

MINUTES
LANE REGIONAL AIR PROTECTION AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
TUESDAY–MAY 9, 2006
Jesse Maine Room
Springfield City Hall
225 5TH Street, Springfield, Oregon

ATTENDANCE

- Board: Dave Ralston, Chair–Springfield; Faye Stewart, Vice-Chair–Lane County; Bill Carpenter–At-Large, Springfield; Glenn Fortune–Cottage Grove/Oakridge; Drew Johnson–Eugene; Earl Koenig–Eugene; Carol Tannenbaum–At-Large; Betty Taylor–Eugene
(ABSENT: David Monk–Eugene)
- Staff: Merlyn Hough–Director; Sharon Banks; Merrie Dinteman; Tom Freeman; Sandra Lopez; Sally Markos; Kim Metzler
- Other: Russ Ayers, Chair–LRAPA Advisory Committee; John Ahlen, Landa Gillette, Robert Houston, Suzanne Pearce, and John Woodrow–LRAPA Budget Committee; Terry Connolly–Eugene Chamber of Commerce; Mike Bucci–Kingsford Mfg.; Anita Ragan–J. H. Baxter; Becky Riley–Lower River Road Neighborhood Association

1. OPENING: Ralston called the meeting to order at 12:17 p.m.
2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:
 - A. Comments Regarding an Item On Today’s Agenda. None.
 - B. Comments on an Item Not Included on Today’s Agenda. None.
3. CONSENT CALENDAR:

ACTION: MSP(Taylor/Fortune)(unanimous) approval of the minutes of the April 11, 2006 board meeting and the expense reports through March 31, 2006, as presented.

4. DIRECTOR’S REPORT: Discussion included several items.
 - A. Two graphs of recent air quality data were distributed to board members at this meeting, and Hough stated that there were a few days in the moderate range in Oakridge during March but, other than that, air quality was good during the mid-March to mid-April reporting period, in both Oakridge and Eugene-Springfield. Hough commented that springtime weather patterns are typically conducive to good air quality.
 - B. A second matter raised by Hough at this time was a letter received from Jerry Hendricks of Eco-Fueler Corporation alleging illegal entry into a commercial property by an LRAPA employee and theft of trade secrets from that operation. Hough explained that the facility in question was a fibreglassing operation for the past decade which shut down last year and went into bankruptcy. The LRAPA inspector noticed renewed activity at the facility and stopped in to speak to the normal environmental contact person. He was told that the individual with whom he wished to speak was not available at that time and was asked to return the following week. Personnel of the new operation were quite surprised that someone from LRAPA would come in unannounced and touch base on how the operation was going. Hough had provided copies of the letter from Mr. Hendricks, as well as his response to that letter, for board

reference. Johnson asked if the new operation is also a fiberglassing operation, and Hough said that it is. The prior operation was boat manufacturing, and the current one is a fiberglass shell for a very fuel-efficient road vehicle. Ralston said the company is developing a new, one-of-a-kind product on which they have patents pending and that they view LRAPA's presence in the facility as an infringement. He said he is familiar with the company and that Bill Morrisette is a co-owner and had called him about it. Hough said that Morrisette had called LRAPA and spoken with Kim Metzler, and that he seemed to understand the situation from LRAPA's perspective. Hough said conversations with Morrisette have been positive and that LRAPA wants this to be the beginning of a good relationship between the company and LRAPA. Hough said the LRAPA inspector, John Morrissey, took two photographs of the operation on his way through the facility, and Hough has offered to give the undeveloped film to the company as a gesture of good faith. He said LRAPA would normally develop prints and, if staff were convinced that the process was in fact confidential, the photos would be locked in a confidential file in the office. Staff does not believe that there is anything in the fiberglass shells that would be infringing on any proprietary information; however, because of the serious concerns the company has raised, LRAPA is trying to go above and beyond in its response in order to start out on a positive footing with the new company.

Johnson commented that it is also important to note that the company is operating without a permit, in violation of LRAPA's rules and regulations, and that they knew that they needed a permit. The patent issue is separate from the environmental issue. Johnson said he has worked with Morrissey, and he thought the tone of the company's letter was a bit inflammatory. He said he appreciated the tone of Hough's response letter. Johnson added that it is important that the facility come into compliance quickly, because they could be subject to citizens' suits and EPA overfiling if they continue to operate in violation of air permitting requirements. Hough said his response letter requested a permit application within thirty days, and that will include the information that LRAPA will need to be able to estimate what the emissions will be and how significant the source will be. LRAPA can then determine whether a permit is required and, if so, what kind of permit it should be.

