

**MINUTES**  
LANE REGIONAL AIR PROTECTION AGENCY  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
TUESDAY–JANUARY 9, 2007  
LRAPA Meeting Room  
1010 Main Street, Springfield, Oregon

ATTENDANCE

Board: Faye Stewart, Chair–Lane County; Earl Koenig, Vice-Chair–Eugene; Bill Carpenter–At-Large, Springfield; Glenn Fortune–Cottage Grove/ Oakridge; Drew Johnson–Eugene; David Monk–Eugene; Dave Ralston–Springfield; Carol Tannenbaum–At-Large, General; Betty Taylor–Eugene  
(ABSENT: None)

Staff: Merlyn Hough–Director; Merrie Dinteman; Doug Erwin; Sally Markos; Nasser Mirhosseyeni

Other: Russ Ayers and Gery Vander Meer–LRAPA Advisory Committee; Landa Gillette–LRAPA Budget Committee; Pat Patterson–Cottage Grove City Council; and Several Others

1. OPENING: Ralston called the meeting to order at 12:16 p.m.

2. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR FOR 2007:

CHAIR. Ralston stated that, customarily, the vice-chair for the previous year takes over as chair at the beginning of a new year. He stated that Stewart was 2006 vice-chair and said he would accept a motion to elect Stewart as chair for 2007.

**ACTION: MSP (Koenig/Tannenbaum)(Unanimous) election of Stewart as chair of the LRAPA Board of Directors for 2007.**

VICE-CHAIR. Stewart then took over as chair, calling for nominations for the office of vice-chair.

Taylor nominated Monk, and Johnson seconded the nomination.

**Ralston nominated Koenig, and Fortune seconded the nomination.** Ralston explained that he was nominating Koenig because Koenig has been on the board for a long enough time, and Ralston believed he deserved the chance to take on some of the responsibilities of the board.

There were no further nominations.

Monk noted that, by nominating himself and Koenig, board members were trying to follow the rotation of offices between jurisdictions. He said he felt that the rotating leadership should be more a function of who is here at the table and if they're interested in assuming a leadership role. Monk said he appreciated Ralston's reasons for nominating Koenig and that, if Koenig were willing to serve, he would be glad to see Koenig serve as vice-chair. Koenig said he was willing to serve as vice-chair. Monk added that electing Koenig as vice-chair, in line to be chair in 2008, would preserve the rotation and would likely be a smoother transition since board members sometimes have issues with Monk, and he would like to make the election of officers as uncontroversial as possible.

Stewart thanked Monk for his comments and called for a vote on the nomination of Koenig.

**VOTE: The vote was unanimous to elect Earl Koenig to the office of vice-chair of the LRAPA Board of Directors for 2007.**

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

- A. Comments Regarding An Item on Today's Agenda. None.
- B. Comments Regarding An Issue Not on Today's Agenda. None.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR:

Adoption of Minutes of December 12, 2006 Board Meeting. Koenig pointed out that on page 1 of the minutes, under the comments presented by Russ Eldridge regarding fallout from sand and gravel operations in the area where he lives, the minutes stated that he said he could hear the grinders starting up at 7:00 p.m. Koenig said he believes that should be 7:00 a.m. instead, because he thought they would start up in the morning. Ralston said he also thought it was an error because he would think it would be illegal to run the grinders in the evening so close to the residential areas. Dinteman said Mr. Eldridge had said it was in the evening, rather than in the morning, and offered to call Eldridge to ask him what he intended. Stewart asked Dinteman to confirm whether it was a.m. or p.m.

*[Eldridge's comment at the December meeting was that he can hear the grinders starting up at 7:00 "in the evening." Field staff confirm that the rock grinders do sometimes operate until dark, or even longer, in the summertime, depending on the demand for crushed rock for summertime road paving projects. In addition, the equipment generally runs all day, but it is batch loaded. There are times when the equipment is actually running but there is no rock inside in between batches. The neighbors might not be aware that the equipment is operating until a new batch of rock hits the grinder. Consequently, it is probable that residents do sometimes hear the grinders begin to grind rock at 7:00 p.m. in the summertime, which is the time of year when he said the major fallout problems occur.]*

Adoption of Expense Reports Through November 30, 2006. There were no questions or comments regarding the expense reports.

