

**MINUTES**  
LANE REGIONAL AIR PROTECTION AGENCY  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
TUESDAY–MARCH 9, 2010  
LRAPA MEETING ROOM  
1010 MAIN STREET  
SPRINGFIELD, OREGON

ATTENDANCE

- Board: Glenn Fortune, Chair–Oakridge/Cottage Grove; David Monk, Vice-Chair–Eugene; Bill Brommelsiek–At-Large (Springfield Area); Brian Forge–At-Large (General); Drew Johnson–Eugene; Scott Lucas–Eugene; Andrea Ortiz–Eugene; Dave Ralston–Springfield; Faye Stewart–Lane County (via phone)  
(ABSENT: None)
- Staff: Merlyn Hough–Director; Merrie Dinteman; Matthew Lee; Sandra Lopez; Sally Markos; Nasser Mirhosseyni
- Other: Earl Koenig, Chair, Amy Peccia, Vice-Chair, Russ Ayers, and John Tamulonis–LRAPA Advisory Committee; Landa Gillette–LRAPA Budget Committee; Bill Carpenter; Jim Daniels–Rosboro; Jan Nelson; Laura Seyler–International Paper

1. OPENING: **Fortune** called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m.

Before moving on to the items on today’s agenda, **Fortune** presented **Bill Carpenter** with a plaque and a letter, thanking **Carpenter** for his years of leadership and service as a member of LRAPA’s board. The letter specifically called attention to **Carpenter**’s ability to see all sides of a issue and make a balanced decision based on what he felt was best for all of Lane County’s residents. It also made mention of **Carpenter**’s willingness to devote extra time, outside of board meetings, to LRAPA activities, and encouraged him to continue to communicate with the agency regarding concerns and suggestions about Lane County’s air pollution issues and LRAPA’s air pollution control programs. **Carpenter** thanked the board and staff for the plaque and for the letter. He thanked the board and staff members for the opportunity to work with them and wished the board continued success.

2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

A. **Jan Nelson**, 85354 Doane Road, Eugene, Regarding LRAPA Public Information Service. **Nelson** requested three things as a public information service of LRAPA:

- (1) Publish annually seasonal and locality-based air quality standards, for the pollutants under LRAPA’s jurisdiction, on LRAPA’s website and in local publications. She suggested a bar graph showing the current levels of air contaminants, compared to the LRAPA standard, and asked that the agency also list known pollutants not under LRAPA’s jurisdiction. She said that information would help the public to understand what the standards are and where Lane County stands with respect to those standards.
- (2) Hold an informational forum for the public to ask questions of all board members and staff.
- (3) Hold a hearing before the Board of Directors to review and reconsider the maximum amount of air contaminants permissible in LRAPA’s jurisdiction.

**Nelson** also presented a petition with about thirty signatures of other Lane County residents who agree with the suggestions she made. She added that she believes the public deserves to have the board present at public hearings. She said she thinks it is very disrespectful of the public when they are asked to speak into a tape recorder instead of speaking to the board directly.

**Fortune** thanked **Nelson** for her comments and for the petition. The petition was given to the board secretary.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR:

A. Approval of Minutes of January 12, 2010 Board Meeting.

**ACTION: Brommelsiek MOVED adoption of the minutes of the February 9, 2010 meeting, as submitted. Monk SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE.**

B. Approval of Expense Reports Through January 31, 2010. Prior to taking action on the expense reports, **Monk** had several questions. He noted that the grants passthrough amount was much less than anticipated, and asked for clarification of that. **Mirhosseyeni** said the only grant that is outstanding is the ethanol grant. The initial authorization received by LRAPA was for about \$600,000 and, to date, only about half of that has been spent. Staff will be working to finalize the project and, if necessary, will request an extension. **Monk** noted that the anticipated estimated expenditures, to date, were \$196,000, but the actual reported was \$11,000. **Mirhosseyeni** responded that the majority of the funds were spent previously and, to date in the current fiscal year, \$11,000 has been spent. He said it is anticipated that some additional funds will be spent by the end of the current fiscal year, and there will be carryover which will be spent in the next fiscal year.

**Monk** then asked about Research & Development (R&D) costs for Airmetrics. **Mirhosseyeni** responded that some of the R&D costs had to do with modifications made to comply with the requirements of one of Airmetrics' major customers in South Korea. The reason those costs were included under R&D is because the modifications resulted in an improvement to the product by adding some functions to it.

**Johnson** asked if Airmetrics lost money last year. **Mirhosseyeni** said the large inventory adjustment made during the last fiscal year resulted in a loss on paper. Reiterating his explanations at prior meetings, **Mirhosseyeni** said the large adjustment was made because, prior to that year, most subassemblies were produced by staff at Airmetrics; but many of those subassemblies are now purchased from outside of Airmetrics. The same inventory was still being maintained on the books, but Airmetrics was receiving some of that inventory as whole assemblies rather than individual parts. Moving from in-house assembly to outside assembly was what required the large inventory adjustment to be made during the last fiscal year. There will not be more of those large adjustments because all of that information has now been reconciled. **Mirhosseyeni** added that, if you look at a single year, costs against revenues, Airmetrics made money last year; but, if you include the large inventory adjustment, there would be a loss. **Mirhosseyeni** told **Johnson** he would be glad to give him more details if he wanted them. He offered to take any interested board members to the Airmetrics shop to show them what happened and why the inventory adjustment had to be made.

**Hough** said there are three major points regarding the adjustment. The key one is going to the lean manufacturing model, where we don't have as much overhead at the agency, by going from individual

parts to sub-assemblies. That resulted in some double-counting of parts for a while. Another factor is going from the old sampler to the new, simpler design. The third point is that the auditors recommended that staff wait to do the inventory adjustment until after the audit for that year had been completed. He said any of those three points could be a detailed conversation on its own, and **Mirhosseyni** agreed that it is complicated, but repeated his offer to show interested board members more of the details of why that adjustment was made.

**Monk** said an adjustment in inventory affects the bottom line. On the books there was a certain amount of inventory for one year, and suddenly staff realized that they had over-counted. He said that obviously impacted what was anticipated to be a financial success for Airmetrics. He said he thought **Johnson**'s question about whether Airmetrics made money last year was valid; and before the budget development process gets too far advanced this year, there should be a much better understanding of how that double-counting worked. **Monk** said he wanted to have all the information available to the board as they talk about funding for Airmetrics and whether a profit can be anticipated from Airmetrics for the coming fiscal year.

