

MINUTES
LANE REGIONAL AIR PROTECTION AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
THURSDAY–JUNE 7, 2007
Library Meeting Room
Springfield City Hall
225 5th Street, Springfield, Oregon

ATTENDANCE

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

Staff: Merlyn Hough–Director; Merrie Dinteman; Doug Erwin; Max Hueftle; Sandra Lopez; Sally Markos; Kim Metzler; Nasser Mirhosseyni; Stan Biles–Strategic Planning Facilitator

Other: Russ Ayers-Chair, and Amy Peccia–LRAPA Advisory Committee; Kevin Matthews, Vice-Chair–LRAPA Budget Committee; Mike Bucci–Kingsford; Terry Connolly–Eugene Chamber of Commerce

1. OPENING: Stewart called the meeting to order at 11:00 p.m.
2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:
 - A. Comments Regarding An Item on Today’s Agenda. None.
 - B. Comments Regarding An Issue Not on Today’s Agenda. None.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR:

ACTION: MSP(Ralston/Koenig) adoption of minutes of the May 3, 2007 board meeting, and the expense reports through April 30, 2007, as presented, by a vote of 8 in favor and one abstention (Taylor).

4. ADVISORY COMMITTEE: Markos reported that the committee had two major discussions at its last meeting.
 - A. LRAPA’s open burning rules. LRAPA’s meteorologist, Ralph Johnston, presented the proposed changes to the committee. The main subject of the subsequent discussion was about wood-burning patio heaters and how LRAPA should regulate them. Markos said LRAPA is proposing to treat the devices as recreational fires which would have to follow fire district rules and LRAPA’s burning advisory. In the wintertime, the home wood heating advisories would determine whether the devices could be used. A second topic of the discussion was the requirement that fires be out by sunset, and Markos said Johnston explained that fires allowed to continue to burn after sunset would smolder and create smoke problems for neighbors.

Ralston asked if Eugene currently allows use of the wood-burning patio heaters, and Markos said she did not believe Eugene allows them. The proposed provision in the LRAPA rule would apply to use of the devices in Springfield and inside the Eugene-Springfield Urban Growth Boundary.

Stewart commented that he had always thought that warming fires were allowed and were not regulated, and that the wood-burning patio heaters were used as warming fires. Hough responded that it is unclear in LRAPA’s current rules and that staff wants to clarify those types of recreational fires. He noted that LRAPA’s rules would apply only to air quality concerns and would be tied to burning advisories for

home wood heating and backyard burning; and that fire safety concerns, such as setbacks from structures or vegetation, are covered by fire district requirements.

Stewart asked how the rules address people who camp in county parts or areas outside of national forest lands. Hough responded that the current definition of "recreational fire" refers to campfires in designated campgrounds or parks specifically designed to accommodate such fires. He added that a strict interpretation of the current rules would categorize the patio heaters as open burning which would not be allowed in some parts of the county. Stewart said LRAPA should be thinking about posting information at stores that sell the devices, such as Costco and Jerry's and Home Depot, so that people who purchase them know what the restrictions are before they make a purchase. Carpenter agreed but suggested holding off on that until the board sees what the final rule will look like.

Carpenter noted that the LRAPA rule currently allows backyard burning on lots of one-half acre or larger within those areas and said he would like to know how many of those properties currently exist. Hough said he had discussed this with advisory committee member John Tamulonis several months ago, and that Tamulonis had said he could provide that information. Hough added that Tamulonis indicated his conclusion is that a lot of the larger parcels have disappeared as development has happened over time, and that a report will probably show a smaller number of lots of half an acre or larger in size than when LRAPA's rules were last revised.

Monk asked if the board will be able to see and comment on the proposed amendments to LRAPA's open burning rules. Hough said after presenting the draft proposal to the committee at its last meeting, staff is giving them some time to respond and comment, after which the proposal might be revised before going to the next step in the adoption process. Hough said staff hopes to have the proposed amendments before the board for public hearing and adoption in October, prior to the beginning of the next open burning season. The process is for the proposal to come to the board, probably at its August meeting, with a request for authorization of public hearing at the October meeting. The board will have the opportunity to see what the proposed changes are and, if board members do not agree with what is proposed, they may deny the request for authorization of hearing and require the rules proposal be revised and brought back to the board with another request for hearing. The board will know exactly what the proposal is, and will have opportunity to comment and provide input, before the public hearing takes place.

- B. LRAPA's Strategic Planning. Markos said staff provided a list of LRAPA's goals and objectives to the committee and asked them to prioritize the goals. The committee considered Goal 1, Air Quality to be of most importance, followed by Goal 2, Involvement, and Goal 3, Service. Goal 4, Partnerships, was ranked last by the committee. Some committee members felt that LRAPA needs to look at more public involvement regarding how the agency functions. They also felt a need to look more closely at the role of the advisory committee and its relationship to the board.
5. ACTION ITEM—PUBLIC HEARING ON LRAPA BUDGET FOR FY 2007/2008: Stewart asked Mirhosseyni to make a brief presentation prior to Stewart's opening the public hearing. Mirhosseyni first submitted into the record affidavit of publication of notice of today's public hearing in the *Eugene Register Guard* on May 27. He said that, as of 11:00 a.m. today, no comments or inquiries on the budget had been received by LRAPA. Mirhosseyni then reviewed the total requirements for the General Fund, Title V, the Airmetrics Enterprise fund and the Everybody Wins Program, for the total budget amount of \$6,487,513. He said it is a balanced budget which provides the requirements for LRAPA to continue to carry out the mission of the agency as it has been in the past. He said there were no additional changes or additions, with

the exception of the normal cost-of-living increase which was proposed by staff and approved by the budget committee.

Stewart asked if board members had any questions before he opened the public hearing.

Reimbursement to LRAPA of costs to establish Cascade Sierra Solutions. Johnson noted that when the board first discussed formation of Cascade Sierra Solutions a year ago, the board talked about making sure that any expenses incurred by LRAPA for that purpose be tracked and that those funds be reimbursed by Cascade Sierra Solutions once it was established. He asked if those costs and reimbursements were reflected in the proposed FY 07/08 budget document.

Hough said the most significant thing was initial funding for the trailer to house CSS's Coburg center, which was paid back to LRAPA within a few months after the purchase was made. Hough added that, since that transaction took place during the current fiscal year, it would not be reflected in future fiscal years, because the separation took place on January 31 of this year.

Johnson asked if all costs, including legal fees, had been reimbursed by CSS. Hough responded that any costs that LRAPA incurred were well within the budget for Everybody Wins and, in some cases, there were legal costs that were of dual benefit for LRAPA and CSS. Mirhosseyni added that any costs which LRAPA incurs in support of the Everybody Wins program qualify to receive tax credit at a rate of 25.5 percent. He added that it would benefit LRAPA to maintain some of those costs within its budget in support of the Everybody Wins Program. Mirhosseyni added that the tax credit comes to LRAPA and relates to any costs which can be qualified as part of LRAPA's program in support of CSS.

