

# **Columbia River Gorge Commission**

## **Meeting Minutes**

**April 13, 2004**

***A complete record of this meeting is available on audiotape***

Location: Rock Creek Recreation Center  
710 SW Rock Creek Drive, Stevenson WA  
Time: 9:00 a.m.

### ***MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE***

Kenn Adcock  
Doug Crow  
Judy Davis  
Dan Harkenrider  
Walt Loehrke  
Joe Palena  
Joyce Reinig  
Dave Robertson  
Kathy Sheehan  
Anne Squier  
Wayne Wooster

### ***MEMBERS ABSENT***

Jane Jacobsen (excused)  
Michael Farrow (excused)

### ***STAFF PRESENT***

Martha Bennett, Executive Director  
Brian Litt, Senior Planner  
Jeff Litwak, Counsel  
Kathy Obayashi-Bartsch, Administrative Assistant

### ***AUDIENCE PRESENT***

Andersen, Steven. Cascade Planning and Associates  
Cornelison, Peter. Friends of the Columbia Gorge (FOCG)  
Curtis, Lee. Oregon Investment Board (OIB)  
Kloos, Jeanette. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)  
Lang, Michael. FOCG  
Lalor, Peggy. Limitless Events and Marketing  
Leipper, Bob. Troutdale, Oregon  
Liggett, Keith. Gorge Games  
Johnson, Patrick. Skamania County Planning Department  
Robbins, Dale. Regional Transportation Agency (RTA)  
Ruhsenberger, Chuck. Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT)  
Sauter, Dave. Klickitat County  
Thiemann, Phyllis. Columbia River Gorge Visitors Association

**Chair Squier called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.**

**Approval of Minutes -February 24, 2004 and March 9, 2004**

Commissioner Wooster requested a change in the March 9th minutes on page 9, next to the last paragraph to reflect his comment of "Spring 2005" rather than "Spring 2004" as this was the context of the discussion. Commissioner Palena made a motion to accept both sets of minutes with the requested change. Commissioner Sheehan seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken and passed unanimously.

**Public Comment**

Chair Squier explained the Plan Review items on the agenda today are new items that have not been discussed previously, therefore the Commission will accept public comment today and at the April 27th meeting.

Steven Andersen of Cascade Planning Associates provided testimony (see Attachment A) on privately owned property designated "Public Recreation". Commissioner Crow asked for his suggestions to resolve this issue. Andersen responded that he did not want to offer his suggestions at this time. Commissioner Sheehan asked if these properties have land submerged or are all above the water line. Andersen said some of the properties were submerged. Commissioner Robertson referred to the Commission's lack of funding and how that affected the scope of work. Commissioner Sheehan asked for clarification of "no objections" in his prepared testimony. He responded that he sent to twenty two landowners, and received seven responses: six people said they object to the designation and one asked for more information.

Bob Leipper of Troutdale, Oregon said he was aware of three properties in violation of the National Scenic Area Act (Act), and only two of three were recorded for violations in Multnomah County. He thinks there's a problem with Multnomah County's enforcement actions. He added that the proposed changes to the County's enforcement code are not going to stipulate fines for existing violations. He supports the Commission's idea of creating a provision in the Plan for consistent enforcement throughout the Gorge, including Multnomah County. Commissioner Loehrke asked for his suggestions to correct the problems. Leipper responded the Commission has to make Multnomah County enforce the regulations. He said he had written to the Multnomah County Commission and testified at their meetings on various issues. He offered a flow chart of the events leading to this revised enforcement code. Martha Bennett, Executive Director explained the revised enforcement code referred to will be analyzed by staff and reviewed by the Commission for consistency with the Management Plan at a later date. She expressed her appreciation of Mr. Leipper's offer of a flow chart and his assistance in other enforcement issues.

**Economic Development Certifications**

Bennett provided a review of the application (see Attachment B) and noted that Lee Curtis of Oregon Investment Board and Peggy Lalor were present. Bennett said both requests were consistent with the Act and the Management Plan.

Peggy Lalor, owner of Limitless Events and Marketing, requested a \$10,000 National Scenic Area economic development grant to partially fund marketing activities for the 2004 Gorge Games. The grant will be used to create a website which will be a core communications tool for the Games. She also requested a \$10,000 National Scenic Area economic development grant to fund a study of the economic viability of a hotel/indoor water park and outdoor water park/theme park in the City of The Dalles. She said that the feasibility study would determine if The Dalles could support a hotel, conference center, retail complex, and indoor/outdoor water park. She said she expected it to be a regional draw that wouldn't rely solely on local business.

