Oregon Solutions Project Team – Applegate Sustainable Aggregate Project
General Meeting Notes

April 9, 2009

Present: (call in--Dennis Halligan, Jay Stallman); John Ward, Jack Shipley, Jeannell Wyntergreen, Geoff Becker, Frank Schnitzer, Heather Tugaw, Chuck Wheeler, David Haight, Jeff Griffin, Steve Rouse, Ian Reid, Bill Peterson, Craig Tuss, Bryan Ross, Jim MacLeod, C.W. Smith, Dwight Ellis, Joan Resnick; Guests: Marc Grembemer (OWEB) and Mark Stewart (USGS)

Next meeting: **May 12, 2009, 1:00 – 4:00 pm, RVCOG Conference Room**

I. Updates & Information

John Ward identified an important training opportunity for interested members of the OSPT relative to Oregon Stream flow Duration Assessment Method, May 6-7 in Medford**.** http://yosemite.epa.gov/R10/ecocomm.nsf/wetlands/oregonstreamflow

II. Handouts and Emails for Group Review

Data Group Meeting Notes and recommendations
Full Economic Analysis proposal from EcoNorthwest
OWEB Grant In-Kind Match chart
Letters of Support to OWEB grant
OWEB Grant Application for Technical Assistance and Process Continuation
Accomplishments to Date score card
Decision Grid with List of Studies

III. Discussion

OWEB Grant Update

Per recommendation of OSPT last meeting, the APWC Riparian Committee authorized working with Stillwater Sciences for project management services for the OWEB technical assistance grant, due April 20. This is typical for APWC, as a non-profit, to work in developing a grant with a provider, and then offer the work to them without competition. Given the OSPT recommendation and the APWC Riparian Committee agreement, Stillwater will provide technical assistance and will partner with Joan Resnick to provide facilitation. APWC will manage the grant and project oversight.

Jeannell explained that this grant application was primarily for continuing the OSPT process, including professional facilitation, and providing technical assistance to the APWC for the ASAP over the next year. Stillwater clarified their role is strictly in a technical assistance role, does not see themselves as decision makers in the process.

The projected timeline would be as follows:

May 14, OSPT meeting
June 11, Signing Ceremony, Declaration of Cooperation
July – off
August – receive notice re: OWEB funding
September 10, 2009 -- reconvene

The OSPT members completed an estimation of their in-kind contributions during the meeting. The total in-kind came to **$46,000,** including $10,000 from the USFS, and a dollar amount for meeting participation by other members. Volunteer time is assessed by OWEB at an average volunteer rate $19/hr.

All letters of support and contribution need to be in to Jeannell no later than April 10, 2009 COB.

> √At the next meeting, the OSPT needs to discuss a "Plan B" for continuation if we don't get the OWEB grant.

Floodplain and Terrace Data Needs

The Technical Team presented the results of their meeting on March 25, 2009 (notes attached, posted to Oregon Solutions website), and explained the phased assessment strategy. The notes are extensive so given below are highlights of the group discussion.

The purpose of the staged approach is to 1) determine where the aggregate resource actually is, and then 2) determine where reach scale data is most appropriate, and characterize fish and wildlife habitat accordingly and 3)focus on Lower Applegate first and Upper Applegate later so we can get on the ground and take it in phases. In other words, the aggregate resource assessment will help determine where the resource is, then evaluate for other data needs. This approach will help determine whether the stream is aggrading, degrading or at equilibrium a lower cost.

It's important to take a scientific approach and supplement the observational nature of Jackson and Josephine Counties' inventories.

If the above studies indicate that it's appropriate or if the potential cost-benefit for in-stream mining makes sense, then we would continue with the previously identified in-stream studies (Reconnaissance Level Analysis, Limiting Factors Analysis, and potentially reach specific studies related to Sediment Budget).

It's important to coordinate this work (the mapping of the buried alluvial fans) with the OWEB technical support for recon-type assessment in order to further explore the relationship between channel migration zone, and the active channel to the buried alluvial fans.