**ACTION: MSP(Fortune/Monk)(Unanimous) adoption of minutes of the December 12, 2006, pending clarification; and adoption of the expense reports through November 30, 2006, as presented.**

5. DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Discussion included several items.

- A. Enforcement. At the December meeting, Carpenter asked about two asbestos cases which seemed similar but had very different penalty amounts. The cases were Regan and Victoria Cummings of Noti, penalty \$10,300 and Cottage Grove Roofing with a reduced penalty of \$1,000. Hough explained that the biggest difference in the two penalties was due to the economic benefit involved. He said both cases involved failure to notify LRAPA of an asbestos abatement project; however, in one case the respondent immediately employed a licensed asbestos abatement contractor to take care of the abatement, while the respondent in the other case did not hire a licensed asbestos abatement contractor. The economic benefit in the latter case was approximately \$4,500 to \$6,500 for not having to pay the cost of the contractor.
- B. Training of Asbestos Contractors. Koenig pointed out that there are about five asbestos-related cases listed on the current enforcement action report. He asked for the status of staff speaking to contractors so that they are aware of the potential of finding asbestos and what to do about it if they do encounter it. He commented that there seems to be a lot of ignorance of the law regarding asbestos. Hough said staff does plan to do additional outreach but has not had time due to other matters which take a higher

priority. He said LRAPA staff routinely keeps building departments and contractors advised of requirements, and the outreach program will be expanded as soon as possible.

- C. Home Wood Heating Season. Hough pointed out that the written report included a review of the current home wood heating season. He said there had not been any red days, so far, in either Eugene-Springfield or Oakridge. There have been three yellow days in Eugene-Springfield and four in Oakridge. Hough noted that, in an average year, there would be from zero to 18 yellow days in Eugene-Springfield by now and 15 to 37 in Oakridge.
- D. Everybody Wins. Hough reported that installations are between 340 and 350 at this point, with installation of the remainder of the 350, total, still being coordinated between the installers and the trucking companies and drivers.
- E. Warm Homes/Clean Air. Hough reported that most of the replacements in Oakridge have been done, and it is now down to the last few households switching their old, uncertified stoves to either certified woodstoves, pellet stoves or some other cleaner heating units under this program.
- F. Air Inversions. Stewart asked if, when there is an air inversion in the Willamette Valley, it is the same everywhere or if there are spots that are different. Hough explained that it would depend on the particular weather system. There are sometimes periods when the weather service calls an Air Stagnation Advisory for most of Western Oregon, or even into Eastern Oregon, and the whole affected area is pretty much the same. At other times some areas are under temperature inversions and others are not. There can be significant differences between Portland and Eugene or between other locations. Koenig asked about the difference between Eugene and Oakridge, and Hough said those two airsheds are disconnected most of the time and can have very different conditions.

Stewart said the reason he asked is because he travels on a regular basis between Cottage Grove and Eugene and, in the past two years, he does not recall very many days when he could smell the Short Mountain landfill. In the last couple of months, he has smelled it almost every day, both in the morning and in the evening. He said he was expecting to see some complaints about that odor and was surprised that there were none in the report. Hough said that a factor that has come up regarding composting operations has been the rainfall the area has had, particularly during November. He explained that significant rainfall makes controlling odors at composting facilities more difficult, which could affect landfill operations as well.

