



CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY BOARD
 Santiam Conference Room at Dept of Forestry
 2600 State Street, Salem, OR 97310

MEETING MINUTES – June 16, 2006 1:30 p.m. – 3:50 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bill Neland, Chair
 Tom McMullen, Vice Chair
 Denny Nielsen, Salem Hospital, retired
 Bob Stutte, Norris & Stevens
 Vickie Hardin Woods, City of Salem Comm. Dev
 Peter Fernandez, City of Salem Public Works Department
 Ron Polvi, Northwest Natural, retired

MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE:

OTHERS PRESENT:

Bill Foster, DAS Facilities Division
 Robin Kirkpatrick, DAS Facilities Division
 Frank Silkey, DAS Facilities Division
 John Oruongo, DAS Facilities Division
 Elaine Schacher, DAS Facilities Division
 Kay Erickson, Budget and Management Office
 John Borden, Legislative Fiscal Office
 Danae Hammitt, Department of Justice
 Tom Wood, Consultant Tetra Tech Engr

Robert McKee, Department of Forestry
 Virginia Carey, Department of Transportation
 Rich Scanlan, Department of Transportation
 Bryant Bischof, Department of Transportation
 Doug Bochsler, Department of Fish and Wildlife
 Karen Tofte, Department of Fish and Wildlife
 Jim Willeford, Military Department
 Roy Swafford, Military Department, Retired
 Lt. Col Rendell Chilton, Military Department

Handouts distributed to all members present:

- Agenda
- Minutes from May 19, 2006 meeting
- Department of Forestry (ODF) Facility Plan and PowerPoint Presentation provided by speaker
- Department of Transportation (ODOT) Facility Plan and PowerPoint Presentation provided by speaker
- Oregon Military Department (OMD) Facility Plan and PowerPoint Presentation provided by speaker
- Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) Facility Plan

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Bill Neland called the meeting to order at 1:30 pm.

ADMINISTRATION

A1. Approval of minutes from May 19, 2006 meeting

A motion was made by *Peter Fernandez* to approve the minutes of the May 19, 2006 meeting. *Ron Polvi* seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

SALEM AREA REVIEWS PURSUANT TO OAR 125-125-0350

B1 No Salem Area Reviews

AGENCY FACILITY PLAN REPORTS PURSUANT TO OAR 125-125-0150

Chairman Neland advised that five presentations are scheduled today so maintaining the time schedule is critical. He will use the gavel to stay on track.

C1. Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) – Robert McKee, Facilities Manager

Overview: The ODF portfolio includes 391 buildings. 36 are administrative sites, 31 guard stations, 32 fire lookouts, and 65 communication sites. Their buildings are categorized by Area, District, Unit, Sub-unit, Guard Station, and Fire Lookout. The smallest units are the guard stations. The fire lookouts are the most remote. The communication sites are in mountain top locations, typically alongside the lookouts. The complete portfolio is valued at \$80M. In addition to the District sites, they have a large seedling nursery, a tree seed orchard in St. Paul and the South Fork Prison Camp which is a 200 bed prison that they run jointly with the Department of Corrections. Department of Corrections provides the housing and Forestry puts the prisoners to work every day.

Newest Facilities: Salem Headquarters – completed three years ago
 Tillamook Forest Center – opened in April, 2006
 Lookout – built to contemporary seismic and code standards
 Operations building in South Fork Prison Camp

Challenges/Solutions:

- **Centralized vs decentralized management** –In 1911 ODF was formed and in 1913 the Legislature passed a compulsory fire protection law making it mandatory that forest land owners would contribute towards their own fire protection. At that time the Legislature required that the land owners form protection associations to manage their own fire protection. Twelve land owner associations were established around the state. ODF was not heavily involved in fire protection at that time; from then forward; however, it became the basis of the agency. Today there are three active ODF and Association partnerships, Coos, Douglas and Walker Range. The other nine land owner associations function simply as Boards of Directors who provide guidance to the agency as well as approve the assessments that they are given and work with the agency on budget matters. Over the years a lot of the associations went bankrupt and they turned over their resources to the Department of Forestry. The current ODF sites were built by the original land owner associations in the 1930's, 1940's and 1950's and have endured decades of exceptionally hard use. A key thing to understand about ODF is that they have relationships that go back a lot further than the facility. The various land owners have a variety of opinions today as to the ownership of those buildings. A lengthy process has just been completed to determine land ownership. Most of the sites now have clear ownership but there are a couple properties where there is still some question as to who owns the land. The land owner associations are really the first line of ODF's budget development and the associations are very reluctant to provide money for facilities.
- **Lack of general fund resources for facilities maintenance, renewal, replacement and expansion.** –Per statutory requirement, ODF must match every dollar the land owner associations contribute. Public sector lands, state forests and BLM lands are subject to payment of the full \$2. Only part of the land has a requirement for matching funds. Matching funds are provided for the operating side of the organization but when it comes to improvements to the buildings, capital improvement particularly, both the Associations and the Legislature are reluctant to provide funding. They have not had any general fund match for capital improvements since 1990-1991 when \$85,000 was received. General Fund is approximately 16% of the total agency budget.
- **Facility condition and functional obsolescence** - There have been some problems with the 32 fire lookouts over the last 20 years. Some of them are on the ground but most of them are towers. They were built before code enforcements in the 1950's and 1960's so they have reached the end of their useful life. There are some issues coming up with replacing them with remote sensing. ODF is doing a test run with remote viewing from a remote location. They are currently working with SHIPO (State Historic Preservation Office). SHIPO would like to preserve the towers for historical significance. The guys out in the field would prefer to take them down and burn them. Functional obsolescence is an issue in Sisters and with a storage building in Central Point. Some of the buildings are not of adequate size to renovate to meet the size requirements of the new vehicles.
- **Urban encroachment and shifting fire protection coverage areas.**
Expansion of operations is impossible in some areas due to close proximity with residential neighborhoods. Surrounding uses have become incompatible with the normal operations. The Fire Protection Program is often noisy, operates around the clock, involves substantial large vehicle activity, including heavy equipment transport and most sites must accommodate helicopter traffic. The steadily growing residential areas reduce emergency response time due to increased traffic near the sites.

Solutions: A leadership team of executives has been formed, consisting of the Associate State Forester, 3 Assistant State Foresters, Budget Finance Director and 3 area Directors so they have representation from throughout the state. Goals of that team include being the sounding board as well as the strategic guidance for the facilities and activities. Steps are being taken to standardize planning processes so they have similar statewide outcomes, assess facility condition and needs for the future, establish facilities goals, finding and allocating resources to achieve those goals and monitoring progress toward those goals. Finding those resources is the key.

