

MINUTES
LANE REGIONAL AIR PROTECTION AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
THURSDAY–FEBRUARY 1, 2007
Freight Room Meeting Room
Springfield Chamber of Commerce
101 South A Street, Springfield, Oregon

ATTENDANCE

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

Staff: Merlyn Hough–Director; Merrie Dinteman; Doug Erwin; Max Hueftle; Sally Markos; Kim Metzler; Nasser Mirhosseyni

Other: Russ Ayers–LRAPA Advisory Committee; Stan Biles; Russ Eldridge; Amy Peccia–SierraPine; Becky Riley–Lower River Road Neighborhood Association; Applicants for General At-Large Board Position (see agenda item 3 for names)

1. OPENING: Ralston called the meeting to order at 11:04 a.m.
2. CONSENT CALENDAR:

ACTION: MSP(Taylor/Monk)(unanimous) adoption of minutes of the January 9, 2007 board meeting and the expense reports through December 31, 2006.

3. APPOINTMENT OF AT-LARGE BOARD MEMBER: Carol Tannenbaum’s term as the general at-large board member expired this month. Applicants were solicited for appointment to this position, representing rural interests. The board decided at a previous meeting to give preference to applicants from Oakridge, in response to a request from the City of Cottage Grove that the LRAPA Board of Directors consider giving both the City of Cottage Grove and the City of Oakridge permanent seats on the board, rather than rotating the shared seat between the two cities every two years. The seat reverted to Cottage Grove this month, and Pat Patterson assumed the shared seat, replacing Glenn Fortune, who has held the shared seat for the past two years.

Board members reviewed the applications for this position at the January board meeting and subsequently used e-mail communications with agency director Merlyn Hough and board chair Faye Stewart to narrow the field for interview at this meeting. Six applicants were selected for interviews.

The applicants were asked to leave the room so that they could be brought in, one at a time, for interview by the board. Carpenter asked why that was done, because when he was interviewed by the board all of the applicants were present in the room during the interviews. Stewart explained that he and Hough felt that having all of the applicants present during the process could give an advantage to later interviewees because they would have the benefit of hearing the other applicants’ responses to the questions before having to answer those questions themselves. Stewart added that, once each applicant is finished with the interview process, that person would be free to sit in the audience and listen to the rest of the interviews and to hear the board’s discussion and decision-making process.

Carpenter suggested that, in the future, when applicants are notified to come in for an interview, they should be notified of the process. He said it is a fairness issue, because this is a public meeting, and these applicants are not being treated fairly by excluding them from a portion of the meeting. He said the board should either

hold the interviews in executive session or allow everyone to be present in a public meeting. The elected officials on the board each stated that such interviews done by their respective public bodies are generally not held in open session. Monk suggested that someone explain this exclusion to the applicants who were waiting in another room for their turn to interview. Stewart said he would do that when he went to bring the first applicant in to talk with the board.

Hough had handed out to the board a list of potential questions for them to use, along with a copy of the agency's Vision, Mission and Goals document. He said he had also given copies of the Vision, Mission and Goals document to the applicants. Stewart and Hough explained that the process they had devised was to allow each applicant two minutes at the beginning of the interview to speak about themselves, to add to what they had submitted with their application. That would be followed by five minutes of questions from board members. The questions would rotate among board members, around the table. He stated further that the interview would conclude after five minutes of questions by the board. Each interview would begin with a question from the next board member in the rotation at the end of the previous interview. Stewart said the board members should feel free to ask whatever questions they would like to ask; and if they do not have a question, they should feel free to pass.

Hough pointed out that, in looking at the statute, he discovered, and had legal counsel verify, that at-large board members are not allowed to vote for an at-large appointment. Therefore, although both Tannenbaum and Carpenter would be able to participate in the interviews and the board discussion, and to make their recommendations as to which of the applicants should be appointed, neither would be allowed to vote on the appointment. Several board members questioned this information, stating that this has never been the case before. Hough explained that when the at-large appointment has been made in the past, the person who previously held the position was already gone, and voting was not an issue. This is the first time that the incumbent has still been present at the time a new appointment is being made.

A. Applicant Interviews. Six people were interviewed by the board.

- (1) Stephen Dignam, Creswell, currently working for Lane Council of Governments as the manager of the economic development program, and a resident of Lane County since 1992.
- (2) Brian Forge, Cottage Grove (Saginaw), currently a small business owner, and a resident of Lane County for 60 years.
- (3) Glenn Fortune, Oakridge, currently an insurance agent in Oakridge, a city council member for seven years and a LRAPA board member for the past two years.
- (4) Don Hampton, Oakridge, retired, and currently Mayor of the city of Oakridge, and also a former LRAPA board member.
- (5) Jose Ortal, Blue River, experienced in administrative processes, human resources and diversity.
- (6) Mike Tayloe, Junction City, currently a practicing Certified Public Accountant with offices in Junction City and Springfield.

Stewart thanked all of the applicants for coming in to be interviewed by the board, stating that the board had a hard task ahead of them because all of the applicants were deserving of the board position.

B. Discussion.

Ralston said he believed the applicants should be asked to leave the room while the board discussed the interviews and made its decision regarding the appointment. Carpenter disagreed, stating that you either have an open meeting or you meet in executive session in which case everyone would need to leave. He noted that when he was interviewed and appointed, everyone stayed in the room during the board's deliberations. Monk agreed with Carpenter, stating that transparency and open process is critical. He said if any of the board members felt constrained from saying something, perhaps they just shouldn't say it. He said he didn't know what the process was going to be, but he wanted to put himself in position to make a motion as soon as the process was decided.

Stewart said he and Hough has spoken about process and that, in his opinion, the board should just go around the table and talk about what they've heard. He said the process he and Hough had talked about was to follow a ballot-type process, having each board members write down their top choice for appointment. He reminded the board that only seven board members would be voting. He said it might be necessary to vote more than once to narrow the field a bit before taking a final vote. He said he would be happy to entertain suggestions from the board members regarding process.

Ralston suggested using a process which has been used before by this board, with the board members writing down several names, then compiling a list of vote. He said that process would at least narrow the field and may even result in a clear winner.

Monk said he was in the audience when Carpenter was appointed and that it was like a straw poll on the first vote, and then the board members were asked to vote for their top choice on the second vote.

Stewart said that process would be fine with him. He suggested voting for the top two choices on the first vote and then going from there.