**ACTION: Ralston MOVED approval of the expense reports through January 31, 2010. Brommelsiek SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (Brommelsiek/Forge/Fortune/Ortiz/Ralston/Stewart) IN FAVOR AND THREE (Johnson/Lucas/Monk) ABSTENTIONS.**

**Brommelsiek** said the Special Projects portion of the monthly expense reports tend to look very similar from month to month. He asked **Mirhosseyni** to highlight new activity in the Special Projects portion, so that board members can tell more easily what has been done recently on those projects.

4. FIVE-YEAR BUDGET PROJECTION: **Mirhosseyni** presented the five-year budget projection, from 2010 through 2014. He started with projections assuming stable funding and then gave the projections assuming worst-case funding.

**Stable case funding assumes: no change in federal funds; CPI increase in state general funds; CPI increases in local dues for each year after the current fiscal year; CPI increase for Title V fees; 4 percent increase per year in ACDP fees; mid-range to break-even for Airmetrics; and no contributions from new special projects.**

The ending fund balance for the current fiscal year is projected to be about \$1-million for the three sources—Title V, General Fund, and Airmetrics. Under the stable case scenario, the fund balance would degrade over the next five years.

Regarding cash on hand, **Monk** asked how the agency could have gone from two days' worth of cash to over twenty days. **Mirhosseyni** explained that two staff members left and were not replaced. In addition, staff is careful about how it spends its limited resources. He said it is staff's expectation to have enough cash at the end of the fiscal year to be able to operate for the first couple of months of the next fiscal year, until funding from the different sources comes in to cover expenses. **Mirhosseyni** explained that 54 percent of the funding received is from permit fees, and the next highest amount is from federal funding, then state General Fund money, then local dues, then fund transfers between funds, and then miscellaneous sources such as interest income from the cash on hand.

**Forge** asked if there is any relationship between LRAPA receiving funding from the state and DEQ not having to monitor in Lane County. **Hough** said LRAPA does most of what DEQ does in the rest of the state, but not all. The state General Fund provided for air programs was initially intended to be a fair split between DEQ and what LRAPA does in Lane County; however, there was significant erosion in LRAPA's share, over time. The amount LRAPA received from the state got down to \$45,000 in 2005 or 2006, but that amount has been adjusted and restored to a level that is more comparable to the historical levels, adjusted for inflation.

**Fortune** asked what it would cost DEQ to do the air monitoring in Lane County. **Hough** responded that Salem is a similar-sized population area, and the monitoring DEQ does in Salem would probably be less than a third of what LRAPA is able to do in Lane County, which he estimated would probably cost them less than \$100,000. Fortune asked what DEQ is giving LRAPA now, and **Hough** said LRAPA is now getting \$182,000 per year.

**Monk** commented that he thinks Hough's presence at LRAPA is largely responsible for LRAPA's getting the state General Fund money restored to historical levels. **Hough** said he would like to be able to take credit for that but would have to say that the Legislature and the governor have been supportive of LRAPA, and DEQ and EQC have also been consistently supportive. Getting the state's budget, including the LRAPA piece, through the governor's office and then through the Department of Administrative Services, and then through Ways & Means and the full Legislature is difficult; and the support LRAPA has gotten—including support from Lane County's legislative delegation—has been responsible for getting that funding restored.

**Johnson** asked if the statute does not require a certain contribution to local agencies such as LRAPA, and **Hough** said the statute does not require a certain amount. It is completely up to the governor to recommend, and the Legislature to approve what they think is the appropriate amount.

**Mirhosseyni** went over the expenditures anticipated over the next five years, the majority of which is personnel. **Monk** asked when the office building will be paid off, and **Mirhosseyni** said it will be paid off in two years.

**Mirhosseyni** said the local governments seem to be providing about two percent cost-of-living adjustments (COLA) for next year. LRAPA has not requested a cola for the last two years. Given that the majority of staff members are topped out in their ranges, they have received no increases in the last two years. In order to be fair to the staff, there is a two percent COLA planned for the next fiscal year. Benefit costs are expected to increase by double digits, and the five-year projection includes eight percent increase per year over the five years to cover the cost of health benefits. **Fortune** commented that he thought CIS, from which LRAPA gets its insurance, had said at its last conference that the increase this year would be about eight percent; and **Mirhosseyni** said it would be about eight percent for health insurance, but dental insurance is expected to increase by about 18 percent. Those number will not be finalized until May, or so, under this year's open enrollment period. **Mirhosseyni** said the projection includes merit increases for the few staff members who are eligible for them. The projection assumes CPI increases each year for operational expenses.

**Brommelsiek** said he had looked at some information about Title V, and it looks like total Title V costs are exceeding what the agency is getting in permit fees. **Mirhosseyni** said that on a year-to-year basis, that is possibly correct. But LRAPA created a substantial reserve for Title V. The agency is using those reserves to bring everything into line as far as the cost differential between the General Fund and Title V. **Brommelsiek** asked if that reserve was created originally through Title V, and **Mirhosseyni** said it was. **Johnson** asked how long those reserves have been going up, and **Mirhosseyni** said at least three or four

years. He explained that not enough of staff's time was being allocated to Title V, and that was why those reserves were building up for a number of years. **Hough** added that a large part of that savings was due to the fact that there was a key permit writer position which was vacant from the summer of 2007 to the summer of 2009.

**Monk** asked how much money is in the Title V reserve, and **Mirhosseyeni** said it is close to \$200,000. **Monk** asked how long staff anticipates those reserves taking care of the balance, and **Mirhosseyeni** pointed to a graph which shows the reserves being used up over the next five years. **Brommelsiek** asked if the Title V reserves must be used on Title V or could be used on other programs. **Mirhosseyeni** said they have to be used for Title V expenses. Expenses are catching up with fees received and, once that "catch-up" period is over, there will be a more normal reserve carry-over.

**Mirhosseyeni** said that under the stable case, of the 20.3 FTE, just under 18 FTE is permanent staff, and the rest is students and temporary staff. **Hough** explained that, in preparing for this presentation to the board, he and **Mirhosseyeni** had spoken about ways to keep the fund balance from eroding over the next five years. One way is to adjust the FTE. If FTE were kept at the 20.3 level, there would be a gradual decline in the ending balance, over the five years. But if the FTE were gradually reduced, the fund balance could be kept at a higher level. The graph displayed for the board assumed maintaining the 20.3 FTE and allowing the fund balance to erode. **Mirhosseyeni** said about two FTE is temporary employees, and that adjustment could be made, to maintain a more stable reserve, if that was what the board wanted to do.