- G. PM2.5 Standards and Air Quality Index. Carpenter asked when the new federal PM2.5 standard goes into effect, and Hough responded that it went into effect 60 days after it was promulgated in October of 2006. The Air Quality Index will be adjusted to synchronize with the new standard, and EPA will develop guidelines so that there will be a national standard for that. Hough said the new 24-hour standard for PM2.5 is 35 micrograms per cubic meter, down from 65 micrograms. The annual average did not change and is still at 15. LRAPA is holding off on changing the AQI the agency uses in determining daily burning advisories and wintertime home wood heating advisories, so the AQI we use will conform with the national standard AQI. In the meantime, we are giving a little bit more margin of safety when calling yellow home wood heating advisory days, to comply with the new standard. Hough commented that the fact that there have been so few yellow days called, so far, this year is even more impressive in light of the fact that staff is trying to be a little more conservative because we know the new standard will require additional protection.

6. **ADVISORY COMMITTEE:** Committee Chairperson Russ Ayers said the committee did not meet in December. He said there are five committee position vacancies coming up, if the board wants to keep the committee at its current size. Ralston asked if the committee positions had been advertised, and Hough said they had. The deadline for submitting applications is January 22.
  
7. **REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION OF PUBLIC HEARING, PROPOSED ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO LRAPA'S PUBLIC CONTRACTING (PROCUREMENT) RULES:** Hough noted that this agenda item was meant more for preparation for the February and March meetings, rather than in-depth discussion at this meeting. He explained that LRAPA needs to update its public contracting rules in order to comply with changes that the Legislature made in the 2003 and 2005 sessions. The rule will need public hearing before the board, and it is necessary to provide at least 30 days' notice prior to hearing. Normally, staff would bring the rules to the board in February with a request for hearing authorization; however, because February has only 28 days, there is not sufficient time between the February and March meetings to allow the 30 days' notice. Hough asked the board to authorize public hearing at its March 1 meeting and said staff will prepare a more detailed report of the specific changes and the reasons for those changes, and how the proposed rules comply with the new public contracting code adopted by the state, for discussion at the February 1 meeting.

Johnson asked, if hearing is authorized and held, would the board still have the opportunity to make revisions or suggest changes. Hough said they would have that opportunity, adding that, depending on how significant those changes might be, the board might want to re-advertise the public hearing notice and delay adoption to a later meeting. Mirhosseyni reminded the board that the changes to these rules must be within the state's rules.

Koenig asked if the rules provided for the board's review (Attachment C to the staff report) incorporate all of the Legislature's changes into LRAPA's existing regulations, so that LRAPA would end up with one set of regulations that is in compliance with the state. Hough said that is the case, adding this rule was designated Title 5 when it was originally adopted in 1986, prior to the advent of the federal Title V permitting program for major industrial sources. To avoid confusion with Title V, the LRAPA contracting rule would be given a different number. He noted that the proposal in Attachment C was not yet formatted the same as other LRAPA rules but will be prior to putting it out on public notice. Hough said Attachment C is LRAPA's legal counsel's recommendation for rules that would replace LRAPA's existing rules. It is based on models that they have used with other local governments.

Monk asked if there is a deadline for LRAPA to come into compliance with the state rules. Hough said there was a deadline in March of 2005. If LRAPA had made the changes before that date, it could have been done without being affected by the model rules. Because it is now past that date, LRAPA needs to be sure to abide by its existing rules, as well as by the state's model rules. That makes public contracting more cumbersome. Fortunately, LRAPA does not do much public contracting, but the agency is still in a situation of having to abide by two sets of rules.

Monk then asked about provisions of section 1.6.1.2. of the proposal, regarding when the board must approve contracts because they exceed the amount for which the purchasing agent has authority. He said it appeared that anything over \$25,000 would have to be approved by the board. Mirhosseyni said it is tiered. Anything below \$25,000 is considered a small procurement and can be done by any method deemed by the purchasing agent to be in the best interests of the agency. For a contract/procurement between \$25,000 and \$75,000, at least three verbal quotes must be obtained. For a contract/procurement which is between \$75,000 and \$150,000, at least three written quotes must be obtained. Hough said the tiered amounts in the proposal

comply with the model code, but they could be revised if the board chose to do that. He said those tiered amounts are probably one of the most significant parts of the proposed rules. Monk said he was wondering about that because the rules also deal with the purchasing agent's discretion, and Monk said he assumed the purchasing agent would be either Hough or any staff member that he designated. Hough said that was correct. Monk then referred to section 4.4.1, Purchasing Agent's Discretion, and more specifically, 4.4.1.11 Contracts for Goods and Services for Airmetrics, and asked if he understood correctly that any contract for goods and services with Airmetrics is at the discretion of the purchasing agent. Hough said that was correct. Monk speculated that such a contract could easily exceed any one of the numbers described above and could be well over \$100,000. Mirhosseyni responded that, while the agency's experience shows that that would not be the case, there is that potentially.