Project Plans:

2007-09 Capital Construction Projects (5)

- Forest Grove District HQ Redevelopment Project - 10 acre facility surrounded by houses.
- Western Lane District HQ – Veneta Facilities Improvement Project – buildings are old and the storage buildings are not large enough to house the bigger fire trucks.
- Central Oregon District – John Day Relocation Project – Site is located ten miles off the nearest highway in a residential neighborhood which is difficult for the equipment to get into. They need to move this facility to a more strategic location out near the highway. They want to stay in John Day.
- Central Oregon District – Sisters Sub-Unit Relocation Project – Current site is two blocks off Main Street in downtown Sisters. Buildings have reached their useful life and parking is an issue. They need to relocate their operations building to a more strategic and appropriate location that will improve emergency response time and space to meet current and future operational needs. The city wants ODF to maintain some local presence. Urban encroachment is an issue also resulting in it taking an hour to drive to the coverage area in LaPine.
- State Foresters Office Building Restoration Project -They are trying to maintain this building because it is their jewel. They have not done a lot with it, though a lot of studies have been done. There were some errors made years back (late 60's and 70's) that they would like to correct. One of those errors is the lighting. Currently there are window air conditioners throughout the building and they would like to install central air. The floor was recently restored in the State Forester's office. A tour of the building was offered to the Board next fall when time allows.

2009-11 Capital Construction Projects (2)

- Central Oregon District HQ – Prineville Redevelopment Project
- Klamath – Lakeview District Facilities Improvement Project

Maintenance Needs:

A facility Condition Assessment Program has been established with two architects on staff (one full time). Deferred maintenance is a major issue for this agency and they are getting their hands around what they have (\$1.2M). Districts vary in the quality of maintenance that has gone on. The Sisters facility is representative of poor maintenance. They are choosing not to put money into some of the buildings because they are obsolete and need to be torn down. Other sites have well maintained buildings. There are some temporary systems at some of their facilities such as Tillamook Forest Center. This facility is monitored and managed with central controls. The facilities condition data will be maintained and monitored through an asset management system the Department is currently in the process of procuring to manage data on all the physical plants. They are working on figuring out where they are within the life cycle of those systems.

Questions from the Board:

Peter Fernandez - asked why heavy urbanization is a problem at the Forest Grove District HQ.

Bob McKee responded that from July 1st through November 1st that facility can be a 24 hour per day agency running fire protection activities throughout the night. They have a heliport at this sight, heavy equipment and various other traffic going in and out which competes with local traffic. That site is large enough to reconfigure to make it work. They have looked hard at doing that and they are leaning toward staying vs relocating, particularly due to the price of land out in that area. They have considered relocating to Banks.

Robin Kirkpatrick stated that Bob McKee had mentioned matching dollars earlier. If there were more availability of state matching dollars, would the additional revenue ODF receives possibly be utilized toward this deferred maintenance?

Bob McKee responded that those matching dollars would be mainly used for capital improvement projects on existing buildings.

Ron Polvi asked if ODF has looked at synergy with other agencies, for example Parks, who is building a facility in Washington County?

Bob McKee responded: He doesn't know if they have discussed anything with Parks but they are just starting to look at the relocation issues and the criteria for that would be location in certain areas. Once they get to that point, they certainly entertain talking with Parks. ODF reviews partnering opportunities with other natural resource agencies and rural fire districts when planning and developing facilities. Co-locating discussions are underway with ODFW and the US Forest Service at John Day and with the local rural fire district at Sisters.

Ron Polvi continued that it seems the two agencies have similar needs to store vehicles under cover and ODF needs a central location to get to the fires.

Bob McKee added that at the Sisters relocation, they are talking to the rural fire department as well as the local fire service.

Tom McMullen asked when they talk about relocation, do they measure where they are located against any set standards.

Bob McKee responded that a number of issues go into that selection process: First and foremost is the relationship to the public areas. The most critical issue is response time. Radio communication is another issue. They need to be at a location that can provide radio communication throughout the target area. They don't want any blind spots. They need to be able to maintain good communication with the guys fighting the fires. Another option they consider is looking to see if there is some parcel they have available within their own portfolio without purchasing another property. They have some other criteria they use for selecting property but primarily its response time. They also perform enforcement activities throughout the state so being within a fairly close proximity to where those activities are going on will cut the gas bill quite a bit and make it a lot more efficient.

Tom McMullen – He's not sure how complex siting conditions are for ODF. It seems that if they locate on one side of Bend or the other, they will always face these issues of driving through Bend. On the one hand they talk about wanting to maintain a presence in the town of Sisters where in Forest Grove they are talking about being surrounded by houses but they don't really want to be there for a number of reasons. In listening to the presentation, he is left with some feeling that there is not a particularly clear standard for making the relocation decision or the process is complex to the point where they make it up as they go along and it sounds like there are political decisions.

Bob McKee responded that the East side of Bend is where they are looking because right now from Sisters to LaPine, it's about an hour drive.

Tom McMullen clarified that he is just looking at the standards, not specifically. It would seem to him that if they had some basic criteria that it would be easier for this Board and other people who evaluate their plans, to look at that criteria and make recommendations. The goal of the Board would be to not actually do that physical evaluation but to see that ODF is doing that evaluation and providing that information in a way that it can come together. It may be that simply suggesting that it seems a little jumbled will be helpful to ODF.

Bob McKee responded that in all those relocation projects there are certain criteria. If he had been allowed more than ½ hour, he would have brought some fire prevention people in to discuss this.

Chairman Neland requested a motion to accept the report.

A motion was made by *Tom McMullen* to accept the report presented by the Department of Forestry without exception. The motion was seconded by *Ron Polvi* and unanimously approved.

C2. Department of Transportation (ODOT) – Virginia Carey

Overview: ODOT has 4,500 employees and 1,105 structures to maintain with approximately 3M square feet of space valued at \$357M.

Lease Plan: ODOT currently has 87 leases (404,640 sq. ft.) and their lease plan includes three additional leases for the next biennium:

Salem Lease: If they the Transportation building project is approved, they will be looking at leasing initial space in the Salem area for temporary housing for employees currently housed in their key building project.

Beaverton Lease: This Drive Test Center is kind of a misnomer because they stopped doing drive tests there in year 2000 because it is so unsafe for new drivers to exit and enter the area. They have found that the building is very inadequate. They have parking for about 50 customers but typically they have a demand for 75 to 100 customers there at a time. For the short

term they are looking for a suitable leased space where they can do drive tests and provide a better environment for the customers. Hopefully to be able to add some counters to serve the customers quicker. They do own the current facility and if they move to a leased facility they will probably surplus it and sell it and look to rebuilding some time in the future. Right now, the property value is escalating so fast around the state that it is not likely they will be able to afford to buy something without selling the property first.

