



Oregon Solutions Project Team – Applegate Sustainable Aggregate Project
Meeting Notes by Joan Resnick, Project Manager

Meeting Date: February 12, 2009

Present: Dwight Ellis and C.W. Smith, Co-Conveners, Lesley Adams, Rich Angstrom, Geoff Becker, Lin Bernhardt, Jeff Griffin, David Haight, Jimmy MacLeod, Bill Peterson, Ian Reid, John Renz, Brian Ross, Steve Rouse, Heather Tugaw, Craig Tuss, Chuck Wheeler, John Ward; call-in: Pete Dalke, Anita Huffman, Judy Linton, Jeannell Wyntergreen

Guests: Nick Anderson, Ben Mundie, Dennis Halligan, Lyle Woodcock, Rich Whitley

Next meeting: March 12, 2009, 1:00 – 4:00 pm, RVCOG

I. Announcements & Updates

1. Geoff Becker, APWC meeting announcements: Geoff discussed. *Preparing for Climate Change in Rogue River Basin of Southwest Oregon*; Doeppelt, Hamilton, Deacon, Koopmen 12, 2008 paper; co-author Deacon-Williams available for presentation.. The APWC issued an invitation to Dennis Halligan to come to this meeting.
2. Craig Tuss talked with FWS management regarding Janine Castro's availability to assist with this effort. She is available for technical questions or assistance, especially to the group working on the data gaps and the flood plain/channel of the Applegate.
3. ("Data Group") Tech Team – team did not convene in interim; discussed ftp (file transfer protocol) issue, later resolved by RVCOG.

II. Discussion (✓ = action for follow up; ♦ = decision)

RVCOG Website Link

The RVCOG graciously offered to create a website/link for the ASAP on its own website, thus allowing the transfer/upload/download of large documents and serving as a local resource for the long-term life of the project. Lisa Marston is webmaster and recommends we use .pdf format wherever possible.

✓**The RVCOG** will create a page on its website for the OSPT ASAP that will serve as repository for technical documents. The ASAP Tech Team will work with Lisa.

✓**Tech team** to digest what's really relevant to the Applegate (ASAP) and decide what should be on the website and post documents. Ian compiled a partial bibliography.

Draft Project Milestones

The Core Team presented their recommended project definition and long-term desired outcome (December 2012) in a paper dated February 10, 2009 (*attached to this email*). This paper needs some work and the group will continue to develop it as we go along. The paper can serve as the backbone of the Declaration of Cooperation.

✓**The OSPT** accepted the recommended project definition, with edits as suggested by Dwight Ellis to reconcile the draft on the milestone paper and today's agenda.

✓**All future correspondence**, agendas, papers, etc, will be date stamped and noted as to whether they supersede a previous document.

The group read the draft milestones paper briefly and commented on issues related to 1) sustainability and 2) clarifying the early, broad-based portion and mid-term portions so that any policy statements result from our investigation, taking care not to suggest any results that pre-judge policy and management directions.

Steve Rouse offered three definitions and clarification on "sustainability" to help us determine the most appropriate usage for this project and the group liked the 3rd iteration:

"Are we being asked to define a meaningful and measurable sustainable natural resource planning framework that balances the need for appropriate aggregate extraction while encouraging sustainable aquatic and riparian habitat?"

♦ **The OSPT agreed** that the 3rd clarification was the approach we will take and Rich Angstrom noted the Governor's Executive Order #62-02, "Sustainability for the 21st Century" in which sustainable long term planning is identified as the primary intent.

✓**Steve Rouse** will send out his drafted statement for sustainability to the entire OSPT. Understood that we can massage definition as we go but agreement in concept.

✓**Core Team** will continue to refine this milestone paper as we go and towards a DoC, other members invited to contribute ad hoc as we go. Will include glossary.

✓**Craig Tuss** asked if people could commit in trust to early steps so we can move forward while recognizing we may not have all the answers to the questions that we'll be investigating. Ultimately we'll need a DoC and have to act in good faith that that we can get there.

♦ **The 2012** outcome was generally accepted with no major concerns.

Discussion: The group discussed keeping in mind the idea of doing a project. Copeland does hope that there is a way to do an in stream project that helps answer the question, "What can we do collectively that enhances fishery and allows for meeting some portion of the social and economic demand for aggregate?". Group recognizes that in stream issues are what brought people to the table, we must find a solution there.