Johnson restated his original question. He said he recalled asking for an accounting of the startup costs which LRAPA incurred for CSS, because he did not recall that the board specifically budgeted anything for that. He said his understanding, at the time, was that LRAPA would contribute to the startup of CSS, with the expectation that, once Cascade Sierra Solutions was up and running, LRAPA would be reimbursed for all of those costs, including legal fees and other administrative costs, time of personnel, and any capital expenditures. Johnson asked if those expenditures had been tracked, and Mirhosseyni said they had been. Johnson asked Mirhosseyni to prepare an accounting of those costs and reimbursements to present to the board at its July 12, 2007 meeting.

Hough commented that the big costs were for the diesel manager, which overlapped with the finance manager replacement. He said the startup of CSS occurred approximately November 1, which was less than the six months which was budgeted in the current budget for the diesel manager position. He noted that, if you compare that with the budget, LRAPA actually had less costs related to the addition of CSS than were identified in the budget. Hough added that, when Sharon Banks left LRAPA's payroll, the agency settled the accrued vacation time that she had accumulated, but that expense was offset by the fact that she left LRAPA's payroll approximately two months earlier than what was budgeted. Hough said Banks's time was being paid by the EPA grant through the West Coast Collaborative for the two months before she actually left LRAPA and was spending the majority of her time on CSS business.

Monk noted that Hough had said that some of those expenses were budgeted into the Everybody Wins budget and program; however, it seems to him that CSS and Everybody Wins were, clearly, two separate things. Everybody Wins is still a part of LRAPA, while CSS is a separate entity. Monk said he is confused about how monies that were budgeted for Everybody Wins and used to initiate CSS were reimbursed, and that it seems to him that they should be. Hough said he understood Monk's comment; however, on the flip side of that,

LRAPA has received ongoing assistance from Sharon Banks and Angelique Dodaro, of CSS, on ongoing LRAPA grant projects, and that time had to be reimbursed by LRAPA. Hough said there have been mutual benefits in the transition, and his overall sense has been that LRAPA has actually benefitted more than any case could be made for shared costs that could have been paid only by CSS. He added that there will be no precise dollars associated with that mutual benefit.

Monk asked if Hough was saying that Banks and Dodaro have been working of Everybody Wins for LRAPA, and Hough said they have been helping with the ethanol grant, providing information to help with the continued administration of the Everybody Wins program, and helping with the administration of the School Bus USA program. Hough said staff will provide the requested tracking of costs, recognizing that he believes this has been in the financial interests of LRAPA because the people who established the existing transportation and fuel-related grant-funded programs have continued to help with administration of those programs.

Monk requested that the accounting prepared for the July 12 meeting include a narrative to explain Hough's sense of why this has been a benefit to LRAPA.

PUBLIC HEARING: There were no further questions from the board. Stewart opened the public hearing at 1:21 p.m. and asked if anyone present wished to speak for or against the proposed FY 2007/08 LRAPA budget. Hearing no response, Stewart closed the public hearing at 1:21 p.m.

****MOTION: Ralston MOVED to adopt the proposed budget document as proposed. Patterson SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Discussion of motion.

Monk noted that in the minutes of the May 3 budget committee meeting, on page 3 (third paragraph, second line), in the discussion of Everybody Wins and the amount of money paid to LCOG for its work on Phase II of the program, the minutes state that Mirhosseyni talked about \$80,000 in the current budget, with a total of \$190,000 for two years. He asked if it was supposed to be \$90,000 with a total of \$180,000. Mirhosseyni said the correct amount of \$90,000 for a total of \$180,000.

Monk asked for clarification of the monthly financial report in today's board packet. He said in the Everybody Wins budget, there are figures for the budgeted and actual EDT, and that the variance should represent the difference between the proposed budget and the actual amount expended to date. He noted that the grant revenue under Everybody Wins shows \$166,000 budget and \$107,000 actual, with a zero variance. He asked if that should actually be a variance of \$59,000. Mirhosseyni said that would be correct and apologized for the number in the report being incorrect. He also confirmed Monks' assumption that the same would be true of the total for that section of the report.

Koenig noted that early in the fiscal year it looks like there is a huge variance on almost every item in the report and asked if it would be more realistic to have a prorated budget for that period of time rather than the total budget. Mirhosseyni said he can do that if it is what the board wants to have. Mirhosseyni did point out, however, that at the top of the report there is a variance percentage which is acceptable at this point in the budget, which for the current report is 83 percent. That percentage can be compared to the far-right column which provides what is being spent currently. He said the comparison between the two is the point of the report, to indicate how each of those line items is performing over the course of the year.

Johnson noted that the board had a strategic planning discussion later on today's agenda. He asked, if the board adopted the budget as presented, and strategic planning resulted in a change in priorities, could the budget be amended to reflect the new priorities. Mirhosseyni said adoption of the budget would appropriate the funds for operation of the agency's programs for the coming fiscal year. Funding can be redirected or reallocated by the board, provided the changes do not result in more a 10 percent difference in the allocations to the individual categories in the adopted budget. He reminded the board that any change of more than 10 percent would require another public hearing. Patterson commented that it would be like an amendment to the budget or a supplemental budget, and Mirhosseyni confirmed that statement. Mirhosseyni said if the board were to decide to make changes, staff would define those changes and bring back a new proposed amended budget to the board. If the figures were within 10 percent of the original budget, no hearing would be necessary.

Monk pointed out that the adoption resolution included a \$70,000 transfer to the General Fund from Airmetrics. He noted that at the May 3 budget committee meeting, Mirhosseyni had said that \$70,000 is "the contribution in the form of allocations for general fund salaries for the work done for Airmetrics by LRAPA employees." Monk said he had understood that Airmetrics provides a financial benefit for LRAPA, but it looks like it is just a reimbursement. Mirhosseyni explained that it is both. To balance the budget, LRAPA must look into every available resource, and Airmetrics is one of those resources. He explained that, although \$70,000 is budgeted to the General Fund from Airmetrics, the costs which get reimbursed over the course of the year do not generally come up to that figure. For example, in the last fiscal year, only \$30,000 was reimbursed for staff labor time. The remaining \$40,000 was a cash contribution to the General Fund. Mirhosseyni said this year appears to be on roughly the same schedule. He said the reimbursement figure for the first eight months of the current fiscal year was about \$30,000. If that amount were prorated, the ending figure would not be \$70,000, and there would be a cash contribution at the end of the fiscal year. Monk said he still had a different opinion, and Mirhosseyni said he could provide Monk with the allocated costs so he could see what the costs are and compare it with the \$70,000 budgeted amount. Monk said he would contact Mirhosseyni and arrange to come to the office for a discussion of last year's budget.

Carpenter noted that the Airmetrics budget does not have a personnel expense associated with it like every other program does. He suggested that providing those figures in the budget would allow board members to clearly see what expense Airmetrics is using for personnel and what the cash contribution might end up being. Mirhosseyni said he could do that. The personnel costs are the labor costs involved in creating the MiniVols, and some general expenses are also included in the Airmetrics costs. He said those costs are allocated every month, and he can provide that information to the board so that they can track what percentage of the \$70,000 is attributed to LRAPA staff time. Johnson asked if all the labor is done by LRAPA employees, and Mirhosseyni said it is.