Eugene/Springfield Lease: They have a motor carrier office located at east 15th Avenue in an area that is coveted by the University. ODOT is not fully utilizing the site and they will probably surplus that property and sell it. They will move the motor carrier staff to Springfield where they have a district office and co-locate those two groups together. This should get some efficiencies out of that lease and the lease rate at that site is quite good right now. They have not finalized this yet.

Building Maintenance Needs:

ODOT has \$13.8 in deferred maintenance. 750 structures were inventoried and inspected this past fiscal year trying to establish what their maintenance needs are. Their funding level has been flat. ODOT's Maintenance and Capital Improvement budget is approximately \$4 M.

Project Plans:

The project plan will look very familiar because the last legislature did not approve any of the new projects in ODOT's capital construction budget submitted last biennium.

The Sylvan Phase III project was the only one not eliminated – The legislature tied the facilities construction projects to the bridge construction projects and therefore, since the bridges were not done, the facilities projects didn't get funded.

2007-2009 biennium:

1. Baker City Maintenance Station – Highest priority

- Obsolete and failing buildings. They are two years out from where they were before so they are now in worse condition.
- Undersized facility - They have approximately 10 bays and only 4 are usable. They cannot put equipment inside. The snowplow and other equipment do not fit into the bay in Baker City. When it freezes, the staff literally has to chip the ice off to use the equipment. It is a safety concern.
- Environmental concerns (herbicide storage) - This site has herbicide storage and some of the waste water issues they have been dealing with statewide.
- Poor welding shop ventilation
- No vehicle washing facilities
- The electrical service is very poor. They cannot run the computers and air conditioning at the same time. These buildings were constructed in the 1930's.

Questions from the Board:

Chairman Neland asked if most of the buildings are wood construction.

Virginia responded: Yes, built in the 1930's or 1940's.

Bob Stutte asked if it is ODOT's plan to replace this site.

Virginia responded: Yes, they plan to replace this site with an old stockpile property they already own outside of town. One of the things they do when looking to relocate is to look at the property they already own to simplify their relocations. They have an excellent site on hwy 12 near Baker City. It is a nice flat site with good potential.

Denny Nielsen asked what would become of the current site.

Virginia responded that the current site will be surplus and sold. Again, urban encroachment is very evident there with somewhat luxury homes overlooking the property. Since the ODOT site isn't the prettiest thing in Baker City nobody will be sad to see them move out of town.

Bob Stutte asked if there is any plan. Are they going to be able to do this in the near future?

Virginia responded: Hopefully the legislature will give them a second look this time. The Transportation Commission supports this project. In fact one of their commissioners is from Baker City and understands the issue very well. They will do a little bit more pre-work with the legislature to try to get this approved. It is very necessary.

Robin Kirkpatrick stated that Virginia indicated that before ODOT could move forward with some or all of these projects, the highway condition has to be at a better level.

Virginia responded: Yes, the bridges.

Robin asked about the likelihood of that continuing to be an impediment to being able to get the facility funding or approval through the legislature.

Virginia responded that she wishes she knew the answer to that. The Department has made significant progress getting the bridges in place and they can make a good argument that they are getting it done.

Robin asked if significant progress will be enough.

Virginia responded: Yes.

2. Salem Transportation Building

The plan presented last biennium (05-07) was for DAS to purchase the building, renovate it and lease it to ODOT. This plan was not approved. One of the directions that came from the legislature is that they prefer that ODOT keep ownership of the building and do their own renovation. The cost information is now very old so a new cost study was put together and tied into that study are some sustainability standards for Leed Certified Gold levels and two options under those. One option is filling in the courtyard which gives them an extra 50,000 square feet.

Questions from the Board:

Bill Foster asked if they intend to fill the courtyard in with all five floors.

Virginia responded that the fifth floor is indented. They would probably do something architecturally so the whole thing is not out to the street. It may be indented also, up to the fifth floor. The consultants were quite positive about the option because it gives them a new structure to put some of the equipment to run the whole building. The cost is very feasible if you look at the whole 20 year payback on the building and some of the efficiencies realized from the consolidation of leased space and staff. It is very good use of the building. They are asking for design funding this biennium (2007-09). As they go into the design process, they will look at those options a little closer and see what the real payback is and at what level they will look at the sustainable Leed certification. There are other dollars in there to start looking at the leases and the move costs. The air conditioning system is still hanging out the windows and all the other issues they have had regarding maintenance have been delayed in hopes of doing the renovation. They don't want to replace carpet and tear it out in two years so a decision will have to be made this time around. If the renovation doesn't happen, they need to do maintenance.

Bob Stutte asked is they could build a new building more cost effectively when you consider the cost of remodel and dislocating the staff in and out of the building.

Virginia responded that this was an option that was looked at early on. It is cost effective but politically there is probably not a likelihood of ODOT getting a new office building in Salem.

Bob asked even if it is the same dollars?

Virginia responded that actually it showed that ODOT would be saving dollars because the multiple moves cost millions. She doesn't have the figures with her.

Bob commented that saving money to build a new building doesn't surprise him at all.

Virginia responded that the in and out costs are high. If they end up in multiple locations, the cost of outfitting just the computer infrastructure in multiple locations is incredibly expensive. They are going to give it a try again and see if the legislature will give them approval to at least make an addition to this building.

3. Sisters Maintenance Station – ODOT is located on US Forest Service land that is being sold so they have no choice but to move. They have been on a Forest Service permit there for free for 30+ years. US Forest Service realized that they are sitting on a gold mine so they want to sell the largest portion of the property for development and keep a portion inside the Urban Growth Boundary, on the edge of the property. ODOT's first choice is to co-locate with US Forest Service again. However, it is unlikely that they will do that for free any more. US Forest Service is willing to work with ODOT to give them some property when they are developing a site plan. This is contingent upon the City of Sisters approving that site plan and ODOT's piece of the plan. Like Forestry, ODOT has noisy equipment especially during the winter time, primarily to sand and keep sand in storage. There are issues on access and they are getting a team together to work that out. There is a need to keep a small maintenance station, and a sand storage facility for sanding the area from the Santiam Pass down. They will have to fund this some way but it is not in the budget yet.

4. East Portland Maintenance Station – All the issues are still the same. The buildings are falling apart and getting worse. The buildings were never built as Maintenance Stations and they are older buildings. One of them was moved in from another location. In spite of the fact that the design for this project was completed last biennium, the legislature still did not approve the project. ODOT will probably do this one in phases depending on how the cost plays out.

