

MINUTES
LANE REGIONAL AIR PROTECTION AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
THURSDAY–NOVEMBER 6, 2007
LRAPA Meeting Room
1010 Main Street, Springfield, Oregon

ATTENDANCE

- Board: Faye Stewart, Chair–Lane County; Bill Carpenter–At-Large, Springfield; Glenn Fortune–At-Large, General; Drew Johnson–Eugene; Kit Kirkpatrick–Eugene; David Monk–Eugene; Dave Ralston–Springfield
(ABSENT: Pat Patterson–Cottage Grove/Oakridge; Betty Taylor–Eugene)
- Staff: Merlyn Hough–Director; Merrie Dinteman; Max Hueftle; Sandra Lopez; Sally Markos; Nasser Mirhosseyani
- Other: Russ Ayers, Chair, Amy Peccia and Gery Vander Meer–LRAPA Advisory Committee; Landa Gillette–LRAPA Budget Committee; Terry Connolly–Eugene Chamber of Commerce; Jim Daniels–Rosboro; Earl Koenig; Becky Riley; Rick Smith–SierraPine

1. **OPENING:** Faye Stewart was unable to be present at the beginning of the meeting. In his absence, **Earl Koenig**, as the 2007 vice-chair, called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m.

Monk said he thought that Agenda Item Number 6, Greg Aitken's (DEQ) update regarding the railyard cleanup project in the Trainsong area of West Eugene, was on today's agenda just to update the board regarding what LRAPA has been doing in conjunction with DEQ, to resolve this issue, in light of what the Department of Human Services has said about health effects from the groundwater contamination at the railyard. He requested that Item 6 be moved later on the agenda in order to allow as much time as possible for the plywood MACT item and the strategic planning discussion of new ideas. Ralston said the strategic planning had been on the board's agenda for several months, and it didn't really matter if that were cut short today; however, Mr. Aitken had been asked to come and speak to the board, and it was important to hear that information. Johnson said he had to leave promptly at the end of the meeting, if not sooner; and that, while he was interested in what Aitken had to say, he was more interested in having full discussions of the Plywood MACT and Strategic Planning agenda items. Carpenter said his only concern would be whether Mr. Aitken's schedule would accommodate moving that item later on the agenda. Aitken said he had no problem with changing the order of agenda items.

ACTION: Carpenter MOVED to change the order of today's agenda by moving Agenda Item 6 to follow Agenda Item 8. Kirkpatrick SECONDED THE MOTION, and the MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 6 to 1 (Ralston).

2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

- A. **Becky Riley, 202 Hawthorne, Eugene, 97404.** Riley said she is always reminded of how important the LRAPA board is, with regard to the policies the board is setting for local air. She had five topics to bring to the board's attention.

- (1) Smoke from home wood heating. Riley said she is glad to see LRAPA working to encourage Eugene and the other jurisdictions to update their home wood heating ordinances to help the area meet the tighter federal air particulate matter standards. She said she would also like to see more of a public education program or a financial incentives program considered. She said her observation is that people seem to be affected by the rising cost of electricity, gas and oil, and that use of wood for heating is on the rise in her own neighborhood. Riley said she is noticing a lot

more wood smoke in her neighborhood and is wondering what can be done to curb a seeming trend in the wrong direction.

- (2) J. H. Baxter. Riley said she had not heard from staff for quite a while about the situation at the Baxter facility, and she wonders if there will be an update soon about the Baxter permit renewal process and implementation of the Best Work Practices Agreement.
- (3) Railyard diesel emissions. Riley said the results of the railyard risk assessment coming out of California, which is based on estimated emissions of the diesel particulate matter from locomotives, had been eye-opening. The assessments are showing significantly elevated cancer risk due to diesel particulate exposures, mostly in large areas surrounding the railyard. She said she hopes that more air monitoring and risk estimates can be done in residential areas of Eugene surrounding the railyard. She said she hopes that LRAPA and other local officials can do as California air agency officials are doing, in negotiating with the railroads for better practices to reduce these emissions, including cleaner fuels ahead of the federal schedules, and cleaner-burning engine technologies and idling reduction strategies. Riley said that Brian Jennison agreed, years ago, to help negotiate with railroad officials about ways to reduce diesel emissions at the yard in Eugene; however, after his departure, it seems to her that the idea was lost. She said she hopes it can be revived soon, although she knows that LRAPA has a lot on its plate right now.
- (4) Air toxics monitoring in West Eugene. Riley said this subject has come up repeatedly and that an air toxics monitoring station in West Eugene is long overdue, because residents of the area deserve to know what levels of toxic chemicals are in the air they are breathing. Riley said she is hoping for either a permanent air toxics monitoring station in West Eugene, or a portable device that can be ported around and used for ongoing studies.
- (5) Plywood MACT. Riley said the SHINE program found elevated risk of acute myelogenous leukemia in the Bethel Census Tract, near J. H. Baxter and other industrial facilities, adding that the appendix from that report listed some of the chemicals known to be associated with elevated risk of leukemia, including formaldehyde. Riley said she had done a search to see what facilities in the area emit formaldehyde and was shocked to see that Weyerhaeuser's flakeboard facility on Danebo is the twelfth-largest emitter of formaldehyde in the U. S. She said she was glad to read about the MACT standards requiring improved technology and emission reductions for plywood facilities which went into effect last month, adding that it is long past time for formaldehyde emissions to be better controlled at this Weyerhaeuser facility and others. However, Riley said she is disappointed that LRAPA would consider granting year-long extensions to individual facilities to delay their compliance with these new standards, noting that industry has been on notice since 2004 that they would need to comply with new emission standards by this year. Riley said she understood that at least one local facility has installed new control technology that meets the new standards and wonders why others should be exempted from compliance. She said allowing the extensions would penalize the facilities that have made the effort to comply by the deadline. She added that, if LRAPA does have the authority to grant extensions to the mandatory compliance deadlines, she hopes that the agency will exercise it very judiciously and with great scrutiny of each application. She also hopes that any extensions granted are for far less than a year, because the public should not have to wait another year to see these long-awaited rules implemented and formaldehyde levels reduced in their neighborhoods.