Patterson said he would prefer to discuss the applicants and interviews in executive session. Stewart said that executive session was not included in the agenda and there was, therefore, no prior notice given to the public.

Johnson asked what the other governing bodies do if they are filling a city council seat, or something like that. Ralston said the Springfield City Council appoints a lot of people to various commissions and committees, and the applicants are not in the room when the council discusses it. He said he does not care whether it is done in open session or executive session. Ralston suggested just doing a strawman vote to see where the decision stands after that vote.

Stewart agreed and said he would like to go around the table and learn from each board member if they want to vote first for their top two choices or for just their top choice.

Monk said he favored writing down the top two choices. Monk commented that the board is very fortunate to have gotten the quality of people that applied for this appointment. He said it is most critical, to him, that the at-large board member represent a rural Lane County perspective. He said he also has great concern that, if one of the candidates from Oakridge is appointed to this position, when the appointment expires in two years, will that individual resign the seat or say they're representing the rural perspective and that they want to be reappointed, even as Cottage Grove is passing the shared seat back to Oakridge. He said the idea of Oakridge having two elected officials on the board is very

problematic for him. He said he thinks that it is appropriate for the two jurisdictions to trade off, given their populations, and that it has worked well. Monk then asked, if Fortune were to be selected for this at-large board position and then in two years the shared Cottage Grove/Oakridge seat reverts back to Oakridge, how should the board deal with the city of Oakridge taking over the shared seat and also having an Oakridge City Councilor occupying the at-large board position.

Stewart addressed that by saying it is his understanding that the at-large position is a two-year position and that it coincides with the two years that the sitting individual serves in the shared seat. He said it could be the understanding of this board that if one of the Oakridge representatives gets appointed now, there is no guarantee that that individual will automatically be reappointed in two years. The board may require that the same type of application and interview process be followed for this particular appointment when the two-year term expires.

Monk said his understanding has been that when someone has served and they want to be reappointed, generally they have been. He said he understood and agreed completely, that today's vote would not bind a future board.

Patterson said he wanted to encourage the people who have applied for this position, and do not get appointed to the board, to apply for the LRAPA Advisory Committee.

Johnson said the discussions at this meeting had been very informative for him and given him perspective on what the board has been doing and how it could be done better. He agreed that the applicants were well-qualified and also agreed that the rural perspective is important. Johnson said he agreed with Monk, that both Hampton and Fortune have already had the opportunity to serve on this board as elected officials from Oakridge, and Johnson supported getting someone outside of Oakridge for the rural perspective.

Koenig said he was torn between opening it up to new people who are from the rural areas but not having experience on the board, and appointing one of the Oakridge applicants, who do have experience with LRAPA. He said he was leaning more toward appointing one of the Oakridge applicants because they would require a shorter learning curve regarding what the board and the agency do.

Taylor agreed that there were some very good candidates from which to choose, adding that she thought everyone who applied is from a rural area. She said the board has discussed dealing with Cottage Grove and Oakridge and the fact that the board would like to see both of them on the LRAPA board permanently. Taylor said she thinks Oakridge really is rural. She does not see it as a big city. The board stated that there may be a preference to appoint someone from Oakridge, and that would be a perfect fit. Taylor said it might step the board into the next set of processes that get into looking at legislative issues of how the board should be expanded. Taylor said she has been on this board with both Hampton and Fortune, and she thinks it would be a good idea to let Hampton have a turn now. She said she likes his ideas, that he is very knowledgeable about what has happened in the past and has good ideas about how to prevent problems.

Ralston said that Fortune's current experience on the LRAPA board and his knowledge of the process would make him a perfect fit for appointment to the board. He said he thought board members should vote for one person, and if it comes out to be a tie, another vote would be taken.

Stewart said he was also torn, because he thought all of the candidates would add something to this board. He said he is a little concerned about the new PM standards and the position that it put Oakridge in, from the standpoint that LRAPA will be spending some energy in Oakridge trying to get that community to meet the requirements. Stewart said he felt that it might be better to have someone from Oakridge on the board, to get through that hump over the next couple of years. He noted that both of the applicants from Oakridge have experience on this board and that they could help LRAPA get through that. At the same time, the other candidates are from rural areas and could lend that perspective to the board's deliberations. He said he, too, was leaning toward appointment of one of the candidates from Oakridge.

Tannenbaum said she had been on the board for six years in the position to which the board intended to appoint one of the candidates today. She said at the time she was interviewed, there was very little interest in being on this board and very little knowledge out in the community about the board. Tannenbaum said she is impressed that LRAPA is much more well-known now, and that there are so many very talented and interested people that want to be a part of it. She said she has had a rural perspective on the board, and she would like to see this position continue to have that perspective. She went on to say that Oakridge is currently in compliance with the PM2.5 standard but that the standard has changed, and Oakridge might no longer be in compliance as a result of that change. She said she thinks it is the challenge of this board to see that Oakridge does not go out of compliance and, from that perspective, she would encourage the board to appoint one of the applicants from Oakridge to the at-large position on the board.

Carpenter said he, too, was glad to have candidates who are so well qualified, and picking one for appointment would be a difficult task. He also agreed that the PM2.5 issue in Oakridge will be a key item for LRAPA in the next two years. However, Carpenter said he does not necessarily see Oakridge or Cottage Grove as being rural in nature and he is concerned about appointing an administrator from either of those two cities to the board to represent rural interests. On the other hand, he said, most of the candidates have occupations that you see in metropolitan areas, rather than what would be deemed rural occupations. Carpenter said he would not make a specific recommendation as to which applicant should be appointed.

C. ACTION.

Monk MOVED that board members select their top two candidates in the first round of votes. Koenig SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED, by a vote of Five (Johnson/Koenig/Monk/Taylor/Stewart) in favor; to Two (Patterson/Ralston) in opposition.

At the end of the first round of votes, in which each board members wrote his or her two top choices on a piece of paper and handed the votes in to Hough for tallying, the field was narrowed to three candidates: Brian Forge, Glenn Fortune and Don Hampton.

Stewart then asked board members to write down the name of their top choice of the three remaining candidates and hand the votes to Hough for tallying. The result was that Glenn Fortune had four votes, and the others had fewer than four.

MOTION: Ralston then MOVED to appoint Glenn Fortune to a two-year term in the at-large position on the LRAPA Board of Directors. Patterson SECONDED THE MOTION.

Discussion of Motion. Monk again expressed his concern, stating that the current board cannot bind a future board but should recommend to a future board how to address the issue of how to handle this situation when Cottage Grove relinquishes the shared seat to Oakridge in two years, and how to avoid having two representatives from Oakridge on the board.