Peter Cornelison of FOCG expressed support of Peggy Lalor's request for \$10,000 for the Gorge Games web site, however he said there was no comment on the second request, without more details of what is being proposed.

Commissioner Palena asked whether it would be compatible with the recently proposed SDS project in Washington. Lalor explained that the market would be different, so it wouldn't detract from that market. He asked how the project would address the unique nature of the Gorge. Commissioner Crow commented the fact that The Dalles is a hot dry place only 90 minutes from a major metropolitan area and passing through the lush western Gorge was a unique feature.

Commissioner Adcock made a motion to approve the certifications H04-0106 and H04-107 with a correction on the last page of the Director's Report to indicate the City of The Dalles not Hood River County. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Loehrke. A voice vote was taken and passed unanimously.

Commissioner Robertson asked whether these projects will be funded soon. Curtis responded that the OIB approval is still pending for the website proposal. The OIB has approved the water park feasibility study. She said as the Commission had expedited their certification process, the OIB process will be revised as well.

Chair Squier explained that public comment on the Plan Review items on the agenda would be taken today and at the next meeting on April 27th.

### **Follow-up on Plan Review Issues**

#### **Hood River/White Salmon & Bingen Replacement Bridge**

The Commission discussed the results of the March 9, 2004 workshop on a scenic resources policy that would govern replacement of the bridge between Hood River and White Salmon & Bingen. Bennett introduced the topic and said there was considerable consensus among the 40 people who participated in the workshop. George Crandall and Don Arambula presented the results of the workshop (see Attachment C-1). Brian Litt explained how the workshop results were drafted into the final revisions of the Management Plan (see Attachment C-2).

Commissioner Crow asked about the handout as there seemed to be some pages missing. Litt provided corrected copies.

Commissioner Sheehan asked for clarification about why only dark green and black were specified as proposed colors, and not other dark colors. Crandall said with a predominately green setting, a dark brown can work but typically dark green is the accepted color.

Commissioner Adcock commented on the tally of the meeting and noted that 37 votes seemed to be a small number for the impact of the decisions being made. Crandall responded not everyone who participated completed a ballot and the tally was an actual count of the ballots received. He said unless you are willing to engage in an in depth public education and outreach effort, it would be difficult to determine any meaningful results as a "comments only" survey is very difficult to make decisions from.

Commissioner Adcock asked him to comment on the cost of a contemporary design versus a historic design. Crandall responded that he could not put a number on either style at this point in time as one is not necessarily more expensive than the other.

Commissioner Wooster asked him to comment on the issues of historic versus contemporary design and the issue of a preferred dark green color. Crandall said dark green was recommended for a steel bridge. Commissioner Wooster asked him to comment on the issue of permanent sidewalks on both sides and whether it meets safety requirements determined by Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT). Crandall said 8 ft. wide is inadequate, especially for a mile long bridge crossing as people will naturally prefer to stay as far from vehicular traffic as possible and ideally it should be at least 14 ft. wide. Commissioner Wooster asked him to comment on the bike lane that could also be used for stalled vehicles and other emergencies as outlined in the transportation agency's plan. Crandall said there is a safety issue having only 1 pedestrian sidewalk and no designated "bicycle only" lanes.

Commissioner Robertson asked for wording clarification for "light". Crandall said it means light in terms of the look, that is "light and airy."

Commissioner Robertson said having more than one walkway and designated bicycle lane is important for safety. He asked about the Dalles project in regard to how the public process worked to accommodate the community's desires and not just meet highway standards. Crandall explained that the first step was education with the design group, a first-hand look at underpasses, and then they developed very prescriptive design guidelines to get to the goal. The funding was approved because the underpass met other needs, such as economic development and was bold and creative. Crandall and Arambula explained how stakeholders were involved in this project.

Commissioner Davis asked about lane widths and how the 8 ft. width is measured, does it include 8 ft. total for bikes and pedestrians or is it 8 ft. for bikes and 8 ft. for pedestrians. Bennett explained that 8 ft. is to be measured as a total for bikes and pedestrians on both sides.

