

ELDON MILLS

TAPE 2, Side 1

June 25, 1996

M.O'R.: This is a continuation of the interview with Eldon Mills on June 25th.

E.M.: That was a major windfall for the City, believe it or not, because the City got all that land, and that's the land where the Park & Ride is now, you know, between Baseline and Washington, all that land west of Adams to Dennis, and then there was some land on the west side of Dennis that also came in that transaction.

So the City traded that land to Copeland Lumber for the land Copeland Lumber had right across the street from the old City Hall, and the City made that one into a parking lot. There were a whole bunch of land trades went on there, all beneficial to the City, and I suppose General Foods made something out of their significant contributions, too.

M.O'R.: Well, like you say, they got the tax write-off.

E.M.: Yeah. They sent an Executive Vice President out from White Plains to sit down with us and do the final stuff, and of course I was really pleased with that one.

M.O'R.: Okay. Well, another topic that I know was really important throughout the Valley here was something you alluded to earlier, the poor quality of many of the sewer districts, the one Hillsboro plant included, which I guess all came to a head in the early 70's.

But actually, before we talk about that, can you tell me what you actually observed in the river at that time, when things were,

you know, pretty bad in terms of the outflows? I mean, you said that the river flows really diminished in the summertime, but were there other signs of distress as well?

E.M.: Well, sure. There wasn't any - in the first place, there wasn't any water in it, and what was in it that was being put in by those various sewage treatment plants was being pumped out 400 yards downstream by some farmer that didn't have any right to it. So in the summertime the water was - the river was - well, it was just an absolute mess, whatever there was, you know.

M.O'R.: Well, when the State finally cracked down - I guess that was, what, in 1971?

E.M.: I think it was '71, yeah.

M.O'R.: When they essentially ...

E.M.: They put a building ban on the county.

M.O'R.: Right. And I believe they to some extent dictated the solution, too, didn't they? They wanted to see a single entity out there ...

E.M.: Well, that's what they wanted. They didn't get it, but that's what they wanted.

M.O'R.: Well, can you tell me where you were then, when you heard about the building moratorium? That must have put a bit of a monkey wrench in your plans, too, in terms of development?

E.M.: Well, yes. I heard about it about 11:30 in the morning, and at 5 o'clock that day we were to stop issuing building permits, which we did. But we took a look at here we were sitting with a brand new - basically a brand new treatment plant and a brand new - we had a brand new operating permit on that Rock Creek

plant that they had just issued a couple months before. Maybe I'm wrong on a couple months, but a short time before.

And we said, you know, "This is just not right." So the next meeting of the Commission was in Bend. So we filed to make a presentation for the Commission in Bend. So we drove over and made our presentation. They then released the part of Hillsboro that was going into that plant for building permits and left the rest of the county frozen. Well, god, you can see what happened to us; all of a sudden we got all the building in the whole damn county.

Then they started putting together the idea of the USA. Well, it became abundantly clear, just like the freckles on your nose, that if we became a part of USA we were going to get back into that ban, because it was going to take them a long time to put together not only a plan but to build some facilities.

So we said, "No, we'll go it alone. The rest of you go USA." So everybody bought off on that. So we kept our bonds. They were responsible for their debt. And then when it - further down the road - I don't know, ten or twelve years down the road, maybe longer than that - longer than that, I guess - when it became - you know, they were up and running, it became apparent to me - it became apparent to us, I should say, I guess, as the Council, and my staff, that it now made sense to make overtures toward joining USA.

So we negotiated a deal with USA which basically says, "We will keep the bonds that we have to here, and you pay the bonds that you have to there. Now, we will join you, we'll become a part of the Agency, under these various conditions, you know. You set the rates, and we'll collect the money, and we'll give you a

percentage of the money that we collect." Much the same as the other cities did. I think there were a few minor changes in it, but USA was very anxious to get us under the one umbrella, and it made very good financial sense to us as well as technical sense. So we became a part of USA, but many years later than they had hoped we were going to.

M.O'R.: And originally the main reason was that you wanted to avoid the moratorium?

E.M.: Sure. We were the ones that had spent the money to build the plant, and this plant was being held up by people in the EQC as, "This is what everybody needs to do." We had done it. It's up and running. Like I told you, Jim Burns was out there drinking water out of the outflow line, you know. It didn't make any sense for them to give us an operating permit and then include us in the ban. But it did make sense for them probably to include the old plant in the ban, because we were in the process of getting it up, but it wasn't up yet, you know.