2009-2011 biennium

Meacham Maintenance Station

Buildings are failing due to age and poor construction. Buildings are inefficient in meeting modern operational needs. It is very cold in this building.

2011-2013 biennium

Salem-Woodburn Maintenance Station

They would like to get involved in this project in the future but it is not likely to happen with two other buildings in the Salem area to get done. It is over 40 acres and they would like to create an office complex.

Sustainability: ODOT has hired a limited duration Sustainability Coordinator to make sure that all the projects and contracts include recycling of materials and try to use recycled materials as much as possible. They are experimenting with waterless urinals and other new ideas that are coming along.

Major Issues:

Construction cost increases: Even their most current project estimates are under-funded by the time they go out to bid. They are cutting projects because they are unable to fund them. Right now, some electrical component costs are about 70% greater than last year. It is hard to control.

Deferred Maintenance: ODOT uses a little different Building Condition Model than the DAS model. The reason is they have to compare their buildings conditions to their highway conditions. They use a five level model rather than a four level model. Right now at least 18% of their buildings are in very poor condition. They are consider a building “very poor” if the cost to repair it is 50% or more of the replacement cost of the building. They have 205 buildings that are “very poor”.

Questions from the Board:

Bob Stutte asked if is within the Boards purview to make a recommendation on any of these issues. He looks at these projects coming back here for the second time and he sees the Baker City Project where they are forced to manage the decline and nothing happens.

Chairman Neland responded that this is his ninth year on the Board and he has heard this 3 or 4 times.

Bob Stutte again asked if it is within the purview of this Board to make a recommendation that something happen.

Chairman Neland responded that he is not sure.

Bob Stutte asked if this is why the Board is here or does it exist just to listen to this?

Chairman Neland responded that the Board is here to make sure that what goes forward to the legislature is in order essentially. When it gets beyond the Board, they do not have any authority.

Chairman Neland asked if ODOT is general fund dependent.

Virginia responded: No, highway fund.

Chairman Neland asked Virginia to clarify for the Board where the money went. If Legislature is not authorizing your building, is it still sitting in some trust?

Virginia responded: Unknown, but she is assuming it went to a highway project.

Bill Foster commented that basically what it boils down to is that the 2003-2005 legislature wanted efforts put on roads and bridges and not buildings. Despite the fact that there were some reasonable projects, and certainly the recommendation from this Board that those projects be approved, they weren't.

Chairman Neland commented that there is a political issue we cannot deal with. A motion to accept the ODOT plans was requested.

A motion was made by *Ron Polvi* to accept the report presented by the Oregon Department of Transportation without exception. The motion was seconded by *Tom McMullen* and unanimously approved.

C3. Oregon Military Department (ODM) Lt. Col. Rock Chilton, Director of Installations; Jim Willeford, Major Construction Branch Chief; Major Roy Swafford, (Retired) Chief of Real Property Operations and Maintenance

Overview: by Lt. Col. Rock Chilton, the new Director of Installations for the Oregon Military Department.

Oregon Military Department has a dual mission under the US Constitution Article I and State Constitution Article X (State Militia): To provide a ready force of citizen soldiers and airmen, equipped and trained to respond to any contingency. Currently there are approximately 1,000 Oregon National Guard citizens deployed overseas. They recently sent 900 soldiers from the 41st Brigade to Afghanistan to defend us in the war on terror. The Adjutant General, Raymond F. Rees' goal is security and defense. The National Guard goal is to recruit, train and equip a quality force that is prepared to respond to state missions when directed by the Governor and Federal missions when directed by the President. Supporting goals are to meet authorized strength levels, meet federal training and readiness standards, maintain equipment to readiness standards, provide facilities to meet National Guard requirements and serve as community assets and invest in Oregon's future – youth and community. The Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, on the war on terrorism has forced the Army to go through what is called Army Modular Force. This means they are to become lighter, more lethal, with more equipment. Every unit within the Oregon National Guard except two, the Army band and the Headquarters is being transformed. This is having a tremendous impact on their facilities because they are standing up units, moving units and reorganizing some units. They need to meet Federal Training Standards. They have State codes as well as Federal codes they must abide by. The criteria they use in the construction part of the facilities are dictated by the National Guard Bureau. OMD must maintain their equipment to Federal standards which affects their maintenance facilities and their logistical support. A lot of their facilities need to be heated storage buildings because in the past they were stored in unheated facilities and they had a quick turn over on equipment. They are trying to improve that. OMD has a responsibility to the Federal Government to provide facilities that meet National Guard criteria. OMD armories serve as community assets and they try to generate revenue through a rental program that will offset the cost to operate those programs and it's also General Rees' concept that each of the armories that they construct and maintain are community centers. They try to foster that through partnerships with local, state and federal agencies. For every general fund dollar spent, they bring in \$24 of Federal funds.

Operations Program - Roy Swafford, former Facilities Operation Manager

A map of Military facility locations was displayed showing OMD's Training sites, Logistical sites and Armories throughout the state. OMD has approximately 250,000 acres of owned or leased land to maintain. Army Guard owns 414 buildings amounting to 2.6 million square feet of owned and leased facilities to maintain. A chart of OMD employees was presented showing the number of employees by state biennium with a comparison of state employees (general fund only), state employees (mixed funding) and federal government employees. The number of federal government employees has remained constant, however, the number of mixed funding has increased from 143 in 91-93 to 425 in 05-07 and the number of state employees (general fund only), has dropped from 101 to 45.

Space Needs Plan:

The following facilities will be replaced subject to availability of federal and state funds:

- Newport – 3 acres on Newport Airport will be disposed of
- Klamath Falls Armory – Replace 2007
Part of the work has been done. They have not vacated current armory. They plan to dispose of that property some time next year.
- Ontario Armory – Replace 2009
- The Dalles Armory – Replace 2010
- Cottage Grove Armory – Replace 2010
This is their 2nd oldest facility built in the 1930's

Additional requirements:

- Ontario Readiness Center – 22,056 square feet in addition to the Ontario Armory – 2007-2009
- Multiple Armory Addition/Alteration Phase I – 72,000 square feet – 2007-2009
- The Dalles Readiness Center – 23,058 square feet – 2007-2009
- Clackamas Armed Forces Reserve Center – 102,618 square feet – 2007-2009
- Multiple Armory Addition/Alteration Phase II – 76,000 square feet – 2009-2011
- Boardman Multipurpose Training Range – 1,295 acres – 2009-2011

Emergency Board Actions: Jim Willeford, Major Construction Branch Chief

Actions taken in 2004 E-Board:

- Salem Army Aviation Support Facility – Other Fund (COP) to purchase land \$1.965 million.
- Lane County Armed Forces Reserve Center Phase 2 - \$2.99 million other Fund (\$1.56 COP + \$1.43 admin fees)
- Weapons of Mass Destruction / Civil Support Team Facility - General Fund \$300,000, Federal Fund \$3.0 million
- Salem Army Aviation Facility – General Fund \$650,000, Federal Fund, \$5.5 million

Chairman Neland asked if all these projects have been approved.