Commissioner Crow asked about the why certain bridges were selected as prototypes. Crandall explained the Glenn Jackson bridge was not an appropriate contemporary style for the setting.

Commissioner Harkenrider questioned the need to specify the width of the sidewalks. Bennett said it was important to specify to ensure an appropriate width as a minimum acceptable width is inadequate when put into actual use. Commissioner Harkenrider said when the bridge was actually designed, there would be consideration for multiple uses and he has faith in the process. Commissioner Palena said it might be presumptuous in selecting a width other than what was recommended by experts in the field.

Chair Squier called for a break at 10:55 a.m. and called the meeting back to order at 11:08 a.m.

Chair Squier called for public comment and noted written comment and testimony would continue to be accepted on this issue.

Dale Robbins, RTA, Jeanette Kloos, ODOT and Chuck Ruhsenberger, WSDOT addressed the Commission on the draft bridge design guidelines as prepared by staff based on the workshop results.

Dale Robbins explained they are requesting general policy guidelines and believe some of the draft guidelines are too prescriptive. He said as to the issue of visual quality, item 2a- to choose a concrete bridge with a black or dark green tint, the cost would increase the concrete costs by 15%. The term "transparent structure design" needs to be explained or defined . As to the issue of historic design, item 2b- all three types of bridges recommended by his agency were not considered in these draft guidelines. He said overall the language was too prescriptive, such as "wooden historic benches", noting that wood was often not preferred due to maintenance issues.

He explained the RTA had conducted a number of public meetings and workshops and this information was used in drafting their proposal. As to the issue of two permanent sidewalks and designated bicycle lane, he said that people would certainly prefer a sidewalk on both sides but when looking at the probability of increased costs, people supported a single 15 ft. wide area rather than an 8 ft. wide sidewalk on both sides of the bridge.

As to the issue of creating elevation or other barrier from vehicular traffic, he said the two 10 ft. wide shoulders provided by the highway standards, would be ample for touring bicycles and typically those users won't be on the sidewalks. He said the viewing platform language was too prescriptive.

As to the issue of funding, he said based on input from a variety of people, it was determined that \$1.50 per bridge crossing was the maximum amount that people would pay. The bridge toll would finance \$50 million. The gap of \$150 million would need to

come from agencies and federal government and anything over \$200 million would need to be supported by additional local levies.

Robbins asked that these guidelines provide some flexibility for additional public input and provided a revised version of the guidelines (see Attachment D) developed by staff based on Crandall and Arambula's workshop results. He said we don't seem to be miles apart for the most part but some of the guidelines seem to be prescriptive.

Jeanette Kloos, ODOT said she supports Robbins comments and emphasized the following points:

- "transparency" needs a definition,
- a concrete bridge does not need to be painted
- do not specify a construction method; for example, poured in place concrete has many drawbacks
- ornamental railings must also meet crash tests and newly designed railings are expensive to have crash tested
- differentiate between different patterns of bicycle use, as some will use the sidewalk and some will use the shoulder
- creating good pedestrian connections to the communities is critical
- need clarification on the issue of signs

Chuck Ruhsenberger said he supports Robbin's comments and written comments from his agency would be submitted.

Commissioner Robertson asked for clarification of the bike lanes and widths. Robbins explained how the lanes would be used and their widths. Robertson said the midpoint language for a viewing site is too prescriptive and cautioned about using the phrase "visually unobtrusive" as this could create interpretation problems.

Commissioner Palena asked if there was any way to differentiate between local users and visitors. He suggested having reduced fee toll tickets for local users. Commissioner Wooster said there were 200-300 thousand vehicles per month, with 300 thousand being the high use summer months.

Michael Lang, FOCG addressed the procedural issues related to the inclusion of this item in the Plan. Chair Squier explained there was an oversight in not starring this item on today's agenda for public comment. She said written comments will be accepted in prior to the April 27th meeting and there will be public testimony on the 27th.

He said the Plan provides general guidelines, but it seems that the bridge guideline language is specific . He emphasized the following points:

- "replacement" bridge title—what kind of "replacement" is this? is this removal of the old structure? is this a new bridge or a replacement of the old bridge?
- supports specifying dark colors but want to see language for non reflective as well
- supports siting as close as possible to the current bridge

- supports height similar to the existing bridge
- supports a separate and distinct bike lane that is not an overflow or emergency lane for vehicles

Commissioner Reinig said we should be cautious about any last minute additions, such as the air quality issue. She said stipulating construction methods isn't appropriate as new methods will be developed by the time the bridge is constructed. Chair Squier said that there is a difference between this issue and the air quality issue.

