



DANA  
MISSION  
SUPPORT  
TEAM



# Umatilla Chemical Depot Redevelopment Plan and Implementation Strategy Support Services Contract

---

Deliverable Report Contract Task 2.7:  
Focus Groups: Community Sampling  
Groups Interviewed October 27, 2009

Attn: Rod Skeen, CTUIR  
Contract Manager

Umatilla Project Site Office  
PO Box 1059  
Umatilla, OR 97882  
541-922-9339

“SOLUTIONS PLANNING  
FOR THE CHANGING  
ENVIRONMENT OF THE  
UMATILLA CHEMICAL  
DEPOT”

Prepared by: Dick Stone, Communications Specialist,  
Dana Mission Support Team  
Contributors: Brian Cole, Executive Director  
Kim Swentik, Executive Administrator  
October 27, 2009  
Final Submittal November 06, 2009

October 2009



November 6, 2009

Attn: LRA Board Members and Interested Parties  
From: Dana Mission Support Team

RE: Contract for Professional Services, July 21, 2009  
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation and Dana Engineering, Inc.

**Deliverable Submittal:** Contract Task 2.7: Workshop #1: *Planning and leading a minimum of two community focus group meetings. The meetings will be scheduled so that members of the community will have the opportunity to voice their concerns and discuss their ideas of redevelopment options.*

The purpose of this letter is to formally transmit a contract deliverable to the UMADRA - LRA.

This document provides a complete report of two focus groups conducted on October 27, 2009 during a morning and evening session:

1. Report of methodology and demonstrated strategy to approach the focus groups
2. Summary of findings
3. Appendices of participant information, focus packet, participant written comments and personal observations, and facilitator notes and observations.

Brian Cole

Executive Director  
Dana Mission Support Team

CC:

Hansell  
Chilton  
Minthorn  
Caldwell  
Scheeler  
McLane

Neal  
Mittelsdorf  
Taylor  
Turner  
Puzey  
Skeen

Fairley  
Tallman  
Quaempts  
Anderson  
Caplinger  
Cathey

Orr  
Headley  
Ferguson  
Dana  
Moravek  
Swentik



## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Purpose .....	2
Questionnaire .....	2
Participant Selection .....	3
Methodology .....	3
Summary of Findings .....	4
Appendix A: Focus Group Participant Information .....	8
Appendix B - Focus Group Packet.....	9
Appendix C - Participant Written Comments.....	11
Appendix D - DMST Focus Group Notes and Observations .....	28
Appendix E - Participants' Personal Observations.....	36

## Executive Summary

On October 27, 2009, 22 key community members from seven communities met in two different groups to share their concerns and their ideas on redevelopment options for the Umatilla Chemical Depot (UMCD). This report summarizes findings, and shows in the appendices comments recorded by interviewers and comments written by participants.

Although a report of responses for each question in the study may be read in the Summary of Findings, the more heavily discussed observations related to concerns and suggestions for options are shown here.

### Concerns

- The Army would turn the site over with a lot of environmental cleanup to be done by the new occupants or the Counties – don't let the Army off the hook for cleanup
- The LRA Board Members cannot collaborate and develop a site plan in a timely manner – participants want them to work together with statesmen-like cooperation
- Participants do not want the site to be a tax burden to either County
- Good paying jobs, which will be lost when the UMCDF closes, must be replaced
- Too much public involvement delays the closure process; the LRA needs to make decisions and take actions
- Bridge the communication gap between truth and perception; communicate more with the public
- Transfer process is taking too long – get going and get it done!

### Redevelopment Options

- Balance economic growth with environmental protection
- Establish a wildlife refuge / interpretative center showing area geology, history, natural habitat
- Develop rail, road and river transportation assets – regional warehouses and distribution centers
- Limit development to the highway areas and on site developed areas; leave undisturbed areas that way
- Find uses for igloos – mushroom farms, data and other storage, other
- Develop groundwater storage and recharge capabilities
- Seek to establish an enterprise zone with favorable tax benefits
- Make decisions on a regional basis, not territorial basis
- Look for ways to replace family wage jobs before UMCDF lays off



## Purpose

The LRA Request for Proposal directed:

***Task 2.7: Planning and leading a minimum of two community focus group meetings. The meetings will be scheduled so that members of the community will have the opportunity to voice their concerns and discuss their ideas of redevelopment options. Notes of these meetings will be prepared and maintained by the successful proposer, and provided to the LRA.***

Key members of the community assembled in two separate groups and discussed:

1. Redevelopment options for the UMCD site
2. Concerns related to the property and the process of closing the UMCD

## Questionnaire

The following questions to be discussed by focus group participants were prepared by the Dana Mission Support Team, and approved by the LRA, with the understanding that time constraints may prevent all questions from being discussed. Questions two and three were essential to the purpose of the focus groups.

- 1) What do you expect to happen once the Army leaves?
- 2) What concerns do you have regarding the closing of the UMCD?
- 3) What would you suggest to the LRA about development of the UMCD once the Army leaves? What might be included? What might be excluded?
- 4) What obstacles, difficulties or challenges might this community face in redevelopment of the Army base?
- 5) Please discuss your thoughts of economic benefits and environmental protection on the site.
- 6) Tell us what you think about the use of some of the site for Oregon National Guard.
- 7) What further suggestions or thoughts would you like to share with the LRA?
- 8) Conclusion – round robin: Considering everything that has been said, as well as anything new, let's go around the room and everyone share what he or she personally believes to be the most important message to be shared with the LRA Board.

## Participant Selection

Lists of key community leaders who would be good candidates for focus groups were solicited from LRA Board members, area Chambers of Commerce, and leaders in Hermiston, Echo, Stanfield, Umatilla, Irrigon, and Boardman. People on the lists were called to determine their availability and willingness to participate on October 27. From those who were available and willing, participants were selected based on city of residence, gender, occupation, and self-determined knowledge of the Army's Umatilla Chemical Depot site. Emailed messages informed participants of their selection. Another email informed all others, who were possible substitutes, of their status. Participants were again emailed on Friday prior to the Tuesday interviews. Phone calls reminded participants on Monday, the day before the interviews. Emails were sent to those where only messages were left. Initially, two groups of 12 participants each included eight towns, 13 males and 11 females, and ten participants from Morrow County and 14 from Umatilla County.

Substitutes for those who had to withdraw, coupled with two females who failed to show made up the final sample of 14 males and eight females. Eight were from Morrow County and 14 from Umatilla County. Participants came from Hermiston, Lone, Boardman, Irrigon, Heppner, Pendleton and Umatilla. Appendix A shows the city, gender and occupation of participants. One man in the second session, who came as a substitute at the last minute, had to leave a little over halfway through because of other commitments.

## Methodology

Following introductions, a short presentation was made to focus group participants telling them about the Land Reuse Authority (LRA) process, and informing participants of their role in the LRA's gathering information. A brief presentation was also made on major site assets.

Each participant received a packet that stated the purpose of the focus group, defined acronyms, and listed all eight questions with one question to a page. Appendix B shows that packet, although questions are all shown on one page for the sake of this report's brevity. Before discussion, each question was read twice, and participants were asked to write down as many ideas pertaining to the topic as they could come up with. Discussion followed. Participants were asked to jot down other thoughts or questions that occurred during the discussion and to bring those up for discussion. Upon completion of discussion, participants' notes were collected. Notes from these discussions may be seen in Appendix C. Participant notes are almost all verbatim. Occasionally a word has been added for clarity because many abbreviated their responses as they wrote quickly. Such words are bracketed [ ]. Abbreviated and misspelled words are spelled out and corrected. Occasionally, a word was illegible, and is so noted.