Monk asked staff to provide for the February meeting a history of the kinds of contracts that Airmetrics has actually had, what the sums of money have been, and over what period of time, if that could be fairly easily compiled. Hough commented that the discretionary items Monk had referred to were to be a key part of the more detailed discussion planned for the February meeting. He said staff will provide findings for all of the discretionary items. Hough said LRAPA's legal counsel has recommended that there be specific findings, reviewed and approved by the board, for each of those items, in case a contractor should ever challenge LRAPA's rules in the future. Hough added that the two things that Monk had brought up—the tiered amounts and the twelve discretionary items under 4.4.1, are probably the key parts of the proposed rules that are worthy of discussion. The other parts of the rules are primarily making sure that LRAPA complies fully with the new state code. Hough said Airmetrics requires some parts to be made to its specifications in order to produce the equipment as designed. The agency needs to be able to contract with a vendor to ensure that we will continue with them as a vendor so that their investment in meeting our specifications is justified. Monk said that made sense to him.

Monk asked whether legal counsel would be present at the February or March meetings, and Hough said he had spoken with Jill Bruce, the firm's expert on contracting law, and determined that it would probably be most useful to have her here for the March hearing. He said he can compile questions between now and the February meeting and get answers from her to share with the board. The same thing can happen between the February and March board meetings. If there are any last-minute questions that come up as part of the board's consideration of adoption, she will be available to respond to those. Monk agreed that the March meeting would be a good time for legal counsel to attend. He said he did not have much time prior to this meeting to look at the proposal and, not having training in accounting or law, he had a lot of questions and was glad to know that there would be opportunity for a more in-depth discussion at the February meeting, prior to the March hearing and proposed adoption. Hough asked that board members get any questions they already have to him before the February meeting so that he can have answers to those questions at the February meeting.

Carpenter referred to section 1.2 of the proposed rules, which states that the purchasing agent, at their discretion, can rely on these rules if our rules are silent, essentially. He said he thinks a different tack to take would be to have the attorney general rules kick in if our rules are silent. He said, if you are looking at these rules to protect the public from purchasing abuses, you don't want to have a purchasing agent have discretion when there is no rule. You want to have some kind of fallback rule. Carpenter said he was curious as to why legal counsel wrote it the way it is and suggested that it would be easy to just write it to say that our rules are applicable and, when our rules are silent, the attorney general rules apply by default. Hough said he would ask for clarification on that point. Mirhosseyni agreed with Carpenter's comment and that the fallback rule should be the state attorney general's rule. Hough added that he had spoken with Bruce about doing a shorter version of the state rule to replace LRAPA's existing rule, but it was decided to stay with the long version

of the rule, to be as comprehensive as possible. Carpenter agreed that it is good to have a comprehensive rule that does not have many empty spaces that leave a lot of discretion. He added that, if it turns out that there is something that is not covered, and it becomes serious, the board can amend the rules, accordingly.

**ACTION: (Ralston/Koenig)(Unanimous) authorization of public hearing at the March 1 meeting regarding the proposed public contracting rules.**

Stewart reminded board members to get any questions to Hough as soon as possible so that he can get answers for the February 1 meeting.