Commissioner Davis said the guidelines as drafted are too specific overall, such as stipulating two pedestrian sidewalks and the width of bicycle lanes.

Chair Squier said it seems that there are some issues to be resolved and that everyone agrees revisions are needed. She said there is no mention of the old bridge.

Bennett said the understanding is the bridge is a replacement of the old bridge (which would therefore have to be removed), as building a new bridge is restricted on the Columbia River. She said staff will work on the following issues to address the concerns expressed today:

- color and reflectivity
- "transparent" structural design
- construction methods
- keep visual and historic elements separate
- existing sign requirements

She said certain items are of substantive disagreement at this time including:

- decorative or ornamental features, should be built into the bridge itself
- pedestrian lanes need to be on both sides, we need to be clear to be sure that it really works to promote the recreational element

Commissioner Wooster said he disagrees about needing to specify two lanes and feels that this is an issue that can be worked out at a more appropriate time.

Commissioner Robertson suggested we draft guidelines that pertain more the desired outcome rather than prescribing design elements.

Commissioner Loehrke said that he disagrees with the idea that we've been too prescriptive. He said that this bridge can be an enhancement of the Gorge and it's the Commission's shot to ensure that this is lasting asset in the Gorge. The Wal-Mart version of the bridge may be functional and a less expensive version but it doesn't enhance the area. He said specifying elements to promote the recreational value is needed but we may have gone too far in specifying materials and construction methods.

Commissioner Adcock said in regard to the historic design element #1 the Columbia River Historic Highway is not pertinent to the bridge. He said he does not agree with Loehrke and we should leave design and engineering to the experts. These guidelines

need to be less specific. Commissioner Palena said there needs to be ample crossing areas onto the bridge.

Commissioner Sheehan supports permanent sidewalks and designated bike lanes. She said she was concerned about stipulating sidewalks on both sides and the siting of viewing areas as there should be some leeway on these items.

Bennett said we can develop some level of criteria as opposed to specific design elements and agreed that the viewing platform language was too specific, that it ought to have criteria such as being accessible and providing valuable views. She said vehicular safety was an issue that the transportation agencies were experts at but we need to consider various users besides vehicles and promote recreational use as well. She agreed with Commissioner Loehrke that this was the one shot to make it right for the area without overly prescribing.

Chair Squier asked staff to prepare a revised version and Bennett said the revision would be sent out on Friday or Monday at the latest. She said this will help identify the areas of agreement and disagreement.

Chair Squier called for a lunch break at 12:25 p.m. and said the executive session pertaining to possible litigation would begin after a 5 minute break. The regular meeting would resume at approximately 1:30 p.m.

Chair Squier called an executive session to order pursuant to Commission Rule 350-11-006 (1)(g) at 12:35 p.m. and Jeffrey Litwak, Counsel provided a review of possible litigation.

Chair Squier closed the executive session at 1:35 p.m. and noted that no deliberation or decisions occurred in the executive session, and no follow-up actions were needed. The regular meeting was called back to order at 1:40 p.m.

### **Public Hearing and adoption of revised Commission Rules for open meetings and public records, 350-11 and 350-12**

Commission legal counsel, Jeffrey Litwak, provided a review of the issue (see Attachment E). The National Scenic Area Act requires the Commission to adopt rules for open meetings and public records that are consistent with the more restrictive of the two state's provisions. After reviewing the results of the 2003 legislative sessions, the Rules Committee recommended minor changes to these rules. The Commission initiated rulemaking on these draft rules at its January 13, 2004 meeting.

Chair Squier asked for public comment on this item.

Michael Lang of FOCG commented on the revisions as provided. He said the only concern is the lack of definition for the term "security". Litwak explained the language is verbatim from Oregon law and doesn't recommend defining the term at this time. He suggested taking cues from Oregon law. Chair Squier referred to page 5 and asked if the section on public records assists with the definition. Litwak responded we don't have

these types of documents in the office or expect to receive this type of document. The rules simply are to ensure we are consistent with Oregon law.

