander: Look into the regulations on subsurface rights to the LRA</p>
<p>Value Added Fisheries</p>	<p>Without potential</p>	

Strategy	Activity	Notes
<p>Energy Development: Not only alternative energies, but other forms of energy development could be considered under this strategy</p>	<p>Solar array  Concrete array  Blomass  Synergy might be achieved through environmental agricultural plantings such as poplars– biomass, wind turbine,  Use infrastructure  Develop industries to develop wind turbines and other parts manufacturing closer to the place where they are installed  Nuclear energy plant  Energy transmission hub  Igloos could be used for bases to solar panels  Energy parks for multiple types of energy structures</p>	<p>UEC can assist in supporting any and all energy distribution the LRA determines</p>
<p>Business Expansion and Retention: Making sure we are keeping business and allowing them to expand. With the Depot it is a little different. Can the LRA take any role in wanting to extend that?</p>	<p>Wal-mart distribution center / other distribution centers  Pursue businesses consistent with bldg there  Identify or determine another use for the UMCDF  National Guard bringing more people in to staff but these are government jobs  What infrastructure can we take advantage of that would lead to business expansion?  Inventory what’s available needed to make decisions  What can we do for rail expansion</p>	<p>One of the issues: does the LRA want to retain the buildings currently on the site.</p>
<p>Business Cultivation:  Identifying businesses that could be placed or replaced to the Depot.  Import Substitution: Imported items can supplement local businesses production</p>	<p>Strategy makes sense  Could a place such as the Walmart Distribution Center be moved to the Depot?</p>	
<p>Infrastructure Development:  Not only how the infrastructure is currently, but what business lines could be developed through infrastructure.</p>	<p>How do we connect roads, rails  Connections from the depot to Patterson Ferry would afford another barge option  The rail yard is an excellent source; there would be good potential for a freeway ramp near it.  Create jobs by building infrastructure, and jobs by using the infrastructure  LRA needs to determine/plan new grid  Alluvial water available if we recharge it  Work in business cluster areas – that drives infrastructure  Figure out strategy over time is challenge</p>	<p>Two interstate access points, what would the potential be with another?   Morrow county is reviewing and has reviewed potential for transportation networking. Plan to implement in their Transportation Plan   Water availability is an issue: currently 7 wells, only 3 functioning.</p>

Strategy	Activity	Notes
	<p>Decision by LRA to partial out to Morrow and Umatilla counties or does LRA keep control of development</p> <p>Infrastructure would need to be phased as needed. None of the LRA can afford to upgrade the entire system.</p> <p>The airstrip could be used for small planes</p> <p>After the UMCDF comes down, that area will be primarily industrial and can be used as such.</p> <p>City of Irrigon intends to submit an NOI and would request from the LRA in taking over the entire municipal water/sewer system for the depot. The current lines can be expanded. If the LRA is interested, we could do a similar transfer to what the UEC is now negotiating with the Army.</p> <p>Potential builders would need to include infrastructure upgrades as part of their bids. The LRA cannot afford to do it.</p>	<p>All current water comes from the Morrow side for the whole depot.</p> <p>All the waste currently goes to Morrow as well.</p> <p>Wells are in critical water areas, they could not be used for agriculture.</p> <p>Business opportunity will drive need for infrastructure and available funding.</p> <p>Current economic conditions limit development; the current infrastructure does not promote building.</p> <p>The DMST is tasked to inform the LRA of what is currently available to help the LRA decide how it can be used or upgraded.</p> <p>The airstrip has been condemned by the FAA</p>
Downtown Development	Site does not really lend itself to such a strategy	Don't desire a downtown development at the depot to take away from surrounding cities/towns
Entrepreneurial Development: All communities have people with great ideas, not all communities have the components in place to make those ideas come to fruition	<p>The depot would provide opportunity for a small or new business incubator</p> <p>The site has assets that could be utilized: igloos, warehouses, freight platforms</p> <p>What about igloos? Wine storage</p>	
Business Recruitment: Is the act of bringing business into a region where it doesn't normally exist.	<p>Job replacement?</p> <p>More jobs will be lost in Oregon than WA</p> <p>The strategy needs to have access to the surrounding towns/cities.</p> <p>Our goals are not to provide more jobs for WA jobless individuals; we want to keep the Oregon talent working.</p>	<p>Gary N: I think it is more of a timing issue. What becomes available when and how the infrastructure is building up.</p> <p>Jerry: considering long term.</p> <p>Strong yes</p> <p>Carla: we have 1000 jobs to replace. So recruitment is critical. If the reuse plan has a Guard component in it, what kind of jobs will come with</p>