- B. **Gery Vander Meer, 2604 J. Street, Springfield, 97477.** Vander Meer, a member of LRAPA's Advisory Committee, said the committee was informed the previous week that Earl Koenig had submitted an application for appointment to the committee. He said it seemed strange that a member of the Board should want to be appointed to the advisory committee; but as it turned out, the committee was told that Koenig was being removed from the board by Mayor Kitty Piercy and replaced by someone of her choosing. Vander Meer said that, according to the minutes of the July 12, 2007 LRAPA board meeting, when Bill Carpenter was reappointed to the board, the board's policy would allow Carpenter to be automatically reappointed if he chose to continue to serve, because he had served only one term. In looking at this, Vander Meer said, it would appear that Koenig should also be eligible for automatic reappointment because he also had served only one term. Vander Meer said contact had been made with the mayor of Springfield, to find out if the city had been consulted regarding the appointment of Carpenter, and that there had been no such consultation. Vander Meer said it appeared to him that Springfield is being treated inequitably by not having input into Carpenter's appointment, while Eugene appears to be able to make patronage appointments to the LRAPA board. He said he is concerned about the credibility of the LRAPA board, because of public perception of favoritism toward one participating body, disrespectful [*sic*] of another. He added that this does not engender confidence that this is an open process or one that includes all potential players involved with a board appointment. Vander Meer went on to say that his perception of Koenig's presence on the board is that he has done a fine job representing the community at-large. He asked, if Koenig has been found to be non-qualified for service on the board, his efforts lacking, his input immaterial or not useful to the board, why would he be appointed to the Advisory Committee. Vander Meer said he would hope that the board would discuss this issue and that, if they feel that Koenig has been a quality representative, that he would be reappointed to the board, as per the standard established with the reappointment of Carpenter. On the other hand, he said he would hope that, if board members find Koenig so lacking in his representation and contributions to the board and should not be reappointed to that body, they would also not be inclined to appoint him to the advisory committee.

Carpenter commented that he serves as an at-large member on the board and is not appointed by one of the member jurisdictions. He said he does not know how the city of Eugene appoints their board members, but he believes it is done by the council. Hough confirmed that the mayor nominates an appointee, and the nomination must be approved by the council. Carpenter told Vander Meer that he (Carpenter) is in a position which could have been filled by a person from anywhere in the county, but the board elected to appoint a resident of Springfield. Vander Meer responded that the minutes of the July 2007 board meeting describe a board policy—not a city policy. He said he would hope to see a board review and discussion of their policy and a confirmation of the process by which Carpenter was reappointed in July; or, if it is found that the reappointment was done in error, that the position be opened up again for the mayor of Springfield and the Springfield City Council to have some input regarding this membership.

Monk repeated that Carpenter is filling an at-large position on the LRAPA board, and that at-large members serve at the discretion of the rest of the board members. Those members who represent the various governing jurisdictions serve at the behest of their respective governing bodies. Monk added that Carpenter, as a resident of Springfield, was appointed as an at-large member representing Springfield in deference to Springfield's growing population and the chance that they would be eligible to have a second representative in the not-too-distant future.

[Faye Stewart arrived at this time and took over chairmanship of the meeting.]

- C. **Earl Koenig, 2587 Northampton Road, Eugene 97404.** Regarding Vander Meer's comments, Koenig pointed out that he was not an at-large board member appointed by the other board members. He was a resident of Eugene, nominated by the Eugene mayor in office at that time to represent Eugene on the LRAPA board. The city council voted to appoint him in the late fall of 2004. Koenig said he was present at today's meeting to make a few final remarks and say a few words about his term on the board. He said it was a great experience and that he thoroughly enjoyed it and enjoyed working with the board members and staff of LRAPA. Koenig said he thought the board accomplished a lot in the past three years, particularly since the agency came near extinction in late 2004 and early 2005. He listed some of the accomplishments of the past three years, including assisting in the birth and success of Cascade Sierra Solutions, and reducing the complaints about odor from the Baxter facility. Koenig also noted that the board has worked long and hard over the past two years, with initial and interim assistance from Jim Johnson and Stan Biles, to develop a strategic plan, developing the mission statement, and objectives, and a fine list of new ideas that LRAPA could pursue in the future. Koenig wished the board luck in prioritizing those and whittling them down to a few that the agency can really pay attention to. He also wished Kit Kirkpatrick well in her term on the board.

Stewart asked Koenig to stay for a moment. He read aloud a letter from the board and staff to Koenig, thanking him for his service to the agency and noting that his knowledge of air quality processes and issues had been particularly helpful and that his thoughtfulness and objectivity in dealing with the issues facing the agency had been very much appreciated. Stewart also presented Koenig with a plaque recognizing his leadership and service in promoting the role of local government in Lane County's air quality program from 2004 through 2007, and serving as board vice-chair in 2007.

3. **CONSENT CALENDAR:** Stewart asked if board members had any comments or corrections regarding the minutes of the October 9 board meeting or the expense reports through September 30. Mirhosseyni distributed a corrected page for the expense report, stating that there was a digit added to a number in the original report which made the numbers incorrect.

Johnson acknowledged that the fact that he missed the last two meetings, and made his request to correct the July 12 minutes by e-mail, had created an awkward situation. Since he was present at today's meeting he said he wanted to go on the record as saying that he did not make the comment that was attributed to him in the July 12 minutes and that he appreciated the board's action to correct the July 12 minutes as he requested.

MOTION: Fortune MOVED to approve the minutes of the October 9, 2007 board meeting and approve the expense reports through September 30, 2007. **Ralston** SECONDED THE MOTION.

Discussion of Motion. Monk said he did have one correction. He said on page 17 of the minutes, he had abstained from the vote included on that page. Stewart said he did remember Monk abstaining from that vote.

Stewart asked if the maker and second of the current motion agreed to amending to motion to include that correction. They both did agree.

AMENDED MOTION: To approve the minutes of the October 9, 2007 board meeting, as corrected, and approve the expense reports through September 30, 2007, as corrected. The MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE.

4. DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Only one item in the written report was discussed.

Air Quality Charts. Hough said Fortune had pointed out to him that there was a discrepancy between the information in the written report and the charts depicting air quality over 15 months. Hough explained that, if you just went through October 15, the high AQI was 47 for particulate matter, but the chart shows the data through the end of October which included a few higher days in the latter part of the month during an air stagnation period. Hough said staff tries to have the charts include the whole calendar month when there is time to print that before the board meeting.