M.O'R.: So did the moratorium add urgency to that project, then, to getting the old plant up to snuff?

E.M.: No.

M.O'R.: You were already well into it?

E.M.: We were probably at some stage of design; I can't remember. Rarely in my career did I add urgency to something because somebody always told me, "If you hurry up with something, you're going to miss too much." So you're better off staying with your carefully laid out plan and doing it right and not trying to cut corners.

M.O'R.: So that meant that you did have the building moratorium in effect for part of the city?

E.M.: Yeah. The west side. There wasn't any building going on on the west side to speak of, anyway. This area in here was all going to the east side, which - this area was built later than that, quite a bit but - this was built like seven, eight years after that ban.

M.O'R.: Now, there were - I don't even remember how many, but there were a lot of little sewerage districts that were impacted by this.

E.M.: Yeah, I don't remember, either. Krahmer should have told you. He knew.

M.O'R.: Yeah, I think I did hear from him, you know, who they all were. If I remember correctly from what Gary told me, the idea that all of these individual plants would have to give up their own little turf and merge into one agency wasn't something that went down real easily at first.

E.M.: Probably not, but I wasn't involved in that since I kept the City out of that, you know. Probably not. But there was Fanno Creek and there was - I don't know what all.

M.O'R.: Well, what I'm curious is that with Hillsboro setting the example of being able to kind of opt out of this, whether others maybe attempted to follow your lead. In particular, I'm wondering why Gary Krahmer, who at that time was the head of the Aloha Sanitary District ...

E.M.: His operating permit wouldn't meet DEQ guidelines.

M.O'R.: But wasn't his plant also fairly new?

E.M.: I don't remember. I don't remember whether it was or not.

M.O'R.: But that was the critical - that was the litmus test, then, was whether the ...

E.M.: Just my opinion. Like I say, I wasn't involved in that because we said - you know, we told the Commission, "We're out of this thing," you know. "Leave us out of this thing." And they did, you know, and like two weeks later one of their guys sent us a letter and said, "You're permitted to issue building permits on anything going into the Rock Creek plant."

M.O'R.: Then you also mentioned that you did opt to get into USA later. And what was that negotiation - was that fairly smooth?

E.M.: Oh, very good, yeah. They were anxious to get us, and you know, it made good sense; it made economic sense, it made political sense. And we were ready to go in, and so it was just a matter of seeing who could get a little bit of edge on the other guy in negotiating it, you know. And nobody - you know, everybody walks away and thinks they're a winner, and that's good. If everybody walks away and thinks they're a loser, that may be better.

M.O'R.: Another issue that I think has been there all along, and certainly surfaced, I think, in the mid-80's when the lawsuits were filed, but it's the issue of various communities sort of competing with one another or pointing the finger at, you know, at somebody else in terms of where the problems are coming from. The one that I'm thinking of in connection with the lawsuit was Lake Oswego complaining about, you know, the quality of water that was coming down the Tualatin at that time and the fact that they were

having, you know, problems with algae growth in the lake and other things.

I'm just wondering if you had much to do with any of these squabbles?

E.M.: No. I was a part of USA and let USA handle all that. Sat back and rubbed my hands in glee and said, "God, I'm glad I'm not in there."

M.O'R.: Do you have any thoughts or did you observe anything that was particularly interesting as far as these kinds of struggles went on?

E.M.: No. I don't remember it well enough.

M.O'R.: Well, what about when the ...

E.M.: You know, I guess I always did feel that the Tualatin was a bad river, no question about it, but had it flowed through Portland, and Portland had been responsible for the damn thing instead of USA, those things would never have happened. Portland's still not meeting anything.

M.O'R.: So this is a comment on the way things work in terms of your political clout?

E.M.: You're damn right. You're damn right. All the political clout in Oregon sits right there in Portland. You know that, and I know that. And it's getting worse.

M.O'R.: Yeah. I guess half the state's population lives in the Portland area. I suppose by analogy that if you confine yourself to looking at - well, I guess Portland would still have clout out here, too, but Hillsboro must be a major player in Washington County?

E.M.: Yeah, I'd say that they are a major player, but they play very well with Washington County, and I think with the other cities. That might not have always been the case, but I think it is now. Because - you know, like they're tied together now in so many ways. You know, they're on the same team for such things as light rail issues; they're on the same team with a lot of the transportation issues. They're on the same team with sanitary sewer issues.