8. DISCUSSION OF PROCESS FOR APPOINTING GENERAL AT-LARGE BOARD MEMBER, ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND BUDGET COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Hough reminded the board that, in February, Pat Patterson would be taking over the shared Cottage Grove/ Oakridge seat which Glenn Fortune has held for the past two years. He also reminded them that Carol Tannenbaum's current term on the LRAPA board will end in February. He said she has been on the board for over six years and, before that, was the on the agency's budget committee. Hough said the agency appreciates Tannenbaum's years of service to LRAPA. He noted that Tannenbaum had submitted a resignation letter which had been distributed to board members.

Tannenbaum said her service on LRAPA's Board of Directors has been a good experience for her, and she will miss the interaction and the friendships that she has made. She said she feels that it is time for some new ideas and new blood to come in and add to the mix on the board, and she wishes the board all successes in the future. Tannenbaum said she is very optimistic about the status of the agency and believes it has a very bright future. She said she is looking to her fellow board members to ensure that. Stewart thanked Tannenbaum, and Hough said there will be more formal recognition of Tannenbaum's service at the February meeting.

At-Large Board Member Appointment. Hough said the position has been advertised, and that the notice and the application are on the agency's website. Applications will be received through January 22. Hough said that part of the reason for choosing that date to close receipt of applications was to allow time for copies of all applications will be sent to the board prior to the February 1 meeting.

Board members indicated that they wanted to interview candidates for the at-large board position but did not feel it was necessary to interview the applicants for the open advisory committee positions. Hough said the process for appointing the at-large board member would depend on the number of applications received. If it is a manageable number, all of the applicants could be invited to the February 1 meeting to be interviewed. If there are a lot of applications, the board could screen the applications at the February 1 meeting and invite the top candidates to be interviewed at the March 1 meeting. Several board members stated that they would prefer to make the appointment made in February, rather than March. One reason given was because that was to be Tannenbaum's last meeting. Hough asked her if she would be available to attend the March meeting if the appointment could not be made in February. Tannenbaum said she could continue until March if that was what the board wanted. Another reason why board members wanted to make the appointment at the February meeting was because the strategic planning discussions were to begin on the same day, immediately following the regular board meeting. Board members wanted the new member to be able to participate in those discussions.

Taylor suggested that board members review the applications prior to the February 1 board meeting and indicate to staff which ones they would like to interview. Then the individuals whose names were selected

for interview by the most board members could be interviewed at the February 1 meeting. Ralston agreed, stating that he would like Tannenbaum to have the opportunity to be involved in appointment of the at-large board member. Hough said if the board wanted to do as Taylor suggested, staff could send electronic copies via e-mail, or fax copies, to board members on January 23. He said staff would like to have the packets for the board meeting ready by January 26, in preparation for the following Thursday's meeting. He said staff could poll board members by e-mail or by phone to get the information regarding choices for interviews as quickly as possible. Monk pointed out that the applicants likely have their own tight schedules, so the board process to choose those to interview should be as quick as possible to allow staff time to give those individuals as much advance notice as possible prior to the February 1 board meeting.

Carpenter brought up the question of public meetings law and said he was a little concerned that deciding on which applicants to interview via e-mail might violate that law. Koenig noted that would be just the screening process. Ralston said that is a fairly standard practice on several boards and commissions on which he serves. Taylor agreed and said the Eugene City Council looks at applications for boards and committees frequently and that the first decision, screening of the applications and choosing the top few from which to make an appointment, is not made in public. If someone from the public wants to see who applied, they can do that, but the public is not involved in the screening process. Stewart said he believes that, as long as the board states ahead of time what the process will be, there would be no problem with the board using e-mail communication to screen the applications and decide whom to interview, without public participation.

There was lengthy discussion of how the board wanted to proceed with the application screening and applicant interview processes, resulting in two motions.

- A. **ACTION: MSP (Taylor/Monk)(Unanimous) to use the first half-hour of the February 1 board meeting for interviews with the final candidates for the at-large position, and then 10 minutes to decide which candidate to appoint. Then the person could join the board for the rest of the meeting.**
- B. MOTION: Taylor MOVED to authorize Stewart and Hough to determine whether the board should interview all of the applicants or if some should be eliminated from the running. Stewart and Hough would get in touch with all board members to make that decision, either by e-mail, or personal visits, or fax-by whatever method they choose. Ralston SECONDED THE MOTION.