****ACTION: THE MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE.**

6. CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING: Stewart thanked each of the board members for taking the time to meet with Stan Biles, individually, to share their thoughts about LRAPA's strategic planning with him. He said he and Hough had a review session with Biles following the interviews and that Biles was quite positive with the results and very thankful that everyone met with him and contributed very positively toward the process.

Biles said the purpose for his meetings with board members was for him to hear what each person felt the issues are, and what they wanted to get out of today's session. He said the board members' comments were driving the agenda for this meeting. Biles said the purpose for this session was to try to come out with some

concrete ideas that could be used in a four-to-five-year time frame; but, pending discussions and what those items might be, there might be some things that surface out of this meeting that the board might want to get started with earlier than that. Biles stated the agenda for this discussion as:

Opening Remarks
Summary of Board Interviews
Review of LRAPA Successes
Vision/Mission/Goals/Priorities
The Advisory Committee Role and Process
The Board and the Budget
New Ideas
Next Steps
Closing Remarks

- A. Summary of Board Interviews. Biles noted that board members had shared information with him, but other board members had not heard those comments. He summarized the subjects which were brought up by the majority of board members so that board members can understand their colleagues' thinking. Biles said he had a list of questions which he asked each board member, but there were things that were brought up by board members that weren't on his list. He made note of those topics when he heard comments from four or more board members on the same topic. He said those were the things he wanted to share with the board at this time.
- (1) Comfort with LRAPA's existing vision, mission, goals, and priorities. Biles said no one indicated a desire to make any significant changes to the existing document. There might be some fine tuning, here and there, but the substance is acceptable to all board members. The document is recent, and nothing has really changed that much in the two years since the document was developed.
 - (2) Confidence and respect for staff integrity. Biles said that came up in the context of several different topics and was brought up by many of the board members. He said the fact that it was brought up spontaneously and was not prompted by him indicated that it is very genuine and sincere.
 - (3) LRAPA Successes. Biles said he usually has to pry information from boards or CEOs about success stories, but LRAPA board members quickly came up with success stories: victories, wins, progress that was being made. Biles said many of the board members also indicated that they are optimistic about the future of LRAPA and the need for LRAPA and advantages of having the local agency vs. the alternatives of DEQ or EPA.
 - (4) Concern about the LRAPA Advisory Committee, its role and who has the authority to assign tasks for them to work on. Biles said in the discussion today, he wanted the board to think not about how the committee has been in the past but, rather, how they want it to operate in the future.
 - (5) Consider new ways to accomplish LRAPA's goals. Biles said board members had communicated a lot of ideas to him about different approaches to use in various aspects of the agency's programs. Instead of the tradition process of adopting rules, enforcing rules, monitoring rules, handling appeals, levying fines, reporting progress, board members indicated a desire to turn to unique and innovative approaches to get to the same result.
 - (6) Concern about the potential impact on LRAPA if Lane County experiences large budget cuts. Biles said the interviews with board members culminated the day before the results of the ballot measure on the income tax for Lane County was announced, and Lane County funding was on everyone's minds.

- (7) A desire to become more confident of the board's understanding of the budget. Biles said he struggled with how to express this point at this meeting, and he said one of the board members had said their understanding of the budget was "fuzzy." He said understanding should not be fuzzy. An example of the "fuzziness" is the fact that, during the year, money can move from one area of the budget into another area of the budget in certain areas, but not in others. The restrictions on various resources are not well understood by board members. Biles said he did not get the sense from board members that this was a matter of wanting to micro-manage the budget but was, rather, a desire to gain a better understanding of how the budget works—how it comes together and how it is administered through the year.
- (8) Biles gave a direct quote from a board member to describe a point raised by the majority of board members: "During this meeting, let's identify a small number of things the entire board can get behind." He said much of this sentiment related to the topic of new ideas, about thinking of new ways of doing things to get to the desired end result. The end result isn't any different, but the strategies used could be outside of classic regulatory means.
- (9) Everyone indicated a desire to adjourn by 2:30 p.m. today.

Biles asked if there was anything on that list of topics that really surprised any of the board members and had the following responses.

Understanding the budget.

- Ralston said that the majority of the board members are elected officials who deal with budgets much more complex than LRAPA's. He said he sees nothing at all "fuzzy" about LRAPA's budget; and he suggested that if some board members do not understand it, they should get together with Mirhosseyni and Hough to get a basic crash course in how a budget works, rather than having the whole board spend time with that.
- Patterson agreed with Ralston but said he thinks there needs to be greater clarity about funding sources and the state of financial stability for the agency.
- Koenig said he is used to simpler budgets, and that the LRAPA budget contains separate grants that are out of phase with each other and not on the same time schedules. He said that could create some "fuzziness" to people trying to understand the budget.
- Stewart said he wanted to provide some clarity about Lane County's current financial situation. The county did receive a one-year reprieve by the federal government, but he does not want people to think the possibility of losing that Secure Rural Schools funding no longer exists. There is a real potential that the funding will not be received in the future and Stewart said he thinks LRAPA should keep that in mind as a potential problem a year from now, or two, or three years from now. Stewart said there was some hope that the Oregon Legislature would allocate some funding for road funds, to the counties; however, once the federal government granted the one-year reprieve, the state discussions were taken off the table and the money allocated elsewhere. In addition, with the Secure Rural Schools funding being tied on a national level to war funding, federal funding is probably not likely. Stewart suggested that the board begin thinking of new ideas to replace that money, or move forward without it, in the future.
- Johnson said he is one of the people on the board who does not have an understanding of the agency's budget, and what he has struggled with is, what are the options to deal with potential

shortfalls in various areas of the budget. He said he does not have a clear understanding of where changes can be made to the budget to tie in new ideas and creativity. He said it feels as though creativity is being constrained by the budget, and he would like to understand that better. Ralston commented that it is simple to understand if you remember that there are things that the agency is required to do in exchange for the money it receives. There is a finite amount of money in the budget, and the board can't just think up big new projects and come up with funding for them.

Johnson said that the agency has a number of revenue streams, such as Airmetrics, permit fees, grants, and state and federal dollars. He said if the board had a better understanding of how those funds are tied to specific activities, it would be easier to see whether LRAPA should try to increase funding from some of those sources. For instance, if there is a project that is benefitting a particular member community, perhaps the board should ask that community to contribute more funds to cover those costs. Of if more money is being spent of permitting and enforcement, perhaps permit fees should be raised. Johnson said if he could see the connections between income and activity costs, he would be more comfortable with the budget.

Biles commented that there would not be enough time for a big budget presentation or expanded discussion of the workings of the budget today; however, he said Hough had said that if the board is clear about where they would like to have more information, staff could arrange to follow up with individuals, or small groups of board members, to do a series of briefings, over time, to increase board members' understanding of the various aspects of the agency's budget.

B. LRAPA Success Stories. Biles asked board members to share their thoughts about the ways in which LRAPA has been successful, and board members began stating successes.