Ralston said he believes that situation will resolve itself because in two years Patterson will leave the board and Fortune will likely once again become the representative from the city of Oakridge. The board will then need to take another direction with the at-large position. The strategic planning which is to be done in the next few months will determine the direction the agency is to take, and the board will have the next two years to think about how to handle the at-large position when the seat becomes available again in February of 2009.

Monk said he does not believe that Fortune would necessarily become the representative from Oakridge. He said he does not know how council members in Oakridge are appointed to other boards and committees, but in Eugene the mayor nominates the individual for appointment and the council votes on the appointment.

Stewart commented that the board did decide to have the second at-large position represent the city of Springfield; however, that does not mean that when Carpenter's two-year appointment expires, he or any other Springfield resident will necessarily be appointed to that position. By that time, the city of Springfield might have the population to warrant a second dedicated Springfield position on the board, making the second at-large seat unnecessary. Stewart said he is confident that the board will make that decision two years from now as to what type of representation will be important on this board.

Johnson said his concerns were that the at-large position not be used as something to keep Oakridge and Cottage Grove in permanent positions on the board, and that the board not lose the opportunity to get people who are not elected officials to participate in this agency. He said that getting citizens involved and participating keeps this agency well represented throughout the county, and he would like to see the board avoid getting locked into existing members and not expand and reach out.

Taylor said it had occurred to her that the board should have thought previously about whether or not the at-large person could be an elected official. Both Monk and Ralston indicated that the statute allows it. Taylor said she meant whether or the board wanted the position to be filled by an elected official; that if the board wants more participation from people who are not elected officials, they should not fill the at-large position with an elected official.

THE MOTION PASSED by a vote of Four (Koenig/Patterson/Ralston/Stewart) in favor; to three (Johnson/Monk/Taylor) in opposition.

Following the vote, Stewart took a few minutes to present Tannenbaum with a plaque which read, "Presented to Carol Tannenbaum by the Lane Regional Air Protection Agency, in recognition and appreciation of your leadership and service in promoting the role of local government in Lane County's air quality program." He noted that Tannenbaum served as an at-large board member from 2000 to 2006, serving as vice-chair in 2001 and chair in 2002. Stewart thanked Tannenbaum for being a part of the board and helping to move the agency forward.

Tannenbaum stepped down, and Fortune assumed the at-large seat at the table.

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

A. Comments Regarding An Item on Today's Agenda.

Russ Eldridge, 2125 Lakeview Drive, Eugene. Eldridge had two issues about which he wishes to address the board.

- (1) The first issue was fugitive dust from the sand and gravel operations in the area around Delta Highway in north Eugene. He said he spoke at the December meeting about this problem and had yet to hear anything from the agency in response to his comments. Eldridge asked if the regulations had been checked for compliance and, if so, what results were determined. He wanted to know if anyone had done anything about the complaint. He said he had checked on the Internet and found that there are standards set for cement plants. He said he also understands that LRAPA has the power to set and enforce regulations stricter than state and federal rules. He said he expected some response and some answers to his inquiry, and he was frustrated at not having heard anything back from LRAPA.

Stewart said he recalled having been contacted once or twice by Mr. Eldridge about this problem and that Stewart had the Public Works Department look into the complaint for the county. He said perhaps Hough could look into the situation and find out what has been done by LRAPA to address it. Hough said that the agency has received complaints from Mr. Eldridge and others on the different gravel operations in that vicinity and have responded to those complaints. The facilities in question are also inspected by LRAPA staff periodically. All of the facilities have permit conditions with which they must comply, and Hough said it might be best if Mr. Eldridge could come to the office and sit down with staff to discuss the various operations. Hough added that most of the companies in that area have at least once in the last few years been cited by LRAPA for violations, and LRAPA has asked them to take correction actions. In some cases civil penalties have been involved.

Hough explained further that this particular source category requires ongoing diligence to keep the fugitive dust down. They cannot just put on a piece of control equipment and then just stand back and watch it work. They must be responsive to changing weather conditions in order to prevent the dust problems. Hough said the companies generally do a fairly good job of that but there have been times when LRAPA has had to take enforcement actions against them.

Eldridge noted that it is not just a nuisance problem, but also a health problem because of the fine particulate matter. He spoke about health studies linking particulate matter to heart disease and strokes. He said he is concerned, because if this particulate is laying all over patio tables and cars, it must also be going into people's lungs. He asked that the board not forget about this issue and said he would like to see what is being done about it.

Ralston asked Hough to prepare a report for the board regarding the sand and gravel situation in the north Eugene area that Eldridge spoke about. He said he would like to know the scope of the problem, the distance between the homes and the gravel operations, if the source of the fugitive dust is the operations or the truck traffic, whether LRAPA regulates the companies, and what the possible corrections of the situation might be. Johnson added that he would like information regarding enforcing stricter rules than what is currently on the books.

Carpenter asked Eldridge to clarify for him a factual issue from his comments at the board's December meeting. He asked if Eldridge had said the pollution was coming in at 7:00 p.m. in the evening or 7:00 a.m. in the morning, because the board had talked about amending the minutes of that meeting regarding that fact. Eldridge said he saw that mentioned in the January minutes. He said he couldn't tell the board exactly when the pollution is deposited; however, many evenings in the summer, at about 7:00 p.m., you can hear them crank up the grinders in the evening. When you get up in the morning, the fine particulate debris is all over your patio table, your car and the siding on your house again. Carpenter then asked Hough, if there are fugitive dust emissions that are controlled by opacity, is there a limit to the operations taking place in the night time, where the opacity cannot be measured, if they do not have in-stream opacity meters. Hough said there are techniques for reading opacity measurements at night, with back lighting. If the work area is lit, opacity would be obvious, whether it was day or night. Carpenter asked if LRAPA field staff could take night opacity readings of this situation, and Hough replied that that is not normally done. He said he does not believe that LRAPA has responded to that area during night-time hours, and he does not think that the complaints received are that specific about certain sources being a problem. Carpenter pointed out that Eldridge had a major problem with fallout on his patio after having cleaned it off the previous day. Hough said there have been other complaints. He noted that September is probably the time of year that most complaints of this nature come in to LRAPA, and there are sources other than sand and gravel companies that create dust problems at that time of year. There is more agricultural tilling done at that time of year in the Coburg area north of the housing area that Eldridge is talking about. It is also more difficult for the sand and gravel companies to keep their yards watered and control the dust. The higher levels of fine particulate happen during the November to February home wood heating season, but that is a finer particulate than the dust particles seen in the summer months.