AMENDMENT: Monk made a friendly amendment to Taylor's motion, that if there are more than five candidates, there be e-mail correspondence to narrow the field to three. Taylor accepted the amendment.

AMENDMENT: Ralston said he had no problem interviewing five people. He said if there are five applicants, why not interview all five. He made a friendly amendment to increase the number of people to five. Monk accepted that, as did Taylor.

**RESTATEMENT OF AMENDED MOTION: If there are more than five applications, authorize Stewart and Hough to get in touch with all board members, either by e-mail, or personal visits, or fax-by whatever method they choose-to decide which five applicants to interview.**

**VOTE: 8 to 1 (Carpenter) in favor.** Carpenter said he was still concerned because the board had an issue in the past few months about not being public enough in its process, and now the board is deciding to do an informal cut, out of public view, if there are more than five applications. He said if the board really wants to emphasize public involvement, they should just bite the bullet and interview everyone who

applies. He said the interview process should be totally public. If people take the time to submit applications, they should all be treated equally.

Patterson reminded the board that the applications should also be seen as a reservoir of applicants when it comes time to make appointments to the advisory committee or the budget committee.

Budget Committee Appointments. Regarding budget committee appointments, Monk said he understood he is to nominate an individual from Eugene to serve on the budget committee. He asked when he should have that nomination ready, and Hough said the committee appointments need to be made in March, in order to have a full committee ready for the budget committee meetings in April and May. Therefore, all board members whose committee appointees' terms are expiring need to have candidates ready to propose for board action at the March meeting.

Taylor asked if there are term limits on budget committee appointees, and staff said all committee members are subject to the same limits, according to the board's policy. A person can serve two terms and then must reapply when the second term expires if they wish to continue serving. However, the board can decide to waive that requirement if it wants to do that.

Ralston said he would ask John Woodrow if he wishes to continue to serve. He also said that Tannenbaum's appointee, Landa Gillette, also has an expiring term and asked if Tannenbaum wanted to talk to Gillette about whether he wishes to continue on the committee. Tannenbaum pointed out that Gillette was in the audience at this meeting. She said she didn't know whether she should make the nomination for appointment, or if the new at-large board member might want to make his or her own nomination. Tannenbaum said Gillette has been interested in the activities of the agency and has served well on the budget committee. Gillette agreed that the new board member might have someone in mind to nominate. Hough said the timing is such that he thought the new at-large board member could be involved with the budget committee counterpart, for the decision by the board at the March meeting.

Advisory Committee Appointments. Regarding the advisory committee appointments, Hough said the applications are to be in by January 22, and the board will receive copies of all of those applications prior to the February 1 meeting. There are five potential vacancies, and two current members—Russ Ayers and Doug Brooke, have indicated they intend to reapply. Lorena Young and Dave Breitenstein have both indicated that they do not wish to continue to serve on the committee. It is not yet known whether Bill Young will reapply for the agriculture spot on the committee.

Carpenter asked if there is information regarding the attendance records of any of the current members who are applying for reappointment. Hough said that is not a part of the application form, but staff can supply that information if the board wants it. Several board members said they would like to have that information.

Ayers said the committee is scheduled to meet on January 30, the day before the board's February meeting. The committee usually looks at the committee applications and makes recommendations to the board for the ones that they feel would be the best fit. He said there will be time to provide that information to the board.