- (1) Wood-burning restrictions on woodstoves and fireplaces (Taylor)
- (2) LRAPA still exists as a viable organization (Patterson)
- (3) Within the last ten years, LRAPA bought its own office building (Taylor)
- (4) A competent director has been hired and is moving the agency forward (Stewart)
- (5) Everybody Wins Program (Fortune)
- (6) LRAPA's assistance in the birth of CSS (Koenig)
- (7) The Warm Homes/Clean Air Program in Oakridge (Stewart)
- (8) Working with businesses to warn them about what future regulations are coming out of Washington, D. C. (Patterson)
- (9) Significant improvement in the J. H. Baxter Situation (although that has a ways to go) (Koenig)
- (10) Increased public awareness of the agency (Johnson)
- (11) Promotion of alternative fuels (Stewart)
- (12) Open burning advisories on the Coast (Ralston)
- (13) Improvement of relationship with the state, regarding state general fund contribution to LRAPA's budget (Patterson)
- (14) Drastic improvement in complaint response (meaning that because of issues such as Monaco and Baxter, the public has become more aware of where to call to complaint, and staff has responded to try to validate the complaint condition) (Ralston)
- (15) Improvement of asbestos abatement program (Ralston)
- (16) Air quality improvement trend over the past twenty or thirty years (particulate matter and carbon monoxide) (Hough)
- (17) LRAPA influence in getting benzene content reduced in gasoline produced by Northwest refineries (Hough)

- (18) Success of Airmetrics over the years (Hough)
- (19) Recent awards from Federal highways and EPA, national recognition for Everybody Wins Program and Cascade Sierra Solutions (Ralston/Hough)
- (20) Having an advisory committee which broadens LRAPA's base of communication in Lane County (Patterson)
- (21) Progress on permit renewals backlog (Hough)

Biles asked if board members were surprised by this list of successes. He asked how they feel about the fact that they have been involved, along with staff, in one way or another, in the agency's successes.

Ralston said it looked like LRAPA is doing what is supposed to do. Stewart commented that there are not many organizations that can sit down and shoot off a list like that, and that it is impressive. Patterson commented that, when he was first assigned to the LRAPA board, he could see absolutely no value in the agency. But after being on the board and seeing what the agency has done and how it has influenced things, he is impressed with the agency. He said he would never have believe LRAPA could do so much when he first became acquainted with the agency.

Taylor said LRAPA needs to do more publicity about its successes. She recalled that three years ago, the Eugene city manager cut LRAPA out of the city's budget without a word to anyone. She noticed it in time to get it restored at that time. But she believes it is important to keep all of the agency's successes in the public eye, and that it would be a good idea for Hough to go to each of the governmental bodies once in a while to "brag" about what the agency is providing to its local partners.

Ralston noted that one of the things on staff's list of successes is inspection of 75 of 449 asbestos abatement projects. He said he assumed that they all had applications, and staff knew about them. He said he wondered how many of these projects LRAPA does not know about, and how important it is to inspect them all. Hough said the agency is committed to inspect 15 percent, and staff meets that commitment. He explained, further, that staff tries to prioritize its inspection schedule to contractors that need the most attention so that staff resources are used as efficiently as possible.

Biles commented that most agencies do not go through this exercise as quickly as the LRAPA board did, to define successes. He noted that, often, when something is put up as a success, there will be disagreement as to whether it should or should not be considered a success. He said LRAPA board members had done this so well in their individual meetings with him, he wanted to do the same thing as a group, to see if anyone would have a major disagreement about a particular success story. He said the non-verbal signals he was getting from board members indicated that most board members are comfortable with this list of successes and that it reflects generally what each member would say, as well.

Biles encouraged board members to think, individually, about what it took to achieve these successes. What did it take from the board. What did it take from staff. What did it take from the public. He said once the board knows what the common denominators of those successes are, they can begin to identify new things that they want to do—either new end results or new methods. He said they can keep in mind what the successes of the past are and what has been learned from them, to build steps for the future.

- C. Vision/Mission/Goals/Objectives. Biles repeated that, when he asked board members whether they were comfortable with their vision/mission/goals/objectives, board members all indicated they were comfortable with them. He said it is important for board members to talk to their colleagues about that,

as well. He indicated a summary of the priorities which Hough had provided for today's meeting and asked if board members were still comfortable with that document.

Patterson commented that board members have to remember that LRAPA is a regulatory organization which operates under certain guidelines. He said as Lane County's communities grow, LRAPA needs to be aware of what effect other counties and other cities who might have uncontrolled growth have on Lane County's airshed. He suggested that Lane County could be an example for other counties, regarding how to get the best air quality by working with people to achieve the best results.

Carpenter said the vision and mission are good. He said he thinks the issue is, are we there and, if not, how fast should we do things. He said we do have to enforce the regulations imposed by EPA; however, LRAPA has the opportunity to craft its own regulations that may be more stringent than EPA regulations if it is necessary for a particular community. He said there is always a borderline issue of whether you just follow the norm or decide to take some extra steps to protect the citizenry and public health.

Fortune noted that the vision statement says that LRAPA wants to provide clean air for everyone. He noted that it is not possible to always provide clean air for everyone, and cautioned that the wording of the vision statement can cause your organization to become liable if someone decides to hold you to the statement.

Monk also wondered if that vision statement, while a worthy one, is attainable. He said there is an air toxics monitor in his neighborhood but none in the Four Corners area where most of Eugene's heavy industry is located. He said his sense is that LRAPA should be doing its best to protect the most at-risk populations, which are the people living closer to the industrial facilities. He said that does not mean that LRAPA should shut down the industries. But it does mean looking at what others are doing, elsewhere in this country and in the world, in terms of alternative materials and alternative processes, to see what might be done in Lane County problem areas to move toward the vision statement of clean air for everyone. Monk said he is hopeful that MACT compliance will help significantly, generally, but he agrees with Carpenter, that LRAPA should be looking at creative ways to go beyond federal requirements to effect desirable impacts on Lane County's airsheds. Monk added that Lane County has naturally occurring geographical and topographical situations that make the county's airsheds unique, and that has to be addressed in the best way LRAPA can.

Biles commented at this point that, in his individual discussions with board members, he sensed agreement that the goals are what board members want to achieve. Where he saw some disagreement was in how the agency gets from where it is today to where board members have said they want to go, how fast it should be done, what strategies should be used, and whether LRAPA should be going beyond federal requirements in some instances. He noted that those discussions also get into budget issues and legal restrictions—where LRAPA has authority to do something different and where it does not. Biles said this subject of disagreement in how the agency operates will be an ongoing discussion by the board. Biles asked if board members had any more comments regarding vision/mission/goals/objectives before moving on to the next topic.

Patterson said no one said anything about partnerships. He said, to him, it seems that LRAPA should be in a position where it partners with the citizens of Lane County, and there should be lines of communication open to answer people's questions about what they need to do to comply with rules. Ralston said the way he sees it, almost everything on the goals list involves partners, from "community

partners working together” to “involvement and service to citizens and stakeholders.” He said, to him, partnerships are just a given with everything LRAPA does.