Carpenter asked if Morrissey was on private property when he took the photographs, and Hough responded that Morrissey was inside the building. He had checked in with an employee and was on his way back to meet with Gary Bolling; and along the way, he saw some fiberglass shells and took pictures to document that, in fact, fiberglass operations had resumed at the facility. Carpenter asked if any of the shells could be seen from the public roadways, and Hough said he did not believe so. Johnson commented that it seemed to him that taking photographs is standard inspection procedure. Hough agreed and said that the employee with whom Morrissey had spoken was aware that Morrissey took the pictures. No one reacted or expressed concern at that time. Hough repeated that LRAPA is fine with giving the undeveloped film to the company owner because the letter from Hendricks documented that there is a fiberglass operation at the site, which was the purpose for taking the pictures.

- C. Hough reminded the board that he is due for a performance evaluation by the board in July and that, in order for that to happen, the process needs to start in May. He explained that the evaluation forms will be sent to staff and advisory committee members and then, after the board receives those feedback forms, the board will need to fill out their own forms evaluating his performance as agency director and to conduct that evaluation at the July board meeting. He said both the long and short evaluation forms will be provided to all individuals who are being asked to provide feedback to help the board members with their evaluations.

- D. Koenig said he had the impression from looking at the enforcement reports that LRAPA is very lenient with violators, and it seemed to him that a lot of cases are closed without assessing a civil penalty, particularly with asbestos violations. He asked for an explanation of that. Hough said he had spoken with Sandra Lopez, LRAPA's operations manager, about that, and he asked her to speak to the board at this time. Lopez said it appears that there has been an ongoing policy that, when the inspector finds that no asbestos survey has been done on a remodeling or demolition project, he writes a Notice of Non-compliance (NON) to let them know they are out of compliance with LRAPA's rules and that the survey needs to be done right away. If they get the survey done quickly and it is the first time he has had contact with the particular contractor, the inspector closes the case whether or not the survey indicates the presence of asbestos-containing materials. Lopez said she and Hough have talked about possibly changing that policy for certain types of cases. Hough said when an NON is issued, there are two basic types of response. One is that they are given a warning, and that is the end of the case. The other is to refer the case for civil penalty action. Hough noted that this is similar to what DEQ does with these types of cases. Some are automatically referred for civil penalty and other are evaluated on a case-by-case judgement. LRAPA's policy on these cases has been to issue an NON if there has been no asbestos survey, and the respondent has two choices: either they can have the survey done and follow up from there; or they can avoid the survey by simply assuming there is asbestos and treating it as if it were asbestos-containing material. As long as they are responsive in either of those choices, LRAPA considers that adequate response by the party, and the case is closed.

Lopez said she and Hough have been meeting with the inspectors to discuss this, and part of the problem appears to be matrix under which fines are assessed. When asbestos is involved, the rules automatically put the violation into a higher category, and the penalty can easily go straight to the maximum \$10,000 fine category. Hough commented that he knows that David Monk has raised some questions at recent meetings about some fines not being high enough to deter the behavior. Hough suggested that, if there is interest among board members, staff could prepare a presentation to walk the board through how the enforcement rules and the penalty matrices are applied to a particular violation and demonstrate the case-by-case specifics involved. He said it would be instructive for everyone and would also be a useful feedback loop for enforcement staff and management. Hough said that if, after seeing such a demonstration, the board disagrees with the manner in which staff handles these cases, staff would certainly welcome that feedback.

Koenig then asked how the fines are calculated. Lopez explained that it is spelled out in the agency's rules. There are the fine matrices, and then there are aggravating and mitigating factors, such as the degree of cooperation demonstrated by the respondent, that are applied to each case to determine the ultimate amount of the fine. Lopez said LRAPA's enforcement staff apply those rules quite well, and it seems to be very consistent. She said it appears to her that, based on previous policies and personnel at LRAPA, the inspectors are not comfortable issuing any asbestos violation as a minor violation, based on the wording the rules.