The group needs to be clear about when/where/how to mesh or not the recon-level needs for in-stream. Depends on ultimately whether in-stream mining is practical from a permitting and conflict standpoint. Connectivity issues will need to be specific to a site rather than recon level.

> √Group needs to keep this in mind, please address at next tech team meeting (i.e., high probability of capture, then we need to look at state of river)

Aggregate Resource Assessment – Anticipated Summer 2009 – Winter 2009

1) Develop a preliminary map for aggregate resource.
2) Perform field investigation concentrating on boundaries and margins of deposits inside and outside of the 100 year flood boundary.

√**APWC** will work with landowners to request permission for access and digging test pits, and reclaiming pits for mapping buried alluvial fans.
√**Copeland Companies** will provide equipment and operator to dig test pits and pay for ODOT quality testing (approx $2,000/per sample)
√**DOGAMI** will provide oversight, organizational assistance and will coordinate with Technical Assistance (OWEB grant if successful); Important to match up with in-stream interplay and timing of studies.

Outstanding costs for this process: *$15,000 to $25,000* for field work and analysis
Potential resources: Dr. Wampler, student interns, DOGAMI oversight.

→The group identified that this area of investigation may be "***THE GOLDEN NUGGET***", for figuring out the interplay between the river and the floodplain that can then be used as a filter to help design a round rock pit so habitat is protected. This is worth considering and asking, – is this the most appropriate area for us to focus, recognizing that there are advantages and disadvantages to both in-stream and floodplain mining? Is this the basic issue for this group and should we focus studies there?

√**defer** further discussion to tech team; do we limit our attention or figure out what we'd like to have and make it work?

Data Collection at Existing Floodplain Mines
The objective is to evaluate and provide detailed information in a summary format of existing mine site. This can be used to develop a ranking of mine practices related to value of habitat, lack of habitat, etc, what worked well, what didn't work, what should we model, what needs improvement?

√**DOGAMI** will compile summaries
√**Copeland** agrees that DOGAMI files can be released (made available) for this assessment

Temperature Data
Starting in August, determine if these pits are warming the river, using a fiber optic cable or spot temperature data collection.

√**DOGAMI** staff and volunteers can collect initial temperature data
√**Need more volunteers** (Rogue Fly Fishers? APWC?) for monitoring

Additional Costs: If temperature probes are buried in stream buffers or other locations *$7,900*

Data Collection for Channel, Floodway, and 100-Year Floodplain – reach scale
Define the 100-year floodplain in Jackson County, this is important so that future mining could be located at sites where the potential for pit capture is minimal or part of the pit design.

√**R**e-survey 9 cross-sections from 1998
√APWC gain landowner permission for access
√**N**eed a surveyor for this part of study
√**1**st phase – GPS and flag cross-section locations, determine amount of vegetation clearing; **2**nd phase – survey with volunteers, clear vegetation

√**Geoff Becker** to contact FEMA about existing data

Total costs could be up to $326,350 (see paper), with a cost of $120,000 being more likely as we won't map all intersecting watersheds

Conclusion:

√**OSPT** accepts the Technical Team proposal in whole and recognizes that we have yet to address riparian and aquatic habitat health. The Tech Team will address this component at its next meeting.

Full Economic Study Proposal

The EcoNorthwest proposal would cost $20K on the low end and should ideally be concurrent with other studies.

At this point the group agrees that this study is not a high priority. At the same time, the group wants to keep the big picture in mind and recognize the real costs with respect to damage to resources and river migration.

Other groups are currently looking at assigning values to resources, e.g., full cost accounting in natural resources.

√**Group agrees** that we want to maintain awareness of the full cost. Keep our awareness up to unspoken costs in general sense and then look more fully as case by case.

Next Meeting
Aquatic and riparian habitat
Zoning issues
Plan "B" strategy
Declaration Support Statements
Plan for June 11