Johnson said he was impressed with the amount of research Eldridge had done in bringing this information to the board. He commented that the LRAPA board has the authority to enforce source category-specific rules that are more stringent than the state or the federal governments' rules. Johnson said part of the value of having a local air agency is being able to deal with these types of problems with specific solutions. He said he thinks the LRAPA board is here to serve the people of Lane County when they come forward with specific air quality problems, and that the burden is on the LRAPA board to take action to resolve that problem rather than putting the burden on the person to prove that there is a problem. Johnson asked Eldridge if he had found it difficult to get information from LRAPA, and what could be done to make it easier on him and his neighbors to participate with LRAPA. Eldridge said the first time he called he got a standard answer about fugitive dust from the grounds of the sand and gravel companies, but he does not think that is the issue. The second time, he came to the board in December and everyone listened politely, but he has not seen anything to suggest that there has been an investigation of the problem. He said if someone from LRAPA went out there at noon and they were grinding and the dust bags were doing what they were supposed to be doing, and everything was fine, then they would be running in compliance. But if someone from LRAPA went out there at night, it might be different. Eldridge commented that if he were out of compliance he would do a lot of night grinding because LRAPA would not be out there at night.

Taylor said she thinks that all of the complaints have merit and that the board should not only get a report back from Hough about what has happened, but something should happen. She said if there are violations, then the agency should be doing something about them and then telling the

board what was done. It is not up to the board members, themselves, to do something, but the board should direct the staff to do something

- (2) The second issue Eldridge brought up was the process for the at-large appointment at this meeting. He said he had applied for the position but was called a couple of hours after he turned in to the office and told that he was not eligible because a Eugene resident could not be appointed to this position. He said the form indicated that preference would be given to a resident of a rural area of the county and that, to him, "preference" means all other things being equal we will do this. If the intent was that no application would be accepted from Eugene or Springfield, that should have been clarified on the application and in the notice that was published. Eldridge said the fact that a person is a resident of a city does not mean that the individual is a lackey to the politicians of that city. He asked if the LRAPA Advisory Committee or the public had any input into this process. He also said he was embarrassed by the board's lack of preparation and the way the interviews and appointment were accomplished, and that all of the applicants should have been asked the same questions. Eldridge said he thought the process should have been worked out ahead of time and that the way this was done at this meeting put people in an untenable position. Lastly, Eldridge commented that the board asked those who were not appointed to the board if they would like to be on the advisory committee. He asked what the advisory committee does and if they have any input as to the applicants or how the applicants are selected. He commented that it is all done before the public input gets on the agenda. He said there are some things this board could do better and thanked the board for its time.

Ralston said the board decided to give preference to someone from a rural area, and there was no way to know how many people, in all, might apply. Several of the people who submitted applications live within either Eugene or Springfield, and neither of those jurisdictions is technically allowed to have another position on this board. Consequently, Ralston said, he felt the recruitment followed the rules.

Monk said he was embarrassed and ashamed that a member of the community had to come and explain to the board what the statute says. He said he believed there was an incorrect reading of the statute, that another Eugene resident could not be appointed, and he encouraged Hough to clarify it. He said he thought the Eugene and Springfield applications should have been in the pool, because he had a very different reading of the statute. Monk commented, further, that having someone from the public come in and tell the board the kinds of things it can do as a body makes him think that some board members do not realize what the parameters of the Lane Regional Air Protection Agency are about. He said the board needs to listen to what was just said, because he thought the process was not good and should have been decided beforehand. He thanked Eldridge for pointing that out. Monk said the board should be fully aware and not mis-speak themselves and mis-represent what the board has the authority and capacity to do.

Taylor said she thought Eldridge's complaint was legitimate. If the board was not accepting applications from people inside the cities, that should have been made clear. And if that is not legal to do, then the board should accept all applications. The board could still give preference, but not accepting an application is wrong unless there are legal grounds for not accepting it. She said his complaint about the way the questioning was done at this meeting was also legitimate, because the questions and process should have been worked out prior to the meeting. She agreed that each person should have been asked the same questions, and probably by the same person.

Stewart thanked Eldridge for coming to the meeting and said the agency will report back on the situation in his neighborhood. If the companies are not complying with regulations, staff will address that. He also apologized for the process for the at-large position appointment. He said board members were sent questions and were asked if they also wanted to formulate their own questions. The process was discussed at the beginning of the meeting, and he thought everyone agreed as to how the board would go through the questioning process. He explained that something said during the applicant's introductory comments sometimes triggers a specific question from a board member. Stewart again apologized if the process was not comfortable, but he said he has been a part of a lot of interview processes at the county and they do not always ask the same questions of all applicants. He added that he will try to do a better job of developing the process for any future interview process or appointment process that the board might need to do.

- B. Comments Regarding An Issue Not on Today's Agenda. None.
5. DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Discussion included several items.
- A. Shortage of Pellets for Pellet Stoves. Koenig asked if the current shortage of pellets for pellet stoves could be affecting the results of air monitoring in Oakridge. Fortune said he understood that a large pellet manufacturing facility in Canada burned down, creating the shortage.
 - B. Oakridge Air Monitoring Site. Patterson brought up the location of the air monitoring site in Oakridge, which had been referred to by Hampton during his interview earlier in the meeting. Hampton had said he disagrees with the location of LRAPA's air monitoring site in Oakridge, and that it was his understanding that the PM2.5 monitoring was supposed to be done in the average areas of Oakridge, but the station is at the site that was established for PM10 monitoring which was supposed to be in the worst area of the town. He said he thinks air quality in Oakridge looks worse than some other towns because the monitor is still in their worst area of town rather in an average area of town.

Patterson said he has always questioned whether the equipment is in the proper location. He said he understood that DEQ had decided where the station was to be located, and he asked if DEQ had asked for any input from LRAPA in that regard. Hough explained that both federal EPA and state DEQ siting criteria require that the station be located in the area of maximum impact, which is where the Oakridge monitoring station is located. He added that LRAPA has done surveys in the Oakridge area with the Airmetrics Minivol, to confirm that the equipment is located in the area of peak PM2.5 impact. Monk commented that Hampton had said the equipment was not located in the right area. Hough explained that Hampton was expressing his understanding that at one point in the process, PM2.5 was intended to be an average in an urban area. Hough said he remembers that discussion in the past, and his understanding is that LRAPA is required to compare compliance in the area, based on a worst-impact monitor, and that it may have to do with calculation of the annual average. He said he can explore that further.