Commissioner Robertson said he participated in a work group when Oregon was developing this legislation and this was a post-September 11th security effort. It is intended to keep information about security plans and critical functionality for entities, such as utility providers, secure from misuse.

Lang said without a definition of the term, FOCG's concern is public's ability to review and a concern as to what sort of information will be kept from the public. Bennett said for the most part the Commission doesn't receive this type of information as part of a development application. She understands the importance of full public disclosure but wouldn't want the Commission to have inadvertently released sensitive security information. Commissioner Reinig said she doesn't see that this would be a huge issue for the Commission to spend a lot of time on.

Chair Squier asked Lang to provide an example of FOCG's concern. Lang said if a new utility facility was to be developed and may have scenic, cultural or other resource effects, key information may be withheld would not be accessible for public review. Commissioner Robertson said any utility facility location would be disclosed and the public would be aware of the proposed location. The sort of information that would not be accessible are internal security measures and security plans.

Chair Squier asked if the Commissioners had further discussion, there being none, Commissioner Reinig made a motion to adopt rule 350-11 and 350-12. Commissioner Sheehan seconded the motion and a voice vote was taken. The motion passed unanimously. Litwak said the rules will be effective on June 1st.

### **Follow-up on Plan Review Issues (continued) Policy statement for uniform application of the Management Plan**

Litwak introduced the topic and said at the March 23, 2004 Special Meeting on Plan Review, the Commission directed staff to develop a policy that would specify the Plan should be interpreted uniformly throughout the Scenic Area.

Michael Lang, FOCG said the concept was fine but it should not be limited to the Management Plan. He said this should be applied to all revisions, definitions and the Act. Litwak said the language can easily be broadened.

Squier suggested the following revisions:

- in #1 substitute "shall" for "should"
- in #2 use an active language tense
- in #3 revising an awkward sentence to read "In applying the provisions of the Management Plan the Gorge Commission, Forest Service may consider but shall not be constrained by, county interpretations, state interpretations and application of state law and administrative regulations, for judicial decisions that do not directly affect the Management Plan."

Commissioner Loehrke said the recommended policy was fine. It needs to be clear that all six counties have the responsibility for enforcement of the Plan if they adopt it.

### **Process for 2005-2007 Budget Submittal and Transmittal of Required Strategic Plan to Washington**

The Commission discussed the process for developing the 2005-2007 budget submittal to Oregon and Washington and transmitting the required Strategic Plan document to Washington. Bennett reviewed the important dates and recommended process, and asked for approval to transmit the Washington Strategic Plan (see Attachment F).

Bennett said in the next few weeks, the Executive Committee needs to meet to discuss policy packages, base budgets, and related issues. She recommended we work with Gorge stakeholders, such as counties, to create a full funding strategy for the Gorge. She reviewed the base budget exception requests that will be submitted to Oregon on April 15th.

Commissioner Robertson asked Bennett to review the draft Strategic Plan. Bennett said she updated all goals, strategies, activities to reflect the status of the Management Plan review, made reference to "statewide results" as required by Washington and deleted all performance measures as these are not due until later in the budget process. She said this document takes the place of the "budget jumpstart" material.

Commissioner Robertson asked about the discrepancy between state funding and how that affects the ability of the Commission to use the funds. Bennett said current funding is lower in Oregon than Washington and based on the "matching" requirement of the bi-state compact, the Commission can only spend to the lower amount. She said the Oregon budget can be spent over a two year time frame but the Washington funds are broken out in year one and year two amounts. These constraints make it difficult to spend all the funds appropriated.

Chair Squier said it is important to graphically explain the problem and will work with Bennett on this issue. Commissioner Crow said the document did not portray the work of the Commission in an exciting way. Bennett said this document was only used internally with Office of Financial Management (OFM) and the format was prescribed. Commissioner Davis said she supports the idea of working on a way to graphically explain the funding problems and would assist Squier and Bennett.

Commissioner Wooster suggested showing the trend of expenditures in a graph.

Chair Squier asked for public comment on the item.

Michael Lang, FOCG suggested that a way to request funding would be to make it clear to the state Ways and Means Committee of what isn't being provided to land owners and recreationalists. He said there were a number of plan review items placed on the long term list, such as stream buffers, high value farm land and key indicators. He asked how these items would fit in to the statewide results and how would they be tracked. Bennett responded they were mentioned in a general manner in this document

but would be addressed specifically for the work plan. She said certain projects would be developed as a base funding level was determined.