Jim Willeford stated that all 2004 E-Board projects presented by OMD were approved except for projects they will be asking for this biennium. They have a feeling they will be approved also.

2006 Emergency Board Actions:

- Lane County Armed Forces Reserve Center
- Ontario Readiness Center
- Anderson Readiness Center
- Baker City Readiness Center
- Medford Armory addition/Alteration

Project Plans: 3 remodelsMedford Armory Addition/Alteration

They have a major, critical Armory in Medford where a significant remodel was done in 1990. A portion of the remodel was completed. However, significant improvements are needed to the storm water system and some re-surfacing of the parking lot. They got the permit for occupancy from the presiding building official for the remodel; however, OMD was required to make a commitment to seek funding to complete this work. Since 1990, OMD sought funding to complete that work and was unsuccessful. An opportunity presented itself when the City and County came to OMD and said that the site Wal Mart was considering, adjacent to OMD, was just under what they needed for their parking so they needed an additional two acres (1.9 acres). They were able to negotiate a three-way deal between, OMD, the county and Wal Mart to sell 1.9 acres. Medford is one of those facilities where the facility sought property and received property from local communities with a reverter clause. That property is to be used for Military purposes in perpetuity. However, if not used for Military purposes, it reverts back to the owner (the county). Wal Mart was interested in moving in and OMD was interested in receiving some compensation. They were successful in that negotiation. Wal Mart has agreed to compensate OMD \$850,000, the county has agreed to allow OMD to relinquish their reverter for those 1.9 acres. There were a lot of details to this project; these are only the high points. The completion of this project is actually being funded by the sale of this parcel to Wal Mart. The Project is scheduled for completion in October, 2007.

Multi-Armory Add/Alt Phase I (Woodburn, St Helens, Newport and Gresham) - Completion in 2010 andMulti-Armory Add/Alt Phase II (Albany, Hood River, Redmond and Jackson) – Completion in 2012

This project is directed by Governor Kulongoski and uses a different strategy by OMD. In the past, what they have sought is additional alterations. They go through a process called Installation Status Reporting (ISR) by DOD. Basically it is a process to evaluate the condition of their facilities. Their facilities fall into three general categories: *New* that meet the current requirements (they have 7-9 of these); *Armories no longer suitable for remodel because of space or acreage constraints*; or *facilities that have declined so much that it is not cost effective to remodel* (this represents about 1/3 of their facilities). They do not receive federal funds to replace them and they are in a situation where it is an attractive option to replace. In the past the agency proposed a number of individual armory add-ons. They are taking a different approach now where they are bulking them together over a six year period. It is their intent to seek one design-build contract for these multiple facilities and put the project to bid to larger design-build contractors. They feel they will get economies by grouping these facilities together as one project. This proposal is considered a new proposal because they are putting a new plan together and the approach is different but most of the facilities are those that have been proposed in the past. This is really a business decision. Somewhere along the line, you must make a decision to replace or invest to extend the business life. They have come to the point that as an agency trying to take care of their facilities and their employees they must keep bringing this forward every biennium. Hopefully, some time they will be successful.

Vickie Hardin Woods asked if she is correct in concluding that these eight facilities they have identified are ones that they see are viable to add onto.

Jim Willeford responded: Yes, they went through an evaluation process and these are the ones where it makes sense to remodel to extend the life span. It was an exhaustive process. They brought in outside consultants, internal review was done and this plan was the result of quite a bit of staff work.

Project updates on projects previously taken to the legislature:

Salem Airport Operation and CST (Weapons of Mass Destruction)

These two projects were previously brought separately to this Board and the Legislature. The agency proposed co-developing these projects and was given that approval. This is now one project. OMD is pursuing partnership opportunities as they do with all their facilities. They were pursuing a partnership with the Department of Aviation and that agency has since decided to pull out of that partnership. This came as some surprise to DAS.

Chairman Neland asked if the Aviation pull out will jeopardize the OMD project.

Jim Willeford responded: No, they will move forward without Aviation. The reason for the pull-out is unknown. OMD thought it would be a good fit but Aviation does not want to move forward. OMD will look for other Local, Federal or State partners.

Peter Fernandez: Was the property to the South of the Salem Airport acquired?

Jim Willeford responded: Yes, they were successful in acquiring the Eyerly property. OMD has a complicated situation at the airport as they are surrounded on three sides. It is a property that is absolutely essential to their continued operations. Not just for this facility but the operations currently at that facility.

Building Maintenance Needs Plan: - Roy Swafford

The budget is about \$700,000 less in this biennium (05-07) than the 91-93 biennium. When you think about how much more costly things are today, fuel, cost of goods and services, building materials (wood and metal, steel particularly), they have lost a lot of ground. Square footage – The split funded (General and Federal) square footage has dropped from 400,000 sq. ft. to 27,000 sq. ft. now. Over 300,000 sq. ft. became federally supported. The 1.2 million sq. ft. is the armories. That is the heart of their facilities. Those are their most expensive facilities to maintain. While the agency moved a significant square footage to federal support, in that same time frame (12-13 years) they have increased their square footage about 650,000 sq ft. There are numerous issues including seismic (85% do not meet minimum standards), ADA (77% are not compliant), asbestos (72% contain asbestos fibers), and lead based paint. 77% of the armories are dysfunctional or completely unacceptable and 81% are undersized according to construction criteria.

The average age of an Armory is 37 years. The older Armories are very undersized given the type of unit that is there now. An Installation Status Report was recently completed. When they started the cycle, something over 600 inspections are done and results recorded. There are nine Armories that are acceptable. Everything else falls below that. There are two categories; mission and quality. The mission relates to determining if the facility supports the unit or does it impede the unit. One of the things they look at is that the armories are really community centers. They are part of the support mechanism in the event of a natural disaster so the unit has to mobilize there and maybe be a community collection point. Without standby power, it cannot perform that function and provide that service. There are a variety of reasons why deferred maintenance has risen dramatically. In the late 1990's when they started doing the ISR's, their funding was at a low point so more maintenance projects moved into deferred. They didn't start focusing on collecting that information and identifying what those requirements were until 5 or 6 years ago. Then as the ISR has gotten more robust and more detailed, they have extracted a lot of information from it and populated their existing deferred maintenance list. Of the \$89.4 M in deferred maintenance, \$50 M is for Armories alone.