Monk brought up the makeup of the advisory committee, stating that the statute requires at least one member from each of several interests, and asked if he is correct in his view that, beyond that requirement, there is no formula for the makeup of the committee. Hough briefly reviewed the requirements for the committee, that members serve three-year terms, that there are to be between seven and fifteen members on the committee, and that the groups that need to be represented include public health agencies, agriculture, industry,

community planning, fire suppression agencies, and the general public. In order to meet the minimum number of members, at least one category must have two representatives on the committee. The committee currently has 13 members. Monk said he really had not paid much attention to where the various members of the advisory committee are employed, but the fact that Lorena Young is employed by a member of Lane County's regulated community caught his attention. He noted that Young is in recycling; however, it said it does not make sense to him to have someone who is employed by a permitted source serving on the committee as a representative of the general public. Monk said this discussion came up when Jim Leary, who works for Country Coach, was appointed to represent the general public. He noted that Leary's status was subsequently changed to represent industry. Monk said that, as the board makes the appointments to the committee, he hopes that the appointees are identified as representing the appropriate categories, and he thinks that is a subject of who their employers are. Monk said he does not care how many industry representatives are on the committee, as long as they are identified as such.

Ayers responded by saying that the committee undertook an exercise to address this issue with Jim Johnson. Johnson reviewed the definitions of each of the categories, and the committee went through those and re-categorized committee members based on those definitions. Hough said that was the subject of the last meeting Jim Johnson attended before he left LRAPA. He said most people on committees are employed by someone, and some of those employers happen to have permits from LRAPA. One of the advisory committee members, David Breitenstein, considered himself more of a public health representative because he worked at the Eugene wastewater facility; however, the facility does have an operating permit from LRAPA. Hough pointed out that Breitenstein ended up representing the general public, but he could have ended up in any of three categories, depending on which you felt was the more significant influence on his opinions on the advisory committee. Monk asked whether Breitenstein determined his own category because of his views and his interest in serving, and Hough said Breitenstein recommended public health but was ultimately put in the general public category. Carpenter said he had the same concern, about two of the members of the committee working for the same employer, and asked if the board could get a copy of that discussion by the advisory committee. Stewart suggested that this point could be made during the board's deliberations to appoint new committee members, that the board does not want to appoint someone who works for the same company as an existing member of the committee, or two new applicants who work for the same company. Stewart asked staff to include more background information in the staff report for the committee appointment agenda item, to address these concerns.

Monk referred to Carpenter's question regarding attendance records of committee members, stating that it seems that having a large number of members on the committee would make it easier to get more members who are able to attend the meetings regularly. Monk said it would seem that the board would want to keep the membership number fairly large, as opposed to not filling some of the current vacancies, because the committee would be less effective with a smaller group due to the inability of some members to attend all the meetings.

9. OLD BUSINESS:

Strategic Planning. Hough began by saying the original plan agreed upon by the board was that the February and March board meetings would be extended, 11:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., to allow time for strategic planning discussion after the regular board meeting business was done. Hough said a key discussion at today's meeting would be how much participation the board wants to have in the strategic planning. He suggested several options, including having just the board participate, having the chairpersons of the budget committee and advisory committee also participate, or inviting the budget and advisory committees to participate as a larger

group. In anticipation of having a larger group, staff arranged with the Springfield Chamber of Commerce to use a meeting room at that location (101 South A Street in Springfield).

Taylor said she thinks it should be just the board. Johnson agreed but said if there are to be two meetings, perhaps the board should take feedback at the second meeting from people who attend the first meeting and observe the board's discussion. Taylor agreed, stating that perhaps people who wish to comment could do so at the beginning of the strategic planning portion of the second (March) meeting.

Monk said the board should make the decisions; however he did not have a problem with the advisory committee or anyone else who wants to come and observe the board's discussion so that they understand the issues. He said the chair of the advisory committee should certainly be present to hear the board discussion.

Carpenter commented that these are public meetings, and anyone who wishes to attend may do so.

Stewart suggested that, once the plan is formulated, the board may want to take the plan to the advisory committee for their review and comment and any recommendations they may want to make, before the board formally adopts the plan. He agreed that the committee members are welcome to attend the meetings and monitor progress so that they can have some input into it before it is finalized.