Fortune said he drives through town to work and, when he turns around to look back to the west, he can see that the air quality is worst in the area around the monitoring station. He added that the smoke, as well as the river fog that is generated early in the morning, is probably located within less than an eighth of the whole area of town. The rest of the town is clean, but the city is being judged every day by that one small area of town. He said it would be nice if it could be measured differently, because that one small area of town is not reflective of air quality in Oakridge, generally. Johnson asked if there are

people living in the area where the monitoring station is located and, if so, how many, and Fortune said there are some people living there, probably at least 50 homes. Ralston noted that there are also a lot of people living in the outlying areas, which might be where some of the smoke is coming from. Fortune said he does not think Westfir affects Oakridge air quality, but there might be some residences just west of town that do affect it. Fortune added that people living in the area around the monitoring station do not complain about the air quality. Stewart asked if, when LRAPA was asked to remove the monitoring equipment from the Coburg site, it was place elsewhere and, if not, whether that equipment could be located in another area of Oakridge. Hough said that might be possible, although staff has been in discussions with people in Florence about establishing a monitoring station in the Florence area, where LRAPA has not previously monitored the air. Hough said it may be time to do another Minivol survey which would establish several temporary sites to characterize the area.

There was more discussion about the Oakridge monitoring site, and the board asked Hough to bring back to them a report including what it would cost to establish and run a second, seasonal, site in Oakridge, and what it would cost to do a study using the Minivol samplers.

6. ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

- A. Committee Activity Report. Ayers reported that the committee talked about membership at its last meeting. He said that sometimes, in the past, the committee has reviewed the applications which have been submitted for appointments to the committee, decided which of them committee members would recommend for appointment, and made that recommendation to the board. That did not happen this time; however, committee members did comment on applicants whom they knew, and those comments were provided in the meeting notes. Ayers said some members suggested emphasizing the need for representatives with experience in the area of interest to be represented, as well as air quality knowledge and experience in general. There are several vacancies to be filled, including one agricultural representative, one ACDP industry representative, one general public person who was in recycling and one general public person who manages the Metro Wastewater Plant.
- B. Appointment of Committee Members. There were eleven applications for committee appointments, and two of the applicants for the at-large board appointment, Brian Forge and Stephen Dignam, had indicated they were interested in being appointed to the advisory committee if they were not appointed to the board. Ayers was the only person whose term had expired who had applied for reappointment to the committee. Ralston asked if the committee members felt that any of the applicants fit into the categories that need to be filled. Ayers replied that Stephen Dignam came closest to fitting into the agriculture category because he has a five-acre filbert orchard, although his income is from his work for LCOG.

In response to questions, Ayers noted that there are currently thirteen members on the committee, of which five positions need to be either reappointed or filled with new applicants at this time. The maximum number of people who can serve on the committee is fifteen. There was some discussion about whether enough appointments should be made to reach the maximum number of fifteen, with some board members believing that a larger committee could result in problems getting a quorum for meetings and others believing that having the maximum number of members on the committee provides a broader spectrum of ideas and experience.

MOTION: Ralston MOVED to reappoint Ayers to the board, representing Title V industry, appoint Stephen Dignam to represent agricultural interests, and then have each board member vote for five additional appointees from the list of applicants, from which the top three vote-getters would be appointed. Patterson SECONDED THE MOTION.

Discussion of motion. Monk pointed out that Lorena Young was on the committee since 1992 and was considered to represent the general public even though she was employed by Weyerhaeuser. In addition, Russ Ayers has been on the committee since 2000, representing Title V industry, and his term expired seven months ago. There is a candidate among the new applicants who works for SierraPine which is also a Title V source. He suggested that the board consider new appointments to get a new perspective, adding that SierraPine would probably like to have a representative on the committee, and it might not be appropriate to have two Title V representatives on the committee. He said he would oppose the motion based on that perspective.

Carpenter said he, too, would oppose the motion because all of the applicants should be given equal stead. He said he also had an issue with someone who owns a five-acre filbert orchard but makes his living at something entirely different being a viable agricultural interest representative.

Johnson said the committee bylaws say that someone needs to know how agriculture impacts air quality. He said there are two consultants in the group of applicants, both of whom appear to be highly qualified air quality engineers and, being consultants, would probably have a better understanding of how agricultural practices would impact air quality. He said he, too, would oppose the motion.

VOTE ON MOTION: The MOTION FAILED with four members (Fortune/Koenig/Ralston/Patterson) in favor and five members (Carpenter/Johnson/Monk/Taylor/Stewart) in opposition.

There was some discussion of the process by which the appointments were to be made. Stewart asked if board members wanted a small committee of one board member, one advisory committee member, and Hough to interview all of the applicants and make a recommendation to the board at the next meeting, or if they wanted to just move forward with the appointments at this meeting. Several board members said they had read all the applications and were fine with making appointments at this meeting. It was decided to fill six positions at this time, bringing the number of members to fourteen, and then to recruit someone from the agricultural community to represent agricultural interests on the committee, bring the total number of members to the maximum allowable number, fifteen.

MOTION: Carpenter MOVED to have each board member vote for five of the applicants, including Stephen Dignam and Brian Forge from the list applicants for the at-large board position, with the ultimate goal of appointing six applicants from those who receive the most votes, to fill the positions representing industry and the general public. The seventh position, representing agriculture, would be recruited for later appointment. Monk SECONDED THE MOTION.

VOTE ON MOTION: The MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE.

Board members then wrote down their top five choices and handed the vote slips to Hough for tallying. The results of that vote were: Brian Forge and Amy Peccia with seven votes each; Russ Ayers, Hugh

Larkin and Marilyn Lowe with four votes each; and the remainder of the applicants receiving fewer than four votes.

MOTION: Taylor MOVED to appoint the top five applicants, including Ayers, Forge, Larkin, Lowe and Peccia. MONK SECONDED THE MOTION.

VOTE ON MOTION: The MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE. Russ Ayers, Brian Forge, Hugh Larkin, Marilyn Lowe and Amy Peccia were appointed to three-year terms on the LRAPA Advisory Committee.

7. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO LRAPA'S PUBLIC CONTRACTING (PROCUREMENT) RULES: Hough updated the board regarding the proposal to adopt new public contracting rules, reminding board members that public hearing on this proposal is scheduled before the board at its meeting on March 8. The information Hough provided at this time was in response to questions raised by board members at a previous meeting. First, findings which have to do with the discretionary items that are part of the contracting rules, are available to be reviewed during the public notice period prior to the hearing. Second, Carpenter had raised the question of whether these new rules would totally negate the state's model rules. Hough said legal counsel has concluded that the intent of the proposed rules is that, if the rule is ever silent on a particular question, the model rules would apply. Hough said that point could be emphasized in the rule if the board would like it to be made more clear. Third, Monk had asked about the typical contract amount involving Airmetrics, which is included in the discretionary items in the rules. Hough reported that staff had gone through the financial records and had found that pumps and circuit boards are the two biggest-priced items purchased for the samplers. When multiplied by the 500 units that were sold in Airmetrics' biggest sales year, those two items could cost several hundred thousand dollars. Hough explained that Airmetrics does not typically purchase parts in such large quantities. The biggest invoice in the biggest year, to date, was for \$89,000, accumulative for a total year, for circuit boards. It would have cost about \$120,000 for that year, but Airmetrics switched vendors part-way through the year and paid less per circuit board to the new vendor. The total for that year for pumps was about \$70,000, for purchase of pumps from the same vendor throughout the year. Hough said those are the biggest numbers, and all of the other parts cost less. He said the intent of the rules is to accumulate the total 12-month purchases for comparison to the contract amounts, so that there is no question of trying to circumvent the amount in the rules by doing them in batches. Airmetrics typically orders these parts on a quarterly basis.

Hough said that if board members feel strongly that legal counsel Jill Bruce should attend the March 8 board meeting to answer questions, he would invite her to attend. If board members have further questions that can get answered in preparation for the March meeting, it might not be necessary to pay the cost of having legal counsel attend that meeting.

Ralston said he did not feel it is necessary to have legal counsel at the March board meeting. Monk said it depended on what questions were being asked. He questioned whether the board would have time at the March 8 meeting to have this item on the agenda. He noted that today's meeting has taken longer than expected, and he thought there was too much on the agenda. Monk said he just does not like to see too much on an agenda resulting in the board being forced into a position of not being able to give sufficient time to the issues. He noted that other board members did not seem to share his concern.

Hough commented that the March meeting will be an extended meeting, but with a little different focus than what was originally planned. Rather than wrapping up the strategic planning, staff plans to have briefings at the March meeting. He said he would give the board more details of his proposed plan for completing the strategic planning in a later agenda item at this meeting.

Stewart asked board members to review the information in the staff report and get questions to Hough as soon as possible so that he can discuss them with legal counsel before the March 8 board meeting. He added that he and Hough planned to meet a week prior to the March 8 board meeting, hopefully with Vice-Chair Koenig, and review any questions Hough has received by that time. They will try to determine whether there are any questions or concerns that will require legal counsel to be present at the board meeting.

Johnson said he planned to make a point of reviewing these rules very thoroughly because he sees the rules as being really critical, and thorough review is part of the board's responsibility. He asked if that was a correct assessment of the situation, in light of the board's financial responsibilities described by the auditor [*As a courtesy to the auditor, Stewart has rearranged the agenda to allow him to give his report of the FY 2005/06 financial audit report earlier in the meeting. See discussion below.*] Stewart said this is one of several sets of procurement rules that he has been involved with, to make sure that the government body's procurement rules are adjusted to comply with the state's recently adopted rules. He said a lot of it is standard, more-or-less boilerplate, and Hough confirmed that, stating that Jill Bruce prepared the draft rules for LRAPA working from a template that her firm has used with other local governments. Mirhosseyni added that the section of exceptions to the rules was customized for this agency and that entities such as the city of Eugene or the city of Portland have much more extensive exceptions. Johnson said it would be helpful for him to see a comparison of LRAPA's exceptions with exceptions of other government entities, just to put LRAPA's rule into perspective. He asked if Mirhosseyni knew how LRAPA's exceptions section compares to other public agencies, and Mirhosseyni said the only thing LRAPA really has is Airmetrics. Other government entities have similar projects which they qualify as exceptions. LRAPA has qualified the Airmetrics program.

There was no further discussion.

8. PRESENTATION OF FINANCIAL AUDIT REPORT FOR FY05/06 (PAUL NEILSON): Neilson distributed copies of the draft audit report to board members. He said the organizational chart included in the report was the only version they had in their office at the time this report was prepared and that there are some names on that chart that are not correct for this time period. That will need to be corrected. He noted that he also needs to change the name of the agency to Lane Regional Air Protection Agency to reflect the name change. He then briefly reviewed the sections of the report, noting that his report to the board is required because of what happened with ENRON and that next year there will be some new requirements. They will not affect the report, but there will be new procedures that will have to be done in the audit process.

Neilson reviewed the responsibilities of the agency's management and the auditor's responsibilities. He explained that the auditors do not account for every nickel and dime spent by the agency. They test the records, maintain an understanding of internal controls, obtain written representations that the statements are accurate, and provide an opinion that the financial statements are free of material misstatement. Materiality means that, while there might be mistakes somewhere in the records, they are below the level at which such a mistake would affect the users of the statements.

Neilson said there are estimates in the financial statement, the biggest of which is now depreciation. All needed adjustments were made, and he did not think there are any past adjustments. The back of the audit report includes some other information that is not required by governmental accounting standards but is required by the state of Oregon. Neilson said the auditors have no disagreements with management and that there was no evidence of opinion shopping during the period covered by this audit. There were no issues that would cause Neilson's accounting firm to not want to be retained by LRAPA. Neilson said the auditors experienced no problems with the audit process, and he added that Mirhosseyni did an admirable job with the audit this year even though he was not with LRAPA during the audited period. He said Sharon Banks was present for a small portion of the audit process, but Mirhosseyni pretty much took care of the whole thing and did a very good job.

Regarding the agency's cash reserve, Neilson repeated what he has said in previous years, that the agency should have about three to six months' worth of operating funds on hand. At the end of FY 2004/05, the agency was down to a balance of just two days. For FY 2005/06 that balance was up to 11 days.

The agency's major asset at this time is the accounts receivable on the Everybody Wins program leases. Neilson pointed out that that large asset is offset by the large debt for the same program, although the receivables are higher than the debt.