**Monk** suggested that, as the agency approaches the end of the five years, DEQ is probably facing a similar reality. DEQ goes to great lengths to negotiate with the Associated Oregon Industries and the legislators for an increase to Title V permit fees, and it would be in LRAPA's interests to be a part of that conversation as the years progress toward the end of the five-year projection where the reserves are getting low. **Johnson** asked if federal law requires that Title V fees be adequate to sustain the Title V program. **Hough** responded that, over the five-year projection period, the Title V program is self-sustaining. **Hough** also said there are categories in Title V that have some flexibility, as far as how Title V funding is allocated to portions of monitoring and operations activities, as well as administrative costs. He gave as an example, the new air toxics monitoring station in the Bethel area of Eugene, and determining how much of that expense is appropriate to charge to Title V.

**Johnson** asked if the definition of what is a Title V expense is fixed or flexible, and **Hough** responded that there are very specific guidelines and an EPA matrix to use in determining those cost allocations. There is probably more guidance on the use of Title V funds than on any other category of funding. He said EPA has to go through the same determinations on lands where it directly administers Title V, and they recognize that those determinations are not black and white. States and locals are expected to do something reasonable for those allocations. **Mirhosseyeni** added that there is no one staff member whose time is spent 100 percent on Title V. Title V fees are allocated to portions of many staff members' time, and that gives some flexibility to how those allocations are made. He also stressed that the allocations must be reasonable. **Mirhosseyeni** reminded board members that the Title V program was audited by EPA in 2006/2007, and that audit found LRAPA's allocation method to be acceptable.

**Johnson** asked if Everybody Wins has an effect on those balances. **Mirhosseyeni** said Everybody Wins has no effect on those balances, because Everybody Wins is broken out and separated from the other funds for the five-year projection. **Mirhosseyeni** added that Everybody Wins does not contribute to the core programs because it is now in a maintenance stage to accept payments from truckers, to pay off the loans LRAPA got from DOE for the program. At the end of the program, in 2014, the final trucker payments will be received

and the final payments to DOE will be made. Staff is hoping to have a positive cash balance at that time, assuming that the rate of bankruptcies does not increase and payments are maintained at the levels originally projected. A ten percent default rate was calculated into the original setup of the program, even though it was then anticipated that the rate would be more like one to two percent. At the time, ten percent was considered to be very conservative; however, due to the current economic downturn, the default rate is running just about at ten percent. **Hough** said that is something staff is watching very closely. **Brommelsiek** noted that the graphs showed either negative or flat cash flow from Everybody Wins from September 2011 to September 2012. **Hough** responded that there will be a period of time when LRAPA is waiting for what will probably be the last Business Energy Tax Credit (BETC) payment, which will get the fund back to a positive balance. **Mirhosseyni** added that the BETC funds for which LRAPA qualifies are paid every two years rather than on an ongoing basis.

**Forge** asked why the beginning fund balances in July 2010, 2011 and 2012 seem much higher than the balances in July 2009, 2013 and 2014. **Mirhosseyni** explained that the balance depends on how the cash funds are used. Because there was no COLA last year, some funds were added to the cash balance. Having a two percent COLA for the coming fiscal year, and including eight percent increase in the cost of benefits, will cause some erosion in the cash balance for the end of FY 2010/2011.

**Hough** explained further that the budget includes four funds, including the General Fund, Title V, Airmetrics and Everybody Wins. Although there are inter-fund transfers from Airmetrics and Everybody Wins to the other funds, the General Fund and Title V Fund are the main parts of the agency's core activities. Under the stable case scenario, the Title V reserve would be completely used up in July and August of 2014, before that year's Title V fees come in.

Another way to plan is to reduce FTE to keep the fund balance consistent over the next five years. That could mean eliminating the temporary positions (students and interns), delaying filling a vacancy, or reassigning duties when an employee retires instead of hiring someone to fill that position. **Monk** asked if Title V staff are currently sufficient, or if there is still a position that has not been filled. **Hough** responded that the vacant position has been filled, and LRAPA is now fully staffed for Title V.

**Worse-case funding assumes: 10 percent reduction in federal funds; 10 percent reduction in state general funds, and no CPI increase; 10 percent reduction in local dues; loss of 5 percent of Title V sources; CPI increase for Title V fees charged; 10 percent reduction in ACDP sources and 4 percent annual increase in fees charged; breakeven for Airmetrics; and no new special projects.**

**Fortune** asked if staff is assuming that the economy will continue in the current downturn until 2014, and **Mirhosseyni** said that is not the case. The worst-case scenario assumes things that staff hopes do not happen. If the agency has to take those reductions in revenues, it will mean cutting staff, possibly as down as far as 16.3 FTE, which is not sustainable for long. He explained further that, under the worst-case scenario, staff would be reduced in 2011 by half an FTE. After that, a substantial decrease would be made each year until the staff complement is down to 16.3 FTE. The reason for those reductions would be to sustain enough cash reserve to be able to operate during those first couple of months of each new fiscal year. If Airmetrics continues to be able to contribute to the General Fund, it would be okay; but, without Airmetrics' contribution, the General Fund would be in deficit.

**Ralston** asked what would be the minimum FTE for LRAPA to remain functional, doing just the core programs. In response to a question from **Hough**, **Dinteman** said the agency went from 18 FTE to 12 FTE in the early 1980s; however, there were a lot of things that were not being done at that time, such as Title V.

**Hough** said his sense is that 16 FTE would be the very lowest the agency could go and still be able to operate its core functions. He said staff has not gone through an exercise to determine exactly how many positions would be needed, and he hopes they will not have to do such a specific exercise. Under the worst-case scenario, with FTE going down to 16.3 over the five years, the ending fund balance would be about \$60,000. If the goal is to have additional cash reserves at the end of the five-year period, the FTE reductions would need to be done more rapidly.

**Monk** noted that the revenue from Airmetrics to the General Fund is always the same in the graphs presented by **Mirhosseyni**. He asked if, under the worst-case scenario, Airmetrics would not contribute to the General fund at all. **Mirhosseyni** said that, under the worst-case scenario, assuming Airmetrics at breakeven, it would pay for only its own staff and not provide any support for LRAPA staff. **Monk** asked if staff expects Airmetrics to break even during the coming fiscal year, and **Mirhosseyni** said that is correct. He said the breakeven point is about 18 or 19 samplers per month, and sales have been at 20 samplers for the past few months. **Hough** said there is also fine-tuning on Airmetrics to make sure it stays within budget targets. This year, one of the two Airmetrics staff people has been cut to half-time, although there has been enough filter contract work to keep that individual on at about 60 to 65 percent time.