Declaration of Cooperation

Pete Dalke and Rich Angstrom discussed two existing DoCs that could be helpful to the group in developing our own Declaration. Rich recommended we look at the mediated solution on the farmlands (*project name to follow from Pete*). It deals with aggregate extraction in the Willamette. Pete recommended Delta Ponds example which is focused on re-connecting ponds back to the river to benefit habitat: <http://www.orsolutions.org/willamette/deltaponds.htm>. The ASAP DoC is expected to be developed and signed by the June meeting.

✓**Joan and Pete** will begin to develop a skeleton DoC for the next meeting. Pete will identify the DoC that Rich referred to above.

✓**Each member** of the OSPT is asked to review existing DoCs and to begin developing ideas about their own role, contribution to the process, etc.

Stillwater/Field Trip (meet at 9:00 Applegate Store on Friday am).

Dennis has experience working with similar issues in Humboldt, Mendocino, and Sonoma counties in CA in very similar processes to this OSPT. People in Humboldt County realized that the "head butting" wasn't getting them anywhere. Dennis referenced the Mad River (Humboldt) and the Russian River (Sonoma) examples where heavy extraction took place post WWII. Issues were salmonid listing, bridges under-mined and degrading river. Got together a scientific review committee (County of Humboldt Extraction Review Team or CHERT in Humboldt and the Scientific Review Committee in Sonoma) that helped gravel operators, agencies, and consulting biologists come up with more holistic river management plans. For example, in-stream gravel extraction, riparian management, and habitat restoration are incorporated into management plans on rivers. Trout Unlimited, River Keeper, Agencies, and an operator (Shamrock Materials) are collaborating to come up with a management plan in the Russian River that combines flood control, gravel mining, in-stream habitat enhancement, erosion control, and riparian re-vegetation..

There is advancing science in river management that can help us come to solutions, recognizing that we're working within managed watersheds. The scientific review boards are funded by gravel operators, not on per ton basis. The scientific review committee is a quasi-county organization, run by the county, answer to the County Board of Supervisors. The billing is pro-rated and based upon how much time they spend on any one operation.

USFS Project, Ian Reid

USFS is working on a feasibility study to assess viability of gravel augmentation in the Applegate River below Applegate Dam on USFS land as a restoration option. This is independent of Oregon Solutions project but has similar interests, opportunities to leverage, work together on things like need for sediment budget, etc.

Ian did some preliminary research, summarized below:

- Army COE sediment studies post 1997 flood: COE has some good sediment transport models above the dam before the dam was closed: estimated 265,000 yds/year transported by river upstream of dam. Bathymetric analysis later showed about 600,000/yds year transported and deposited in

reservoir. Between 8 – 16million yds of sediment deposited in reservoir since it was built.

- Bill Elliott, geomorphology professor at Southern Oregon University, interested in doing some core samples of lithology of what's been deposited to figure out quality of gravel inside reservoir. Different sources, different grades, etc.
- Viability – can USFS sell it to purchaser? Currently withdrawn from mineral entry for locatables (i.e. gold) but is yet to be determined if withdrawn from salable minerals (aggregate). However, RRNF Forest Resource Management plan shows it off-limits for aggregate source development due to developed recreation land allocation; therefore it may require a Forest Plan amendment.
- An Amendment to Forest Plan is something that is generally approved at the Regional Level (Portland, Regional Forester Mary Wagner) with local forest support (Forest Supervisor Scott Conroy). Gravel extraction would require NEPA process coupled to a general plan or proposal from operator, county, or other party under CFR 228.
- Sales History: Public record shows USFS did sell gravel in 2006 to Robco, Grants Pass, purchased 4300 yards @ \$2/yd; Trying to figure out if selling from the dam is economically and socially acceptable given the haul route. It may be ecologically feasible but the rest may depend on some subsidy (per Nawa paper). Haul route is long for Copeland, may not be economical for them, possible for competitors.
- As a restoration project, to augment below dam, it makes sense to get the gravel from above the dam. Requires some give and take, but needs to be consistent with Plan.
- Ian compiled a partial bibliography related to gravel/environmental issues. He has the majority of the sources available electronically. About 70% is general topic, the rest is specific to Applegate. ✓Ian will pass around to tech team and rest of OSPT. Also passed around *Fisheries* instream gravel mining issues paper.