Johnson agreed with Patterson and thought the words, “leadership,” “leader,” and “advocate” go along with partnering. He said where air quality is concerned, LRAPA has the opportunity to partner more and be at the table when the community is talking about transportation, because transportation planning and decisions have a tremendous impact on air quality. Johnson said, in the future, he would like to see LRAPA take more leadership on helping the community to connect the dots between community planning decision and the impact on air quality.

Biles pointed out that if each of those successes were looked at in depth, one of the things that would show most often throughout would be the concept of partnership. It is unlikely that the board members and director got together and made these things happen by themselves. Each of the successes involved some type of partnership to be successful.

D. LRAPA Advisory Committee. Biles said this subject was brought up by several board members during his individual interviews. The questions to be discussed by the board are: what is the role of the advisory committee; and who has authority to place items on the advisory committee’s work agenda. Biles said the subject of the committee was generally brought up in the context of the board’s letter to legislators regarding field burning.

(1) *The role of the advisory committee.*

- Ralston said he sees the committee’s role as being almost identical to that of the planning commission. Taylor disagreed, saying that she sees it as being a group of people who are in touch with lots of different groups around the county, who can give the board advice. Koenig said he agreed with Taylor, but he would add that it is a two-way flow of information between the board and the committee. He said sharing information could avoid the recent problems with the board’s letter regarding field burning. Koenig added that the communication between the board and the committee should take place under process rules established by the board.

Carpenter said he agreed with both Ralston and Taylor, in that the planning commission makes recommendations that the city council then moves on, but it also has its own quasi-judicial standards and can make final decisions on its own. Carpenter said the committee seems, to him, to be more like the Federal Science Advisory Boards, who actually serve at the calling of the decision makers, to provide information when the decision makers need additional information in order to make a decision. He said it is a sort of technical arm of information development which gives advice to the decision makers. Ralston agreed that the advisory committee does not have authority to make any final decisions.

Stewart said Lane County has ten or fifteen advisory committees and that each of them has a work plan for itself. If the commissioners need them to look at something specific that is not on the work plan, they are asked to spend some time and focus on that topic and make suggestions to the board of commissioners. They do not make final decisions, but each committee is made of experts in a particular area where the commissioners do not have expertise.

Biles said he has seen committees handle the transmittal of the information in several ways. He asked if board members had a preference as to whether they would like a single recommendation from the committee or if they would prefer to have choices, analysis and a recommended choice.

- Patterson said it would depend on the topic. He said the committee could bring back to the board the information on the subject in a form which can be easily understood by the board and provide the committee's best recommendation. Then it is up to the board to decide what should be done, whether the committee agrees or not.
- Monk said he sees the committee's largest role to be helping the board to understand the constituencies that the committee members are in touch with that the board might not be, and to provide their expertise in whatever interest they represent on the committee. Monk said if consensus cannot be reached by the committee, its report should include multiple recommendations and a minority report to explain differing opinions of committee members.
- Stewart said it might not be necessary to have a specific minority report because there are minutes of the advisory committee meetings, and those minutes should reflect the discussions held during the meeting and how the committee came to make the recommendation on the topic. Stewart said if the board is looking for a recommendation, the committee could hopefully work through the different options and narrow it down to one. If they cannot do that, the board would receive multiple options. He added that the committee's recommendation is just a recommendation and is not binding on the board. The board can choose to do just the opposite of what the committee recommends, if it chooses to do so, and the board meeting minutes would reflect the discussion and why the board made the decision it made.
- Johnson said he is more interested in the analysis piece than in the specific recommendations. He said he would be interested in a consensus recommendation but, where there are dissenting opinions on the committee, he would rather focus on getting an analysis back from them and looking at the different sides of the issue. Johnson said he would not like to see a single recommendation if there were a split opinion on the committee because it would represent only the majority opinion, and he would not want to lose the minority perspective. Johnson said if the board can get an analysis back from the committee that can incorporate multiple perspectives, it will have the effect of giving the board a better sense of the different ways to look at a problem or an issue. Johnson said he does not think the board wants the committee to meet and take on their own projects and calling that, "feedback."

Stewart asked for clarity on that point. for instance, if one of the committee members said they've heard about a brand new process that will reduce benzene 50 percent in the area and wants to know if the committee should suggest that the board have the committee look into that. Stewart said he was getting the feeling that this board wants the committee members to do only what the board tells them to do. Ralston and Taylor both said that was not the case. Stewart said he does not want to inhibit the creativity of the committee and its ability to bring something to the board that might be helpful. Ralston said the committee should bring that to the board, and the board can then tell them to look into it. Stewart said he understood that it had been agreed that the committee could request tasks; however, it sounded to him that board members want to be more restrictive in what the committee is allowed to do.

In response to Stewart's concern, Koenig said he has never heard of feedback in such a negative context before and that he sees feedback as a positive thing. Taylor said her understanding of the discussion, so far, was that if committee members want to bring information or suggestions to the board, that is okay; but if the committee wants to take on a project that would require some time to develop conclusions, that should be assigned by the board.

- Ralston agreed that he would like to hear both sides if there are dissenting opinions on the committee. He asked Johnson if that's what he meant, and Johnson said it was. He said he wants to have both majority and minority opinions and recommendations as part of the total analysis of where the committee sits on the issue.

Biles paraphrased Johnson and Ralston's comments to say the board would like to have consensus and analysis. If there is not consensus, the board would like to have a majority decision and an analysis that would incorporate the views of the minority.

Biles asked, if the committee has information or suggestions on a topic, but it is not a topic about which they're requesting authorization to spend additional committee time, are they empowered to bring that to the board?

- Taylor said of course they would be.
- Johnson said they would be, only if there were consensus on the committee. He qualified that by saying, if it were something technical, they could bring the information without consensus among the committee members; however, if it were something political, the committee should reach consensus before bringing it to the board.

Biles said he saw a lot of heads nodding, with Taylor's description of the committee as authorized to bring to the board information and suggestions, even if it is not a subject that the board has specifically delegated to the committee. He asked if everyone on the board agreed with that.

- Monk said it would depend on how much time they would spend doing that.
- Carpenter said that is a "slippery slope" because they could say they were doing that with the field burning letter issue. He said he interpreted the committee's feedback at that time as meaning that they believed they had a groundswell in the community that was against the position in the letter and that they wanted to bring that forward. He questioned whether the board want them to use their limited time for that purpose.
- Ralston said he thinks the board is trying to micro-manage the committee.

Biles said this is often a sort of "slicing point" for organizations, as to how much independent authority is given to an advisory committee. The question is: what can they do on their own without specific board direction? Biles suggested that the ideas that the board clearly agreed on today be written up in a more formal document and then sent to the advisory committee to get their thoughts about this subject. He said the committee might actually be able to give the board some thoughts and ideas on the feedback issue that will make it easier for the board to find that place for

agreement on this. Biles also suggested that the board leave this discussion for now and devote some of the time remaining for this meeting to discussion of the remaining items on the agenda. He said there will be some next steps that will flesh this out some more and bring it back to the board with a recommendation, within a month or two.

Biles suggested that, when the board finishes with this topic and makes its final decision in a public meeting, they should draft it up in a written document, which could be just a one-page resolution or something like that. That would be done so that the points the board has agreed on will not be lost and so that they will be available to orient new committee members who may ask what their role and authority are.