LRAPA's main asbestos inspector, Tom Freeman, was at this meeting and spoke to the board. He said one of the big problems with asbestos civil penalties for first-time violations is that the way the rules and definitions are written, any time asbestos-containing material is disturbed and some of it happens to get outside of the building, it is automatically a Class I violation because it has been introduced into the environment. If it stays inside the building, it can be considered a Class II violation. He said if he finds an illegal abatement project, he issues an NON and requires the respondent to have the asbestos abated immediately, particularly if it is exposed to the exterior of the building. To get an asbestos abatement

contractor to respond immediately, the bill for the abatement will be into the several thousands of dollars. Freeman said that generally gets the person's attention, and there are no repeat violations by that individual. If he catches the same person committing the same violation at a later date, they are required, once again, to get an immediate abatement, and they are also assessed a civil penalty by LRAPA. If they have disturbed 160 square feet or more (the size of an average living room popcorn ceiling and larger), it is an automatic major violation, making it a Class I major violation for which the base penalty is \$6,000. Then when you add the aggravating and mitigating factors, and in the case of a second-time occurrence, it would be a flagrant violation, the figure would go up to about \$12,000. The maximum amount the agency can assess per day, per occurrence, is \$10,000. When you add that to the cost of the immediate abatement, the expense to the respondent will be quite large. As an example, Freeman referred to a recent case which came before the board, when Bill Serios of Stewardship Properties had a roof pressure washed. Freeman said he believed the total cleanup cost for that was in the neighborhood of \$25,000.

Hough noted that the Serios example would be at the high end of the spectrum, as opposed to a first-time violation which is issued a NON and required to get an asbestos survey done. He said asbestos probably has the greatest range, because it is considered a Hazardous Air Pollutant. That is why the range of penalties and expense to the respondent is so great between a first-time offender who has failed to get an asbestos survey and a repeat offender who has exposed asbestos-containing material to the ambient air.

Freeman added that when building permits get issued to homeowners to do remodeling or demolition projects, the permits do not include information regarding the possible presence of asbestos-containing materials. He said if a building is to be demolished and not be replaced, there is a stamp on the demolition permit that mentions asbestos and says the asbestos must be removed before the building is demolished. But if there will be a replacement building, the demolition permit is included in the building permit, and the attention to asbestos is lost. Freeman said LRAPA puts literature in most of the building departments in the county; however there is no mention of asbestos in the building permits. He added that LRAPA's rules require a survey on single-family residences, which is more stringent than the rest of the state, but most of the smaller contractors are not aware of the importance of inspecting for asbestos and taking care to avoid releasing friable asbestos into the air.

Stewart said he had a constituent call him the previous week who said that a home owner in Cottage Grove went to tear down an old building and had an LRAPA inspector stop by and ask if they had had a survey done, and the person didn't know anything about an asbestos survey. Stewart said he had done a little research and had not found any documentation that the city of Cottage Grove told them about it or acknowledged that they needed to do a survey. He said it would be good for LRAPA to work with the local governments that issue demolition permits to try to find a way to let people know about this requirement. Freeman indicated that what Stewart had found is fairly typical. When the rules were amended in about 2002, LRAPA personnel visited every public works department in all the incorporated communities in the county, and none of them were particularly interested in this. Once they found out they would not be responsible for compliance or enforcement of our rules, they just left it up to LRAPA to deal with it. Also, Freeman said, when a house or real estate changes hands, LRAPA sends them a letter to notify them that if there is to be any renovation or demolition, a survey for asbestos by an accredited asbestos inspector is required. He said LRAPA has been getting a fairly good response from that program in the form of calls from residents asking about the requirements, since the agency began notifying people at the time of sale of the property. Hough added that Freeman and Lopez are planning

to touch bases again with all of the building departments and make sure that they are familiar with the asbestos requirements and that we get their cooperation to include LRAPA brochures and materials with their building information.

Koenig noted that one of LRAPA's goals is to provide asbestos information to home owners, and asked if the agency shouldn't also contact all contractors so that they will know what to do if they encounter asbestos on a job. Freeman said that, at the time these rules were adopted, every contractor in the state who was licenced through the CCB received a letter outlining the changes in LRAPA's rules and requirements. Lopez suggesting doing that again. Freeman said he also does asbestos awareness programs for anyone who will listen. He said he has one scheduled with Rainbow Design and Construct on June 5. As he comes across contractors and has contact with them, the word spreads through those circles, but he would like to be able to spread the word more effectively than that.