Three individuals from the Dana Mission Support Team recorded comments. Their comments were combined and appear in Appendix D. Comments from the two groups were kept separate because of some differences in the two groups. For instance,

everyone in the morning group wanted the entire chemical depot incinerator totally torn down and no more incineration of any type. Many participants in the evening group saw the incinerator site as a valuable asset and were okay with incineration of non-polluting garbage, using a brand new incinerator.

One participant, who had given great thought to this issue, presented one of the facilitators with a previously prepared typewritten list of his personal observations. A second participant emailed one of the facilitators' additional observations. Consistent with the objective to provide the LRA with thinking of community members, those personal observations may be found in Appendix E.

## Summary of Findings

The opening question asking about expectations turned out to be more than an ice breaker. Issues, concerns, desired reuse options, and some questions quickly surfaced. Some of the responses in the first question about what participants expect to happen when the base closes deal with both concerns and reuse options. Thought was given to moving responses to their appropriate questions. But to do so would lose the impact of what was first on participants' minds, so responses were not moved in appendix D (interviewers' notes and observations).

This section summarizes the comments for each question that was asked. As expected, more questions were prepared than time allowed to discuss. Interviewers found it interesting to compare the discussion with the issues participants wrote. Some issues were written, but not brought up for discussion. Read appendices C (participants' written comments) and D for more complete understanding of the interviews.

### 1) What do you expect to happen once the Army leaves?

- Clean up and remediation will last over ten years
- Concern that the Army will perform inadequate cleanup and cleanup cost will fall on counties
- Expect economic growth and environmental issues to be balanced
- Develop Interstate areas; study the internal areas or develop wildlife refuge
- Tribes expect ceded land to be returned
- Some want the site cleaned ready for public and business use
- One spoke of the Army cleaning only to CERCLA or RCRA requirements
- Get much property on tax rolls
- There will be lots of "unfriendly discussion" during the planning process
- Some participants expect the Army to make the infrastructure usable before leaving

### 2) What concerns do you have regarding the closing of the UMCD?

- Army will leave with inadequate cleanup
- Polluting industries will come in
- Governance will be other than the County

- Army doesn't dialogue with locals and won't work well with the LRA
  - Burn facility infractions and cover ups
  - Reuse decisions be made by outsiders
  - Burn facility won't be totally demolished
  - Need to boost local economy and replace good paying jobs
  - Site will become a burden to taxpayers
  - Public involvement will further delay an endless process
  - Members of the LRA won't collaborate, will fight with dissension and prolong the process
  - There is in place a predetermined outcome – land going to Tribes and Oregon National Guard
- 3) What would you suggest to the LRA about development of the UMCD once the Army leaves? What might be included? What might be excluded?
- Undisturbed areas be kept that way; only build on areas be further developed
  - Establish wildlife refuge/park and interpretative center showing the geologic history, ice age, World War II history, natural habitat, horse drawn equipment of old
  - Farming
  - Farming warehouse and distribution centers
  - Tax base development in proximity to Interstate highways
  - Use rail system
  - Microbrewery
  - All in one group did not want any continued incineration; most in the second group were open to incineration of non-toxic substances to produce power
  - Igloos should go to counties and uses found for them
  - Mushroom farming in Igloos
  - Establish an enterprise zone with favorable tax benefits
  - Do not build a prison
  - Sell place to a private entity
  - Anything that does not bring economic growth to the area should be excluded
  - Secure water for agricultural and business purposes no matter what
  - Establish view sheds shielding industrial sites from highways and the river
  - Develop groundwater storage and recharge
  - LRA members must be statesmen-like, and make decisions on a regional basis
  - The site screams transportation – roads, river, rails – warehouses, distribution centers
  - Establish a timetable and benchmarks and stick to them to achieve and implement the plan
- 4) What obstacles, difficulties or challenges might this community face in redevelopment of the Army base?
- The two counties and the Tribes to establish solidarity in making decisions
  - Learn to work together





- There is a large communication gap between truth and gossip (perception) – LRA must be open and transparent and provide public information
  - Time lag between burn facility layoffs and start of new jobs – people may leave the community
  - Loss of jobs will collapse house prices, drop retail sales and services
  - Too much study, too little action
  - Heritage Centers don't pay for themselves
  - Interference from outside factors – federal and state laws and regulations
  - Property must pay for itself – not taxpayers – some aspects must pay for other aspects
  - Private enterprise will find a use for the land; government entities probably won't
  - Loss of children in the community from people leaving brings less funding to schools
  - Keep the ability to make decisions local
- 5) Please discuss your thoughts of economic benefits and environmental protection on the site.
- Need to protect wildlife and plants
  - Need a geological interpretative center
  - Need family wage jobs
  - Training site for the military is good
  - The Depot has been a huge economic benefit to this community
  - The Army has done a good job preserving habitat and wildlife as natural areas
  - Attract more taxable industries
  - Benefit the entire region, just as the Tribes' casino benefits a large region
- 6) Tell us what you think about the use of some of the site for Oregon National Guard.
- Tribal members and others objected to the ONG taking over some of the most valuable steppe shrub and native habitat areas in the north
  - Others thought ONG use is good
  - One suggested the ONG use the ammunition dump area (ADA) for small arms fire
  - One was concerned about terrorist attacks if the ONG were there
  - Time did not allow participants to discuss this question in session two
- 7) What further suggestions or thoughts would you like to share with the LRA?
- Neither session discussed this
- 8) Conclusion – round robin: considering everything that has been said, as well as anything new, let's go around the room and everyone share what he or she personally believes to be the most important message to be shared with the LRA Board.
- Do not let the Army off the hook for environmental cleanup
  - Maintain good working relationships within and among LRA Board members



- LRA take title and control ASAP
- Identify contaminants out there and control cleanup
- Make decisions – there's no perfect answer
- Support ONG for training
- 1<sup>st</sup> group consensus: Balance environmental preservation and economic development, but get on with the job in a timely manner
- Remember details as well as the big picture
- 2<sup>nd</sup> group consensus: Get going, get together, get it done, make a plan



Appendix A: Focus Group Participant Information

Focus Group Participants: City, Gender, Occupation			
Session	City	Gender	Occupation
<b>Session 1 – 8:45 a.m.</b>			
	Heppner	M	Former county judge
	Hermiston	F	Self-employed process facilitator
	Hermiston	M	President, health care facility
	Boardman	F	Owner, Pharmacy & Hardware
	Umatilla	M	Store manager
	Hermiston	F	Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
	lone	M	Farmer
	Hermiston	F	Small business owner
	Heppner	M	Former County Commissioner
	Hermiston	F	Newspaper reporter
	Boardman	M	Real estate agent
	Pendleton	F	Tribal Science Committee member
	Hermiston	M	Business owner
<b>Session 2 – 5:15 p.m.</b>			
	Irrigon	M	Former planning commission member
	Pendleton	M	Farmer
	Hermiston	F	CPA
	Hermiston	M	Credit company president
	Hermiston	M	District Mgr., Irrigation business
	Hermiston	M	Public Relations Director
	Irrigon	M	Extension Agent
	lone	F	Public Works Morrow County
	Pendleton	M	Tribal Science Committee Chairman

Number of Males = 14  
Number of Females = 8

Morrow County = 8  
Umatilla County = 14

Hermiston = 10      Heppner = 2  
lone = 2              Pendleton = 3  
Boardman = 2        Umatilla = 1