Summary

- OMD has been trying to "manage the decline" of their facilities for the last 7 biennial periods.
- Deployments in support of the Global War on Terrorism and building code changes endanger Armory Rental Program revenue. The mobilization of troops also impact earning potential because they cannot rent out a facility if they are using it. Revenue generation is a constant effort.
- Facilities "Mission Support" impacts soldier recruiting, training, readiness and retention.

Questions from the Board:

Chairman Neland asked if Oregon is unique nationally in deferred maintenance or are other states facing this same challenge.

Lt. Col. Rock Chilton responded: Oregon is not unique; other states are facing the same thing. Other states have been more successful than Oregon in renting their facilities. New Jersey for example earns about \$3M to \$4M a year from renting their facilities.

Jim Willeford added that there are varying degrees of support from the states to maintain their facilities. Some states are a little smarter in knowing how to pursue additional federal funds for new facilities. It comes down to a commitment by the state to maintain the armories.

Lt. Col. Rock Chilton commented that it's all tied together. He expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to come before this Board today and tell their story. They are proud of it and they are proud of their people. They are performing the missions they have around the world and some of them are pretty tough and they are doing a good job and are of value to the state.

Vickie Hardin Woods complemented OMD on this presentation. It was one of best she has seen. It was cohesive and comprehensive and explained what they were proposing.

Lt. Col. Rock Chilton responded that he apologized for the technology failure (their inability to get their projector working) but in military jargon, they are taught to adapt and overcome.

Bill Foster asked about the status of the Prineville Plan in terms of getting some Federal funds to purchase the Ochoco facility.

Jim Willeford responded: They have a request in, as they do every year. It is on the Adjutant General's priority list of long range construction plans. They are seeking financing to purchase the facility. It is nowhere on the budget. This holds true for the Hillsboro Armory as well. The funds have been requested; in fact he just made a trip last week seeking funds for that project along with six others that were not funded previously.

A motion was made by *Tom McMullen* to accept the report presented by the Oregon Military Department without exception. The motion was seconded by *Peter Fernandez* and unanimously approved.

C4. Department of Aviation (ODVA) - Jim Wilson,

Overview: The Department of Aviation sent a letter to the Oregon Military Department and the Governor stating that the Aviation Department was pull out of the joint partnership between Aviation and Military on the Salem Airport project. This decision was based upon the fact that Aviation would reach their threshold of \$1.9 million in just the structure alone. That \$1.9 was intended to include the buildings, furniture and computers. They were getting to a point that as an agency, they had to look at the fact that for another \$200,000 they could have their own stand-alone structure either at their current location or, through a property trade with the City of Salem, at another location that is bare land which they would develop. Those are the things guiding the Director at this point. With the new RFP going out, they were afraid they would exceed the \$1.9M ceiling just on structure alone for the joint Military\Aviation facility on Turner Road.

Space Needs:

At this point, they are regrouping. Their need for space remains.

Project Plans:

They don't have any plans as far as building a facility today. They are looking, again, at what their options are before they proceed.

Building Maintenance Needs:

The information presented to the Board last year regarding their space needs and the status of their current building at Salem Airport is still valid. It needs replacement.

Questions from the Board:

Denny Nielsen asked what drove Aviation to pull out of the project now, which perceivably could be more costly in the future given inflation and rising construction costs to get the same value per square footage or however you want to measure it.

Jim Wilson responded: He doesn't know if the Director had a reason to pull out other than the fact that the construction of the joint project with Military would exceed what Aviation is authorized to spend. Before they spend any money, they decided to pull out and regroup. If they stay in the current building, they will have to remodel but they were at a point where they would exceed what they were authorized to spend so they didn't spend any money. There was fear that they would be committing to more than they were authorized to spend.

Vickie Hardin Woods advised that her department at the City of Salem oversees the Salem Airport and her manager has been in negotiations with the Department of Aviation.

Jim Wilson responded: When they went into negotiations with the Military, they knew one of the biggest issues they would face is constituent and customer visitations. They would not be able to come and taxi up to the Military site, they understood that. That became more of an issue as they went down the road. This was another reason why they thought they needed to back up a little bit and regroup. Even though it was a great idea, and the savings would have been there, a decision had to be made.

Ron Polvi commented that it sounds like there was a little political element in the final decision.

Vickie Hardin Woods concluded that there is no action required of this Board today because there is no proposal.

Jim Wilson responded: Yes, this appearance is only informational. Aviation is hoping to pursue the Salem Airport management staff to help them in finding some FAA dollars to build. They need to explore those options before they make a commitment.

Chairman Neland commented that the Board shall visit with Aviation again. *Robin Kirkpatrick* suggested that perhaps Aviation could make a presentation in July or August.

Jim Wilson responded that he doesn't see Aviation making any movement until next year. It will take that long just to get everybody on board and find out if they can get federal support. It will be a minimum of one year before a decision is made.

Vickie Hardin Woods asked for procedural confirmation that since these reports are going to the legislature for funding, does this mean that this agencies' report won't happen in the 2007-2009 biennium.

Robin Kirkpatrick responded that this is correct. If they were able to proceed with this project in a year for example, it will be necessary to go to the Emergency Board if there is going to be a possibility of funding. This is the opportunity to bring it before the legislature through the normal agency budget request process.

Chairman Neland stated that essentially the Board is confirming that there is nothing to act on.

Ron Polvi commented that he thought that what the E-Board is for is for agencies to acquire additional funding. If the agency needed \$200,000 to make this project work, they should have gone to the E-Board and questioned it. It sounds like there was more of a political issue that squashed the idea.

Robin Kirkpatrick responded that there may be some truth in the accuracy of that statement.

No Board action was taken.

Bob Stutte stated that the state has more stringent standards to rent from a private entity than applies to their own buildings. He also stated that he is confused about his role here and why this Board cannot make recommendations.

C5. Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) – Doug Bochsler, Acting Project Manager of Facilities and Engineering and Karen Tofte, of the Realty Section

Overview: The ODFW mission is to protect and enhance Oregon's fish and wildlife and their habitats for use and enjoyment by present and future generations. This mission is accomplished by the use of scientific methods to balance the protection of

fish and wildlife with the biological, economic, social and recreational needs of Oregonians. With the cooperative efforts of other agencies, volunteers, property owners, and sportsmen, Oregon's fish and wildlife are thriving in healthy habitats.

The management structure consists of the Governor, ODFW Commission, Director, Fish and Wildlife programs, Administrative program, Fish Division, Wildlife Division, and then each Region. One interesting thing about their structure is that the regions are organizationally directly under the Director. They are not under a realty or facilities group. Each region has autonomy so they have to deal with that when they try to manage the progress of things. It has evolved that way. It is an efficient way to do it. The guys out in the field do a great job. However, it does make it difficult to set up a program and make it agency-wide. The guys in the field take care of their own facilities. Doug and Karen are in the Fish Division but their function supports the whole agency. The divisions consist of: Fish Division, Wildlife Division, High Division, NE Division, NW Division, and SW Division.