And then the cities are all on the same team, again, with USA on some of this water stuff, see, so - and some of the cities are tied together with Rural Fire Protection District No. 1. And maybe, depending on who gets the - or where the contract for ambulance services, maybe Hillsboro's going to be tied in with them, too, you know. So there's a lot of commingling of governmental entities. In the first place, there are too many governmental entities in the metropolitan area.

I started a study when I was at the Bureau of Governmental Research back in '61 about the various governmental entities in the Portland metropolitan statistical area. And I've forgotten how many it was; it was just mind-boggling, and there are still probably almost as many of them left as there were. I don't know why people won't give those damn things up. You know, there are cemetery districts, there are drainage districts, there are all sorts of districts out there. Most of them have very little function.

M.O"R.: What about organizations such as Metro that sort of attempt to bring ...

E.M.: You just spoil my day when you talk about Metro.



M.O'R.: Yeah?

E.M.: I have nothing good to think about Metro, nothing good to say about Metro, so -.

M.O'R.: So you don't think they've been very effective?

E.M.: I don't think that Metro is worth the powder it would take to blow them to hell.

M.O'R.: And why is that?

E.M.: Well, in the first place I don't think that Metro is a necessary entity. We've got Metro on one side, and we've got Tri-Met on the other side. And of course Metro has the authority to take over Tri-Met, too, by a stroke of a pen, in case you're not aware of that.

Everything that Metro has assumed authority over - and the people have given them the authority, right or wrong, they have the authority - could have been done with existing governments had they had the sense to work together.

It's just like this regional water plan. I don't know whether you're up-to-date on it or not, but all the water players, all the water purveyors joined this regional water plan to come up with water for the year 2050 or 2040, whatever it is. A consortium such as that could have done the same thing that Metro is doing and not cost any money. Do you have any idea what the hell Metro costs? I don't know, but I know it's pretty spendy. I enjoy writing that check to Metro every year.

M.O'R.: So your approach would be something more along the lines of the 2040 Consortium and ...

E.M.: I think it's done a good job on evaluating the water issue, and that's gone from everybody from the very smallest to the

very largest, which is the Portland Water Bureau. And the same thing could - you know, what has Metro done? You tell me. Well, it's set out some open space. Big goddamn deal. Every community can be required by one stroke of the legislature pen to do the same thing. And you don't have to spend the kind of money that they have elected to spend it. That's enough of that.

M.O'R.: So it's just an inefficient way to accomplish the task, then, in terms of money, anyway?

E.M.: It may turn into something someday worthwhile; I don't know. I've gone through all this, I've gone through the CRAG - do you know what CRAG was? Columbia Regional Association of Governments, which involved all the governments on this side of the river as well as the ones over across the river in Vancouver. We met with that for I don't know how many years. It didn't work, either. I'm not even sure Tri-Met's going to work. I'm not even sure this light rail thing is - I've got an open mind on it, but I'm not sure it's going to solve much. It damn well better solve something for the amount of money that's going into it. Do you think it's going to solve anything?

M.O'R.: Well, I don't know.

E.M.: Would you as a businessman put that kind of money into something that you weren't convinced was going to solve something? Hell no, you wouldn't.

M.O'R.: I imagine it is going to more closely tie some of the areas out here to the city, and that there will probably be a fair amount of development along the corridor.

E.M.: Sure. Sure. The question is, though, are the people that are going to live in that development going to take the light

rail? I don't know. They're looking at an area right out here, just, you know, not very far out, maybe a mile out, they'll build all this high rise stuff right up next to the light rail and, you know, covered walkways to get to the stop and all this stuff, but there isn't any incentive - if you want to drive your damn car and put up with the traffic, there isn't any incentive to put you on the light rail.

Now, there may be some day. There may be. They may - you know, they may put some kind of a tax on there that makes you not want to drive your car, or they might put some kind of an incentive on you that you get some kind of a rebate for riding light rail, but the way it's set up now I don't understand that it would do that.

M.O'R.: Yeah, although with the traffic you sometimes encounter, especially during rush hour, getting from here to Portland or back ...

E.M.: How long do you think it's going to take to get from here to Portland on the light rail?

M.O'R.: Well, I assume it would be quicker than the traffic.

E.M.: It might be quicker at some times in the day, but it's going to be the majority of an hour.

M.O'R.: It's that bad, huh?