Irrigon = 2



## Appendix B - Focus Group Packet

**UMADRA-LRA  
October 27, 2009  
Focus Group – Participant Notes**

**We would like to thank you for your participation in this DMST planning activity.**

**This Focus Group has two key purposes:**

- 1) Gather information of the community leaders' ideas of redevelopment options**
- 2) Gather information regarding the concerns of the communities leaders in respect to the planning of the Depot property**

**The information gathered here will be generated as a report to the LRA and be used as a basis for community thoughts, concerns, and ideas while preparing the plan that will be submitted to HUD and the DoD.**

### **Terminology:**

**BRAC: Base Realignment and Closure**  
**CTUIR: Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation**  
**DMST: Dana Mission Support Team (UMADRA support contractor)**  
**DoD: Department of Defense**  
**HUD: Housing and Urban Development**  
**LRA: Land Reuse Authority**  
**UMADRA: Umatilla Army Depot Reuse Authority**  
**UMCD: US Army Umatilla Chemical Depot**  
**UMCDF: Umatilla Chemical Depot Facility**

**Please think about and briefly write all your ideas regarding the topics. If during the group discussion, you get an additional idea, we encourage you to write it down and share with the group.**



**Expectations:** What do you expect to happen once the Army leaves?

Each question was on its own single page – shown in this format to conserve paper

**Concerns:** What concerns do you have regarding the closing of the UMCD?

**Options:** What would you suggest to the LRA about development of the UMCD once the Army leaves? What might be included? What might be excluded?

**Community Challenges:** What obstacles, difficulties or challenges might this community face in redevelopment of the Army base?

**Economy/Environment:** Please discuss your thoughts of economic benefits and environmental protection on the site.

**National Guard:** Tell us what you think about the use of some of the site for Oregon National Guard.

**Further Suggestions:** What further suggestions or thoughts would you like to share with the LRA?

**Most Important:** Conclusion – round robin: Considering everything that has been said, as well as anything new, let's go around the room and everyone share what he or she personally believes to be the most important message to be shared with the LRA Board.

## Appendix C - Participant Written Comments

**Expectations:** What do you expect to happen once the Army leaves?

### Session 1

**Bulleted comments are grouped by an individual participant. Bullets below a skipped line space denote comments of the next participant.**

- That private enterprise be allowed to work
- That county lines be maintained
- That the tribes be part of the decision-making
- That an extensive clean-up of the property be done by the Army – the investigation of problems be done by a non-military group
- That no plan be fixed in concrete until the clean-up is complete
  
- That the land will be cleaned and restored to original condition by Army
- That only the road areas along Interstate 84 and Hwy 87 be developed
- Indian area to be left to original form
- Open to use by CTUIR as a place to gain their culture
  
- There will be some clean up the Army will not undertake. And there will probably be a lot of that type of thing happening – I don't believe it will be turn-key ready – I am hoping for some sort of wildlife refuge.
  
- The assets of the depot to be used to benefit the region in a variety of mixed use ways – eg., industrial, economic development, heritage, recreation, tourism.
  
- Jobs would be lost
- Why can't the Army use the facility for training or another form of military service, since there are many buildings already in place
- Expectations: variety of uses
- Army needs to clean the depot up before anything can happen – because of any unknowns
- Hold the Army accountable to clean up the facility, ground water contamination
- LRA needs to take title and control of that property
- (Do) a study on how clean it really is and [by] whose standards
- Tribal control
  
- LRA takes title and control
- Land is leased and sold for economic development
- Prime objective: 1) Value Added Agriculture; 2) Distribution center for Pacific NW
  
- Clean land-use environment
- Build solid working relationships with all involved parties
- All previous goals and expectations met

- Remain as advisory capacity / liaison
- Mix-use – need tax base
  
- Main concern is before the Army leaves: current stress on Army budget; demonstrated reluctance of federal to clean up sites, i.e., Hanford; ground water contamination – will pumping continue?
- Listed species: Washington Ground Squirrel and birds
  
- I expect that environmental and Indian issues will keep it at a standstill for some time
- I also expect that Morrow and Umatilla counties to butt heads until they can go separate ways
  
- That the Army really considers local input into future use. I'm concerned that the Federal and State Government will pre-empt local desires and (after hearings like this) do what they wanted all along.
- I hope that these can be several uses for the land including: re-investment, industrial development, Ag, Tourism.
- Try to bring to this area at least one large employer
- Must get State and county to offer incentives – a free port zone
- LRA needs to take title and control of property
  
- Based on previous happenings of large land use opportunities, i.e., Boeing, State, Port of Morrow land, Northwest Racing Speedway Project, I expect that out-of-area organizations will use the land to further enrich their potential profit. These entities will not want to live [in] or raise their families near this new development, nor will they support local cultural or heritage groups.
  
- To use the facilities to best advantage to all the communities in the area
- To promote the growth of the area economically, bring jobs
- Variety of uses
- Clean concerns
- Dealing with unknown
- Holding Army accountable

### **Session 2 – Expectations**

- I think the Army and / or the contractor involved in decommissioning the incinerator will be here for ten years, probably including environmental remediation. I don't have a good feel for how much LRA work can be accomplished concurrently with closure.
  
- Private ownership of real estate
- Irrigation [for] agriculture
- Industrial opportunities
- Use the current infrastructure



- Put on tax rolls to increase tax base
- No taxpayer burden
- Keep jobs
  
- Clean up of the 20K acre area – restoration
- Consider uses of the area?
- Utilize railroad possibilities
- Give high consideration to groundwater recharge area that has been identified
  
- [Site] become LRA directed property
- Building left intact
- Code
- Cleaned
- Negotiation between LRA and DoD
- Public / private good somehow – sports complex, business incubator, reserve, use igloos
  
- The site to be cleaned to the level that an individual or farmer could go in and use [with] no additional cleanup required
- LRA carve a land use plan that addresses the ongoing needs and wants of the communities
- LRA carve a plan that has minimal financial impact to tax payers
- Craft opportunities for the 800 jobs
  
- I would like to see the property used in various ways. I understand that the Oregon National Guard is interested in a training facility for the whole state. This would be a great location for our ONG.
  
- Also the Tribes have an interest in the land. What would they want to use it for?
- It has a lot of infrastructure that can be utilized.
- Expectation [of the Army] to clean the land and have it shovel ready for the next landowners
- Have land back on tax rolls
  
- I hope, hopefully expect, that there will be multiple uses of the property, with all parties, i.e., business, state and local governments, and the tribes, each having access to the land and assets.
- I expect there will be loud “discussions” about how those uses will be decided. I also expect that there will be hard feelings on the part of some parties
- I expect that the chemical depot will be taken apart and destroyed as promised
- I expect this conversion not to be a tax burden on the local counties
  
- A lot of currently open wildlife habitat will be considered for development
- Demil operation buildings will be destroyed that could be put to good use
- A section that is still encumbered with explosives will continue to pose problems



- A considerable period of time will pass before a final decision on usage will mature and come to pass
- Land will be made available for private development for the benefit of the entire area
- Some portion of the area to be set aside for future military use
- Land for wildlife and ecological purposes
- Existing facilities to be made available for new uses both industrial and agricultural

**Concerns:** What concerns do you have regarding the closing of the UMCD?

### Session 1

**Bulleted comments are grouped by an individual participant. Bullets below a skipped line space denote comments of the next participant.**

- Concerns of local control
- Concerns of cleanup to acceptable state
- Outside influences taking control, [including] environmental groups, Indian claims, preserves, US and State government reversing decisions not to use the property
  
- Lack of local control
- Lack of organization and funding to develop anything
- Paralysis by analysis or politics
- Ending up with a polluted site which cannot be used for anything
- 20 years from now – moldering buildings – a blight
  
- Commitments not met
- Lack of continuing working relationship with all parties (need to foster)
- Control of governing process – which or what type of governing body
  
- As stated on first sheet [land to be restored to original condition by Army]
- Cleanup by Army – do not let them off the hook outside
- Big money people will control – needs to be CTUIR
- Ground water and Columbia River [keep from contamination]
- The cover up of infractions that are happening now with burning and cleanup
  
- Must give title of 20,000 acres of UMCD to the LRA
- Economic development must be highest priority
  
- Clean up – is it adequate?
- The process will take too long
- Who will be in control?