Carpenter asked Hough if, with the three-year running average for particulate matter and the new PM standard going into effect, the Oakridge days in January and February counted as needing to be under the 35 micrograms per cubic meter standard, or if that requirement will be imposed at a later time. Hough said there is a sequence of events that are triggered by the new standard. A letter is required in December of this year, from the governor, identifying which areas of the state do not meet the new PM2.5 standard. That initial assessment is based on data from 2004/2005/2006. The letter will identify Klamath Falls and Oakridge as the two areas of Oregon that do not comply with the new, tightened standard, using the most recent three years of data. EPA encourages states to update that information, with each calendar year. Several events will follow that letter, as far as when new control strategies need to be submitted and when the strategies need to be fully implemented so that the standard is met some years down the road.

Carpenter asked if there will be a rolling year-add-on/year-taken off compliance evaluation after the initial designation. Hough confirmed that would be the case.

5. ADVISORY COMMITTEE: Committee Chair **Russ Ayers** reported that the committee had reviewed the board's document regarding the role of the committee, with the change of the word, "approval" to "concurrence." While it is up to the board to approve the final document, Ayers wanted the board to be aware that, with one abstention, the committee had endorsed the document.

Ayers said the committee also got into discussion of the permit streamlining rules, which is a huge package. With staff's help, the committee came up with some key issues relating to differences between LRAPA rules and DEQ rules. The committee had a pretty lively discussion, and some confusion, around those issues. Committee members have identified where they are confused, and they will get some education about those issues. Their discussion of the rulemaking package will cross over several meetings.

The committee also discussed plywood MACT, and it was apparent that, if you take the time to listen to staff's explanation and understanding of why one-year extensions are justified, in some cases, it makes sense. Ayers distributed copies of a letter from EPA to regional directors which further explains the issue of the one-year compliance deadline extensions. Ayers said the letter says that EPA is endorsing one-year extensions, provided the sources demonstrate a need. Ayers said that his facility has had three MACT deadlines and has complied with all three, on time. He acknowledged that one facility might look at another and say, "Well, I met my deadline. Why can't they meet theirs?" But as he listened to the staff explanation, he is comfortable that staff is handling these requests really well. Ayers said the committee had a good discussion on the subject but did not come to any conclusions. He added that the committee would be happy to keep this on its agenda and talk about it some more, if the board wanted that.

The committee also talked about committee membership, specifically about Koenig's application for appointment to the committee. There was some e-mail communication between committee members regarding Koenig's application, and there were no objections to his joining the committee, other than the

comment that Vander Meer made at today's board meeting. Ayers said the committee had thirteen members but lost one general public representative, bringing the total current membership to twelve. He reminded the board that the total number allowable is fifteen, though the committee seems to operate better with 13 or fewer members. He said if the board is going to consider Koenig's application, they want to also consider the applications received last year from people who were not appointed at that time. He suggested that, rather than giving Koenig special treatment, the board may wish to wait until the next time they make appointments and consider his application along with the others already on file. Ayers added that the committee still needs a member to represent agricultural interests. Ayers asked Markos if staff is currently advertising for that opening, and Markos replied that it may be advertised, or staff may go out and talk to some specific groups to recruit that position on the committee. Hough added that staff has been considering working through the Extension Service, trying to identify potential agricultural representatives through that agency. That position has been advertised in the past, unsuccessfully.

Hough noted one further item which was mentioned in the minutes of the last advisory committee meeting. Staff has scheduled a stakeholder meeting on November 28, 9:00 a.m. in the Springfield City Hall, Library Meeting Room, for people to hear about the proposed industrial permitting rule amendments and provide comments or ask questions.

7. CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION—PLYWOOD MACT COMPLIANCE EXTENSION REQUESTS: Hough summarized the events which led to LRAPA's receiving several requests for extensions of the deadline for compliance with federal Maximum Achievable Control Technology standards for plywood facilities. He said that in June of this year there were a couple of cases in D. C. Circuit Court, one of which affected the plywood MACT which, in turn, affects some sources in Lane County. There was some discussion of this issue at the August and October LRAPA board meetings, and the board asked at its October meeting for additional details of the extension requests. There was specific interest in the process by which the extension requests are handled and the justification required. Three requests had been received prior to the October board meeting, and two of those had been approved. Because of concerns expressed by the board in October, staff has not yet acted on the third request. Operations Manager Sandra Lopez said there were actually four requests, because one of the three sources had requested two extensions.

Johnson asked if there is a fee associated with these requests, because he understood that they required a permit modification. Lopez responded that the actual requests for the extensions have not been assessed a fee because a permit modification fee will be assessed when it comes time to put the requirements into the permits. Monk asked why LRAPA is not charging a fee for the request reviews. Lopez said the situation prompting the requests for extensions came up at the last minute, and staff didn't think about fees at the beginning. Then the EPA guidance letter was issued, and it became clear that agencies would charge for the significant modifications when everything went into the permit. She said that, in hindsight, perhaps there should have been a fee charge because all the work went into the reviews at the time the requests were received; however, at that point it was not a permit change and didn't require public comment and the costs associated with those activities.

Johnson asked about the requests not requiring public comment, and Lopez said that DEQ consulted with legal counsel through the Department of Justice, who confirmed that issuing an extension does not require public comment, under the federal requirements. The extensions, with their compliance schedules and requirements, will go into the permits, and there will be opportunity for public input at that time.

Carpenter mentioned that he and Lopez had a telephone conversation about this process, and she had e-mailed him the standards in the Code of Federal Regulations. He asked Lopez if the requests received, to date, are

all of the facilities that would be requesting extensions. Lopez confirmed that the requests already received are the only ones LRAPA expects. She said she and Hough had looked at all of LRAPA's permitted facilities that would be subject to the plywood MACT, and there were seven facilities. Three of those are operating under Synthetic Minor permits, meaning that they limited their Hazardous Air Pollutant (HAP) emissions to a level at which they would not be subject to this rule. One other facility, Veneer Technologies, only had to meet the requirements for non-HAP coatings.