E.M.: I don't know. I mean, it's got a bunch of stops, and it goes down through Beaverton, you know, and it's got a bunch of stops. Now, I like the transit system in like Toronto. I think that's a neat transit system. It's kind of a radial - it's kind of like the spokes of a wheel without the rim on, you know, runs out like this. And you can get on over here and run down to here and

jump on another car and go out there in just, you know, ten minutes.

M.O'R.: But you don't think Metro's going to be that efficient?

E.M.: I don't know. Maybe it is. I shouldn't even be talking about it, because I've never even ridden the one out to Gresham. Have you?

M.O'R.: No, I haven't either. I've ridden it from - you know, around downtown or closer in, and it's not terribly fast there - you're right about that - because there are so many stops.

E.M.: But it might be fun, you know? It would be fun for people like me if I need to go downtown, and I've got plenty of time to leave early.

M.O'R.: Well, as you say, light rail has proven to be fairly efficient in some major areas back East.

E.M.: But not in Washington D.C. A very good friend of mine was the General Manager of the Council of Governments in Washington D.C., and when they were starting to put that thing together, 20-plus years ago under the streets and all that, they came to the COG and said, "We're going to need" - I don't know whether they said ten million a year or 20 million a year for ten years as a subsidy for this thing. So the COG said, "Okay. No problem."

The second year they wanted 129 million, I think is what he said, not 20. I don't know where it is now. Walter's retired, so I don't know where it is, but I bet the COG or somebody's subsidizing the hell out of it. But I don't know how else you get around Washington D.C., either. If I have to go to Washington D.C. I land at National and get on that thing and go downtown, you know.

M.O'R.: Yeah. Well, that's - as a matter of fact, I was thinking of Washington when I said that it works well, at least from the rider's point of view.

E.M.: Yeah.

M.O'R.: You can get on it and get around fairly easily.

Well, the one other subject that we should talk a little bit about is the lawsuit that came along in the middle 80's.

E.M.: I really don't know anything about it. I really don't.

M.O'R.: You said you knew Jack Churchill, so you must ...

E.M.: Well, I've known Jack - you know, not very well, but I've known him for a long time.

M.O'R.: And were you aware of him in particular in connection with the lawsuit?

E.M.: Only what I read in the paper.

M.O'R.: But USA, though, was - well, I guess it didn't have much to do with the City of Hillsboro, per se, but it's an entity that reports to the Washington County Commissioners. I assume that it must have had some impact on the County in terms of the potential damages.

E.M.: Oh, I'm sure. Yeah, I'm sure. But I don't recall that - there were some memos put out by probably Krahmer's office, sort of status reports on that thing from time to time, but that's all I kind of vaguely remember.

M.O'R.: What about the - you said that you finally opted to get into USA. Now, was that something you thought that the City would do originally when you opted out of USA, or was that more a reflection of the fact that you saw what USA had become and thought that they were an okay organization to get involved with?

E.M.: You know, Michael, I'm not sure. I can't remember that I had that thought that we would join or wouldn't join. I suspect that it was one of those wait and see and let them prove themselves. And I couldn't lose, you know. I mean, it was one of those situations you can't lose. You can continue to build. You can stay on the outside, and maybe they'll want to take you in some day. And they made gestures at us time after time after time. It was when the timing was right that we said, "Okay, we'll go."

M.O'R.: And you've been - it sounds like you're pretty good friends with Gary Krahmer?

E.M.: Oh, Gary and I have been good friends for years. We came here about the same time in about '61. He went to work out at the sewage treatment plant, and I went to work downtown. Yeah, Gary and I go fishing and stuff all the time. We've probably been fishing seven or eight times already this year.

Matter of fact, we co-chair the Economic Development Committee for the Chamber of Commerce, and after the meeting tomorrow we're going to - I think we're going to go together to a poker session.

M.O'R.: Oh, yeah? I'm a bit of a poker player myself.

E.M.: Oh, yeah?

M.O'R.: Yeah.

E.M.: Good. Where do you get to play? Where do you play? I guess there's someplace over in Vancouver that you can play, isn't there?

M.O'R.: Well, I play in a private game, you know.

E.M.: Private games?

M.O'R.: Yeah. We meet once a month. It's a fairly small stakes, table stakes game, and we play mostly straight poker.

E.M.: I sometimes go up to La Center. Have you ever played up there?

M.O'R.: No, I haven't.