The 2005-07 total Budget for ODFW is \$228+ M. General Funds = 5%, Federal Funds 42%, Lottery Funds = 3% and Other Funds = 50.5%. Other Funds are basically license fees. They have 1,163 full time employees.

Space Needs:

- Newport – 3,200 sq. ft. – Relocation of leased space out of OSU science center.
- Salem Headquarters - 71,912 sq. ft. lease expires 2008 with an option for renewal.

Peter Fernandez asked what they are thinking about the Salem lease.

Doug Bochsler responded that he has not been in a meeting yet where they have not talked about relocating.

Karen Tofte added that the intent is to renew their lease, but to eventually move into the building to be constructed by DAS on the Yellow lot.

Bob Stutte asked if ODFW has an option to purchase their current building.

Karen Tofte responded: No, they only have an option to renew.

Bill Foster stated that legislation directed the ODFW move to Salem. It is currently set up that ODFW property will probably be on the Mall or adjacent, in a state-owned facility, when the timing is right to move to that facility.

Bob Stutte commented that they are running out of time.

Project Plans:

No Capital Building Projects have been identified for the next biennium.

Building Maintenance Needs:

ODFW is trying to catch up on their deferred maintenance. Last summer and through the fall and into the winter, they lost a maintenance manager. They hired an outside consultant to do a comprehensive evaluation of the majority of their facilities (DLR out of Portland). Ten of their groups went out through the state and they did an evaluation of all the ODFW facilities for mechanical, electrical, roofs, windows, walls and site. They took a comprehensive look. There is a report (66 3-ring binders) and all the information was captured in a database. They took the results of the raw surveys and put an Executive Summary together so the agency leadership could start to put together a budgeting process. While that was going on, they sent the results of the surveys to the field offices to verify what was found and add anything that was missed. They are in the process now of capturing and prioritizing. The leaders of the agency have been working on the budget matters. The report identified \$9.5 M worth of current deficiencies, things that are broken down and need to be fixed. The first round of preventive maintenance is another \$1.5M so about \$11M basically needs to be fixed right now. The program does a year-by-year predicted failure of systems out into the future and those numbers get big in a hurry.

Robin Kirkpatrick clarified that they are in the process right now of trying to access the critical nature of those \$9.5M needs. Of the \$9.5 maybe there is a \$1M or \$1.5 M that is critical vs non-critical?

Doug Bochsler responded: Correct. The very first thing they did was sort out the things by safety. That list was given to each region immediately. Then they took the remainder of the list and they are prioritizing that.

Robin asked if they have some numbers for the life-safety related issues.

Doug Bochsler responded: Yes, but he didn't bring that with him. *Karen* responded that the number is \$1.6M. Those were sent out to the regions immediately.

Questions from the Board:

Ron Polvi asked if there was funding available for that kind of work.

Doug Bochsler responded: Not to that level. The current funding that he helps manage is \$700,000 per biennium for deferred maintenance. The Hatcheries have other funds that don't come through his department that they can use for certain things. They are looking at a \$10M need. ODFW leadership has decided to ask for \$2.5M the first biennium as a start, to boost their deferred maintenance budget, and repeating that in future bienniums.

Vickie Hardin Woods asked for clarification that they currently have \$700,000 to spend but they think they need \$2.5M to do a good job and that's what they plan on asking for.

Doug Bochsler responded: Yes, that's what he said. In the report there are bigger numbers shown than that but Doug doesn't control the bigger numbers. There are funding sources that the hatcheries can use on their own without going through headquarters to get things done. What they are going to try to do as part of this program is to have the field report back on the progress. This program will include forms that go back and forth to the field so they can track progress whether it gets done by them or the hatchery itself. There is more than \$700,000 available in the agency this biennium that they are using for maintenance needs. If the field can't get it done with the funds they have, they can have access to the \$700,000. For the next biennium the leadership is trying to put \$2.5M into deferred maintenance. ODFW will be happy with whatever they receive so they can start getting caught up on this.

Tom McMullen asked if their study shows a rapidly escalating maintenance need, and they are currently \$11 M behind, how they came to the logic that \$2.5 M somehow puts them closer to their goal.

Doug Bochsler responded that he would have to report back on this question because he didn't go to the meetings where they reached this decision.

Tom McMullen advised that perhaps his question is really a statement.

Robin Kirkpatrick commented that perhaps Tom is correct, at this rate, they will never get there.

Tom continued that ODFW will get further behind and soon their deferred maintenance model will look like the Military model.

Chairman Neland added: "And every other model in state government."

Doug Bochsler responded that all they can do is do the best they can with what they've got..

Tom advised Doug Boschler that he doesn't need to get back to CPAB.

Vickie Hardin Woods asked if this is the first year that ODFW has used a specific maintenance plan. Do they have a history of this?

Doug Bochsler responded that before they had a different strategy for a deferred maintenance program. They would just solicit projects from the field with their own cost estimates. What was happening with that program was that it was really apples and oranges. The people doing the evaluations were not trained in construction. They were mostly biologists trying to do the best they could. The available maintenance data was very inconsistent. When the leadership went to look for money, the inconsistent data was a weakness in their argument. So they hired a consultant. A large part of the value of that consulting effort was to come up with a defensible estimate of the maintenance need so they will not be under funded in the future.

Vickie Hardin Woods commented that in two years, they will be able to show that of the \$11M need this biennium, they were able to take care of \$2.5M for example and they will be able to show a consistent measurement that can be compared.

Doug Bochsler responded: Yes.

Bob Stutte commented that their process seems very progressive compared to many other agencies. He wonders if they studied energy efficiency as part of this; where they might spend money to save money to apply toward other things. Was that an element of this inspection?

Doug Bochsler responded: No, it is not a data capture element. –They have no people to manage an energy efficiency type program. Energy efficiency progress is made out in the regions by the regional people. He would like to work toward an energy efficiency program from headquarters. Starting with education and moving forward, but they are a long way from getting there. ODFW facilities are offices and hatcheries and maintenance-type buildings. At a hatchery, they have residences and the hatchery building which includes a process water heater for tempering water for incubating fish with lighting. A certain fraction, approximately 15% have water supply pumps. The pumps are their biggest energy users at these hatcheries along with the lighting. From headquarters, they are looking at

ways to optimize pump efficiencies. Outside of that, it gets down to the basis of lighting. When they do a remodel, they will capture all the energy efficiency technologies that they can. They have 409 buildings total. Most of their buildings are smaller but that doesn't mean they help with energy use. He would like to do a better job with energy but they don't have much to go on yet.