Carpenter asked if there is a lead paint warning disclosure in the building permits issued by the cities and the county, and Freeman replied that he did not know about that but he doubted it. Carpenter said it seems like it should be very easy to get a line printed at the bottom of building permits, telling permittees that they may need to investigate for asbestos and citing the two or three most common building structures that are known to contain asbestos, such as popcorn ceilings. Freeman responded that the building departments allow LRAPA to put literature in their offices, one of which is a small pamphlet called, "Asbestos In the Home," which tells where asbestos is likely to be found, where to have it analyzed, what to do if you think you have asbestos, and how to handle certain kinds of asbestos. But the building departments do not generally point out that information.

Regarding fines for violations, Johnson noted that some fines for open burning in the report are as high as \$900, and others are only \$50. The materials burned appeared to be similar in the different cases, and Johnson wondered why the fines were so different. Hough said he had asked those same questions and had a discussion with staff. It turned out that, in the particular case in this report with the \$50 fine, it was more an incidental amount of prohibited materials which were inadvertently left behind when the materials were being sorted prior to burning. Freeman commented that there were two NONs written to that individual, one for demolition open burning and another for not getting an asbestos survey. The \$50 in this case was not a civil penalty but a fee for a letter permit for demolition open burning. The individual had pulled about 95 percent of the fiberglass insulation and electrical wiring from the materials out of a trailer house that he was demolishing and burning. That material was set off to the side, but he simply did not get it all.

Johnson asked if there has been any effort to look at the trends, to see if the penalties being issued for open burning of carpet, wiring, PVC pipe, etc. is having any effect on the amount of burning that happens. He asked if the agency is seeing any reductions in open burning of those types of materials over time. Lopez asked how open burning trends would be characterized. She said she has talked to long-time employees regarding how well the enforcement program is working, and the response has been that the open burning program is working as well now as it ever has, and LRAPA is going out on every single complaint. Sometimes there are inspectors in the field all the time, just working on open burning. With only two inspectors, that is hard on resources. Lopez said staff is trying to figure that out and would welcome any suggestions Johnson might have regarding determining a trend in open burning. Lopez added that staff will be opening up the open burning rule for amendment in the near future and will work with the fire departments to look at how the rule is structured. Johnson said his only idea would be that, as new things are done with the rules and policies, LRAPA needs to make sure that the

public is informed through media channels, that it is not okay to burn garbage and that the fines will be serious if people are caught doing that. Lopez said she agrees and that staff is on target in that regard.

5. **ADVISORY COMMITTEE:** Metzler handed out copies of the minutes of the last advisory committee meeting. Ayers commented that the board has a good group in its advisory committee. The board put mobile sources on its agenda at the last meeting, and the committee also added it to their agenda and have had some good discussions, as indicated in the minutes. Ayers said consensus among the committee members is that there is a lot of concern about jumping on a Inspection/Maintenance (I/M) mandatory program, but potentially a lot of opportunity for a voluntary program.

Koenig asked why there is such a big different in the cost of the DEQ I/M programs in Portland and Medford.

Hough said the Portland program was one of the first two or three programs in the country, starting in the mid-70s. It was already established at the time the need was identified for the Medford program. A lot of the overhead investment had already been done in the Portland program. Another factor is the Medford program was established for carbon monoxide reduction, whereas the Portland program started out as a carbon monoxide reduction program but transitioned, over time, to where it is now probably more important for maintenance of ozone standards, with the projected growth in that area. Hough explained that there is a middle group of vehicles that are between the 1996 models which started to have the on-board diagnostics and the 1980 to 1996 models, which require enhanced I/M in order to get maximum ozone benefit from the program. Portland invested in the enhanced I/M lanes, as part of their program. That program uses a dynamometer which is much more involved than the original I/M programs were. It is called the "I/M 240" which is based on having to operate the dynamometer for 240 seconds to do the test. Hough said all of those things, initial overhead and then the enhanced lanes, contributed to the higher cost of the Portland program.

6. **OLD BUSINESS:**

- A. Status of J. H. Baxter Odor Complaint Situation. Hough reported that comments received at the April public meeting regarding J. H. Baxter have been very helpful to staff. One key issue is Alternative Number 2, the EcoSorb misting system, and concerns about whether it would be simply masking the odor, making Alternative Number 1, the mechanical system, a superior option for controlling the odors from the retorts. Hough said staff had a follow-up meeting with Baxter personnel and is also attempting to get feedback directly from the companies that have implemented something like either of the two alternatives. Staff had originally proposed to institute Alternative 2, with Alternative 1 to be implemented if Number 2 was not sufficient. Staff is now pausing to get as much information as possible on the relative effectiveness of the two alternatives prior to making the final decision. He said that Alternative Number 8, the steaming emissions, has received good support from all sides as the single-most-significant thing that could be done at this point. Hough reported that the number of complaints for this reporting period, 22, was about the same as the number for calendar April and is running significantly less than the same time period in the past few years.