Tannenbaum said she has a totally different perspective on strategic planning. She said she has had experience with strategic planning, and you usually start broad and narrow it down. She said it should begin with as much input as possible from the advisory committee and the community, and that input helps to frame the board's discussion. If you wait to the end to ask for input, you miss something. Monk agreed, stating that is especially true if you want people's buy-in into what you are planning. He said if you wait until the end of the process to ask for input from the public, they don't feel that they've had an adequate opportunity to contribute to the planning effort. They believe that the governing body's mind is already made up before they are allowed to comment. Monk noted that the board had previously discussed finding a facilitator for the planning process and how long the process should take. He said he does not believe two meetings will be adequate for this process and that a skilled facilitator needs to be present to focus the discussion.

Hough said staff is working from previous discussion with the board, at which time the question was whether the process should be the same as the last strategic planning done by LRAPA which took several months. That was the subject of the LCOG proposal which the board believed was too complicated and too expensive. The board talked about doing something at the other end of the spectrum, which would mean taking another look at the goals and objectives which were developed a year ago with input from the advisory committee and from staff. Hough said those goals and objectives were designed to cover the next one to three years, and the strategic planning was to go beyond that. The board talked previously about having two extended meetings to accomplish the additional planning, as opposed to the more elaborate process under the LCOG proposal. Hough said that discussion was what lead staff to believe that the board preferred to have just a couple of extended board meetings on regular board meeting days, and to have some facilitation assistance for those two meetings. He said he has been evaluating options for a facilitator and that he intends to explore a little further the possibility of hiring a particular person whom he believes would be very helpful.

Ralston pointed out that he has seen a goals and objectives document in the past that appears to be nearly completed, and that he sees the strategic planning as taking those things and fine-tuning them, rather than doing some sweeping policy change.

Carpenter said he liked the earlier suggestion by Taylor and Johnson. He said he was swayed against having it wide open at the beginning, because he thinks there would be a problem focusing it in a constrained period of time, even with two meetings. He suggested that anyone who wishes to hear the discussion be encouraged to attend the first meeting, and then have a period of time at the second meeting for the public to provide oral comments. The board could also receive written comments prior to the second meeting. He said there should not be more than a half hour provided for public comment on what people heard at the first meeting.

Johnson said he heard what Tannenbaum was saying about opening it up at the beginning, and he agreed with that; however, from the previous board discussion that Hough had referred to earlier, he said he thinks the board has enough diverse opinions that the board should have a conversation and try to get on the same page, and then it could be opened up for some broader input and revision. He said he sees the strategic planning as a continual process which would eventually result in a five-year plan. The board could then keep doing planning on a regular basis and not have ten-year gaps between strategic planning efforts. He said he does not see strategic planning as something that is ever really done, but as something that needs to be built in to happen every couple of years, to keep revisiting progress and issues and revising the plan on an ongoing basis.

Ralston asked that staff again distribute copies of the goals and objectives document which was developed over a year ago, to be sure that all board members are aware of what is in that document. Stewart said he was hearing suggestions from board members ranging from starting over with broad input from the advisory committee and the public to simply refining the existing goals and objectives document. He also asked Hough to provide that document in the packets for the February meeting so that board members will have time prior to that meeting to review it and have some ideas of how the group wants to move forward. He also suggested that Hough have the person he is considering as a facilitator attend the meeting. That person might be able to make a recommendation as to process after reviewing the existing materials.

Hough agreed to do those things and said staff would go ahead with the plan to use the larger meeting room space, in order to provide room in case there is more interest than there generally is in the regular board meetings. The strategic planning discussion will be planned as a board discussion, rather than an extended group discussion.

10. NEW BUSINESS: None.

11. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 1:55 p.m. The next regular meeting of the LRAPA Board of Directors is scheduled for Thursday, February 1, 2007. This will be the first meeting held on the new schedule of the first Thursday of the month. The meeting will begin early, 11:00 a.m., and is scheduled to run until approximately 3:00 p.m., in order to allow time for a strategic planning discussion following the regular board meeting. Because the strategic planning discussion raises the potential for a larger crowd than usual, the meeting will be held in a larger room, the Freight Room meeting room in the Springfield Chamber of Commerce building at 101 South A Street in Springfield, Oregon.

Respectfully submitted,

Merrie Dinteman  
Recording Secretary