5. BUDGET COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS: The terms of several budget committee members have expired, and the board members for those jurisdictions need to reappoint the incumbents or nominate other individuals for appointment. At the February board meeting, **Ortiz** nominated, and the board appointed, **Juan Carlos Valle** to a three-year term representing the City of Eugene. **Forge**, **Monk** and **Ralston** also needed to nominate people from their jurisdictions.

**Ralston** said he had spoken with **Bob Brew**, who was a senior management analyst for the City of Springfield for seven years and was later the budget officer. **Brew** now works in Salem. He has been wanting to get involved with LRAPA in different ways, having applied for committee appointments in the past and not been appointed. **Ralston** said Brew would be very pleased to sit on the LRAPA Budget Committee.

**Monk** said his nominee would be **Dick Beers** from Eugene. He said Beers has a financial background which would be very helpful to the agency.

**Forge** said he had spoken with four different people and could not get a commitment from any of them, but that he would continue to work toward finding someone to appoint to the committee.

**Monk** asked if it is just tradition, that board members nominate people from the same jurisdiction that they represent on the board, or if that is required, and staff responded that it is required.

Neither **Monk's** nor **Ralston's** nominees were appointed by the board at this meeting. Those appointments will need to be made at the April 13 board meeting.

6. DIRECTOR'S REPORT: **Hough** reviewed a few of the items in the written report.
  - A. Air Toxics Monitoring in West Eugene. **Hough** reported that some problems in the quality assurance being done by DEQ on the sampling canisters have delayed the start of air toxics monitoring at the new site at Petersen Park; however, PM2.5 monitoring has been done since late January resulting in continuous, valid data since February 2. Air toxics monitoring costs about \$1,000 per day, and LRAPA does not want to start that until the DEQ QA questions have been resolved. **Hough** pointed out that

there is still sufficient funding to ensure at least twelve months of air toxics monitoring at the new site and the existing Amazon Park site in South Eugene.

- B. DEQ Air Toxics Benchmarks. DEQ is holding public hearings regarding updating of benchmarks, including manganese, lead, and ethyl benzene. Those updates are being proposed, based on the recommendations of the Air Toxics Science Advisory Committee (ATSAC) appointed by the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission.

**Johnson** asked if those benchmarks would be for the whole state, including LRAPA, and **Hough** said that they would be. **Johnson** asked if LRAPA has adopted those benchmarks or if it had any role in setting them, as the agency responsible for air quality in Lane County. **Hough** responded that if LRAPA disagreed with what DEQ has proposed, LRAPA could have a review and discussion and adopt something different from the DEQ benchmarks. The state's benchmarks are adopted as statewide benchmarks, or targets, for air toxics, based on one-in-a-million cancer risk, or a hazard index of one. **Hough** stressed that it would be a major undertaking for LRAPA to try to assemble a group similar to DEQ's ATSAC. **Johnson** asked if any of the members of DEQ's committee are from Lane County, and **Hough** said he does not believe any of them are from Lane County, but that there is someone from Oregon State University in Corvallis. He added that there is the potential for appointment of someone from Lane County as openings on the committee occur.

**Hough** said if the board would like for staff to be more involved in ATSAC, he could see if that could be fit into the agency's overall staffing. He added that the particular benchmarks which are the subject of the DEQ hearings have not been identified as among the higher priority ones for Lane County, and he had not planned to provide testimony; however, there is that opportunity.

- C. Public Information. **Brommelsiek** referred to the homeowner information packets sent out by staff to new home owners, which include information about open burning and wood heating restrictions. He asked if something could be included in the packets regarding remodeling and asbestos because many people make changes to a newly purchased house. **Markos** pointed to a separate paragraph in the report which refers to information packets sent to people who get permits for remodeling, specifically informing them about asbestos and what to do about it. She explained that the City of Springfield and Lane County send her lists of permits for remodeling projects, and she sends the packets to those individuals. She said she prepared an asbestos awareness handout which the City of Eugene includes with every permit issued, whether it's residential or commercial. Staff also does a lot of outreach by speaking to specific groups of contractors and also works with BRING Recycling in that regard. **Markos** also announced that the emphasis of the agency's efforts at the Lane County Home Show the following weekend would be asbestos. There will be a display, and informational booklets will be available. **Brommelsiek** said he was thinking of people who move into a house and make changes such as replacing vinyl flooring, without using a contractor. He suggested including in the new homeowners' mailing a card giving people a name and phone number to call if they will be making particular changes to the building. **Markos** said she can add that information to the cover letter that goes out with the informational packets.
- D. Air Quality Index Charts. **Hough** pointed out that the director's report for this month included several additional Air Quality Index charts. He explained that the additional charts are a preview of information which will be put into the annual report for 2009, coming out later this year.

The PM2.5 chart illustrates that in Eugene/Springfield and Cottage Grove, with the new, more protective standard, there is relatively little margin of safety. In Oakridge there is a need for continued improvements in order to meet standards. He added that there has been encouraging progress in recent years in Oakridge, and it is hoped that additional woodstove changeouts and other program efforts will bring success in meeting standards by the new deadline in about four or five years.

The ozone charts show probably the best overall ozone levels have occurred over the last three years.

Carbon monoxide levels are well below health standards in the part of downtown Eugene where that had historically been highest. LRAPA's data show the area is below a quarter of the standard at that location.

- E. Enforcement. **Johnson** asked about an enforcement action against Johnson Crushers that seems to have been pending for almost three years. **Hough** explained that the violation was first identified through a review of the Toxics Release Inventory which indicated that there were emissions above permit thresholds. Johnson Crushers was required to apply for a Title V Operating Permit. Because it involved Title V, EPA took an interest in the case and asked for the opportunity to look into it. LRAPA has kept it pending while EPA reviews the information. Because EPA is very thorough in its review, it has taken longer than it normally would have taken to complete the LRAPA enforcement action.

7. ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

- (A) Committee Activities. Committee Chair **Earl Koenig** reported that the committee continues to discuss the Expedited Enforcement Offer (EEO) portion of the agency's enforcement rules, LRAPA Title 15. They will be working on recommendations for guidelines, oversight and procedures. **Koenig** said the committee members are pleased that the board reappointed **Russ Ayers, Hugh Larkin** and **Amy Peccia** to new terms because all three of them contribute a lot to the committee.