- Patterson agreed with the discussion but expressed a concern about making instructions too convoluted and losing some of the members, since they are participating on a volunteer basis. Patterson also said there needs to be a balance on the committee, to get a broad cross-section of the county on the committee. Carpenter disagreed, stating that geographic distribution of members is not important as having qualified representation on the committee—people who possess the expertise needed by the board.

Biles said he would put all of the board's comments regarding the role of the board together and ask staff to compose a statement to bring back to the board for its official formal input. He also suggested that the board might want to send the points it came up with today to the advisory committee for its advice.

Biles said what he was hearing from board members was that the committee serving at the pleasure of the board. The board is the boss, and the committee offers advice to the board on selected topics but does not make the final decision.

(2) *How do topics get put on the committee's work plan?* Biles asked if the board felt the committee should take specific tasks from the board or if it should be able to work on anything it wants to do.

- Taylor said they should be able to make suggestions about any subject they want to study. She said the committee can tell the board what they think about an issue, and the board may consider those comments in its deliberations; but she said she had never heard anyone say that the board is required to refer a matter to the advisory committee before making a decision.
- Koenig agreed, saying the board should encourage the committee to make unsolicited comments and give unsolicited advice and information to the board.
- Carpenter commented that, because the committee does have limited time, when it comes to getting involved in a study or an evaluation of something, they should not be able to do that independently, without authorization from the board; however, they should be able to request that the board assign them that task.
- Monk agreed with Carpenter and said that is exactly how it should work. He added that, because the committee members should be staying connected with various groups in the community, they could bring to the board feedback from those groups regarding board decisions or actions.

- Fortune said his view is that the board should ask the advisory committee to consider an issue and provide information and an analysis for the board. If an individual advisory committee person has a concern, that person should approach an individual board member to bring it up to the board.
- Monk then commented that the advisory committee serves at the calling of the board. He asked if staff brings questions to the committee and if the committee makes recommendations to staff that aren't brought before the board. He wanted to know what the lines of communication are between the staff and the committee. Monk said he thinks the board determines what the committee does, and staff should come to the board with a request to ask the committee to work on an issue for staff.

Biles said he was hearing different opinions regarding getting unsolicited feedback from the committee. He asked board members if they want feedback regarding something committee members may be hearing in the community, perhaps about a decision the board has made.

- Johnson said he would like to have feedback on topics which the board has specifically asked the committee to study and provide information to the board. He said he does not want unsolicited feedback from committee members, but that individual committee members are always welcome to speak publicly.
- Ralston said the committee should be able to give the board feedback. He said the committee discussed the field burning letter and gave the board feedback. He gave an example of the board deciding to double permit fees and the committee coming back to the board to say they had spoken with permit holders and found that the permittees are not happy and would rather have DEQ operating the air program because LRAPA is too onerous. Ralston said he wants to hear that kind of feedback.
- Koenig agreed with Ralston, stating that if the board does not get feedback on something it has done, they are flying blind. He also said he doesn't think the role of the committee has anything to do with taking everything the board does to the committee beforehand. The board only needs to ask the committee to work on things about which the board needs the committee members' expertise, to get their information, analysis and recommendations.
- Stewart also agreed that the board should get feedback. He also pointed out that the board has a public comment period on its agenda each month, and committee members are welcome to address the board at that time. Stewart was uncomfortable with the idea of telling a committee member that they are not allowed to address the board because they are on the committee. He said if they come as individuals in the public comment period, or if it comes from the committee as a whole, he thinks the board should welcome feedback from the committee.
- Carpenter said he does not want to see the committee decide to take on projects without the board having authorized it and does not think they should critique board actions; however, the board provides time at meetings to hear from the public, and individual committee members can come before the board at that time to voice concerns they may have. He said he wants the committee to give the board solicited feedback, but not unsolicited feedback.

- Fortune said the board should direct its concerns to the committee to request their assistance. He does not think the committee should be thinking of things to bring to the board. He stressed that the committee also needs to understand that the board makes the decisions and, whether the committee agrees with the decision or not, the board's decision should be the end of it.
- Monk said his sense of that word "feedback" is, for example, if a committee member hears something from one of their colleagues that they think is relevant to a decision the board is about to make, or has made, and they bring that information to the board and share it because they think it is something the board should know about. Monk said he thought there was some solicitation of feedback from the community, with respect to the field burning letter, and we not advocate the committee doing that. However, Monk said, feedback that Mr. Malpass might make LRAPA move its air monitoring site off his land, in response to the letter being sent, would have been helpful. Monk agreed with Carpenter and Johnson, that if committee members hear something in the community that they think the board should be aware of, they should share that information. But they should not take it upon themselves to formulate a decision and have the committee spend a lot of time with it.
- Patterson said his sense of feedback from the committee is in the information, analysis and recommendations regarding subjects the board asks the committee to evaluate. The board may not take the recommendation, but the committee has done the leg work for the board.

Biles said he was still hearing differing perspectives among board members regarding feedback from the advisory committee. He said the board had agreed that the committee's role, when assigned by the board, is to advise, to give information, analysis and recommendations. Biles stated the board's opinion that only the board can send something to the advisory committee.

- E. The Board and the Budget. Fortune said that so much of entity budgeting is determined by what is coming down regarding state regulations and county taxes, and such, and what you cannot do with the budget with an entity like LRAPA. He said, from his perspective, the staff are hired to run the organization, and the board is here to develop policy and set priorities and goals. The staff then develops the budget around what the board wants to see take place. Fortune said the board needs to trust the staff to do that. If the budget is not being done in a way that accomplishes what the board wants to accomplish, the board replaces the staff at will. Fortune said the budget process should not be long and drawn out and, as long as the budget is balanced, the board should trust that staff is doing what should be done.

Patterson commented that LRAPA's budget is very different from any of the city budgets or the county budget, and that there are obligations that the agency takes on in return for the money it receives. The staff knows what the intricacies of the budget are, and board members who want to know more should talk to staff about it. Fortune agreed and said that the board should trust that the staff knows where the revenue sources are and where the grant money is and what they want to do to maximize the agency's revenues and control it as the process goes along.

Stewart pointed out that this is a small organization with a very lean budget. Employees all do multiple tasks, which makes it complicated for board members to see exactly what each person

does. He also said if the board wants to redirect agency activities and spend more effort doing something different, they need to recognize that staff is so lean, and the budget is so tight, that whatever changes are made will take away from something else. Stewart questioned whether permit fees and enforcement fines are regulated by state statute, meaning that the board would not really have the option to double permit fees or other fees. He said the agency just needs to live within its means.