- That Tribal interests won't be considered – wide range of wildlife that needs to be preserved as well as flora
- Clean up will be inadequate
- That some polluting industry will move in and destroy a pristine part of the landscape
  
- I am concerned that environmental and Indian issues will hold this project from actually moving forward
- I am also concerned that Morrow and Umatilla County [officials] will disagree with each other on important issues making it difficult to move forward
  
- My concern is that the Army / military needs to clean up their entire 60+ year mess before leaving
- Level of clean up should be defined by civilians, not the military
- All discussion of future use are useless until the land is clean
  
- Apparently, many other military agencies don't want this property. In my opinion, this property comes with huge liabilities. We want to make sure the “bogey man” in the property is cleaned up before we accept.
- Larry Campbell probably has a good idea. It may be that the LRA should be the agency that continues to monitor until the land is turned over to the counties.
  
- Clean up and who will be in control seeing it done right. Who will set guideline for this?
- We really cannot determine how the land can be used without knowing what is there (contaminants) for the land to be used, especially for agriculture

### Session 2 - Concerns

- That there be specific clean up plans
- That the restoration of wildlife within the 20K acres be accomplished
- That there be prudent use of water on site
- That the LRA seriously consider the Umatilla Indian Reservation [UIR] treaty reserved rights
  
- Jobs
- High paid lower skilled workers
- Economic impact
- Clean? Who decides / defines
- Can LRA get the job done?
- How will [the plan] be developed?
- Will it be developed?
  
- Public involvement – length of deliberation
- Ultimate use – Beneficial to the public; good use of improvements; stimulate local economy



- [Local] taxpayer liabilities
- Environmental clean up
- Keep on short time frame for reuse
- Timely decision-making process
- Job loss
- Predetermined outcome?
  
- LRA members will not collaborate!
- Army will leave the County high and dry
- Use of the facility will attract the wrong type of clients – “Danger to the County”
- Plan contracted and not implemented
  
- That it will take a very long time to be ready to use with new tenants
- Cost of Morrow and Umatilla Counties will be excessive beyond cleanup cost
- That the [Federal] Government move swiftly to bring this land back to that [which] will benefit both counties and the state
  
- The cost involved in closing the depot and converting it to private / state / local use
- That one [LRA] group involved in the decision making will “hijack” the decisions and refuse to cooperate with all
- The environmental effects of cleaning up the site, such as tearing down buildings, etc.
  
- Local entities will be ignored or overridden
- Clean up programs currently in progress will be delayed by lack of funds
- Litigation
- Deterioration of existing facilities
  
- Lack of complete cleanup
- Ability to get the land on tax rolls
- Length of time to get things done
- Access for the public and their use

**Options:** What would you suggest to the LRA about development of the UMCD once the Army leaves? What might be included? What might be excluded?

**Section 1 – Reuse Options**

**Bulleted comments are grouped by an individual participant. Bullets below a skipped line space denote comments of the next participant.**

- Mix use
- Tax base development on land with close proximity to highway and rail
- Wildlife refuge / national monument status
  
- This must be kept to private enterprise. Government should not interfere. Some of the

- flora / fauna should be part of the Tribes' interest
- We don't need more industrial property at this time. Ports of Morrow and Umatilla are doing fine
- No low income housing in igloos
- Land in I-84 and I-82 could be developed for commercial
  
- Interpretative center
- Federal park
- Wildlife preserve
- Youth corrections – **NO**
  
- Wildlife refuge
- Non-polluting industry / business
- Geologic interpretative center
- Use by both Morrow and Umatilla Counties [for] cultural and economic, etc.
- Industry that is transportation based – both for freeway and rail
  
- Museum for large farming equipment, other heritage, including geologic heritage
- Wildlife refuge
- Park
- Agriculture
- Industry – transportation based
  
- For economic development – creation of jobs, good family wage jobs
- Location is perfect: military training, agriculture, interpretative
- Location I-82 and I-84 outlet mall
- There is a lot of land and could be several uses
- Distribution center would be ideal because of location
- Mushrooms
- Car assembly
  
- Value added agriculture
- Distribution center of the Pacific Northwest
- DO NOT WANT: continue incineration or wildlife refuge park
  
- East areas can be further developed
- Undisturbed [land] should be maintained as native habitat
  
- I would like to see warehousing distribution centers, other transportation dependent business
- It would be great to see some farming if possible
  
- Recreational use
- Industrial development – clean, family wage jobs
- Heritage – but watch influences of outright special interest groups



- Enterprise zone – some protection from Oregon’s stifling tax structure
- Can we find a way to use the “igloos?”
  
- I would like to see recreational low impact activities
- Ice age floods – geological heritage interpretative center; Oregon Trail ruts; wildlife refuge; walking, biking, non-motorized trails; picnic areas
- I do not want to see industrial development by out of area interests
- Do not want to see motor cross activity
  
- Recreation
- Business – safe for the environment
- Attraction for the community
- Tribal – to a degree – Center that would present in conjunction with interpretation, learning, history

### **Session 2 – Reuse Options**

- That there be specific clean up plans
- That the restoration of wildlife within the 20K acres be accomplished
- That there be prudent use of water on site
- That the LRA seriously consider the Umatilla Indian Reservation [UIR] treaty reserved rights
  
- Jobs
- High paid lower skilled workers
- Economic impact
- Clean? Who decides / defines
- Can LRA get the job done?
- How will [the plan] be developed?
- Will it be developed?
  
- Public involvement – length of deliberation
- Ultimate use – Beneficial to the public; good use of improvements; stimulate local economy
  
- [Local] taxpayer liabilities
- Environmental clean up
- Keep on short time frame for reuse
- Timely decision-making process
- Job loss
- Predetermined outcome?
  
- LRA members will not collaborate!
- Army will leave the County high and dry
- Use of the facility will attract the wrong type of clients – “Danger to the County”

- Plan contracted and not implemented
- That it will take a very long time to be ready to use with new tenants
- Cost of Morrow and Umatilla Counties will be excessive beyond cleanup cost
- That the [Federal] Government move swiftly to bring this land back to that [which] will benefit both counties and the state
- The cost involved in closing the depot and converting it to private / state / local use
- That one [LRA] group involved in the decision making will “hijack” the decisions and refuse to cooperate with all
- The environmental effects of cleaning up the site, such as tearing down buildings, etc.
- Local entities will be ignored or overridden
- Clean up programs currently in progress will be delayed by lack of funds
- Litigation
- Deterioration of existing facilities
- Lack of complete cleanup
- Ability to get the land on tax rolls
- Length of time to get things done
- Access for the public and their use

**Community Challenges:** What obstacles, difficulties or challenges might this community face in redevelopment of the Army base?