Taylor asked if LRAPA could assure people living in the area that they will be able to breathe this summer, and Hough said he expects to have the complaints continue this summer. He said the process is not yet at a point of getting a specific implementation schedule on alternative 8, and he is not sure how many weeks it would require to get that system installed. Taylor commented that the situation has been going on for a few years, and it is her opinion that Baxter should be pushed, or forced, to do whatever needs to be done. Hough responded that Baxter is agreeable to taking those next steps and that it is a

matter of working out the specifics of what should be in the final agreement, including the option of doing a pilot test of Alternative 2 with Alternative 1 as a backup. He said staff is trying to work with interested parties but there is, as yet, no firm schedule.

Tannenbaum asked about the status of the operating permit renewal, and Hough said it is on hold at present and will go forward when final agreement is reached on the schedule, because the schedule for implementing the next steps will be incorporated into the permit. Hough said, once the schedules are worked out and an agreement is signed, the permit will be started on its public hearing schedule. He said the evaluation of the three alternatives could be done prior to the final draft permit, or that evaluation could be done during the permit process with that implementation schedule being added to the permit depending on when, during the permit process, that information becomes clear.

- B. Outline of June Discussion Regarding LRAPA Response to Complaints Regarding Excessive Emissions from Motor Vehicles. Hough said this subject was discussed with the LRAPA Advisory Committee and he wanted to give the board that feedback and get their thoughts in order to fine-tune the report he will prepare for the June discussion so that it is responsive to the board's interests.

Hough said staff had spoken the previous week with some other states that are operating vehicle inspection programs. The future of these programs is to go to 1996 and newer vehicles which have on-board diagnostics. Those vehicles can be inspected most efficiently, and DEQ is experimenting right now with people actually self-testing their vehicles either by going to a kiosk with diagnostic equipment and using that equipment, or by purchasing a \$50 self-testing kit. The self-testing kit can be plugged into the vehicle periodically, and the information can be sent over the Internet to get the vehicle registration renewed. Hough said a number of other states are watching to see how DEQ's program will work. The majority of vehicles are now 1996 or newer; however, that does not address the concerns that started this issue for the LRAPA board. That issue involves typically older vehicles which are poorly maintained and emit smoke. Hough said that states that are thinking about starting up a program where there hasn't been one before are focusing on those '96 and newer vehicles. DEQ has said that if they were considering a new program they would probably wait and see how these experimental approaches develop before making a long-term decision. The inspection/maintenance programs which have been operating in Portland and Medford for a number of years were instituted primarily to deal with carbon monoxide levels. There were times when those areas had levels twice the health standard and violated 100 or almost 200 days a year. Now carbon monoxide levels, across the state, are less than half the standard. As newer cars have replaced older cars, even with increased traffic, the situation has changed considerably over time. Currently all areas of Oregon meet ozone standards, but there is not as much margin for safety in Portland or Eugene or Medford for ozone. Hough said that if LRAPA were going to institute a program for one of those criteria pollutants, that would probably be the reason to factor it in and compare it to other potential strategies for maintaining standards over time; but Eugene/Springfield does not have the same pressures that the other two areas had when vehicle inspection was first started.

Ralston commented that there is an Oregon Revised Statute that specifically deals with the issue of smoking cars. Carpenter asked Hough to provide copies of that statute for the board at the June meeting so that everyone can see it. Ralston said it should not be that difficult to contact different law enforcement agencies and encourage them to enforce that statute more strictly.

Koenig asked if the Medford and Portland programs include a safety inspection along with the emissions inspection, and Hough said they do not. Koenig said it seems like such a logical thing to do because it is very simple to do things like checking to see that all the lights work and checking the brake linings, to help prevent accidents.

Carpenter commented that some vehicles burn a great deal of oil and produce smoke because of it. He said that, to him, the smoke from oil and from diesel fuel are not that much different, as far as the health hazards they represent. Johnson said he thinks the combustion is different in a diesel engine than in an internal combustion engine, that the formation of polyaromatic hydrocarbons would be higher through burning oil in a gasoline engine and you would have more of it. Johnson said he thinks that when a vehicle burns a lot of oil, it becomes more like a two-cycle engine in terms of mixing oil and gasoline in the combustion process, adding that two-cycle engines are notoriously the highest emitters of toxics. Carpenter said he would like to see some health information about this, such as from people burning recycled oils in boilers.