Johnson said he thinks there are opportunities to adjust permit fees within the law and that ACDP and Title V fees have two different legal frameworks in which they operate. Johnson said he wants to see something from staff that shows the board how effectively the dollars are being spent. He agreed that the budget is lean, and that makes it even more important to see how the money is spent. If the board asks for additional monitoring in a certain part of the county and the staff says the agency cannot afford it, Johnson said he wants to see how the existing monitoring is being paid for and whether there is flexibility to make trade-offs. He said he understands that if the monitoring is being paid for with federal dollars that require a particular monitor to be in a particular location, there is no flexibility. However, if a monitoring site is being paid for with permit fees, there would be flexibility for the board to move the monitor or raise the permitting fees to pay for another site. Johnson said he is looking to understand how the regulations constrain the agency and where that gives the agency opportunities. He suggested that if a community wants monitors, the agency could go to that community and ask for additional funding to help LRAPA get a matching grant.

Stewart said he believed the agency was able to get a grant to do some monitoring in the Baxter situation. But when citizens want this agency to monitor in a particular location, there are decisions that need to be made with respect to whether you want to cut another function elsewhere to accomplish that monitoring or apply for grants. The board needs to remember that it is not an easy decision or an easy process.

Ralston reiterated his opinion that the board needs to trust that staff knows what the agency's resources are and what can and cannot be done.

Carpenter said he knows that staff will provide any budget information the board asks for, but he would like to see more than a one-year budget. With the concern of the potential reduction or withdrawal of Lane County's funding of LRAPA, Carpenter said he would like to see a document which addresses sources where funds might be available and others where the funding might be dropping off. He commented that Airmetrics supposedly is getting out-dated, and those revenues might not be coming in anymore. He would like to see a documents which addresses all of those things.

Monk agreed that the board needs to trust staff. He said the budget is one place where staff can do what they want in and around the direction of the board, and it is important for the board to have a very good understanding of what its priorities are, what the board has specified, and how the money is being spent to accomplish those goals. He said the board needs to ask whether the funds are being spent in the most productive way to accomplish the priority goals. He said that, in his opinion, some of the priorities may not be accomplished, and it is the board's fiduciary responsibility to keep a close watch on the budget. He said he does not feel that he knows enough about how the budget works, and he would like to have some instruction on that. Several other board members indicated they would also like to learn more about how the budget works. Monk

said he has thought about meeting with Mirhosseyni to get that instruction. Mirhosseyni said he would be happy to do that if board members would like to arrange that with him.

Patterson commented that permit fees are one of the main revenue sources for the agency, and Hough said those fees are fairly stable. Patterson also noted that the state contribution to the agency is not flexible and is dictated by other sources such as federal money. Hough said the Legislature has to decide, every two years, what the state contribution will be, and it is unpredictable. Patterson said he agrees that the board needs to know how the funds are being spent, but the board also needs to remember that there is only a certain amount of money that is flexible, and that staff are the people who know what can be done with money from each source.

Johnson said the board is talking about discretion, and how much discretion the board gives to staff in spending the agency's funds. He said he is willing to give staff broad discretion but that, in return, staff needs to provide a measurement that shows what Lane County got for the money spent by LRAPA and exactly how the money was spent.

Fortune noted that what Johnson was asking for was micro-management. He said he does not want to spend his time micro-managing what the people at LRAPA were hired to do. The board is here to set policy and goals and expect the staff to come up with the funding to accomplish those things. If the board tries to determine whether the agency got the value out of every dollar that is put in, they will either agree or disagree with staff and then try to manage it some other way according to what board members think is the maximum value for what is spent. Fortune said that is what the staff is here for. Ralston agreed that what Johnson was proposing is micro-management of staff, and he was opposed to doing that. He said that what Johnson wanted from Mirhosseyni will take a lot of time, and Mirhosseyni has a lot of other work to do.

In order to move on to the rest of the items on the agenda for today, it was necessary to leave some issues surrounding the budget unresolved at this time. The board will continue that discussion at the July 12 meeting to try to reach closure on those issues.

- F. New Ideas. Biles said the goal of this discussion was to get new ideas out so that the board could discuss them. If there is strong support by the board for a particular idea, they could direct follow-up steps on that.
- (1) Multi-Year Budget Perspective. Biles noted that the board might want to spend some time looking at finances in a multi-year state, given the issues of Lane County that Stewart mentioned earlier. He suggested that the board ask staff to come back to them this fall with a multi-year perspective of some of the agency's current programs, information from EPA and DEQ, and the latest feedback from the Legislature regarding the state General Fund contribution to LRAPA, to help with budget development for future fiscal years.
 - (2) Managing for Results. Another idea Biles said he had gotten from the board's discussion is managing for results. Are board members satisfied with the information they currently receive from staff and comfortable with the results they're getting from their budgetary decisions? Biles pointed out that two of the board members had indicated they would like to have more information in order to connect the allocation of money to results to determine whether funds are being spent in the best way. He said if the majority of the board agrees that more

information is needed, there are different techniques and strategies the board could use regarding the budget, performance measures, monitoring, and reports, to move in that direction. If, however, the majority of the board is satisfied with the level of information they are now getting, it would not be necessary to go further with that.

Ralston said he does not think the board needs to go any further with that. He suggested that if individual board members have specific questions, and if Hough is agreeable to meeting with them, they should talk to Hough and Mirhosseyeni instead of taking up more board time with those questions.

Carpenter suggested that, if Johnson and Monk were to meet with Mirhosseyeni and talk about what kind of more detailed information they would like to have, it would be fine with him if they wanted to bring that back for board discussion. Monk agreed to do that. Biles asked if Monk wanted to commit to a time that he would be able to meet with Mirhosseyeni, and Monk said he and Johnson would meet with Mirhosseyeni later that same day.

- (3) Carbon Capping and Selling Credits. Following up on something Stewart had said earlier, Carpenter suggested exploring carbon capping and selling credits. He suggested that LRAPA could work as a “broker” to assist private industry and be a clearinghouse or provider of information. Industry and LRAPA could somehow split any profits if such a program came to pass, creating a win/win for both entities.
- (4) Air Quality Information in Schools. Patterson noted that LRAPA once had a good program for presenting air quality information in the schools and should get back to doing that. He would like to see LRAPA be a purveyor of good technical information about the airshed in classrooms from Kindergarten through high school.
- (5) Awards for Going Beyond Requirements to Reduce Emissions. Taylor suggested that LRAPA give awards to people or industries who go beyond what is required, to achieve further reductions in emissions.
- (6) Higher-Efficiency Control Devices. Koenig noted that no industry is capturing 100 percent of emissions. He said there are probably control devices on the market which could get a higher efficiency of capture. LRAPA could apply for grants to subsidize the installation of the higher-efficiency control devices. That way, even a facility that is already in compliance could operate cleaner and reduce the amount of pollutants being emitted into the ambient air.
- (7) Move to Non-Toxic Materials and Processes. Referring to the SHINE report of high incidence of leukemia in an industrial area of west Eugene, Monk said the report pointed out that formaldehyde is one of the known causes of this leukemia. Monk said OSU has done a lot of research on alternative glues and resins, and some local resin manufacturers are producing non-formaldehyde glues and resins. Because Lane County has a large resin manufacturing industry, Monk said, he would like to see LRAPA work with industry to move toward using non-toxic or less toxic processes and materials in their facilities. He said LRAPA could look at emerging technologies and think about how to help subsidize their use and help to create a marketplace for them.