Strategy	Activity	Notes
		that and how do we deal with the rest of the plan. Access to towns.
Local Regional Tourism	Buildings can be preserved to display historical info Other WWII history preserved Birds habitat and wildlife park	
Pass Through Visitor Services	Travel America Truck stop	
Destination Tourism: A place that is sought out by visitors. Generally has some sort of attraction component.	Wildhorse Casino expansion Eastern Oregon State fairgrounds Large RV park Water Park Golf Course Drag Strip Six-flags type amusement park	State of Oregon planning requirements state a natural attraction must be present  This site doesn't meet definition
Cultural Tourism	Cultural, interpretative center Historical museum, restored buildings, history of depot 1940's style tour strip with period attractions such as restaurants, clothing, war era shops/displays Wildlife park/habitat area Walking/hiking trails ATV park Habitat interpretative center: similar to the one in Burbank for bird watchers Oregon Trail highlights	Thoughts to tourism leans towards involving the natural elements The Army actually has a good collection of memorabilia started There are many interesting items that would be great for a museum
Transportation Distribution Center	Yes Mike Burton, who is somehow connected to the Tribes, has a viable idea for this. Platforms Rail Warehousing/storage	
Attracting Retirees	Nothing	
Attracting Lone Eagles: Consultants and individuals who want a nice place to live, but can relocate to many areas	Nothing	
Telecommunications Businesses	Negative- infrastructure Silos/data systems storage Cell phone towers on high ground Expand fiber lines and other lines – go for excellent wireless and fiber facilities Site can handle 5000 phone lines with expansion capability 60,000+ T1 lines are already on the site Army facilities are not dependent on outside vendors	Port of Morrow has begun expanding fiber optic lines and improving overall systems, may be viable to expand to Depot The Army is not reliant on any other company for the current system. This system could be transferred as a new business line to the LRA.

Strategy	Activity	Notes
	R&D and other similar services could be brought in	
Education Development: lends itself to the provision of educational resources	<p>National Guard Training Center  Firing range training  Law enforcement use NG facilities  Trucking companies training  University extensions for agriculture and other research  Training blue collar in various areas such as machine shops, construction, demolition, electrical, etc.  Junior Training Programs such as Job Corp could be a good option. It would assist youth and would supply training opportunities for them and assist the LRA in low cost labor to help rebuild infrastructures. It would also allow for current employees to become training officials in their areas of expertise. The closest Job Corp training centers are in Moses Lake and Hood River.  Areas could be used for graduate work  There may be an existing college who needs a place to build, something worth investigating</p>	<p>It is currently very expensive to send our Civil forces away to training facilities  Training wouldn't have to be done in Salem  BMCC is not looking to expand its campus to the Depot area.  Similar Training Center was done in Seneca, NY with very successful results</p>
Healthcare	<p>Expansion of local hospitals, local clinic  Lab facilities for analyzing samples  Healthcare facility, I think of a complex Inter-path</p>	
Bedroom Community	nothing	
Attracting Government Jobs	<p>Yes  Increase military presence  Environmental Cleanup  Military options with ONG  Prisons  Workfarms  BPA interested in Energy Sectors  Retain current site Contractor funded by Government  Mini-Hanford  Entrepreneurial opportunities might attract some government activities  Large amount of highly skilled employees  Multiple and unique skill sets</p>	<p>Out placement activities are underway; some people have outmoded skills sets, high incomes, hard to place  Survey of current personnel indicates they are not entertaining the idea of moving. Many are taking alternative training courses to stay in area (medics taking nursing for example) Action Item for Brian to call Phil regarding survey</p> <p>You have to have the opportunity to present to the government.</p>

Strategy	Activity	Notes
		<p>So do you cultivate that opportunity? You are describing the entrepreneurial strategy</p>
<p>Environmental Restoration: This strategy would refer to any and all areas that would take the environmental restoration into consideration</p>	<p>Critical groundwater area – recharge efforts to help ground water Recharge projects to restore aquifers, there is data showing that it is on its way Develop creative recharge efforts – studies – industry – challenge to develop unique E R activities to be markets elsewhere Bioremediation efforts could work towards the environmental restoration. Agricultural remediation. UXO area could be an opportunity for university systems to develop or R&amp;D remediation techniques that could then be marketed in other areas. UXO is a huge concern nationally and internationally. Ag practices developed and exported Model area for potential development of remediation – could be supported with the Tribal desire to support the environmental area. Allow use of incinerator in another area – discussion against that Parks recreation Igloo removal Wildlife preserve Continued Federal investment opportunities</p>	<p>Note: Casey to send note to Brian regarding agricultural/and UXO ideas.</p> <p>Many of these ideas could become a “center of excellence” for the bi-county area.</p> <p>City of Irrigon met and discussed the desire to preserve some of the Sage Steppe areas.</p> <p>A permit modification would be needed to keep UMCDF buildings that are not contaminated. By the time the incineration is done, the structures surrounding the incinerator would be severely contaminated. What would the % of the total remaining facility be? Most likely less than 50% of the structures could be maintained. There would be huge implications to permitting the remediation of those structures.</p> <p>Other industries of similar nature may be able to make use of those structures.</p>

<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Attracting Government Funding	Gain support for rebuilding/building infrastructure ARRA, grants, and others supplying a lot of funding right now especially in the environment and energy sectors Need to identify those areas that will generate tax revenues for counties Government funding support for the ONG training center	If we move from a planning to an implementation LRA more government funding opportunities will be available to us. We need to be able to substantiate and show implementation to our plan.