### Session 1 – Community Challenges

**Bulleted comments are grouped by an individual participant. Bullets below a skipped line space denote comments of the next participant.**

- Contaminated underground water supply
- 1,500 acres ADA area
- Obsolete rail lines and roadways
- Land fill with questionable materials
- Asbestos siding on warehouses
- Water distribution
- Tribal concerns
- Cooperation between counties
- Lack of funding for federal cleanup
- Funding
- Land use laws – state
- Native American claims
- E.S.A., squirrels, birds, salmon



- Lack of control – input
- Again, what or who will be the governing body?
- Will we [local taxpayers] have to pick up any part of the tab
  
- Agreement between counties
- Too much study
- More building \_\_\_\_\_ [illegible]
  
- How to attract business?
- Enterprise zone?
- Other tax incentives?
- Clean up to where people and animals can safely use the grounds
  
- Lack of consensus
- Lack of funding
- Lack of organizational ability to do development
- Factors outside the control of the community, i.e., feds, other laws
  
- Loss of jobs
- Working through the politics, agreement
- The discussion of who will take control of the land
- There are so many organizations that have a role
  
- Too much time delay in implementing economic development would hurt employment levels in Hermiston area
  
- Economics of use in a park or heritage center – there is going to be limited funding for any of these types of projects
- An enterprise zone would probably attract business or [provide] favorable times for development
  
- Challenges – lack of common vision between two counties and Tribal organizations
- Can three entities develop a common vision and mission – otherwise strategies will be too diverse to implement
  
- Army not doing their job!
- Agreement among interested parties...Tribal and two counties
- Environmental versus industry

**Session 2 – Community Challenges**

- Loss of jobs – initially
- Potential increase tax burden – purchase and / or development of site
- Loss of R.E. value initially due to relocation of Demil workers
- Loss of business to local businesses due to relocation of Demil workers



- Retrain and rehire of UAD employees
- Loss of CSEPP funds to local governments
  
- Conflicting interests – industrial versus environmental
- Communication of truth versus gossip
- Lag time between Army closure and next development
- Jobs – time between current job layoff and new jobs
- School enrollment decline
  
- The greatest challenge is learning to work together, collaborating
  
- [Site] is viewed as remote
- [Area] lacks some public amenities – airport, mall, sports teams
- Too diverse of viewpoints to come to agreement
- Cost of infrastructure
  
- Working together to redevelop the Army base might be difficult
- Decide on development and work together to get it accomplished in a timely manner
  
- How to afford the changes that need to be made at the Depot
- Development of an administrator or overseer for the project as changes are implemented
- Agreement between the counties, cities, Tribes – all stakeholders
- Getting community involvement after the Army has turned over the land facilities
  
- Lack of funding
- Voice heard when decisions are made?
- Retention of economic local
- Communication
- Loss of school attendance / funding
  
- Agreement on best use of the area
- Keeping the ability to influence the decisions as to the final uses of the facility
- Acquiring adequate financing to do the necessary development



**Economy/Environment:** Please discuss your thoughts of economic benefits and environmental protection on the site.

### Session 1 – Economy/Environment

**Bulleted comments are grouped by an individual participant. Bullets below a skipped line space denote comments of the next participant.**

- Environment – some of the undeveloped land should be dedicated to a park system
- ADA is a problem
- Don't see much for economic benefit
- Water is a problem
  
- Make use of developed portions and leave the rest for natural habitat
- A potential method of protecting areas from development is to make them a Goal 5 resource under Oregon land use laws
  
- Could be an excellent economic "Enterprise Zone" for part of the land – areas closest to freeways
- We want clean development on the site
- A majority of the space needs to be for recreation and preservation of the lands
- Environmental protection – use caution – good common sense approach
  
- There are economic benefits to development as a recreational / heritage center, and the impact on the environment would be low – cultural heritage tourists are above average income, take photographs, purchase needs, books, and so forth.
  
- Both are so important!
- Does no good to protect the environment if people need jobs
  
- We continue to have a need to develop our tax base
- We will need a plan that will provide for mixed use benefit – some land can be and some land cannot
  
- Economic benefits – jobs, products, building construction, trucking, pay more taxes, lower transportation costs to ag producers
- Environmental protection – not a big problem
  
- It's important to preserve what's there in regard to the environment
- Economic benefits – if it's the right kind of business, and would provide family wage jobs [not just minimum wage], etc., for long term – not short term
  
- There has to be some economic benefit or there won't be anything done. This community doesn't want polluting industries, but some industry will be important. Lots of options.

- Economy: loss of jobs – we do not want to see that we may lose community support from agencies such as Wash \_\_\_\_\_ [illegible]
- Possibly those who are out of the area may look at our area more positively once the clean up is done
- A distribution center would be a great way to keep jobs and wages

### Session 2 – Economy/Environment

- Today the economic development at the UOD would be a benefit to the entire ED area
- The UOD may become an eastern Oregon research center for farming, water, transportation, etc.
- Environmental protection would be one of the greatest research issues.
  
- Economic benefits can be tremendous if the right business / land owner is in place, for both counties and state. Growth of Hermiston, Boardman, Irrigon could increase [and would] bring in more families, the need for more schools, and infrastructure in each town.
- The state has rules and regulations on the environment and they would have to apply to this site
  
- Economic benefits: Increase taxable land and infrastructure
- New businesses and commercial entities
- With increased businesses, there could be a negative economic benefit to cities and school districts in that new schools and city infrastructure would all need to be created
- Environmental protection: All of the older, original buildings are probably filled with asbestos products and must be cleaned up [prior to] destruction / remodeling. [This requires] lots of \$\$ and the chance for negative environmental impact.
- With new industrial growth, I would like care to be given to limiting industries that might contaminate the Columbia River, the ground, or the groundwater.
  
- In the past, little thought was given to activities, i.e., disposal of explosives – washout lagoon
- Careful consideration of economic benefits versus environmental impact
- Tax values should not be first consideration
  
- Pollution of fragile environmental areas
- Productive use of environmental areas to provide economic benefit
- Need complete environmental cleanup of the area
- Development that is not detrimental to the environment
  
- Economic benefits: Community improvement by diversifying the economy
- Transportation: rail and Interstate
- Buildings that can find alternative use
- Environmental protection: Clean up

- Demil has been a huge economic boon for this area
- Depot has added to local economy since 1940
- The many acres of natural habitat have provided areas for wildlife
- The “new” depot area can provide employment opportunities that exceed the current level
- The sensitive environmental areas can be saved and improved
  
- Many good jobs now
- Good potential for new jobs in the future
- Massive current investment
- Likely additional spending for deactivation and new development
- Problems: environmental problems of long standing groundwater and grounds
- Opportunity: Government spending to clean it up
- Problem: prolonged maintenance of deactivated or transitional facility

**National Guard:** Tell us what you think about the use of some of the site for Oregon National Guard.

### **Session 1 – National Guard**

**Bulleted comments are grouped by an individual participant. Bullets below a skipped line space denote comments of the next participant.**

- I need more details about the activities that might be conducted by the National Guard, i.e., tanks using existing paved roads? Tanks creating new trails?
- Why do they want the most usable agricultural land?
  
- Probably a feasible idea
  
- NO WAY!
- There are many current sites for National Guard training and use. We do not want further State or Federal control of UMCD
  
- What about a military school? But only [in] a specified area so that the government does not have control of the land.
  
- **NO!**
  
- No opinion
  
- I don't have enough information to judge
  
- I don't think there would be enough space to provide for economic development, national monument and military exercises.
  
- Unsure



- Department of Army for National Guard – northern half for training facility for National Guard
- No thanks

**Session 2 – National Guard**

Skipped because of lack of time

**Further Suggestions:** What further suggestions or thoughts would you like to share with the LRA?

**Session 1 – Further Suggestions**

**Bulleted comments are grouped by an individual participant. Bullets below a skipped line space denote comments of the next participant.**

Time constraints prevented discussion on this question, but two participants submitted written ideas:

- I think first an agency [LRA] needs to have control of the clean up, so that we can have a report on exactly what land can be used for development
- LRA must take over title and control of UMCD at closing in 2011
- Top priority:
  1. Value added agriculture
  2. Distribution center

**Session 2 – Further Suggestions**

Skipped because of lack of time

**Most Important:** Conclusion – round robin: Considering everything that has been said, as well as anything new, let’s go around the room and everyone share what he or she personally believes to be the most important message to be shared with the LRA Board.