Referring to the notes from the most recent committee meeting, **Ralston** said several issues had caught his attention

:

- (1) **Larkin** said that all of his conservative friends complain about over-regulation by LRAPA;
- (2) **Peccia** said she often defends LRAPA; and
- (3) **Vander Meer** said LRAPA may be losing funding if it associates with fringe elements such as the International Panel on Climate Change. **Ralston** noted comments that there is significant evidence that there is scientific fraud going on. Further in the meeting notes, **Denner** said he was not inclined to bring this to the board and that it is enough just to include the comments in the notes. **Larkin** had commented, further, that junk science needs to be addressed and that he hopes the legal system is doing a fair job of sorting out fraudulent science.

**Ralston** said he does not think the legal system is taking care of sorting that out. He said he had done some research, including going to the article quoted by **Vander Meer** at the committee meeting; and that, to him, there is overwhelming evidence of efforts to discredit climate change skeptics and suppress their information. **Ralston** asserted that there is no real science supporting climate change/global warming. He cited several instances of fraudulent data, such as "China-Gate," where Chinese weather station measurements are seriously flawed because they are using as evidence data from 42 stations which cannot even be found. **Ralston** said he thinks this concern is worth bringing to the board's attention. **Koenig** said he appreciates **Ralston's** concern. He said

he had spoken with **Hough** about the subject, and **Hough** had explained that there are two groups, one at either extreme on the topic of global warming, who are not communicating with each other and so not reaching consensus on anything. **Koenig** agreed that the issue is very controversial; however, he said he believes that every harmful pollutant that can be removed from the air is good for the global condition. He said he believes **Vander Meer**'s concern is whether there will be a conflict between what LRAPA's doing and why they're going it, based on data that may or may not be accurate.

**Hough** agreed, stating that, consistent with LRAPA's mission statement, any reductions in greenhouse gases also means there will be reductions in criteria pollutants. LRAPA is looking for opportunities to reduce air toxics and criteria pollutants for the general improvement of air quality. **Hough** said he thinks it is a good thing, on both sides of the controversy, for people to have a healthy skepticism and to test and make sure that the science is good. He said the frustration, for him, about this situation is that he doesn't see enough meaningful dialogue to sort through what is the meaningful science.

**Brommelsiek** commented that any pollution affecting the air should be minimized, and **Ralston** agreed. **Ralston** also agreed with **Koenig**'s statement that it is not certain what portion of any global warming might be due to human activity.

**Lucas** noted that the Orange County Register article referred to by **Vander Meer** seems to be about as flawed as some of the data it tries to attack. He said he agrees with **Hough**, that the different camps in this controversy seem to have less interest in getting to the truth than in promoting political agendas. **Lucas** said there are a lot of studies that are based on real science, that some people find alarming; and it is a shame that, instead of that being the focus, activists on one side or the other of a political agenda would pick and choose studies that they can use to discredit the other point of view. **Ralston** also agreed with **Lucas**, stating that he just wants the facts. He does not want to listen to speculation because it is worthless. He added that he has charts that show global temperatures fluctuating over decades and stated that that has been the case throughout history.

- (B) Annual Comment Card Analysis. **Koenig** introduced committee member **John Tamulonis**, who was present at this board meeting to report the results of comment cards, about service provided by LRAPA staff, received over the past year. **Koenig** noted that this is the thirteenth year **Tamulonis** has performed this service for the agency, and the committee appreciates the great job he has done.

**Tamulonis** said LRAPA has gotten a good level of return on the survey cards sent out with permitting correspondence and other contacts with the public. He assumes the return level was about the same for the past year; however, he did not know how many cards had been sent out and so could not tell, for sure. He said there is still a high level of comments, in addition to answers to the generic questions asked on the card. Approximately one in seven respondents identify themselves on the cards. Of the cards received this year, two had negative comments about LRAPA. One of those had a specific problem, and the other simply does not like government regulation. Even those two respondents said staff does a great job and provides good information. The majority of the rest of the cards received rated staff response in the "very good" to "excellent" categories. **Tamulonis** said he thinks staff is doing a good

job, based on the comments received. Sometimes a particular staff member is mentioned specifically, in terms of what they have done and how they have worked with certain people.

**Tamulonis** said in some years there have been controversial issues occurring, such as field burning and odor from the J. H. Baxter facility in Eugene. Those issues generated a lot of comments in past years, but not in 2009. A couple of years ago, the comment survey cards included evaluation of how staff did in responding to complaints registered with the agency. **Tamulonis** said perhaps it is time to add complaint response to the survey cards again, to get a base reading, now that those two controversial issues are no longer as much of an issue.

8. FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION AND DECISION—REIMBURSEMENT TO LRAPA OF FUNDS USED TO ESTABLISH CASCADE SIERRA SOLUTIONS: **Hough** said he was okay with whatever direction the board wanted to go with this issue, either requesting that CSS repay LRAPA for setup costs or forgiving those costs as LRAPA’s contribution to the regional programs operated by CSS. He recommended the latter action for a couple of reasons. The \$15,962 costs are modest compared to funds LRAPA has received over the last few years from projects shared with CSS; and it is also modest compared to funds contributed by other local air agencies to get CSS showcase centers in their communities. **Hough** said he is looking forward to the time when CSS has a sustainable cash-flow and begins looking for opportunities to partner with local agencies like LRAPA. He said LRAPA’s contribution to CSS has the potential to be one of the agency’s better investments, looking at the long term. That is the basis for his recommendation with regard to the startup costs for CSS.

**MOTION: Ralston MOVED that the board move forward with staff’s recommendation for letter option two, which would forgive the startup costs. Stewart SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Discussion of Motion. **Ralston** said LRAPA has been partnering and working with CSS for several years, and the regional benefit—for all of the I-5 Corridor—for reduction in pollutants in the air is significant. He said he does not mind having LRAPA be a part of the startup cost, and he is more than willing to say that was what the board agreed to when CSS started.