Robin Kirkpatrick stated that what ODFW has done, through the consultant, is apply a consistent approach to looking at what the building condition is and then measured the condition of all the facilities by that standard. ODFW is laying some real good groundwork to be able to know where they really are. When they are done, they will have a benchmark to use as the basis for funding requests.

Ron Polvi asked if this condition assessment is consistent with what other agencies are patterning theirs after. For example, the four scale rating vs the five scale that we heard from Military.

Boug Bochsler responded: they have a 4 scale vs 5.

Robin Kirkpatrick stated that he and Frank Silkey, State Architect, had an opportunity to meet with representatives of the firm that did the study for ODFW. The process that they used was quite a bit more complex and sophisticated than the one DAS uses. Robin thinks that Bill Foster may have, in the past, also seen some of the information. It is a much more elaborate, complex assessment process at this point than what we are proposing to try to pursue. Although it is a very effective system, it was not an inexpensive process. Although, letting the deferred maintenance continue without being able to measure it and not having a basis from which to seek funding is also very expensive. It is a system that other agencies probably could benefit from. There are other systems out there that would possibly achieve the same result. But, it's certainly something that Robin is hoping that we can at least have people look-at doing, or doing something similar. We have to do first things first which is the process that we are proposing, which is the 4 step standard. We will be reporting back to the Board on that next month.

Tom McMullen stated that ODFW touched on how the four regions have some autonomy in dealing with their own facilities issues. You have gone out and had a recognized company put a comprehensive review together. But then it gets administrated by four sections; by people who know more about fish than they do about buildings.

Doug Bochsler responded that Tom Wood was the architect of this process. Tom left the agency two months ago. However, Doug worked with Tom all the way through the assessment process. Their proposal included manpower to manage it. It was a Central Program so that it could be controlled. Above them, it was decentralized and scaled back. Doug said they have a report binder for every facility that was investigated. They will add tabs to these binders with forms so that when they accomplish something, they fill out the form and fax it back to him; or they can do a spreadsheet. Doug and the field will have binders that echo each other. That will be a start. Doug was told that they are going to allow the Regions to do a lot of this work themselves; the reasons are certainly to take care of a lot of the smaller, field type work at a local level. The Regions are not going to do a lot of the contract-type work. That type of work definitely will come back to headquarters to do the major renovations. The decision was made that the minor issues would be taken care of at a local level. But, Doug is going to try to implement an information feedback system so he can capture that information on the minor issues also.

Tom McMullen asked from a planning standpoint, if funds are allocated to ODFW, on the planning end, is that done regionally or is that done centrally?

Doug Bochsler responded: The funding side is handled at headquarters centrally. It is a complicated system that he learned quickly. They have a hatchery fund, a commercial fishing fund and a support fishing fund. There are many funds out there with dedicated uses that do go to deferred maintenance. The control of those funds is not under his group. This maintenance money would be under his group. -Any of this additional money they are asking for will be controlled by his group. They would have to sign off on its use. All those other funding sources are still available to the agency to get things done, but not under the control of his group. They want to try to build a system that is easy and works so they can capture all the maintenance information.

Tom McMullen asked how they propose to control, in some uniform way, deferred maintenance without central control. It's a peculiar thing to him.

Karen Tofte responded that there may be central control at headquarters. Headquarters needs to monitor and require the regions to report that information back to them. Even though headquarters may not be the entity that is performing the work, we will be monitoring the progress and reporting on it.

Tom McMullen asked about the fact that the people out in the region do not have facility experience.

Ron Polvi commented that ODFW took the right step by having an independent contractor go out and do an assessment. Ron said he had the same situation when he worked for Parks and Recreation. The regional folks would get the work done on the facilities to a certain level. The bigger projects probably require some guidance.

Doug Bochslers responded: The agency needs to figure out how to go forward and manage this. A lot of their sites are very remote and these people are fish farmers. They like to keep it simple, fix it and move on. They are actually very good at keeping the hatcheries functional.

Tom McMullen stated that he does not mean there is an issue with minor maintenance components. The complexity of minor maintenance components is significant. Trying to control them centrally will mean that it will fail. You can't very well do it centrally in a large organization. But, it seems to him, if one of their goals was to assure some reasonable distribution of inadequate funding that would happen best from a central position, not from separate regions. Not controlling the funding centrally could be a flaw in the planning cycle. Tom thinks Bob Stutte is asking the question as to what our job is and should we make recommendations. One might say from a client standpoint, that ODFW needs to rethink some of the control issues or some of the planning issues.

Bob Stutte commented that what they would like to do is control all this by computerization and some of those little posts don't have computers. That the way to handle all this is by having guidelines coming from DAS as to the kinds of questions each one of these agencies has to ask. There are already canned programs that can do this that have been in place for decades.

Doug Bochslers responded that they need to figure this out. Their first focus was more centralized control. They went to the point of building themselves a facilities board with headquarters and representation from each region on that board. That's what they keep coming back to. They are going to keep trying to convince people to get the flag up the pole.

Vickie Hardin Woods commented that maybe CPAB can help get that flag up the pole.

Doug Bochslers responded: Anything they can do to make it happen would be appreciated.

Chairman Neland stated that he is not sure that is their role. How the agencies run their business is their business.

Update of projects presented last biennium:

The Oregon Hatchery Research Center (OHRC) has been successfully completed. This is a joint project with OSU. They converted one of ODFW's old hatcheries into a research center. It is jointly operated by ODFW and OSU. It is a research facility that provides a hatchery for scientists to study the differences between hatchery and wild fish. The center is attracting attention. Its goal is to scientifically evaluate the effect of hatchery fish on Oregon's native fish.

Ron Polvi asked where this is located.

Doug Bochslers responded: Alsea. It is at the location of the former Fall Creek Hatchery.

Chairman Neland asked if there were any further questions. There being none, he asked for a motion.

A motion was made by *Ron Polvi* to accept the report presented by the Department of Fish and Wildlife without exception. The motion was seconded by *Denny Nielsen* and unanimously approved.

D. OTHER ISSUES

D1. Next Meeting – July 21, 2006 1:30 to 4:00 pm

Robin Kirkpatrick stated that presenters will be: Corrections, Public Safety Standards and Training, Veterans' Affairs, DHS/State Hospital/ Schools for the Blind and Deaf and the Employment Lease project on the schedule for review.

There being no further agenda items, the meeting was adjourned at 3:50 pm.

Prepared by Elaine G. Schacher, DAS Facilities