Taylor said it really doesn't matter if smoking vehicles aren't as bad as something else and that anything LRAPA can do to help make the air cleaner is worth doing. She said people are suffering in some neighborhoods from motor vehicle exhaust, and she thinks that working toward an I/M program—for both emissions and safety—is worthwhile. She added that she doesn't want to wait until the area is out of compliance or until this area is the worst in the state or the country, and this agency's focus should be on doing everything it can to make the air cleaner. Tannenbaum agreed, stating that the smoking cars are usually where the people are, and the diesel trucks are not generally in the neighborhoods. She said that is a point the board needs to consider in the process, as well.

Johnson said that, if DEQ continues to do new things with their vehicle maintenance programs, and LRAPA does not do anything, he thinks LRAPA is going to continue to see used cars that are too expensive to maintain and register in Portland showing up here on the used car market. He said he has observed a lot of taxi cabs in this area that emit blue smoke and has concluded, from that, that Lane County's absence of emissions testing requirements has resulted in this area becoming a dirty car dumping ground.

Johnson asked Hough about the fact that the DEQ program started out as a carbon monoxide reduction strategy and now is part of the ozone maintenance plan. He wanted to know if LRAPA's ozone numbers for Lane County are similar to DEQ's numbers for Portland. If Portland needs a vehicle maintenance program to maintain their ozone attainment status, and LRAPA's ozone numbers are similar to Portland's, given the air flow pattern from Portland south to Eugene, he wondered if ozone data monitoring and attainment requirements would support the argument that this area needs a maintenance program. Hough responded with two points. First, as far as the ozone that has been measured in recent years, it is fairly similar between Portland, Salem, Eugene, and Medford. The area with the highest levels will vary from year to year; but the levels are generally in the same neighborhood. Second, the Portland area is projected to grow faster than the state as a whole, and that has been a key part of Portland's program development as the population has grown rapidly for the last ten to twenty years and is expected to continue its rapid growth into the future.

7. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Hough said LRAPA has received 16 complaints about odor from Rexius in Eugene in the first four months of this year. He said staff has intensified efforts to be out there around the facility, and it is not yet clear whether all of the odors people have complained about have actually been from Rexius. Hough said this is a classic case of conflicting land uses. Rexius has been at its location for several decades, and there are residential areas that are not too far distant, resulting in some conflicts. The number of complaints is still far lower than the current number of complaints the agency receives about Baxter. Staff has been giving the source more attention because of the complaints, going to the area at about the times when the complaints have been coming in; but LRAPA has not yet been able to document a frequency or a severity of complaints sufficient to lead to the suspected nuisance process.

Taylor commented that she has had e-mails, one of which stated that the people there aren't the type to complain, or that they don't have the time to complain. She said it could be income level, class level, or other factors that results in not receiving as many complaints about Rexius as about Baxter. Taylor said that, like with the Baxter situation, if people complain and it doesn't seem to do any good, you can't expect the complaints to keep pace with the nuisance, necessarily. She asked if Hough thinks there is any validity to what one of the e-mails said about it being a different type of neighborhood with different types of people who perhaps don't think they have the power to influence government. Hough said LRAPA does get complaints from there, and it turns out that four of LRAPA's 20 employees live surrounding Rexius. Those individuals come and go in the area all the time and do say that they smell it occasionally. But it has not been a significant issue for them. Hough said Rexius has been very responsive to LRAPA's notice to them of the complaints. They have welcomed comments so that they can try to adjust their activities accordingly. They think it is related sometimes to turning the piles at the facility. They are probably more environmentally alert and responsive than the average composting operation of that type; at least that is the feedback LRAPA has gotten from DEQ and others that have more of a statewide perspective. Rexius has done things that other facilities are not doing in other areas, and LRAPA has a problem finding fault with the specific things they are doing. It is a difficult case of a conflicting land use.

8. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 1:07 p.m., and the LRAPA Budget Committee convened at 1:17 p.m. The next regular meeting of the LRAPA Board of Directors is scheduled for Tuesday, June 13, 2006, 12:15 p.m. in the LRAPA meeting room, 1010 Main Street, in Springfield, Oregon.

Respectfully submitted,

Merrie Dinteman
Recording Secretary