**Monk** said he would not support the motion. He agreed that there is a regional air quality benefit from the work of CSS, which he thinks is a good thing. However, what he heard on a number of occasions is that the board expected whatever funds were contributed by LRAPA to the formation of CSS would be reimbursed to the agency. **Monk** took issue with **Hough**’s statement comparing the funds LRAPA put into CSS with contributions from large air agencies in California to set up their showcase centers. He said LRAPA gave money for the center and was reimbursed for that. But the \$15,962 in question, here, is for legal counsel and website development costs. He also pointed out that **Banks** had said the previous month that some of these costs were incurred at a time when LRAPA was not sure whether Everybody Wins Phase III would stay in-house or break off to become it’s own non-profit. He said he had not thought about it in that light before. In looking at the printout of the “direct costs related to the formation of CSS,” provided by **Mirhosseyni**, the earliest expenditure was in June of 2006. He said he was not sure what month in 2006 CSS was established, but he thinks that all of those costs are legitimately attributable to CSS and that CSS should reimburse LRAPA for the startup money. **Monk** then said that a very smart, hard-working staff member at LRAPA recognized a great opportunity when a lot of federal dollars were being put into the issue of diesel emissions, and created a \$120,000 per year position with a non-profit to use as a “golden parachute.” He noted that, at the same time, **Hough** had forgone merit increases to his salary because of the agency’s tight

budget. He said he had not heard **Banks** offering to reimburse the agency during that time because CSS is cash-tight, even though LRAPA was also cash-tight. **Monk** said, to him, the funds LRAPA put into establishment of CSS were public funds, and he questions whether there was private gain from the use of those public funds. Consequently, **Monk** said, he feels that, for LRAPA's benefit, it is better that the board ask for the reimbursement of those costs.

**Monk** also brought up the controversy raised by recently newspaper articles concerning Mesilla Valley Transportation and CSS being under investigation by the Department of Justice for violation of the Business Energy Tax Credit (BETC) laws. **Monk** said they are innocent until proven otherwise; however, it suggests to him that there are some things going on with the manner in which CSS is operating that may not be good for LRAPA to be so intimately involved with. **Monk** said the LRAPA director sits on the CSS board and has agreed to be placed in a difficult position, because CSS owes LRAPA money, and **Hough** is advocating that LRAPA not require the \$15,962 to be repaid.

**Lucas** said he was not inclined to send draft letter number two. He said the \$15,962 seems to be clearly directly related to the startup of CSS, even if there were a few months' delay between the expenditures and the official formation of CSS. Regarding the *Oregonian* article about the Oregon BETC funds awarded to Mesilla Valley Transportation in Texas, Lucas said CSS had an obligation to go beyond just saying CSS doesn't make the rules for awarding those funds, even though they seemed to have information that some of these funds really were not benefitting Oregonians but were instead going to benefit a company that was doing business far from Lane County and the I-5 Corridor. **Lucas** said if LRAPA were to gift money to an organization like CSS, he would want them to have more of a watchdog outlook for the Oregon taxpayer and for the vision of what LRAPA is. He said his concern is not the \$15,962. It is, rather, a symbolic issue of an association with a company that may be getting some more bad press, depending on how this investigation goes. **Lucas** said he would not support the motion.

**Ortiz** said she thinks, philosophically, it is a good thing that LRAPA helped CSS get started; however, \$15,962 is a lot of money. She said she recalled Banks stating that CSS is not making a profit—that everything they bring in goes right back into the mission. **Ortiz** said she would like to see LRAPA get that money back and put it into air toxics projects. Referring to **Monk's** earlier comments, **Ortiz** said if the money was available to start the diesel program run by CSS, and they went after it got it, good for them; however, you also have to pay your own way. She said she did not want to be punitive toward CSS but there should be a return on LRAPA's investment. She would like to see LRAPA get the money back within a reasonable time frame, to be put to use with other kinds of initiatives.

**Forge** said he was not on the LRAPA board in 2006, when the board decided how to deal with CSS. He said he would like to hear from some of the board members who were here at that time and a part of that decision.

**Johnson** said he was here, and it was perfectly clear to him, at that time. He said he had reservations about blessing the CSS startup and LRAPA's involvement in it. He didn't believe there was a specific motion, but it was a clear consensus among board members that there be a full and accurate accounting of all LRAPA costs that were contributed to CSS, so that those would be repaid. **Ralston** said he did not remember it that way. **Johnson** stressed the information in the *Oregonian* article, that \$4.5-million in Oregon taxpayers' money went to a Texas company that does 0.8 percent of its business in Oregon, stating that the situation is an outrage. He said he thinks the board should go further than just demanding repayment of the startup costs: it should divest itself of all agency involvement in CSS. He said his kids go to school in Oregon; and the

thought of \$4.5-million in Oregon tax funds going to a Texas company, at a time when Oregon schools are talking about laying off teachers and shortening school days, is outrageous to him. **Johnson** said the fact that CSS is a part of that is also outrageous. He said he would not support the motion and, in fact, would also like to suggest that LRAPA sever its ties with CSS.

**Stewart** commented that he has been on the LRAPA board for a period of time, and there is a perspective that is not being represented by a lot of the people here that don't have any knowledge. At one time, LRAPA was trying to make the decision of whether or not to do Everybody Wins Phase III in house, and it ended up that CSS was formed to do that instead, because LRAPA didn't have the resources to do it. He said he thinks the investment made by LRAPA was an appropriate contribution, because it is good for LRAPA to support the reductions in pollutants that are being achieved through CSS's efforts. **Stewart** acknowledged that there is some controversy right now because of the BETC funding; however, he does not believe that controversy will reflect back to LRAPA. He said he understood the points other board members had voiced, but he supported the motion.

**Brommelsiek** asked how much of the \$15,962 was necessary to make the decision about whether to keep the program inside LRAPA or start a separate non-profit; and how much was necessary to achieve the startup of CSS. **Hough** said he had read through copies of the relevant parts of minutes going back through recent years, to give himself a clear perspective on this subject. At least through June of 2006, the board was trying to decide whether or not to keep the diesel programs in-house. **Hough** said **Johnson**'s first point, about the board requesting a clear accounting of those costs, was very clear in the meeting records. He said as he read through the minutes, he expected to see a clear decision regarding whether or not CSS was to pay back those startup costs. But the board did not voice consensus or take any formal action on that point. There were individual comments and points of view but no clear board direction regarding reimbursement of those costs. **Hough** noted that staff has provided a clear accounting of those costs for the board.