E.M.: They play Hold Em up there. I've never gone to either one of the relatively new Indian casinos, but ...

M.O'R.: Yeah. Nor have I.

E.M.: I stopped in one of them one day and watched them play Black Jack, and I played three hands and won 40 bucks and quit.

M.O'R.: Well, that's probably the best strategy.

E.M.: Yeah, because I can't play Black Jack. I never could play Black Jack, still can't.

M.O'R.: I remember what it was I was going to ask you; it was about the development angle. The lawsuit of course was brought by Churchill and Jack Smith and some of the others over the issue of meeting the Clean Water Act standards, and it was particularly phosphorus that they wanted USA to address, and there was some question as to whether they could and so forth and so on, but I'm just wondering if - now that USA has successfully risen to the challenge and met, you know, the requirements of the lawsuit, or at least almost met them, do you think that it was overall a good thing that they went down that road, or do you think that it didn't make any difference?

E.M.: Well, I think that the State should have been the ones that forced USA to meet them. I don't know. You know, it had to be done, but it has to be done with all the other substandard rivers, too, damn it.

You know, I flew over the Tualatin Valley not very long ago, and up above Gaston, between Gaston and Cherry Grove, there's a

major dairy operation up there. He had gigantic mounds of manure from his dairy operation piled all over his fields; I mean, gigantic mounds like - oh, bigger than this room. And I don't know how many of them were out there. Let's say 12 to 20 of them. It was raining like hell.

Now, there's a major difference between point and non-point pollution, but as long as that kind of thing can exist where this runoff is going to get in the river, you're never going to have a pristine river. You know, we're required now - in the logging operation we're required to stay 50 feet from a stream. Well, if you get any kind of runoff at all, that 50 feet is just going to be a little bit of a barrier. You're still going to get dirt and silt and everything else running through there, you know.

[end of side one]



ELDON MILLS

TAPE 2, Side 2

June 25, 1996

M.O'R.: So you're saying that ...

E.M.: I'm saying the farming operations are going to have to be cleaned up, too.

These guys are out there putting all kinds of chemicals out there on the ground. They're out there with those big guns pouring the water on the ground, and then it's running off in the goddamn river. We take water samples I don't know how many times a day there at the treatment plant. A lot of this stuff occurs above that treatment plant. Well, we can treat it out, you know. We can get it out. That's not the problem.

There's a lot of it goes in below there. And the stuff that goes on by has already got it in there. You can't just clean up the treatment plants and consequently clean up the river. I'll bet you that there are still - oh, I can't bet you because I don't know how to prove it - but I predict that there are still an awful lot of illegal users pumping out of that river right today. The Water Master I'm sure does his damndest, but it used to be those guys were pretty ingenious about how to run pipes out under the ground, you know, and get into the river, and I don't know, pump at night and however - I don't know how they did it, but -. If you have land and don't have any water rights, you know you can't grow much of anything here in the summer months.

M.O'R.: So do you think the ag. community is the worst?

E.M.: I think the ag. community is next that has to be looked at.

M.O'R.: It's the next highest priority?

E.M.: I think that they can solve as much of their problem as USA could solve of its problem. But you're still not going to turn that Tualatin River into a pristine stream.

In the first place, it probably never was. They talk about the steamboats that used to come to Hillsboro. Man, some of those channels, that must have been a very narrow steamboat, but I suppose they caved in or whatever. But I doubt that it was ever really a pristine stream because it's so flat and it's so slow.

If you had some ripples in it, if you had some falls in it where you're going to get some oxygenation of water and stuff like that, which will add back to the quality of the water, it might make some sense to me, but it's a good old crawdad pond is what it really is. But it doesn't have to be, you know, the kind of schlock it used to be, and it isn't. Right now it's not in good shape because the floods in February filled Scoggins Dam with a kind of a sedimentation. It's not a sedimentation - filled it with a material that just won't settle out, so the turbidity level coming out of the dam is just extremely high, and they're going all the way through. There's no way to get it out.

M.O'R.: So do you see it in your drinking water, then?

E.M.: Oh, no. No. The guys peel it out, I mean, but they have a lot more to solids to dispose of in their drying beds. No, you can't see it in the drinking water. But at this time of the year you normally get to two to maybe five units of turbidity. I don't know what they're getting now, but the stuff coming out of

the dam a couple weeks ago was 130. And I talked to a lady that was up there fishing from the bank, I said, "How far could you see your bait in the water?" and she said, "About a foot."