Squier said the Commission and the public should be aware that the priorities for the work plan would be determined after a review of the base budget and policy packages.

Commissioner Robertson asked about the issue of liability insurance. Bennett explained Washington has provided coverage to Commissioners and the agency. Oregon is offering partial coverage. Commissioner Robertson asked how the insurance issue applied to individual commissioners. Bennett said both states acknowledge that they must cover individual commissioners, and the question in Oregon is agency coverage.

Chair Squier asked if the Commission had any further comments or discussion of the issue. There was no further discussion and Commissioner Reinig moved to approve the Strategic Plan for submission to Washington. Commissioner Sheehan seconded the motion, a voice vote was taken and passed unanimously.

### **Director's Report**

Bennett reviewed the following items:

- Article and maps regarding Senator Wyden's Lewis and Clark Mount Hood Wilderness Area proposal
- Cascade Locks playground funding request
- Kim Kelly, GIS Coordinator-accepted another position and we anticipate filling this vacancy in late summer 2004
- Grants for Oregon counties-Scenic Area grants- During the 2001-2003 biennium, the Oregon counties received grant funds as follows:
  - \$35,000-Multnomah
  - \$40,000-Hood River
  - \$45,000-Wasco

Total grant funds for Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) were cut by 20% for the biennium and, unlike past years, the Gorge grants for the Counties were not earmarked by the Legislature. All DLCD grants are subject to a new committee process created by the Legislature. The DLCD provided full funding for fiscal year 2004 to all the counties. For Fiscal Year 2005, the DLCD grant committee reduce the total amount for the three counties by 20% to match the overall cut, and then they subtracted the amount already received. Finally, the Committee reallocated the remaining funds based on the number of land use applications in each county. Through this procedure all three counties are getting a significant cut, and Multnomah County has the worst cut, going from \$35,000 to \$6,000.

Technical assistance grants will be available for FY-05, so all counties are likely to have funding to adopt revised land use ordinance. Part of our 2005-2007 budget strategy needs to address the funding issues facing the Gorge as a whole.

- Final Draft Revisions of the Plan- were sent out on Friday, noted there was a printing problem using shading of the text and apologized for this. The accompanying press release was sent with an error, which Commissioner Davis caught and staff contacted the media to correct the error.
- Plan adoption process- April 27th meeting is scheduled to allow for 5 minutes of testimony from individuals and no specific testimony times are scheduled, written testimony will be accepted up to noon on the 26th and copies can be picked up in the afternoon, we will try to send electronically as well. The meeting can be testimony and discussion if you prefer to wait until May 11th to take action. Chair Squier said she doesn't have a good sense of how things will proceed on the 27th, so she urged all the Commissioners plan to attend the May 11th meeting in case plan adoption is carried over to that meeting.

Commissioner Crow asked about the work on fire wise issues and Bennett said planning staff have been working on Plan Review and numerous development reviews. and have not done any work on this item.

#### **NSA Manager's Report-**

Commissioner Harkenrider provided a review of the following items:

- Land Acquisition Program 8.o-The April 1st window closed on this program and \$1 million was received to purchase properties identified through this program. A number of properties will convert to General Management Area and he doesn't anticipate more funding than the \$1 million in the next fiscal year.
- National Fire Program-Several local grants were submitted for fire planning and decisions will be made in May. Most of the proposals were for assessment and basic community action plans. The Forest Service is identifying areas related to a 5 year plan for a fuel reduction and will be primarily focused on the eastern side.

Commissioner Crow asked him to comment on the proposed Lewis and Clark Mount Hood Wilderness Area and McCall Point. Harkenrider said the Forest Service was not contacted on these issues and doesn't have an agency opinion at this point. His personal opinion is there won't be a significant change for the area overall with some difference in how we manage trails and vegetation removal.

Chair Squier asked if there were any additional questions and there being none asked if there was any other business. There was no additional business and the meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

The next regular meeting is scheduled for May 11, 2004 at Best Western Inn at Cascade Locks, OR

Minutes taken by Kathy Obayashi-Bartsch

Minutes approved on May 11, 2004