**Hough** said he did not realize the newspaper article about the BETC funds awarded to Mesilla Valley Transportation would be factor in the board's discussion of repayment of startup funds for CSS. He said there is a lot more information than what was published in the papers. When the *Oregonian* article came out, CSS staff alerted the CSS board, and there was a special teleconference that same day. **Hough** said he was very impressed by the thoroughness of the board in asking questions, getting supporting information, asking for follow-up, and specifically directing the type of information CSS staff should prepare and get out to their stakeholders. They considered whether there should be an all-out rebuttal to the *Oregonian* article, but when the editorial came out the next day and focused just on Mesilla Valley, the board decided that was not necessary or useful to do. They felt it was more important to get accurate information out to CSS stakeholders, and **Hough** said he had forwarded that stakeholder letter to LRAPA board members for their information. Neither CSS nor LRAPA wants to come across as defending Mesilla Valley, but the decision on whether or not they qualified for Oregon BETC was not a CSS decision. CSS is essentially a messenger. They work with people involved in the trucking industry, helping them to assemble information for tax credit applications, and then forwarding the packages to Energy, who makes the decision about whether the applicants qualify. **Hough** said the Department of Energy has made changes in its process, making its evaluation criteria stricter than they were at the time they approved the first Mesilla Valley applications. At that time, Mesilla Valley was intending to have a very strong Oregon presence, and that has been delayed because of the economic slump. Mesilla Valley is viewed, nationally, as one of the "greenest" trucking companies. Within its mission, CSS was very interested in having Mesilla Valley establish a stronger Oregon presence, but because of the economy they currently have a kind of skeleton network. Their mileage in

Oregon compares roughly to how Oregon trucking companies compare to the rest of the nation. **Hough** stressed that he did not want to come across as defending Mesilla Valley but did want the board to know that there is a lot more information, and that he thought the CSS board was very responsible in their handling of the situation. **Hough** said if he had realized that the Mesilla Valley tax credit would be such a large part of the board's discussion at today's meeting, he would have put together more of the available information so board members could keep it in perspective. He said as far as he can see, CSS was true to its mission. They were helping Mesilla Valley to get their applications assembled, as they do with all of their customers. The decisions that have changed, over time, have really been more internal Department of Energy decision-making criteria.

**Fortune** said he was sorry this subject had come up in the discussion of the motion on the table. It is a matter between the State of Oregon, the Justice Department, and CSS—not LRAPA—and he didn't see why it had become a part of the discussion of this motion. **Fortune** said he, too, had gone back through meeting minutes and not seen any clear determination regarding payback of those costs. He said he would support the motion because the goal of both CSS and LRAPA is clean air.

**Mirhosseyni** referred to **Lucas's** characterization of the money LRAPA used to help start CSS was taxpayers' money. He said those funds came from the Everybody Wins enterprise program, and the proceeds are not from state or federal funding to LRAPA. The money coming into Everybody Wins is from truckers' payments.

**Brommelsiek** said he understood from the information provided by staff that LRAPA was still in a decision-making mode through June of 2006. He asked if costs incurred prior to July 1, 2006 were part of the decision-making process and cost incurred from July 1, 2006, on, were part of the formation process for CSS. **Hough** said the reason he wanted to make that timing clarification is because that was what he thought **Banks** had in mind when she made those comments at the February board meeting. He said that is something CSS could possibly question or challenge in response to Letter One (requiring repayment of the full amount); however, he said he expects CSS wants a positive relationship with LRAPA, and so he does not know that they would challenge a request for reimbursement of the full \$15,962.

**Ralston** said he clearly does not remember the board's discussion in 2006 the way **Johnson** does. He does remember it the same way **Hough** and **Stewart** have related it. He remembers the board having discussions up through June of 2006 about whether or not LRAPA would be repaid for startup costs; but it was not certain that a separate non-profit would be developed or how that would be done. He pointed out that the costs through June 30, 2006 equal about \$7,000, with the remainder being incurred after June 30. He suggested that, as a compromise, CSS could be billed for the amount incurred after June 30, 2006, with the approximately \$7,000 incurred through June 30, 2006 being forgiven. He said he is sure that the board never came to a formal decision that the money would be repaid.

**Johnson** asked why the board would ask for an accounting if there was no intention that LRAPA be reimbursed for those costs. **Ralston** responded that this accounting really had been brought about over the last year—well past when the decisions were made and CSS came into existence. **Johnson** said there may not have been a formal motion, but the question was asked—will CSS reimburse LRAPA for those expenses. He said there was a response by either **Banks** or **Hough** that, yes, there would be an accounting and, yes, there would be reimbursement. **Johnson** said he wanted to know what was the date that CSS came into existence.

**Monk** said he was surprised because his recollection was the same as **Johnson's**. He thought a motion had been put on the table, but obviously that did not happen. He commented that that shows the shortcomings of not taking formal action on these matters. **Monk** said he really believes that there was clear consensus among board members that there would be an accounting and that LRAPA would be reimbursed for those startup costs. **Monk** said he would do his due diligence and go back through meeting minutes to see if he can confirm that. He added that he was the one who injected the piece about the Department of Justice investigation of Mesilla Valley Transportation into this discussion, because he thinks it speaks to potential ramifications for LRAPA because **Banks** was the financial officer for LRAPA for fifteen years. If it is demonstrated that she violated Oregon law, it is possible that the Department of Justice would want to look at LRAPA. **Monk** said, whether there was a violation of the law, or not, he thinks it is unethical for CSS to be submitting applications that take tax payer dollars from Oregon and ship them to Texas. He said he thinks that CSS facilitated that application, and he is concerned that misrepresentations were made in that application. **Monk** also commented that the letter that CSS sent out to its stakeholders talks about the considerable accomplishments of CSS but does not say anything about the application for BETC tax credits, on behalf of Mesilla Valley Transportation. He said it does not sound like **Banks** spoke to the CSS board about the issue at hand. He said there is an investigation and that **Hough** had not known that. He said no one on the CSS board independently verified whether there was an investigation, or not, and he found that to be troubling.

**Fortune** said he wanted to get off the discussion about CSS and the BETC tax credits to Mesilla Valley Transportation, because it was not germane to the motion on the table. He said the BETC matter can be brought up at another time for a separate discussion if the board wants to do that.

**Forge** said he has no problem separating the reimbursement of funds by CSS from the newspaper article. He disagreed with **Mirhosseyini's** earlier statement that the funds are not tax money, stating that it is federal money and, if we're not paying the taxes on it yet, we will be in the future. **Mirhosseyini** responded by giving an example from when he worked for a large city. The city could not use tax dollars to establish a loan program, but it owned the water company and could use the proceeds from that to establish the loan program. The only tax money associated with the Everybody Wins program is the BETC, which LRAPA receives every two years. The rest of the money in the Everybody Wins program is from the payments made by truckers who have installed auxiliary power units on their trucks.