The Water Master told Carl Borg, who runs the water treatment plant, back in April that it probably wouldn't settle out this whole year.

M.O'R.: Well, I mean ...

E.M.: But it's just dirt.

M.O'R.: Right.

E.M.: It's just soil that's - they had some major washes. Tim River told me that he was on this tour a couple weeks ago, and they had some major wash-out's up above the dam on some of the streams, and there's still a raw bank there that the water's running by and picking that stuff up.

You could solve that, you know; it's a lot of money. You can go in there and build a rock gabion, you know, and close that off, but it's just money. Well, the irrigators don't have any interest in it. The M&I people can treat it out, so it's just running down the river, I guess.

M.O'R.: What about the money that's been spent so far improving the water quality in Tualatin: do you think it's been a good investment?

E.M.: Yeah. Yeah.

M.O'R.: So the fact that building permits are more expensive now, or sewage interconnect permits, et cetera ...

E.M.: I've always been a believer in the user-pay. If you're hooking onto my system, and it cost me - as a bureaucrat it cost me \$6,000 to develop the capacity for you to hook onto my system, then

you've got to pay the \$6,000, or you go build someplace else. I've always believed that. Hillsboro is probably the only community around - it might not be true now, but for years it was the only community around that had a depreciation-amortization fund, both water and sewer, because we not only figured what it costs to hook you on, but what it costs to maintain it, and that's what we charged you. And we took those charges and put them in that D&A fund so that when we had to replace that pipeline someplace down the road, you had a couple pennies in there along with everybody else. We didn't have to go back to the people and ask for a bond issue to do that.

M.O'R.: Okay. Well, maybe just as a way of concluding here, besides the ag. community, what other issues are going to come to the forefront here with respect to ...

E.M.: Well, I think they've solved the problem with the nursery people. That was one that sometime ago I had some questions about. But now they have to have complete recirculation systems, so I think they've solved that one.

M.O'R.: And that was the fertilizer?

E.M.: Yeah, the stuff that they spray on their plants, you know. They had to put in underground drainage and pick it up and reuse it. Can't release it into a receiving stream.

M.O'R.: And was that - do you think that was a big impact on the river originally or -?

E.M.: I don't know. It was just one of those things you think about, before they started having to do it the way they're doing it now, you know.

Besides, the guys that have done it - well, I guess they've all done it - but they say it's a lot cheaper now that they have the systems in because whatever runs off the first time is still in the water, and they pick it up and they get to reuse it, you know, like the fertilizers, the pesticides and whatever. They get to reuse it; just add some more to it and put it back out.

I don't know of anything else. If you had - logging can create turbidity. Road building can create turbidity. And let me tell you something that creates turbidity anyplace there's water running is recreational vehicles. You turn a bunch of people loose with RV's, I'm talking about dirt bikes and four-wheelers and stuff like that, where there aren't roads built for them, you know, turn them loose in the woods someplace, they'll create ruts that water will run down and pick up dirt and wind up in a receiving stream.

I can show you wash-out's on the sides of some of the mountains that you wouldn't believe, all started because somebody went up when it was muddy with a dirt bike or some kind of an ATV, you know, created a rut and started the water running down. The deeper the rut, the more water ran down it, and pretty soon you've got a whole damn arroyo developed, you know. They really irritate the hell out of me. I have no problem with them staying on the roads, but when they start striking off cross-country through the timber, they are a problem.

M.O'R.: Yeah, I would agree with that, too, although I've always thought about it more just in terms of their impact on the wildlife in the woods, and the solitude in the woods, for that matter.

E.M.: Yeah. I don't know that they bother the wildlife so awful much.

The other morning I was going to the project, and I came around the bend and there was a cow elk standing in the road. And she just stood there, and I drove up to her to within I suppose 75 or 80 feet, and she just stood there and looked at me.

So I stopped, and Tim River was with me, and we looked down below the road and there were seven or eight of them right there. You know, you could have back-handed a rock to any of them. And I said, "Well, she's not going to stand here forever." And I started up, and she stood there till I suppose I was 50 feet from her and she walked out of the road and let me go by. But the vehicle didn't bother them a bit.

M.O'R.: Okay. Well, I think I'm running out of questions here, at least for right now. Unless you can think of something else. Have we overlooked any major topics here?

E.M.: I don't think so.

M.O'R.: Okay. Well, thank you very much.

E.M.: My pleasure.

[end of tape]