Carpenter said he had looked at the schedules for the facilities that want more time and said they have provided more details to support their requests. He noted that Rosboro believes they can come into compliance on April 1, 2008. Carpenter said one thing that concerns him is that, even though these facilities were all aware on June 19, 2007 that they needed to come into compliance by October 1 of 2007—or 2008 if they got a one-year extension—nothing on the schedules begins until the middle of September of 2007. Lopez acknowledged that concern. She said staff was in discussion with Rosboro by September, and they were actually trying to meet the October 1, 2007 deadline at that time. She added that SierraPine was also in discussions with LRAPA staff, about internal staffing changes they were making for engineering of changes that were being made. Permit writer Max Hueftle said staff was also in discussions with Flakeboard facility personnel during the period between June 19 and October 1. Carpenter said he doesn't know whether LRAPA's rules allow those communications to be taken into account when determining whether or not to grant an extension; but he thinks that they potentially should be, because it shows good faith by the permittee, that they are actually moving forward with haste to try to put things in order. Carpenter said that was why he was considering a potential nine-month extension, because that would have actually given them a year after the June 19 notice decision, to come into compliance. He added that he noticed that staff was requiring any facility that was granted an extension to provide monthly progress reports. He also learned from his discussions with Lopez that LRAPA only has 30 days to act on the requests. Lopez said staff has already acted on some but held off on the Rosboro request. Once staff deems their request to be complete, staff will have 30 days to review that submittal. Lopez explained further that one of the two requests from Flakeboard has been granted and the extension issued. The other, an either/or alternative request, has not yet been issued because the request is incomplete.

Carpenter brought up the SierraPine request and said that, since he got into it further following the October board meeting, he sees that they have a pretty detailed schedule and that they will be putting in some newer technology that may do a better job of reducing emissions than some of the older technologies. He said it looks like things have been handled correctly. He suggested, however, that it might be useful to have a rule to address that period when the industry would have been put on notice of an impending requirement and what actions an affected facility should take during that period. Those actions could be included as a factor in the evaluation of a request for extension of a deadline. Lopez agreed with that suggestion, stating that, in thinking back, staff should have had the facilities document their progress during that time, to show good-faith effort.

Johnson asked if the extensions are an enforceable agreement, and Lopez said they are. Johnson asked if the extensions are granted as a compliance order. Lopez said she and Hueftle talked about that earlier. There will be a modification application to put the compliance agreement into the Title V permit. In addition, if the renewal date for the title V permit is not yet up, you can have an addendum to that permit. Staff has been discussing how to handle that part of it, but the extension will be considered a Title V permit condition and will have a schedule of compliance. This process is very different from an enforcement action.

Johnson set out a hypothetical scenario where EPA comes up with another creative interpretation of MACT in the spring and asked if LRAPA will once again be in a loop, waiting for the courts to decide how to

interpret the regulation. He said his preference would be that, with the approval of extensions, there be no more changes allowed. That would be the compliance option that would be required, independent of what EPA does. Lopez said EPA has actually modified its rule, according to the court mandate. The deadline for the plywood MACT is October 1, 2007. There are, however, some other sections that don't apply to these facilities, that EPA did not modify in that rule. Lopez said that, in terms of LRAPA's subject facilities and what they have to do to comply, EPA has modified that rule with a final date of October 1, 2007. Johnson asked if all three of the plywood facilities that have extensions will be in compliance by October 1 of 2008, and Lopez confirmed that they must be in compliance by that date.

Kirkpatrick asked if there will be a set penalty if they are not in compliance by October 1, 2008. Lopez there would be enforcement action, and it would go through the civil penalty matrix. To illustrate that October 1, 2008 is a "drop-dead" deadline, Lopez said that one of the alternative requests that staff is not quite sure about issuing includes the provision that, if the facility were not in compliance by October 1, 2008, they would go immediately into enforcement status and be required to install the other control device. Lopez added that, if these facilities do not comply by October 1, 2008, regardless of whether or not they received extensions, LRAPA will be required to issue violations. She added that staff is hoping that does not happen.

Carpenter noted that the facilities have 180 days after the compliance date to demonstrate compliance, which he assumes would be some kind of stack testing. He asked, if they elected to wait until the last thing and then failed that stack test, would there be a presumption that the facility has been out of compliance since the day they were supposed to be in compliance. Lopez said that, based on her work with lawyers in California and Texas, the agency could only find them out of compliance as of the day they took that source test, and until they do another compliance source test which shows they are in compliance. The agency would not have evidence to show that they were out of compliance the day before the original source test. Carpenter suggested that LRAPA require that, if a source test shows a facility to be out of compliance, they must test again within 15 to 30 days of October 1, 2008. Lopez said the requirements can be made more stringent. Carpenter asked that staff add to the extensions a requirement that performance testing be accomplished within 15 to 30 days of the October 1, 2008 deadline. He asked if Lopez needed a motion to include that requirement. She said she did not think she did. She said she needs to look at it very carefully, but it probably would be fore like 15 to 60 days because staff has to look at protocols. She said she thinks it is a good comment and would be a good requirement.

Monk commented that he believes any facilities that are subject to the plywood MACT knew that they would have to be in compliance by October 1, 2007. They should have begun working in 2004 to get information from vendors and prepare to be in compliance by the deadline. Monk said his opinion is that LRAPA does not have the authority to offer extension of the compliance deadline. He said his understanding is that the only justification for granting an extension is if the facility is having difficulty with assessing and/or installing the necessary equipment. Lopez noted that Monk had mentioned this previously, and she had looked into it. She said extensions have been granted under this section for other cases—even ones where they weren't given that year extension, originally. She asked Monk if his point was that LRAPA should have made a determination that they did not need the extension, to begin with. He said that was his point. He said this amounts to foot-dragging and that he is concerned that in this year-long extension period, facility owners will be hard at work lobbying the Bush Administration for some kind of modification to delay compliance again. He reiterated Johnson's point, that whatever equipment and compliance schedules are required in any extensions that are issued must be part of the permit and must be adhered to regardless of whatever actions EPA might take in the next year.

Referring to questions he brought up in October regarding SierraPine's use of a biofilter, Monk said he was glad to see that the technology has apparently improved enough over the last five years to be a good option to bring that source into compliance with plywood MACT requirements. Monk also said he agrees with Hough that allowing additional time for compliance might result in better technology, adding that he is all for that. However, he said he is still concerned about SierraPine's ability to get a biofilter constructed and operating by the deadline. If there any problems, as he knows there were at Forrest Paint with their biofilter, he's concerned that they might not be able to have the biofilter operating adequately in time to meet the compliance deadline. However, Monk said, he thinks installing a biofilter is a much better solution than the alternative solution they were considering.

Monk said he remembered Lopez stating at the October meeting that only one extension had been issued, and two or three more were pending at that time. He asked if any new extensions had been issued since the last board meeting. Lopez said that she actually said that two extensions had been granted, one being the Flakeboard request that was granted previously and the other being the extension to SierraPine. The one to SierraPine had not yet actually gone out at the time of the October board meeting, but it was signed off for approval before that meeting. She said she was hoping someone would bring that up so she could clarify what happened.