Neilson reported that FY 2005/06 was a very good year for the Airmetrics fund and, in fact, the budget had to be amended once during that year because sales were much higher than what was anticipated at the time the original budget was adopted.

Questions.

Monk asked what the threshold for materiality is for LRAPA. Neilson said he would have look it up and could report that back to Hough and Mirhosseyni so that they report back to the board.

Monk also asked for a basic explanation of qualitative and quantitative analyses.

Johnson asked if board members are supposed to look the audit report over and give Neilson comments, and Neilson said that was correct.

9. APPOINTMENT OF BUDGET OFFICER FOR FY 07/08:

ACTION: MSP(Taylor/Fortune)(unanimous) appointment of Nasser Mirhosseyni as budget officer for the FY 07/08 budget.

10. OLD BUSINESS: None.

11. NEW BUSINESS: None.

12. STRATEGIC PLANNING: Hough introduced Stan Biles, who will be facilitating the strategic planning process for LRAPA, describing Biles's background, including holding a number of positions with Lane County, one of which was in intergovernmental relations, where part of his responsibility was the county's working relationship with LRAPA. He also worked for the Oregon DEQ working with the Oregon Legislature. Stewart commented that he had worked with Biles two years ago, when Biles helped the Lane

County Board of Commissioners develop goals for Lane County, and was impressed with the work Biles did for that body. Biles stated that he also served as a member of the Olympia City Council and also as mayor of that city. He said that, when he says, "strategic planning," he means high level, board-appropriate decision making, rather than the day-to-day details of the agency's operations. He said the board should be looking at the agency's vision and mission, as they are currently written, and see if they want to make any changes; then review the goals and see if there are some goals that the board wants to change, some that they want to delete or other they may wish to add. The same thing should be done with the objectives. Biles said the key assumption is that it is at a high level, as the board looks at the future of this agency and the unity, that the board will be focusing on.

Biles described the plan which he and Hough had developed for LRAPA's strategic planning process, over the next few month, to culminate with a deliberation and decision-making session in June. He said that, in terms of developing the plan, there were four objectives that drove this proposal:

- A. How the process can provide the board comprehensive information in advance of their deliberations and decisions.
- B. How to provide the board members time to think about this before the actual board meeting in June, and to provide the flexibility for board members to talk to their colleagues, boards or councils, and constituents before making any decisions. The key is to provide the board with time to think about this information before making final decisions.
- C. To provide third-party professional facilitation of the board's deliberation and decision-making meeting. Biles said he will facilitate the June meeting and discussion.
- D. To complete the process by early June. This would include the board meeting early in June, as well as a debrief that he will have with Hough and the board chair, and whomever else would like to participate, so that the focus would be on implementation of any changes that the board has authorized through the process.

Biles described the monthly steps of the process:

- A. March. Staff will do briefings to the board on issues that are relevant to the June discussion, which could include trends that could be impacting the agency in the future and other specific issues. This is an opportunity for the board to hear from its professional staff in detail, and an opportunity for questions and answers on subjects that would be relevant to the kind of vision, mission and future goals discussion the board will have in June.

The board would also identify issues that they would like the advisory committee to think about and provide the board with advice or recommendations before the board goes into its deliberations in June. The advisory committee would begin its work on those issues in March.

The third piece of information that might be doable would be surveys of selected audiences about specific questions, with time to get the information back so that staff can tally the results and report back to the board in June. The target audiences would be determined by the board.

The objective is to allow the board to hear from their professional staff, their advisory committee, and anyone else that the board would wish to survey, in the community, and have that information available for the board prior to the June meeting, to allow time for board members to think about the information and bring their thoughts back to the discussion with their colleagues.

- B. April. The board has meetings scheduled with the budget committee in April and May. Biles said he and Hough thought that would be an appropriate time, if board members have issues or if there is budget information of an internal nature that would be good for the board to hear, to have those discussions with the budget committee. Those discussions could take place during both the April and May board meetings if necessary.
- C. May. Biles said he plans individuals interviews with each of the board members prior to the June meeting, probably in the first two weeks in May. He has a short list of questions which he will send to board members in advance of the interviews, to give them a chance to think about the questions before the interviews.

All of the information will begin to come together by this time. If there are any additional briefings to be done by professional staff, they would be done at the May board meeting. The survey results will be compiled and shared with the board in May. The advisory committee will have completed its work on the issues the board referred to them, and their comments would be presented to the board in May, in whatever format the board would prefer (oral or written).

Biles would get together with Hough and the board chair, at some point during May to discuss the logistics of the June meeting, which Biles called a "retreat."

- D. June. The board will have its "retreat" meeting and discuss all of the materials among themselves. Whatever direction and decisions the board comes to in June would be followed by a debrief, probably with Hough, the chair and possible the vice-chair. At that point the focus will shift to staff for implementation of whatever decisions the board has made.

Because all of the information will be presented to the board in May, they will have time to think about everything and be prepared to make decisions in June. Biles will also be present, as the third party, to facilitate that June meeting and help focus the discussions.

Biles said that was the plan which he and Hough had developed.

Hough referred to documents in the agenda packets for this meeting, including the goals and objectives document which was developed by the board, advisory committee, and staff over a year ago. He said that, unless the board had specific ideas to the contrary, he planned to use the first six objectives under the air quality goal as providing a framework for the briefings at the March meeting. For the survey, Hough said, he planned to use the document and ask people to help prioritize, with this structure in mind, to build on the document which already exists. He said he did not plan to invent a new survey or come up with entirely new issues. Hough stated that the last page of the attachments to the staff report for this agenda item is the short list of priorities and that it probably would take the agency through the next two or three years, focusing on a lot of high-priority work. Hough said his perspective is to try to build onto work that is already done, to try to do it as efficiently as possible but also get as much value out of the strategic thinking process as possible.

Discussion.

Carpenter noted that the board decided earlier to provide time at the beginning of the second meeting for public comment on something in draft form. He asked if Biles and Hough anticipated allowing the public to comment on any of the proposed discussions, and at what point that might be appropriate. Hough said that could be included as part of the survey process, which would be implemented during the March/April timeframe. Carpenter said he did not think a survey would meet that public input need because the survey would be done before a draft document was available. He said there should be a draft document before the plan is finalized, to give the public a chance to comment before the plan is completed. Hough said he was looking forward to getting public response to the existing document, particularly with respect to helping to prioritize the four goals. He said he would like to know how people would assign emphasis points to the four goals and objectives included with each goal, if they had a hundred emphasis points to distribute. Carpenter said a survey does not substitute, in his mind, for a public comment process, because some people may want to comment that didn't comment on your survey. He said the nature of a survey will always limit its use as a public comment tool.