**Forge** said he liked what **Ortiz** had said, and he thinks that if he were to start a business, he would expect to pay whatever he had to put up to start that business. He said he also likes the idea of using the reimbursed money to benefit air quality in this area. He added that the reimbursement would not have to be right away, but could be worked out with CSS.

**Ortiz** said she is cognizant of the fact that this was a community partnership, and when you're a partner with somebody you bear some of the costs. She asked if the board members who are opposed to the motion would accept a compromise to have CSS pay back their legal fees, which is the bulk of what was paid on their behalf. She said that would be about \$9,000.

**AMENDED MOTION: Ralston agreed to that compromise and amended his original motion to forgive the amount incurred through June 30, 2006 (approximately \$7,000), and ask for repayment of approximately \$9,000, which was incurred from July 1, 2006, on. Stewart, as the second, also agreed.**

Discussion of Amended Motion. **Ortiz** said LRAPA does a lot of community collaboratives, where LRAPA provides all the materials. LRAPA incurs those costs as part of its community outreach to try to get its message out to people. She gave the example of LRAPA providing air quality-related pamphlets to the City of Eugene to give to residents. She said asking CSS to reimburse the legal fees seemed reasonable to her. **Ortiz** also said she hopes the chair and the director can talk about how LRAPA can protect itself in case there is any fallout from the investigation by the Department of Justice, because she has some concerns about that. She added that, if LRAPA is involved in this kind of partnership in the future, there need to be very clear statements about what our expectations are. She said if CSS hits some financial benchmarks, they should give some money to LRAPA. They should create some kind of a foundation to help fund other projects that come up, as part of working as a collaborative. **Hough** said he had seen, in the minutes, mention of one of the CSS goals being that kind of funding.

**Johnson** said he appreciated what **Ortiz** and **Ralston** were saying, and agreed that finding common ground is good. But he said he was emphatic at the time CSS was established, that there be a full accounting and that the monies be repaid. He said, with that recollection, it is difficult for him to come to the middle ground on this issue. He said he is sticking to what he thought was an agreement, whether or not it was made appropriately with a motion and a second and a vote of the majority. He said he wants to see the minutes and wants to know the date that CSS was incorporated as a non-profit organization. He said he needs more information in order for him to support a motion that involved any forgiveness of the debt owed to LRAPA. He said he would not support the amended motion.

**VOTE ON AMENDED MOTION: THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (Brommelsiek/Forge/Fortune/Ortiz/Ralston/Stewart) TO THREE (Johnson/Lucas/Monk).**

9. OLD BUSINESS

A. Legislative Discussion—LRAPA Board Makeup. **Johnson** reported that the committee met twice since the February board meeting and had come up with a strategy to find out what other jurisdictions in Lane County think about the makeup of the LRAPA board. They developed a series of questions as a guide to elicit from some of the other, more rural, incorporated areas in Lane County information such as their interest in LRAPA and its board, some examples of involvement or lack thereof with LRAPA, their views on the statutory makeup of the board and how it should be altered if at all, and general feedback on LRAPA and their willingness to be involved. **Johnson** said the committee identified thirteen incorporated areas to contact, and the plan is to talk with the city manager of each community to arrange a meeting with the city manager and the mayor, and any interested councilors. The four members of the committee will work in pairs to meet with those people over the next two months.

**Ralston** told board members that the questions the committee intends to use in its interviews are intended to promote conversation and get a sense of where they stand, what they know about LRAPA, and ultimately whether they are interested in becoming a part of LRAPA. And any that are interested in direct participation would be required to provide some funding, based on the formula used for the past few years to decide what each jurisdiction's contribution will be. The plan is to meet in person and avoid phone interviews, so that committee members can observe body language and build up some rapport with the representatives of those areas.

**Fortune** said that the committee will meet on a regular basis, according to the process they have agreed to follow, and then will bring that information back to the full board for information and discussion.

**Johnson** added that, down the road, there should be a process to take input from the broader community. He suggested having an open house for the public to give feedback directly to the full board.

- B. Organizational Dynamics and Collaborative Approaches–Draft Request for RFQ/RFP for Proposals for Consultant to Facilitate Board Retreat. **Hough** said staff had begun the process to carry forward the board’s direction to prepare a Request For Qualifications and identify a consultant to facilitate a meeting with the board on collaborative approaches and organizational dynamics. He distributed a document called, “A Practical Guide to Consensus, *Abbreviated Version*,” from the group Oregon Solutions. The documents has guidelines which are very helpful for going through a systematic process to prepare a Request For Qualifications, and also outlines the basic steps in identifying a pool of candidates and finding a facilitator. **Hough** said he had a number of suggested facilitators from the board’s discussion in February, including **Bob Chadwick**, **Stan Biles**, and some additional suggestions from **Johnson**, for the beginnings of a pool of candidates. He said if board members have other suggested candidates, he would welcome that. **Hough** said he has been gathering examples of Requests For Qualifications that would fit this situation, and the next steps would be to meet with the board, to narrow that list and interview candidates. He added that, because of a potentially significant dollar amount, the expense is being planning into the FY 1010/11 budget, and staff’s goal is to try to have the process figured out by July 1 to provide the flexibility to do a facilitated meeting soon after July 1.

10. NEW BUSINESS:

Public Forums to Public Input. **Ortiz** said she did not know **Jan Nelson** was going to be at this meeting to talk about public forums to solicit public input on issues of concern to residents of different areas of the county. **Ortiz** said she has been thinking a lot about the issues that go on in West Eugene, and the consistent comments about J. H. Baxter. She said she would like to put on a future agenda a discussion of doing some kind of panel in West Eugene, or anywhere else that people feel would be a good place, to talk about different things that LRAPA does. **Ortiz** said there have been public meetings about the Seneca Sustainable Energy facility, but they were specific to that one facility. She would like to see a general air quality issue forum where people could bring up issues of concern to them. **Ortiz** said she will work with **Hough** if that is what the board wants.

11. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 13, 2010, **11:00 a.m., in the Library Meeting Room at the Springfield City Hall, 225 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Springfield, Oregon.** The board meeting will be held in conjunction with a meeting of the LRAPA Budget Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

**Merrie Dinteman**  
Recording Secretary