Carpenter noted that there were several people in the audience at this meeting who represent industrial facilities permitted by LRAPA. He asked if any of them would like to speak to the board about the plywood MACT issue, stating that he would be glad to hear from them. Carpenter also requested that the board be on a mailing list to receive the monthly progress reports LRAPA receives from those facilities that have received these extensions. There was no response from anyone in the audience.

Johnson asked if there is a backstop mechanism in the approved extensions, in case the compliance schedules break down or the chosen technology for a facility does not work after all. Lopez responded that only one of the extension requests has a backstop, where within a certain amount of time they would install an RTO (thermal oxidizer), and that is because of the nature of the request. That particular extension has not yet been issued. Lopez said that, with the other extensions, there would be the normal enforcement action to take. She said there would be a compliance schedule if the facility needed further trouble-shooting in order to get the control system on line. If the control system were to completely break down, LRAPA would get a compliance schedule for new controls which would follow the same process.

Johnson said he understands that these extension approvals are not enforcement actions. They are being treated more as permit applications. He said as he understands permit applications, they can be withdrawn and modified at a future date. He said he is still a little unsure about what legal mechanism LRAPA will use to prevent that kind of modification, because his ultimate concern is toxic pollution in the air. The extensions will allow emission of toxic pollutants into the air for another year, and he is concerned about that.

Lopez said the enforcement mechanism is the Title V permit. It will not matter if the regulations change, because the requirements will still be in the permits. The facilities will have to meet those requirements unless they are taken out of the permits. Regarding the compliance extensions, themselves, Lopez said if the facilities don't meet the conditions of the extensions, they will be deemed out of compliance as of October 1, 2007. She explained further that the benchmarks in the compliance schedules are not necessarily drop-dead dates because the engineering sometimes takes more or less time than anticipated. But if a facility were to really miss a benchmark or were operating in bad faith, the extension would be null and void, and they would be deemed out of compliance as of October 1, 2007.

Monk asked which three facilities went to synthetic minor status, and Lopez said they were Murphy Plywood, Bald Knob Veneer (formerly Weyerhaeuser, Springfield), and Swanson (formerly McKenzie Forest Products). Hueftle explained further that Veneer Technologies Junction City (formerly Trus Joist) removed presses in order to fall below the major source emissions category. Johnson asked if there are new small press facilities now, if Veneer Technologies' action to removed presses just spread pollution around the county. Hueftle said that is not the case.

Carpenter asked Hueftle to explain what "synthetic minor" means. Hueftle explained that "synthetic minor" means that a facility can take limits on their emissions such that they are not a major, or Title V, source. They can accomplish that by limiting their operating hours or throughputs, or just the emissions, themselves. They can do that for both HAPs and criteria pollutants. Hueftle said if the source emits 24 tons per year aggregate HAPs or 9 tons of a single HAP, they can avoid MACT, even if they are still a Title V source for criteria pollutants.

Kirkpatrick said she is a little concerned that if they lower their production to reduce emissions, perhaps they are doing it because the demand is low. When the demand rises again, will they increase production and be out of compliance? Hueftle said he does not think the emissions decreases were achieved, in most cases, by lowering production. For example, Hueftle said that Pacific States Plywood (formerly Weyerhaeuser, Springfield) is maintaining the same allowable throughput that they had before. But they have done a more exhaustive inventory of the emissions and determined that they can meet those limits. Lopez added that if, in the future, they want to grow, they would have to modify the permit and be in compliance as of day-one with the new permit.

Monk reminded Lopez that cost recovery is important, because staff has spent a lot of time of this. Lopez said she assumed she could go ahead and finish reviewing the remaining requests and grant the extensions. Stewart agreed.

Lopez reminded board members that boiler MACT is still coming, and there might be some of these same issues with that.

8. CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION ON STRATEGIC PLANNING–NEW IDEAS: Hough said he intended this agenda item to be feedback to the board, to give them the results of the survey of which of the 21 new ideas they would like to pursue further. He said he planned to look in more detail at the ideas that had the most votes, to assess which of those have the greatest potential for making an air quality difference, also considering the resource requirements for each, such as staff and board time and contracted dollars to achieve the results. The board can then decide which of the ideas will have the greatest impact for the amount of resources required. Staff had prepared a chart showing how many votes each idea received, as well as which board members voted for each one. It was decided that the ideas that received four or five votes would be the ones about which staff would gather more information for a future board meeting.

There was some discussion of the somewhat surprising results of the survey in the case of some of the ideas. Kirkpatrick asked what the process had been to come to this decision and whether she could weigh in on these choices at the next meeting. Johnson said there is a lot of background materials that she would need to read to come up to speed. Stewart added that the board has had several strategic planning meetings and goal setting sessions. He said she could be provided with all the background information to review, and get back to the board with any comments she may have. Carpenter said his sense would be that perhaps her input would not be included in the final tally, but he would certainly like to know what her five or six choices of new

ideas would be. Kirkpatrick asked if her input would be more unofficial, and Carpenter asked if that would work for other board members. Monk said it was fine with him. Ralston said he agreed with Carpenter's assessment. He added that her input might be a little skewed if she went through the information and looked at the results of the survey, then made her choices knowing what the other board members had chosen. The survey results have come from board members making their choices without knowing what the other board members' choices would be. Ralston said, though, that he would be interested in knowing what Kirkpatrick's choices would be.

Hough said this list of new ideas, and the board's choices of which ones to look at in greater depth, adds to the core of the strategic plan. The mission has been completed, along with the major goals, and the high priorities have been identified. He said this discussion of new ideas is intended to identify two or three things that the whole board can support, and Kirkpatrick's input is welcome in that regard and will be critical at the very end of the process.

Stewart noted that were five votes for the first idea, multi-year budget perspective on current programs and funding sources. He said he thought that was not to be included on the list because the board has already directed staff to do that. He said he did not vote for it for that reason. He also commented regarding the second idea, managing for results (connect allocation of money to results to determine whether funds are being spent in the best way). Stewart said he supports the idea but doesn't see the agency having much ability to change the way the money is allocated in any major way. He said if the board has options to reallocate money, he would like to know about that.