Discussion:

Hauling, costs, and concerns:

OSU economic study by Bill Yeager, 32cents/ton mileage or 22cents per ton mileage (incremental); full cost is off loading, etc. If you just look at transportation cost comes out to about 22cents. Published, peer-reviewed study on line.

How much would it take as a subsidy to break even in order to keep people working? At 22cents/mile; fair market value \$7/ton over 45miles. Estimated subsidy would have to be 2-3\$/ton.

Haul route questions – county approved road; can expect local opposition though the road is viable. How can we minimize impacts? Per Kondolf paper – externalized costs (bridge under mining, loss of beach sands) aren't currently reflected in gravel prices. Are there other options from a realistic perspective that take a holistic view of costs?

River rock and gravel is a finite resource; so is the best use of the aggregate in the dam best used to augment downstream? Conservation of resources principles apply to rock hardness, ODOT has specifications for this.

✓**Angstrom** to provide citation, on-line link to Yeager paper.

Other Important Studies, Work needed relative to dam:

FERC studies in Applegate could also serve as a mitigation measure relative to FERC licensing. USFS is now intervenor. This could serve as downstream mitigation, could include gravel augmentation.

What about the need of the COE to dredge the reservoir? Is there a way to work with COE since 25cfs (*per COE 1998 post flood-sedimentation study*) loss over summer 90 day period due to gravel build up? Can we leverage resources to bring together a viable restoration project?

✓**Jim Buck** from COE is necessary for this conversation. Judy will approach Jim to encourage his participation on this team or a sub-team.

Potential for gold within the sand and gravel.

In Sacramento area an operator has done well with their ability to extract gold, but it includes a whole different type of equipment, sand classification, etc. It is not an easy "do". Really need someone to assess the gold content to see if it's viable and tie that to anticipated volumes upstream. Don't have to use chemicals to pull different grades of sand.

Would gold offset costs so we don't necessarily go to the taxpayers? Can we work with senators to deal with the withdrawal to make it possible to sell? FYI, Copeland tried gold recovery never got any economic returns on the Applegate.

Stimulus Package

There will be need generated in the stimulus package related to road work that will require supply. State is looking at large transportation package. 60% of aggregate production goes to public purpose (dams, streets, bridges). In putting America back to work, the demand will go up and puts this front and center.

County Commissioners met with Sen. Wyden regarding stimulus package and there is a lot of emphasis on infrastructure, needs immediate economic benefit, moves government out of the way to make it happen;

Economic stimulus budget in USFS budget. Wouldn't be exclusively of interest to Copeland, other operators would also be interested. Wouldn't resolve the whole solution for the Applegate, but it can't be transported currently to Josephine Co. processing plant. Stimulus plan – 90 day response time has to put everything on the fast track for a model project. 90 days ready for bid, 180 days ready for project. Clarification needed.

✓**90-day Team** formed to expedite a project w/in 90 days to meet the needs of the stimulus package and bring all these things together. Team will clarify if riders exist that can help this project. Develop a project frame that addresses the industry issue, COE issue, environmental issue, scientific

benefits. Determine if projects must be NEPA-complete or proposed within 90 days. Team will look at normal-in water work period may be best in Nov-Feb 1. (NMF prefer high/dry and could wave input) Ian Reid, Jeff Griffin, C.W., DSL, Judy Linton, ODFW –David Haight, Craig Tuss will look into Sec. 7 consultation; DEQ contact for 401, (Alex Cero); Jim Buck; CW chair;

Recommendations to 90 day Team from Group:

✓**Recommendation per Ross** – get up to the dam and see the deposits; recognize there is a lot of mud up there. Some of it (Becker) is clean, sorted, and plentiful.

✓**Recommend** that the gravel be looked at also for its habitat value and that we can have both economic and habitat value; We have a unique idea here and need to keep going. This is important.

✓**Recommendation** that County farm out NEPA work to consultants that can expedite the work; in-house analysis is 1-2 years, 3rd party analysis much quicker;

DOGMI Presentation

Showed map of aerial photography of current mine sites along the river in Josephine Co., got imagery from Oregon State portal so we can take this all the way up to the dam and confluence. This is a jpeg.

✓**RVCOG has** layers for zoning, transportation, aerial photography, etc.;

✓**DOGMI** will check with RVCOG (Lisa) and with Jackson County GIS (Lynn Jacobsen), County will do overlays. Ben to coordinate.