Biles pointed out that the board has the option decide to what it wants the final document to be but then add a month or two to the process to put it out for public comment. There could be a subsequent meeting at which the board make a final decision on the draft, after reviewing comments received from the public.

Stewart noted that, at the last board meeting, there was some direction to build on what has already been done, but also some support for starting at the beginning. He said he likes the proposed approach because it is kind of a middle-ground approach. He said he also likes the idea to wait until the discussion in June to draft the document and then put it out for public comment after the June meeting. He stressed that the board will not know, until after its discussion in June, what the final outcome will be.

Monk said he never meant to imply that the board should start from scratch. He suggested that the board be provided the opportunity to add something to the framework that Biles and Hough were working on. He said the schedules looks good, especially having a public comment process and hearing at the end of the process. He added, however, that it might be difficult to attract people to a public hearing during the summer months.

Monk said he was not quite sure what the advisory committee would be asked to do in the process, whether the committee was to be asked to advise the board or if the board would just dump everything on them and have them distill it into something to bring back to the board. He said he did not like the idea of dumping everything on the committee. He suggested that, rather than dumping everything on the advisory committee, the board should form an ad-hoc committee on strategic planning, to include any board members who wish to participate, who would have the opportunity to meet with the advisory committee members. He asked Biles to specify what he is looking for from the advisory committee, because strategic planning is a board-driven process, and the value of the committee is that advises the board and provides expert opinions to the board. In addition, Monk said the board should be able to identify audiences next month well enough to be sure that everyone who wants to have a voice can do so.

Biles said he did not envision putting everything together and dumping it on the advisory committee. What he was thinking was that the board could direct specific questions or comments to the committee, to think about and work on and then come back to the board with their advice on those questions or comments, prior to June. He gave several examples. The board could ask the committee to provide comments regarding whether the committee would like to recommend changes to anything in the vision and mission statements

or the goals and, if so, why. Or perhaps the committee sees longer-term trends at work that might impact the agency significantly over the next few years, but that are not included in the existing list. There could be new rules and regulations coming down from EPA or DEQ that would affect LRAPA. There could be a looming financial issue for the agency and what it plans to do in the next few years, and that should be discussed during this process. Perhaps there could be growing air quality problems in Florence or Creswell, or significant population growth and non-point sources that will show up in this community or that community. The purpose of strategic planning is to look a little farther into the future.

Johnson said it would be helpful for him to know how much the goals and objectives and tasks cost, relative to each other. Biles said if the board would find that information helpful for the June discussions, staff should be directed to work on that. He added that, if there is something specific in the context of the budget, it would be appropriate to discuss that in April or May with the budget committee.

Biles said that, at the June meeting, he will be urging the board members to take the broader, higher-level view on issues because, if the board gets down into the details, it would take the rest of the year to get through it. However, there may be some short-term fiscal issues that require information for board review before they can handle the higher-level questions.

Stewart commented that the board has heard from the auditor for several years that the operating cash level at the end of the fiscal year is too low. He said he sees that issue as the kind of high-level issue the board needs to tackle, and that one of the long-term goals should be to build that fund to a more acceptable level.

Monk agreed, stating that the April meeting would be the time to tie revenues and the budget to program work. He agreed with Johnson, stating that without knowing the revenue picture, it would be difficult to know whether the agency has the resources to accomplish the goals. He suggested that board members get specific budget-related questions to staff in the next month, in preparation for the April meeting. Monk said he thinks it is critical that the board understand what the agency is mandated to do and where the money comes from for those activities. He said staff has been working to try to get additional funding from the state general fund, and there should be some understanding of what will need to be done to accomplish these goals if that does not happen.

Hough responded that staff works annually on its budget to be sure there will be enough funding to meet the immediate needs. The strategic planning activity attempts to look long-range and have a direction and a shared vision, and a commitment to that shared vision that does not get bogged down in the annual budget cycle discussions. The annual budget discussions should follow, once there is the update of the higher-level picture. Monk said he agreed completely, and that is why he thinks it is important to have the discussions and analyses about what the sources of revenue are and whether they are sufficient, as well as what it costs to accomplish the goals, and whether or not the amount LRAPA spends on its programs is in line with what DEQ spends to provide those same services.

Carpenter said he does not think it is necessarily the point to try to put in cost constraints. He said the purpose of strategic planning is to address the agency's vision, mission, and goals without cost constraints and to then prioritize what you have, based on available finances. He said restricting things immediately because, theoretically, it may be too expensive, is not what the strategic planning process is supposed to be about. The board should move ahead and develop the plan, without costs in mind, and then prioritize to meet whatever revenues are available. Monk said he did not want to restrict anything. He just wanted the board to recognize that the budget end of this is a critical component of it.

Johnson said he agreed with Carpenter, that it is important to look at the big picture; but he is the kind of person who needs to be grounded in the reality of what the financial constraints might be. He wants to look at the big picture, but in a realistic way.

Hough said part of the March briefing could be which things are mandatory and which are optional, as well as which funding is dedicated to certain types of categories and which is more flexible across the programs. Johnson agreed that that would be helpful.

Stewart noted that the board needed to tell Biles and Hough whether their proposed process plan is acceptable and whether they should move forward with this projected timeline. He said he knows that the plan is not cast in stone and that there will probably be some adjustments, but he wanted some direction from the board on that. Biles said he had taken a lot of notes during the board's discussion, and the plan will not be exactly as it is written in the staff report because it will incorporate the concerns raised and recommendations made by the board; however, he just wanted to know if he was headed in the right direction, toward a June retreat, and whether the board is comfortable with that.

MOTION: Ralston MOVED to go forward with the plan suggested by Biles and Hough. Patterson SECONDED THE MOTION.

Hough asked board member to get any concerns or any specific ideas, or matters that they feel are critical, to him as soon as possible, and he will fit those into the briefings to be arranged for the March board meeting.

VOTE: The MOTION PASSED on a vote of eight in favor and one abstention (Monk).

13. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:03 p.m. The next regular meeting of the LRAPA Board of Directors is scheduled for Thursday, March 8, 2007. The meeting will begin at 11:00 a.m., and is scheduled to run until approximately 3:00 p.m., in order to allow time for a strategic planning background briefings. Because the strategic planning discussion raises the potential for a larger crowd than usual, the meeting will once again be held in 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