### Session 1 – Most Important message

**Bulleted comments are grouped by an individual participant. Bullets below a skipped line space denote comments of the next participant.**

- Clean up, multiple uses, a) Oregon National Guard, b) economic development – enterprise zone; c) preserve the untouched lands
- Level of clean up is the block to progress – complete clean up is mandatory before Army cuts out
- Whatever is done that is environmentally and economically driven as equal importance and that it is timely
- Clean up and maintenance of natural areas and species
- Return to natural state as is state in our treaty 1855 – will have use of land and water – Do not let Army off the hook
- #1 – An agency needs to take control of clean up, so we would know what is in the soil. The LRA should take control of getting things going. #2 – I also think there should be economic development – the land can be used for multiple purposes
- A balance between environmental and economic needs – not an easy task but not insurmountable. It can’t be all business – there needs to be a balance
- You have a very important job for the future of our area. There is no perfect answer. There does need to be a decision made – paint or get off the ladder
- Take title and control ASAP. Develop for 1) value added agriculture; 2) Distribution center
- Working relationships must continue between the federal, state, tribal governments
- Clean up the ground from environmental issues before the Army leaves. Move control to county level as soon as possible

### Session 2 – Most Important message

**Bulleted comments are grouped by an individual participant. Bullets below a skipped line space denote comments of the next participant.**

- Listen to local input and \_\_\_\_\_ [illegible] those things that provide the greatest benefit to the immediate area around the Army base
- Don’t get so involved in the big picture that the details are lost
- Listen to community groups and area citizens, make a plan for reuse of the depot, develop a timeline, and STICK TO IT! Don’t let squabbles ruin what could be a wonderful opportunity for development
- Listen to the communities, work with them, and follow through in a timely manner to benefit Morrow, Umatilla, and the State of Oregon.



- The LRA has initiated in this focus group one of the most important things, and that is allowing people to speak their piece/peace.
- Get 'er done!
- Keep on "FAST TRACK" TIME FRAME to make a decision and follow through
- Get going – get together – get it done – make a plan

## Appendix D - DMST Focus Group Notes and Observations

**Expectations:** What do you expect to happen once the Army leaves?

### Session 1 – Expectations

- I would expect a variety of mixed use – including agriculture, cultural heritage, etc.
- Concerned about inadequate clean-up, the Army won't clean up everything – the people will be responsible.
- Wildlife refuge
- A non-political firm needs to do a comprehensive study prior to any decisions being made. Until property is cleaned up by Army. Dealing w/the unknown leaves too many areas of concern.

Facilitator Brian Cole in response to inadequate cleanup: Your thoughts are very consistent with the Morrow and Tribal concerns. The message is coming through to the LRA loud and clear. The Army is tasked with the ECP report (in December). I don't think there are so many unknowns. The task is to hold the Army accountable, especially with the tight budgets for the DoD.

- Groundwater contamination – will the pumping continue?
- There are lists of protected species – the government will require
- The LRA needs to take title and control of the property. Part of the problem has been with the Army.
- Hire an independent to study how clean is clean before the Army leaves.
- Define what is clean?
- Make Army accountable
- I support this valid concern for cleanup. What happens after cleanup. I don't foresee a happy experience. I see these projects indicative of outside entities using Morrow/ Umatilla to get richer. They do nothing to help the communities. Not in favor of industrial development. Some awareness of geo-heritage: gravel beds – people are curious about the geological history of our areas. Would love to see an Interpretative historical, agricultural, and geological center. We should be aware of our heritage.
- Why couldn't it be used for another military training facility or another branch?
- It looks like we have given first right of refusal to the feds. My concern is that someone at the top will come in and take over the plan regardless of what our desires are.
- Prevent reuse decisions by outsiders
- The tribes believe the land should be given back to Tribal control.
- The only parts that should be developed are the Interstate areas. The interior needs to be studied.

### Session 2 – Expectations

- I expect the Army and/or contractors will be involved with the clean-up and remediation for at least 10 years. I don't know how the LRA can plan effectively until the site is clean.

- One of my fears is that all the chemical buildings will not be demolished. I expect that the promise we were given stays.
- Everything should be clean, including the munitions areas. Exploded and unexploded.
- It seems like the level to which the Army is willing to clean up is different from the public expectation. My expectation would be the Army will leave it ready for business and public use without further cleanup required.
- I expect the Army to clean to CERCLA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act) and RCRA (Resource Conservation and Recovery Act) requirements, whichever is applicable. This will be less than the public and businesses expect.
- Get the property on the tax rolls with private ownership.
- I think there should be a blend of the two – environmental protection and economic growth – that will be able to function properly. We don't want an "either/or" kind of thing.
- There are some areas that are better suited for environmental uses, and others for economic growth. Make it as diverse as possible. One size won't fit all.
- I don't expect "discussions" will be necessarily friendly through the planning process.
- Everyone wants the same thing...success.
- Does the LRA make the final decision? No the Army will make the final decision. However, the LRA's plan will hold the greatest weight.
- Have there been other BRAC instances where the tribes have been involved? Not specifically with the two counties and the tribes.
- What was the deal made with the tribes? If my memory serves me correctly, the ceded land of the tribes extended through the depot to the Columbia. The tribes also have a vested interest in the Hanford.
- What does it mean that you "ceded" the land? A: It means the tribes ceded the land to the US government that was originally our hunter/gather life blood. We originally had about 500,000 acres, reduced to 250,00, and now have about 170,000 acres
- What is the diminished reservation? A: It is what we currently have today.
- Have you run across much wildlife usage areas in other BRAC closures? A: It is a definite usage possibility.
- Before the Army leaves I expect the infrastructure to be in usable condition.
- I expect the LRA plan to be flexible, not have a large burden to the tax payers, and something that includes job replacement.
- Question about the ONG – do they have an interest? Yes, the ONG seeks a training facility.
- The expectation of the tribe is complete cleanup of the UMCD.
- Expect hard feelings and difficult times
- Wildlife refuge
- Workable infrastructure should remain
- LRA plan must be flexible and adaptable
- Site not a burden to taxpayers
- Replace lost jobs
- Expect clean – including unexploded munitions – maybe not?