Johnson said what he had in mind on number 2, managing for results, is illustrated by the open burning rule amendments that are currently in process. Johnson said in looking at the rule changes, his first question is how much does this rule cost the agency to implement. He said he has some knowledge of the process by which the letter permits are issued and of how the enforcement is carried out; and it is expensive for the agency to implement this rule. His next question is how much air pollution does this rule take out of the air, and he doesn't see any kind of changes in this rule that reduce air pollution. Rather, he sees it as enabling the status quo, as far as burning and disposal of waste material. Johnson said he really is not looking for reallocation of budget dollars, but more at being sure that activities carried out by the agency reflect the board's sentiment—how much does this rule cost, and how much does it benefit air quality.

Monk added to Johnson's comments by also focusing on the proposed amendments to the agency's open burning rules. Keeping in mind the new direction the board would like to go regarding open burning of yard waste, there could be some alternatives put into the rules. Perhaps there are some opportunities to find ways to use any of the materials that could be valuable; and there could be incentives to encourage people to bring yard waste to some central location in their area to be chipped. Monk said that would be huge for our air quality. He said he had been on Mt. Pisgah a couple of weeks prior to this meeting and had observed 18 separate fires. Monk repeated his previous statement that he does not think there is any justification for commercial construction open burning. He recalled Patterson's comment that carpenters grab waste wood and take it home and acknowledged that is probably true; however, he speculated that at a large project with multiple houses, they probably burn a good deal of the material. Monk said he will ask at the public hearing regarding the open burning rules if the board really wants to finalize the rule before having a serious discussion about the kind of incentives that might help prevent as much of this burning as possible. He commented further that grass clippings are the best crawl material you can use for composting and that burning grass clippings and leaves and polluting the air is craziness. Monk said LRAPA has to do some educating, and perhaps changing the rules is the best means of educating the public. LRAPA should perhaps make some

changes that say to the public that they are throwing away a valuable resource and harming the air quality in the process, and that those days are over because people are living too closely to allow it.

Ralston noted that number 12, free or reduce-cost yard debris disposal in rural areas, is basically the same thing as number 11, yard waste disposal alternatives (increase open burning permit fees and use money to partner with forest products recycling industry to subsidize or incentivize other means of disposal of yard waste). He suggested that Monk could move his vote from number 12 to number 11, to give that idea five votes. Monk said the two ideas are the same thing in his mind, too. Hough said number 11 had four votes, so it was one staff planned to look at more closely, anyway.

6. PRESENTATION BY GREG AITKEN OF DEQ REGARDING THE RAILYARD CLEANUP PROJECT IN THE TRAINSONG AREA OF WEST EUGENE: Hough introduced Greg Aitken, a groundwater scientist with Oregon DEQ, and the cleanup manager overseeing the railyard cleanup. Hough said that some of the background for this presentation is that Lane County Commissioner Bobby Green has been receiving contacts of concern from a number of his constituents, and he forwarded those questions and concerns to Stewart, who sent them to Hough. Hough and Stewart had decided this would be a good information item for the LRAPA board, to make sure the board is aware of what is happening with the railyard cleanup. Hough added that LRAPA has been a resource to DEQ through this process, as have several other public agencies.

Aitken said he has been working in cleanup for over twenty years, and the Eugene railyard project is one of the more challenging ones he's worked on for a long time. He said he wanted to thank Hough and LRAPA staff for helping DEQ with some of the regional air quality issues that this project has caused to surface. He also acknowledged the contribution of the Oregon Public Health Division, in alerting residents of the neighborhoods around the railyard in May to a public health hazard, and then to an indeterminate public health hazard based on their most recent health assessment which was issued the week prior to this board meeting. Aitken said he has been working on this railyard cleanup project for over ten years, and DEQ has been working with Union Pacific and its predecessor Southern Pacific since 1993, on a voluntary program to try to get the groundwater contamination cleaned up. He said the railyard encompasses a 200 acre property, with the Lower River Road Neighborhood on one side and the Trainsong Neighborhood on another. The key features of the property are a large diesel shop building and several other small buildings. A lot of demolition has occurred over the last few years in the area where the source of the solvents occurred that ultimately contaminated the groundwater. The original turn-table on the railyard, with its roundhouse, appears to be where chlorinated solvents—mostly the degreasers trichloroethylene (TCE) and perchloroethylene (PCE)—were dumped, spilled and dripped onto the ground over a long period of time. Aitken said the Eugene railyard was Oregon's busiest during the middle of the twentieth century, and there were probably a lot of the chemicals released over time.

Aitken described the two basic exposure pathways that are relevant to this particular cleanup. One is the irrigation well pathway in which the solvents which were spilled or dumped in the roundhouse area migrated down into the groundwater table, which is very shallow in this area—only about 15 or so feet below ground surface in the dry season. The contaminated groundwater then migrates into neighborhoods. Aitken explained that people can become exposed to the chemicals through an irrigation well or through the other exposure pathway, which is the vapor exposure pathway, where these particular volatile chemicals migrate away from groundwater, up through the soil horizon, into crawl spaces under people's homes and into the airspace that they breathe. Aitken said the good news about irrigation well exposure is that, as far as DEQ is aware, everyone in the area is on city water, through EWEB so that no one is drinking the water from the irrigation wells. Eight irrigation wells in the area are currently in use in the dry season and are used for

gardening, car washing, and filling children's swimming pools. Aitken showed a depiction of the contamination plume for PCE, as measured in March 2007, showing that the plume extended several thousand feet into the River Road neighborhood and into a small portion of the Trainsong Neighborhood. Aitken said the thing he tries to emphasize to people is that the mere presence of this contamination is not the issue. The levels of contaminants are very low, at one part per million. From DEQ's standpoint, in terms of their program and how they look at risk, exclusively, it's not the presence of contamination as much as how people are exposed to it, at what doses, and how they may be affected by those doses.