Monk said Title V permittees have to do a toxics use reduction plan. He said that the state of Massachusetts has partnered with the University of Massachusetts to educate technical people who look at various processes and come up with recommendations based on the toxics use reduction plans for those businesses. The governor then gives awards to businesses who save tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars by incorporating these new processes. Monk said he has been talking with people at LCC for ten years, and they have not been in a position to take on such a program. If the time were ever appropriate, LRAPA and LCC could partner to have this type of program in Lane County, to help facilities address their air toxics emissions.

- (8) Motor Vehicle Inspections. Taylor said she would like to take another look at the possibility of an inspection/maintenance program for motor vehicles.
- (9) LRAPA Offer an Air Quality Impact Analysis to Local Governments on Large Proposed Developments. Taylor said she would like to see LRAPA staff testify on the air quality implications of large developments coming before planning commissions and city councils in Lane County.

Fortune agreed that LRAPA should be involved with large development projects. He pointed out that LRAPA has been dealing recently with complaints of dust from aggregate companies in the area around Delta Highway and Beltline, and the city of Eugene is contemplating allowing a hospital to locate in that same area. LRAPA should provide air quality and health input into that process. Johnson also agreed, stating that he does not recall hearing anything about LRAPA input into the decision to locate Sacred Heart Hospital in Springfield. Johnson added that local decision making deserves objective, local science input, and LRAPA is a local agency that has that expertise to help local policy makers in making those planning decisions.

- (10) Use Incentives Rather than Always Using Regulation. Stewart said regulatory agencies tend to use regulations to get outcomes. He would like to see LRAPA use incentives to encourage positive outcomes. As an example, he cited the Everybody Wins project which explained how APUs can help save energy and reduce costs for truck drivers, as well as reducing diesel emissions, to persuade people to put the units on their trucks. The desired outcome was achieved without regulations to force use of the units.
- (11) Yard Waste Disposal Alternatives. Johnson proposed that LRAPA dramatically increase its fees for open burning permits and use that money to partner with the forest products recycling industry to subsidize or incentive other means of disposal of yard waste. Johnson noted that it is expensive to get a chipper out into the rural parts of the county, and it is expensive to load and bring debris into a recycling center from a rural part of the county. He said his suggestion would be a way to take a lot of smoke out of the air while doing something positive for the local recycling industry. He suggested that the advisory committee could explore this possibility to see if it would be economically feasible.

Stewart commented that he doesn't care for the fact that LRAPA charges more money for a burning permit than it would cost to take the materials to a resource yard to recycle it. He said he believes biomass leaching is the coming thing and said it would be nice if LRAPA could write grants and partner the county and with private industry on biomass leaching.

Instead of charging people to be allowed to burn yard debris, perhaps we could pay them to bring their yard debris to us.

Carpenter noted that the city of Springfield has one day a year when it allows everyone to bring their yard waste to a disposal site, for free, and has volunteers to offload the material and dispose of it. He said maybe LRAPA could do something like the bloodmobiles do in the county, in partnership with the recycling yards, to bring equipment to those areas periodically, with advance notice, to pick up that debris and to do so free of charge. Fortune said Oakridge has a chipper which it uses in that way. Oakridge residents know that they can pile tree and shrub prunings at the street and call the city. The city has a schedule for when it goes around town and chips that debris in place.

At this point Biles noted that it was almost time for the meeting to adjourn for today. He said there is more discussion to be had on each of these new ideas and, hopefully, selection of at least one that the board can support and wants to move forward. Biles said the next step is to completely get all the new ideas out. He said he knows board members have more ideas because he heard them in the one-on-one interviews. What should happen is that the board should develop its inventory of new ideas and discuss them collectively as a board, then select a discrete number and have someone develop those ideas more fully. That could be done by staff or the advisory committee, depending on the topics the board selects. Once the board has all the information so that they can understand the pros and cons of each concept, they will need to discuss how much time it would take to put together a program for each of their choice concepts, what the budgetary impacts would be, and whether there are political up sides and/or down sides. Once the board has all of that information, one or more concepts will likely emerge to the point where the board can say whether they want to pursue any of them.

Biles said he could work with Hough to see whether there are common threads that bind some of these concepts into a single concept that the board might want to pursue. He advised the board, however, to allocate some time on their next agenda to fill out the list of concepts so that it represents the result of everyone contributing to a collective list of creativity of all members of the board.

(G) Next Steps. Biles said the board has several next steps.

- (1) Advisory Committee. The board's thoughts about the advisory committee expressed at today's meeting need to be drafted into a single document. He asked if the board would like to ask the advisory committee to review that list and provide advice to the board. Board members indicated they would like to do that. Biles said the first draft of that document will come back to the board to review and fine tune as it deems appropriate. Then it will be sent to the advisory committee to get their input. The board will then make a final decision on that. Hough said the initial draft of that document could be ready for the board at the July 12 meeting. The advisory committee could look at the document at its meeting the last week of July.
- (2) Budget. Biles asked if the board members were comfortable enough with the idea of a multi-year budget projection to ask staff to bring back a proposal of what that might look like. Board members had several comments and agreed on a two- to three-year forecast of revenue

sources, taking into account the county's revenue situation and the action of the Oregon Legislature. Hough said he could see that as being a very helpful preliminary exercise to the actual detailed budgeting for next year. Biles summarized this item by saying that staff will follow through on that document in the fall.

In addition, Johnson and Monk will come back to the board with thoughts and recommendations on the issues of discretion, accountability, managing for results, tying expenditures to results, reporting, etc. He asked when they thought they would be prepared to bring that to the board. Monk said they would need a few months, and Johnson suggested October.

Mirhosseyni said that anyone who wished to meet with him and Hough to get some instruction of the budget should contact him. He will schedule a briefing when he knows how many board members want to attend.

Stewart said the board will continue its discussion of new ideas and complete the list at its July 12 meeting. The list will then be printed up, and the board will talk about those concepts at its August meeting and figure out which one or ones of those the board would like to do. Those will then be investigated further.

7. **NEW BUSINESS:** The LRAPA board meetings have been taking place on the first Thursday of the month because the Lane County Board of Commissioners had Measure 37 cases scheduled for Tuesdays for several months. The schedule of Measure 37 cases has now been reduced to the point where it is no longer necessary to deal with those cases every Tuesday. LRAPA board members would like to go back to the second Tuesday schedule, and that will begin with the September meeting. The schedule for the remainder of 2007 is:

| | |
|--------------|---|
| July 12 | Second Thursday (due to the first Thursday being the day after the 4 th of July holiday) |
| August 2 | First Thursday |
| September 11 | Second Tuesday |
| October 9 | Second Tuesday |
| November 13 | Second Tuesday |
| December 11 | Second Tuesday |

The meetings will be held in LRAPA's meeting room at 1010 Main Street in Springfield, and the start time will be 12:15 p.m.

8. **ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 2:34 p.m. The next regular meeting of the LRAPA Board of Directors is scheduled for Thursday, July 12, 2007. The meeting will be held in the LRAPA Meeting Room at 1010 Main Street, Springfield, Oregon.

Respectfully submitted,

Merrie Dinteman
Recording Secretary