**Concerns:** What concerns do you have regarding the closing of the UMCD?

### **Session 1 – Concerns**

- What happens prior to the Army leaving? Ensure land is clean for use by public
- Clean up of site by Army will be inadequate
- Tribal interests won't be considered – want to see wildlife refuge
- Concerned about polluting industries moving in.
- The property given to the LRA as a governing body may not be a bad idea, but, we have a county line there. There needs to be a governing body or a split w/tribal interests.
- Politics may ruin efforts
- County ownership not LRA or Port ownership
- Separate control by Umatilla and Morrow Counties
- What kind of governance would you expect? Counties not ports
- Paralysis by analysis: one of my biggest concerns – we will continue to analyze to death, and the process may take too long.
- Lack of continuing working relationships. The government doesn't encourage the working together spirit.
- Concern that the Army will transfer power, cut and run before thorough cleanup. Would oppose the transfer of the responsibility of the grounds from the army to another source.
- Army doesn't foster dialogue; continuing dialog and cooperation needed between Army and locals
- Concern w/what is happening with the infractions and the current lack of environmental controls for the current employees and the communities.
- Burning is stopped now / monitor site to ensure the Army stays involved.
- Concerned about air and environmental infractions and cover-ups
- We have to deal with the lesser of the evils, I think we have done the best we can with what we have
- Burn facility (UMCDF) operations are as good as can be.
- Other concerns listed above under Expectations

### **Session 2 – Concerns**

- Fear public involvement will further delay this endless process particularly in Oregon and the time allowed for public comment.
- Do you mean the public involvement will slow down the process? Yes. I'm concerned we will do the same thing as the burn plan (talk a long time before any action).
- Seems like a long time seems before any real action takes place.
- Environmental issues: buildings which are substandard. What is going to happen to the unwanted "stuff?"
- Economics of the area: the skill set will be different. How will we find jobs commensurate with current salary levels? There is need to stimulate the area economy.
- The facility will attract the wrong type of clientele to the area – polluting industries and

- minimum wage jobs
- LRA will not collaborate in a timely manner
- Lack of collaboration coupled with failure to implement actual plans stalls progress. I'm concerned there will be battles between all the "powers that be" and we will lose assets.
- Regardless of how good the plan is there will be controversy and conflict. At some point there has to be a line drawn.
- Is there a total consensus that the LRA will not be able to come to agreement?
- There will be a plan created, but not implemented.
- There is a high degree of skepticism that change will be timely
- Have there been cases where the LRA's have come to an impasse? Brian: I believe so, and then the property will go to the government.
- Do you mean to see site ownership change?
- Is there a total consensus that anything is truly going to happen? Pretty much, we believe something will happen, just when it will happen. Long time, no action.
- If you looked back the LRA was constituted longer than 10 years ago. Yes 1988
- Concern that the outcome is predetermined – Tribes and NG have the window – I see a decision has already been made, and public involvement and focus groups are a front.
- Concerns that the outcome will cost the counties money. How much money is it going to cost Morrow County?

**Options:** What would you suggest to the LRA about development of the UMCD once the Army leaves? What might be included? What might be excluded?

### **Session 1 – Reuse Options**

- Areas that are disturbed or partially developed should be developed
- Areas that are currently undisturbed should be left alone
- Wildlife park, nature preserve
- Establish of a national park with interpretative center showing geologic history and ice age, WWII history, natural habitat, horse drawn farm equipment
- All could be combined in a federal park and the feds would still be responsible for it
- A full heritage park could include the large agriculture artifacts
- Farming - needed
- Farming/warehouse distribution center; transportation
- Tax base development in proximity to the Interstates
- Use rail – expensive to maintain / rebuild
- Cost of rail system is concern...who has the money to maintain it?
- Value added agriculture such as distribution points.
- Micro-brewery – "Depot Brew"
- Concern about agricultural not being safe due to contaminants
- Do not want continued incineration
- No other munitions
- Make sure air and water are clean
- Absolutely no incineration

- Igloos assumed to remain; should go to counties and uses found for them
- Mushroom farming
- How do we make igloos available?
- We need a way through the bureaucracy
- Unless tax structure changes, we will not attract living wage jobs.
- Tax structure is an issue, establish enterprise zone
- Make area a FREE PORT – int'l trade advantage (west area)
- Good marriage with current distribution center
- Approximately how much of the total land mass is igloos? A: About 40%
- Don't want a prison

### Session 2 – Reuse Options

- Consider selling the place to a private entity. Sell for \$1,000/acre without infrastructure
- Estimate on the low side of \$20M, I'm not the expert.
- Improve access for economic development – blend natural environment – multiple uses
- Anything that does not bring economic growth to the areas should be excluded.
- High risk industry should be excluded.
- I believe the incinerator has some uses, but we don't want to create another Hanford. We want to avoid high risk, or dangerous imported items.
- If we are taking garbage and incinerating it to create power, that would be an option.
- We need to secure water for agricultural / industrial uses no matter what.
- May want to consider view sheds as a buffer between the industrial areas and the river and the highways.
- I would like to see something that does not pollute the Columbia any more than we used to have.
- Consider groundwater storage and recharge – benefit to salmon
- The Columbia Improvement Organization may be willing to take on a new industry?
- The reason they are involved is because they are in the right place.
- The economic and environmental aspects could be very viable.
- The area needs to be developed. Those areas that are already there. The rail yards, the airstrip, the roadwork.
- The tribes have been looking at all of these factors as well.
- The groundwater storage is very important.
- Don't exclude anything. But keep an open mind. No preconceived notions because the market place will determine the need.
- LRA Board members must be statesmen-like – decisions affect whole region
- Decisions need to be made on a regional basis
- The site screams transportation – rail, roads, and river – for economic benefit. Don't approach this with "axes to grind."
- Storage sites and conditions for warehouses and distribution centers on two Interstates
- Pursue trade zone incentives for tax advantage – accelerate depreciation
- There are also potential storage opportunities to go with the transportation. The marketplace will supply ideas.
- Retain part of it as a historic area – major shipping depot from 1940s through 1960s

- Establish a timetable and benchmarks to achieve and implement plan – don't turn over to Governor or others to decide

**Community Challenges:** What obstacles, difficulties or challenges might this community face in redevelopment of the Army base?

### **Session 1 – Community Challenges**

- Solidarity between the two counties and the tribal union
- Factors outside the control of the community – laws, regulations, coming down from feds
- Too much study, too little action
- Economics – there are other entities to fund, we can't count on government funding
- Heritage centers don't pay for themselves
- Property must pay for itself rather than leaving it to county taxpayers
- The challenge is what are the uses we are proposing going to pay for themselves
- Some aspects of the zone should pay for other aspects of the zone
- If the counties take over, they would be responsible, the land needs to pay for itself
- Private enterprise will find a use for the land; government probably won't (Condon AFB a good example)

### **Session 2 – Community Challenges**

- Learn to work together – understand and respect one another's thoughts, ideas, and concerns. There is no one group that has the right answer.
- Money, money, money – lack of it.
- If, at some point, the plan does get completed, get the public involved.
- Time lag between burn facility shutdown with layoffs and start of new jobs – people may leave the community
- Our community as a whole is viewed as remote (rural, not urban). Bringing in some businesses/people is not enticing.
- There is a big communication gap between truth and gossip. The LRA needs to be very transparent, and provide much public information.
- Facilitator: What is the best way to communicate with this community? A: The CSEPP program is doing a great job, but still there is a lot of misinformation about what is going on. Go to the schools and tell the kids. Provide information and have them bring it home to their parents.
- Loss of jobs when DMIL work ends – house prices collapse, retail sales down. They are good jobs and it will affect the values.
- The schools may be challenged; the loss of children as people leave brings less funding.
- Keep the ability to make decisions local.