Aitken then showed a depiction of the same pathway, but with TCE, the other one of the two chemicals that DEQ has been worrying about at that location. He said TCE is much more toxic than PCE, and it drives all the human health risks that DEQ worries about with regard to those contaminants. TCE appears to have less of a presence in the plume into the River Road Neighborhood, and a small portion of the plume into the Trainsong Neighborhood is TCE

Monk asked if that is a sinker, and Aitken said it is, but DEQ is not aware of pure produce. He said that, unlike some of the other DEQ cleanup sites in Oregon with similar problems, they have never documented free-phase solvent product, either on the railyard or off-site. It appears to be purely dissolve-phase. Aitken said that for both River Road and Trainsong neighborhoods, DEQ has plotted up groundwater concentrations of TCE, screening against a threshold that calculates the level of solvent that would have to be there before DEQ would begin to think there is even a potential for a health risk from TCE. He pointed out that, in the case of both neighborhoods, with regard to the irrigation well scenario, given the threshold they have developed, DEQ is able to screen out a potential health risk from any groundwater in either of the two neighborhoods, for outdoor use purposes. They have concluded that use of irrigation wells, even those few that are mildly contaminated with these solvents, in either neighborhood, is safe.

Aitken then focused on the vapor intrusion pathway, with potential vapors entering indoor air spaces. He showed another depiction of groundwater concentrations of TCE plotted for both neighborhoods, with a threshold value calculated for where DEQ would begin to think there is even a potential risk to public health. He explained that the threshold value does not indicate there is a risk but is a screening tool to tell DEQ whether they need to do more investigation and more risk assessment. For most of the area on the map, Aitken said DEQ has found that groundwater contamination is below that threshold, which tell them there is no—or negligible—potential for a health threat in terms of vapor intrusions coming from contaminated groundwater and entering people's homes. He pointed out one area in the Trainsong Neighborhood where the groundwater at one well, at the intersection of Haig and Bethel Drive, exceeds by a considerable amount that threshold value for TCE. That indicated that more work needed to be done in the Trainsong Neighborhood to evaluate potential threats from vapor intrusion.

Ralston asked if someone had been documenting this since 1998, and Aitken said groundwater wells began to be installed by the Southern Pacific Railroad in 1998, meaning that there is about ten years' worth of investigation of the groundwater. Soil investigation began in 1993. The Union Pacific Railroad began several rounds of air monitoring in the area in August 2007. The project included monitoring of 31 homes, measuring concentrations of these solvents in soil gas, about five feet below the ground surface, samples taken in canisters inside people's crawl spaces, and samples taken immediately outside that crawl space to be representative of outdoor air on that property. A third set of samples was taken inside the air space in nine homes. Aitken said the reason all homes do not have their inside air sampled is because there are a lot of problems with interference and cross-contamination from products in use in the homes now, such as spot cleaners and cleaning products. DEQ chose to focus mainly on crawl spaces as a surrogate for indoor air,

assuming that whatever is in the crawl space ends up inside the home. Aitken pointed out seven homes in one location which are potentially affected by vapor intrusions from the groundwater contamination originating from the railyard. Aitken also explained that there is a background level of these solvents everywhere because they are still in use and are common contaminants in the urban environment..

Kirkpatrick asked if DEQ would target point source locations such as dry cleaners, to clean those up initially. Aitken said they would not. In DEQ's cleanup program, all that they would do is focus exclusively on the extent to which the railyard and groundwater contamination associated with that is a contributor. They look at the excess risk that the railyard generates as a result of the groundwater contamination, above and beyond background. Aitken explained a bit further about the levels at which groundwater pollutants trigger a DEQ cleanup process, indicating that the cleanup levels for TCE and PCE are two orders of magnitude lower than the levels which trigger concern for LRAPA. As far as equivalent concentrations that the health division concerns itself with, in terms of categorizing risk, DEQ's cleanup standard, and where DEQ is with the crawl space maximums that they measured, those concentrations are in the negligible risk category for the health division. He also pointed out a maximum TCE measurement of 18 in one of the homes but stated that, although there is no way to prove exactly what that was, it appears to be an outlier—fugitive emissions from an unknown source, and DEQ does not attribute that measurement to the railyard.

Aitken summarized DEQ findings regarding the two neighborhoods by saying that the final conclusion is that River Road is safe, both in terms of irrigation well water use and in terms of the possibility of vapor intrusion from low levels of groundwater contamination that occur in that neighborhood. In the Trainsong Neighborhood, DEQ has concluded that all the irrigation well water is safe, but up to seen homes closest to the railyard could be seeing some contribution from the railyard. The risk, however, is still very low and not an imminent health threat. The air in all other Trainsong homes tested is safe from vapor intrusion from the railyard groundwater plume.

Aitken then described what is being done about the contamination. Fortunately, Union Pacific agreed to do mitigation for the seven homes deemed to be getting some contribution from the railyard. They will accomplish this by lining the crawl spaces with an especially high-quality vapor barrier and by providing ventilation underneath the vapor barriers that would draw anything migrating subsurface out from underneath the crawl space and outside of the homes. Aitken said this process is still on-going because of problems of getting into the crawl spaces and eliminating rodents so they can't puncture the vapor barriers. In addition, Aitken said, Union Pacific had agreed, just three weeks before this board meeting, to DEQ's request to do a soil vapor extraction pilot test of the one well which had the highest concentrations of TCE off-site of the railyard. This will involve applying a vacuum to the subsurface and, hopefully, drawing out solvents that occur in the soil gas. Aitken said, while this is a step in the right directions, there is reason to be a little skeptical as to how effective that process will be, given how tight soils are and how slowly things move in that environment. Aitken also described the groundwater treatment Union Pacific has done underneath the original turntable area, using a dextrose injection/extraction system by which they fed naturally occurring bacteria in the ground that are predisposed to degrading those chemicals naturally. He said that has been more effective at this site than it has been at other sites where he has tried using this technology.

Aitken then went over the next steps to be taken in the cleanup, including: the vapor extraction system will continue at the corner of Haig and Bethel; the crawl space vapor barrier installations and associated monitoring will be completed; by mid-2008 the cleanup process will reach the final cleanup actions for the railyard and neighborhoods. He said there will be some big engineering studies for that phase which might take a year to complete and will look at all the various cleanup alternatives that are reasonable for that area,

to deal with contamination, not only from the solvents that he had been talking about at this meeting, but by other contaminants that occurred on the railyard, itself, such as heavy hydrocarbons and heavy metals. DEQ hopes to propose selection of the final cleanup remedy or remedies in 2009, through a public comment and participation process. Following that, in 2010, the DEQ director will select the final cleanup actions that Union Pacific will be required to implement.