✓**FLIR flights** over Applegate can be added. (APWC)

✓**DOGMI** will have coverage all the way to Dam and confluence for next meeting and all the way to the CA border...show the whole pool; include area to the NW, still in Oregon.

✓**Pedigree** of sites, active/extinct/available. **DOGMI** will help us see the difference between active/extinct/available sites in the next map iteration.

Supply Discussion

Ashbar, Murphy Creek --- most sites on the map date back to the 1970s and are mined out. Ashbar has about 3 months left, Murphy Creek is a processing site. Reserves that are permitted are miniscule, at least on the Applegate. Most counties have 100 years of supply. Of other upland sites, only 2 have ODOT quality material.

Issues related to supply include long permit processing time, only about 3 or 4 operators (Knife River, Rough n Ready). Copeland out of sand and gravel in 2006, try to use upland quarries whenever possible. The Middleton bar got permitted in 2006 and that's what made the difference.

Next Meeting Desired Agenda Topics:

f/u 90 day group

Presentations wanted as identified below:

Big picture on supply/demand information from DOGMI/industry/County

✓DOGMI to get 1995 Document by DOGMI predicting aggregate demand by county based on population, consumption, upgrading to current projections onto RVCOG website
✓Craig to follow up with Bill Peterson and/or Ben regarding further needs
✓County to provide the status of zoning reviews on significant aggregate; designation of significant sites
✓pilot project, case studies – Daryl Jackson, Dennis Halligan, Chip Andrus✓what studies do we need and how are we going to pay for those – Tech team will be prepared to talk about the needed studies; Group discussion on how to pay for those
✓At some point want to invite prof on Russian River symposium, Guerillmo from Oregon State has been running gravel round table – need those materials. At some point would be worthwhile to hear from Guerillmo.
Seminar in 06 in Coos Bay is available from Heather;
✓Heather will supply to RVCOG site
✓if we have time next time group dynamics/small group discussions relative to the other components of the river

II. Action Summary

✓**The RVCOG** will create a page on its website for the OSPT ASAP that will serve as repository for technical documents. The ASAP Tech Team will work with Lisa Marston to implement.

✓**Tech team** to digest what's really relevant to the Applegate (ASAP) and decide what should be on the website and post documents. Ian compiled partial bibliography.

✓**The OSPT** accepted the recommended project definition, with edits as suggested by Dwight Ellis to reconcile the draft on the milestone paper and today's agenda.

✓**All future correspondence**, agendas, papers, etc, will be date stamped and noted as to whether they supersede a previous document.

✓**Steve Rouse** will send out his drafted statement for sustainability to entire OSPT.

✓**Core Team** will continue to refine the milestone paper as the OSPT ASAP project evolves and towards a DoC, other members invited to contribute ad hoc as we go. Will include glossary.

✓**Craig Tuss** asked if people could commit in trust to early steps so we can move forward while recognizing we may not have all the answers to the questions that we'll be investigating. Ultimately we'll need a DoC and have to act in good faith that that we can get there.

✓**Joan and Pete** will begin to develop a skeleton DoC for the next meeting. Pete will identify the DoC that Rich referred to above.

✓**Each member** of the OSPT is asked to review existing DoCs and to begin developing ideas about their own role, contribution to the process, etc.

✓**Jim Buck** from COE is necessary for this conversation. Judy will approach Jim to encourage his participation on this team or a sub-team.

✓**90-day Team** formed to expedite a project w/in 90 days to meet the needs of the stimulus package and bring all these things together. Team will clarify if riders exist that can help this project. Develop a project frame that addresses the industry issue, COE issue, environmental issue, scientific benefits. Determine if projects must be NEPA-complete or proposed within 90 days. Team will look at normal-in water work period may be best in Nov-Feb 1. (NMF prefer high/dry and could wave input) Ian Reid, Jeff Griffin, C.W., DSL, Judy Linton, ODFW –David Haight, Craig Tuss will look into Sec. 7 consultation; DEQ contact for 401, (Alex Cero); Jim Buck; CW chair;

✓**Several** data requests to DOGMI

✓**Several presentation** requests to County, DOGMI, Dennis Halligan, Daryl Jackson, Copeland

✓**several agreements** to supply technical papers to RVCOG site via tech team (Heather, Ian, DOGMI)