**Economy/Environment:** Please discuss your thoughts of economic benefits and environmental protection on the site.

### **Session 1 – Economy / Environment**

- Need to protect wildlife and plants
- Geological interpretive center
- We need family wage jobs – no fly by nights: we want stable long term business
- Proof from future economics that they will bring in **family wage** jobs, not just minimum wage jobs
- Land-use: Goal 5 resource to protect environment
- Ammunition Dump Area (ADA): Did the Army turn that down? A: No, but they were put into another category
- Training for the military is good

### **Session 2 – Economy / Environment**

- The Depot has been a huge economic benefit to the communities.
- The Army has done a fairly good job in preserving habitat and wildlife as natural areas.
- Attract more taxable industry. The negative impact of economic growth is the cost to the schools, and city infrastructure.
- Figure a way to benefit the region, like the Casino benefits a wide area and not just the Tribes. (Wildhorse foundation) Understand economic impact to all communities.
- Develop ag and other research facilities in this area



**National Guard:** Tell us what you think about the use of some of the site for Oregon National Guard.

**Session 1 – National Guard**

- Why is the Oregon National Guard (ONG) only interested in the north side? What about the bombing range area?
- Objection to the ONG taking over one of the most valuable areas of the property: Steppe shrub areas largely in north
- Would be good for ONG to have some area of property
- Again UXO concerns and cleanup
- Only area I would consider for the military is the ADA – perhaps small arms
- Concerns about terrorist attacks if ONG is there

**Session 2 – National Guard**

Omitted for time constraints

**Further Suggestions:** What further suggestions or thoughts would you like to share with the LRA?

**Both Sessions – Further Suggestions**

Omitted for time constraints

## Appendix E - Participants' Personal Observations

*The following was handed to a DMST facilitator after the focus group session. It represents the additional thinking of one participant.*

In thinking about the disposition of the Army Depot, there are several things that I would like to discuss:

1. It is important that conversation be maintained with the Confederated Tribes. They seem to have a vested interest in some of the property and so their concerns must be heard on the front end of the decision-making process.
2. This property is owned by the U.S. Army. It was taken for obvious reasons. There are some usable buildings on the property. There are utilities, roads that need considerable repair.
3. There is an area known as the ADA (Ammunition Disposal Area) that will probably be contaminated with live ammo forever. There has been a surface clean-up of some sort. There remain underground, untold amounts of live ammunition, bombs, etc. left from attempted detonation.
4. There is a "washout lagoon" that was used for washing TNT out of shell casings. This was likely cleaned up, and the contaminated soil was transformed into compost. An inspection of this area needs to be done with extreme care.
5. There is a landfill site on the property that contains numerous remains of depot odds and ends. This landfill needs to be thoroughly inspected.
6. Underground water aquifer has been contaminated by the washout lagoon TNT contamination. This underground aquifer needs testing for continued contamination.
7. Warehouse buildings and other buildings contain asbestos siding. This needs to be resolved.
8. Other: *(no content listed under #8 in the original document)*

In my opinion, a non-political, independent firm with expertise needs to do a complete analysis of the condition of the property prior to any premeditated suggestions for future use. The local Reuse Authority has been wrestling with this matter since about 1987.

It is an effort in futility to determine future use of the property until a comprehensive study is completed on the project, and that the Army corrects the problems prior to deeding the property prior to deeding the property to Morrow and Umatilla County along with any legitimate claims that the Confederated Tribes may have.

County lines must be recognized. Legitimate ownership must be established. Only then can private enterprise be invited to inspect the property and to locate whatever business would generate enough income to build a profitable enterprise.



In my opinion, for this body to predict or try to attract companies to locate without first:

- 1) a complete hazard assessment;
- 2) a complete clean-up of the property of that hazardous material, prior to turning over the property to its rightful owners, would put Morrow County, Umatilla County, and the Tribes in the position of great financial risk.

I would also suggest that our congressional delegation be brought into this negotiation so that funding for the clean up makes it through the proper channels.

Much more can be said about this matter. In my opinion, years of identification of problems and clean up should be expected.





The following came in by e-mail, as a “Further Suggestion,” a topic that was skipped due to lack of time:

**Further suggestions:** What further suggestions or thoughts would you like to share with the LRA?

Dick was an excellent Focus Group Leader for this exercise. He did capture every participant’s thoughts and suggestions in an impartial manner. I was pleased to see five representatives from Morrow County, which contains 60 percent of the depot acreage. Far too often, outsiders wishing to reap economic benefits from Eastern Oregon resources, wave the \$ and have a greater influence in decision-making.

I sincerely hope that the suggestions made by a number of people regarding options for Non-Industrial economic development are included in the final report. It was clear to me that industrial economic development was not the most important direction to pursue.

Many of those of us actually live in nearby communities, (not just focus group participants) stated that we would prefer to see the property used for recreation, heritage, historical and educational purposes.

Do not denigrate our suggestions by jumping ahead in the process by saying “There is no funding to build or operate Interpretive Centers.” There is funding for planning, updating and maintaining museums and interpretive centers. For example, the Oregon Heritage Commission is in the process of reviewing 48 funding proposals for a statewide variety of Heritage Centers, Historic Sites and so forth.

The economic benefits of focusing on Cultural Heritage economic development are significant. A recent research study reveals *78% of all U.S. leisure travelers participate in cultural and/or heritage activities while traveling, translating to 118.3 million adults each year. With cultural and heritage travelers spending an average of \$994 per trip, they contribute more than \$192 billion annually to the U.S. economy.* I am attaching a copy of the article\*, which is the source of these statistics.

Thank you for inviting me to participate in this process.

Respectfully,

Carol Michael, Commissioner  
**Oregon Heritage Commission**

\* Referenced article is shown below



## **New Study Reveals Popularity of U.S. Cultural and Heritage Travel Large, Affluent Market Focuses on History and Tradition**

WASHINGTON, Oct. 21 --A recent research study reveals that 78% of all U.S. leisure travelers participate in cultural and/or heritage activities while traveling, translating to 118.3 million adults each year. With cultural and heritage travelers spending an average of \$994 per trip, they contribute more than \$192 billion annually to the U.S. economy.

"We discovered that an impressive number of U.S. travelers seek out cultural and heritage experiences," said Helen Marano, director, Office of Travel and Tourism Industries, U.S. Department of Commerce. "With 78% of all domestic leisure travelers participating in cultural and heritage activities, their expenditures confirm that this is a strong market, and they are contributing significantly to our communities during these challenging economic times."

The study is the first to segment cultural and/or heritage travelers, showing the diverse groups that exist within this broader category of traveler. The segmentation analysis uncovered five different types of cultural and heritage travelers: Passionate, Well-rounded, Aspirational, Self-Guided, and Keeping it Light.

Three segments - Passionate, Well-rounded, and Self-guided - were more serious about their travels and said that cultural and heritage activities had a greater impact on their destination choice. Together, these three segments represent 40% of all leisure travelers and contribute nearly \$124 billion to the U.S. economy.

Cultural and heritage travelers as a whole are more frequent travelers, reporting an average of 5.01 leisure trips in the past 12 months. They are more frequent business travelers and more likely to have taken an international trip in the past 12 months than their non-cultural/heritage counterparts. They are also likely to travel farther to get the experiences they seek: about half of most recent overnight leisure trips were 500 miles or more from home. More than a third say they traveled between 100 and 300 miles for a day trip.

The study found that cultural and heritage travelers are more likely to participate in culinary activities, such as sampling artisan food and wines, attending food and wine festivals, visiting farmers' markets, shopping for gourmet foods, and enjoying unique dining experiences as well as fine dining.

Other cultural and heritage activities identified by travelers include visiting historic sites (66%); attending historical re-enactments (64%); visiting art museums/galleries (54%); attending an art/craft fair or festival (45%); attending a professional dance performance (44%); visiting state/national parks (41%); shopping in museum stores (32%); and exploring urban neighborhoods (30%). The vast majority of these travelers (65%) say that they seek travel experiences where the "destination, its buildings and surroundings have retained their historic character."

The study was conducted by Mandala Research for the U.S. Cultural & Heritage Tourism Marketing Council, in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Commerce. Heritage Travel, Inc., a subsidiary of The National Trust for Historic Preservation, and its website [www.gozaic.com](http://www.gozaic.com) was lead sponsor of the study.

For more information about the study or to purchase the report, please contact Laura Mandala at [laura@mandalaresearch.com](mailto:laura@mandalaresearch.com) or 703.798.5452.