Fortune asked what the radiation lifetime of TCE is. Aitken said he did not know exactly what the half-life would be, but that it depends on the environment in which it exists. For instance, he said, TCE and PCE are relatively unstable in air, particularly PCE. They tend to degrade quickly when exposed to ultraviolet light and temperature in the ambient environment. Subsurface they degrade much more slowly, as evidenced by how stubborn these plumes are in those West Eugene neighborhoods. He pointed out that the contamination plumes he showed the board, while big, are not growing any more and, in fact, the contaminants actually appear to be slowly declining, though not quickly enough for most of us. In conclusion, Aitken said DEQ is not worried about it. Underground, the half-life is quite long; however, once it reaches the ambient air, it degrades much more quickly. Hough said that staff member Tim Sawyer had put together some information on this, and PCE has about a 15-day half life in ambient air, with TCE having about 100 days.

Kirkpatrick said she had heard that the groundwater plume is actually receding and that water was being pumped out of groundwater sources, having some effect on this problem. She asked if those statements were true. Aitken said the concentrations in the plume seem to be declining at some locations; however, it is not a clean, nice declining trend that he sees at other sites that he works on, with similar contaminants. He said he would not like to raise expectations by stating that the plume is shrinking, but it certainly is not expanding. He added that, where it counts—close to the source area—the concentrations are declining; and he attributes a lot of that to the groundwater treatment that has taken place on the source area. As to pumping the water out, Aitken said the conventional approach in these situations is to pump to get as much water as possible out, then treat it by running it through carbon or aeration, and then injecting it back in or dumping it somewhere. That has not been a technology applied at this site. They have been extracting it, nourishing it with dextrose solution, and then pumping it back into the ground to feed the “bugs” that then naturally degrade the contaminants.

Monk noted that neighbors who have been told that the ground water is safe for irrigation have probably pumped tens of thousands of gallons over the past decade. Aitken agreed, stating that, given the size of the water-bearing zone and the amount of pumping that actually occurs during the summer months, the amount of the water that has been pumped out for those uses has been a lot less than DEQ sees at other sites where these conditions exist. Groundwater scientists have to take a very hard look at exactly what those pumping effects are.

Monk then noted that the health division report recommends that water from municipal water supplies should be used for drinking water purposes and to fill backyard wading pools for small children. The DEQ information says that irrigation wells in the neighborhood are safe for outdoor groundwater use, including gardening, car washing, and swimming. He asked why the recommendations are different for dermal contact for small children. Aitken said he did not know the answer to that. He said his understanding, from talking to the epidemiologist who authored that health assessment, is that she offered that up as a precautionary recommendation not based on risk determination. DEQ’s perspective, given their bright-line standard of one incidence of cancer in a million, is that they are loath to provide that sort of precautionary advice if they determine, technically, that the risk is less than what they consider to be their bright-line standard for cleanup.

Johnson said he wondered if the Spokane background concentration was high. He said he believes Spokane has a municipal waste combustor, and he wondered if that wouldn't explain the high background concentration. He also asked if there is any data from the Amazon Park monitors and, if so, what that background looks like. Hough said that when Tim Sawyer searched for data, he had two criteria in mind. One was to have a least a full year of data, and a multiple site if possible. The other was that it be in an area reasonably comparable to Eugene/Springfield. Spokane had a special air toxics grant in 2005, to do four different sites; and they had similar levels at all four sites, within plus or minus 20 percent. Consequently, Spokane's data seemed the most useful. Regarding LRAPA's Amazon monitoring site, Hough said the agency does monitor background at that site. He said the detection limits that LRAPA uses, which are similar to Portland or Idaho, are very close to the ambient benchmark that come out of the Air Toxics Science Advisory Committee, half a microgram per cubic meter. Hough said TCE has rarely been detected at the Amazon site at that level; in fact, the annual average cannot actually calculate, because there aren't enough measurables. Hough said the Spokane study went to an ultra-clean detection level, which is what the railroad consultants also had to do in order to set those detection limits low enough to measure TCE and PCE at the Eugene railyard site. Johnson asked if Hough was saying that the Amazon background is at or below the DEQ benchmark, and Hough said that is right.

9. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Reply To Vander Meer's Concerns. Stewart asked Hough to reply to Gery Vander Meer's concerns about appointments to the LRAPA Board of Directors. Stewart said it would be good to reiterate that the mayors of Cottage Grove, Eugene, Oakridge and Springfield appoint people on their own separate schedules, and the Board of Commissioners representative can be a different commissioner every year. Johnson suggested also attaching a copy of the statute that spells out board makeup in detail. A brief discussion clarified that Eugene can appoint four people to the board, all nominated by the mayor and appointed by the council. Springfield has the ability to appoint one councilor but, when the population of Springfield reaches a certain threshold, the city will be able to appoint another member to LRAPA's board. Johnson commented that Springfield's population status being so near that threshold is the reason that the board decided to appoint a resident of Springfield to the second at-large board position in 2005, when Carpenter was first appointed.
- B. Earl Koenig's Application to LRAPA Advisory Committee. Monk brought up the subject of Earl Koenig's application to be appointed to the advisory committee. Stewart said there was a question from Russ Ayers relating to the fact the committee has lost one member and is down from thirteen members to twelve at present. Stewart asked if the board wanted to look at directing the committee to look at potentially filling one spot or multiple spots since they are allowed a maximum of fifteen members.

Monk said the board needs to replace the member who recently left, Bonnie Palmer, who represented the general public on the committee. He said the only reservation he had about just automatically appointing Koenig was that, as Ayers had mentioned, there were some other applicants who were probably well qualified, who did not get appointed earlier in the year when the board made several appointments to the committee. Monk suggested that the board look again at those individuals in the near future, to get at least one other person on the committee. Hough commented that the board had reviewed all of those applications and had interviewed several of the applicants in the spring, and Koenig's was the only new application that had been received.

Johnson suggested that the board review all of the applications, including Koenig's, and go through a process to select one person to appoint. Monk concurred.

Carpenter asked if the new appointee would fill out Palmer's term or start a new term of their own. Staff member Dinteman said the board has usually appointed members to new terms in the past, but it depends on what the board wants to do in appointing someone to replace Palmer on the committee. Johnson said the statute just says that the terms need to be staggered so that they do not all expire at the same time. Whether a new appointee filled out the remainder of Palmer's term or started a new term would not matter, as long as the terms are staggered.

10. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 2:12 p.m. The next regular meeting of the LRAPA Board of Directors is scheduled for Tuesday, November 6, 2007, in the LRAPA Meeting Room at 1010 Main Street, Springfield, Oregon.

Respectfully submitted,

Merrie Dinteman
Recording Secretary