



Oregon Solutions Project Team – Applegate Sustainable Aggregate Project

Meeting Notes by Joan Resnick, Project Manager

January 8, 2009

Present: *Dwight Ellis, Convener*, David Haight, Chip Andrus, Frank Schnitzer, Geoff Becker, Rich Nawa, Jeff Griffin, Anita Huffman, Daryl Jackson (guest), Ian Reid, Steve Rouse, Bob Schaller, Jack Shipley, Michael Cavellero (facility host/guest), Leslie Adams, Jimmy McCleod (guest), John Renz, Shannon Priem (guest) Shawna Harvey (guest), Heather Tugaw, Bill Peterson, Ken Phippen, Craig Tuss, Chuck Wheeler, John Ward (guest), Lin Bernhardt, Pete Dalke; by phone: Judy Linton; Jane Bacchieri, Jeannell Wyntergreen, Rich Angstrom, Merina Christoffersen (guest), *C.W. Smith, convener*; Jane Bacchieri; Joan Resnick

Next meeting: February 12, 2009; 1:00 -4:00 PM, RVCOG Conference Room

I. Announcements

Guests in the room are not official Oregon Solutions Project Team members and were attending the meeting to determine the appropriateness of their participation in the project. At the end of the meeting Jimmy McCleod, Rogue Valley Advocates, and John Ward, Rogue Fly Fishers, determined they would like to participate. Project Sponsors (APWC) and Conveners will determine if and how to engage each and will send official letters of invitation accordingly.

II. Summary and Action Items

Opening: Comments by Dwight Ellis (included below), Jane Bacchieri, C.W. Smith.

Welcome to the Applegate Sustainable Aggregate Project, a Governor's Oregon Solutions Project Team meeting. My name is Dwight Ellis. I am Chair of the Josephine County Board of Commissioners and co-chair, or co-convener of this Oregon Solutions Project Team (OSPT), along with C.W. Smith, Jackson County Commissioner.

This series of meetings will be about collaboration rather than confrontation, about scientific data rather than chaos and confusion, and about environmental and business issues. As co-conveners, I see our job as keeping the meetings civilized and moving forward these next six months or so.

(Introductions of participants, Jane Bacchieri, Jack Shipley)

We have a draft set of ground rules. Once we develop and accept our ground rules, I will ask each participant to sign to abide by the rules.

Project Background: Jack Shipley, chair of the Applegate Partnership and Project Sponsor, offered background of project development, history of collaboration in the Applegate Partnership and Watershed Council, and a vision for the future. The APWC worked collaboratively with Copeland on riparian setbacks in the past and feels that we are ready now to develop solutions. Jack thanked people for coming and recognized that people would have strong feelings about the issues we would deal with on either end of the spectrum. Jack asked that we each put those feelings on the shelf while we seek solutions for having aggregate and resource protection. Jack referred to the rock on his driveway, the construction materials in his house, and being an Applegate community member who wants healthy fish in the river. Neither aggregate nor healthy fish and environment should be mutually exclusive. Jack suggests "*We want to have it all*".

We are like a roundtable and should answer the question, "Can we take aggregate? If so, how, where, when?"

Jack would like to imagine that 100 years from now people would look back at the work we did in this process and be really pleased that we had our act together and got it done, that we did the right things and found a way to do extraction and keep fish healthy in the river. Let's put something together that we can really be proud of that satisfies the needs and protects resources.

Ground Rules: Draft guidelines were passed out and offered as a starting point for this OSPT. Discussion centered on the role of the OSPT members in communicating about the project. For the most part, it is expected and desired that OSPT will freely communicate with their respective stakeholders, including distributing the official meeting notes. Members agreed that the more transparent we are the better! Dwight asked that we speak about the process not from our own bias but objectively. Beyond that, each member is expected to speak with respect for the process and the other team members. In basic terms, this means "*no sniping*" or undercutting each other and the process. We expect any issues that emerge to be taken up with the OSPT, the conveners, project sponsors, or Oregon Solutions staff.

√Action: the guidelines on the hand out were adopted for this group "as is" with the understanding that we may add to them as we go. (Attached)

√Action: The Riparian and Aquatic Committee of the Applegate Partnership and Watershed Council can host additional meetings, involve people beyond these monthly, focused meetings

√Action: Meeting notes will be posted on the website and are freely available for distribution.

√Action: Steve Rouse will write up his notes and send them to the Oregon Solutions staff to be sure they are within these guidelines and are not inadvertently inflammatory.

The group also recognized that any other ongoing processes outside of the Oregon Solutions process are not a part of this collaborative work effort and may continue on their own path.

Oregon Solution Process: Pete Dalke, Oregon Solutions Natural Resources Program Manager, described the 5-step Oregon Solutions project, passed out brochures that described the requirements and indicators necessary for a project to be designated as an Oregon Solutions Project; including that projects must support the Statute (). Oregon Solutions works with community-place-based topics where folks have identified a problem, agree to share information; agree to identify all possible solutions and data gaps, and then sign the Declaration of Cooperation.

Pete reiterated the importance of asking if we have the right people at the table, check and see if we are missing anyone. If so, we should address through project sponsors, APWC, and the conveners. There is a difference between this stakeholder process and a public forum, so we'll have to manage that.

Project Definition: The group was able to identify the general principles and objectives of the project, though actual wording of a project definition was assigned to the core team for developing the statement. It's important to differentiate between what we expect to achieve in the next 6 months in the Oregon Solutions Project leading to a Declaration of Cooperation and the larger, longer term process of defining if, when, where, how and to what level gravel mining can occur while protecting resource values.

Over the next 6 months to:

- 1) identify existing data and, if necessary, data gaps ;
- 2) Identify questions that need to be answered and studies that can help answer them. For instream and active floodplain mining the first question could be "what is the vertical trend of the river?" If the answer is in equilibrium or aggrading, the second set of questions revolve around the sediment budget;
 - 2a) Identify questions and study needs relative to out of stream sources as necessary.
- 3) identify how to pay for those studies and who would do them,
- 4) And identify what to do with the results of the studies. Need to focus on a creating decision tree or contingency matrix. For instance: For instream and active floodplain, if the answer to the first question is degrading, then the evaluation needs to focus on other options.

In reference to the scope of the project, we did agree we're looking at the entire Applegate Watershed, not limited to the streams and their riparian corridors. Geoff Becker and Jack Shipley identified instream gravel above the dam as a possible aggregate source.

√Action: The core team will draft a project definition with the goal of having a completed definition that has been reviewed by the OSPT within 2 weeks, using the concepts on the flip chart from this meeting.

There was also discussion about whether or not an "*on-the-ground-project*" could be investigated and designed within 6 months, understanding that it wouldn't likely be possible to permit such a project within the 6 months.

Craig Tuss said that we cannot realistically expect to create fish habitat with an aggregate extraction project. Only natural processes can do this. The best that can be done is “no fish impact” for an aggregate removal demonstration-type project, while having a separate location for fish habitat restoration project.

Members agreed that it would not be feasible to design and permit a restoration project within the time frame of the OSPT. Also, the studies evaluating the aquatic and riparian zones would likely need to precede a project. Perhaps a project could grow out of the studies.

Ian Reid, USFS, talked about projects that the USFS is currently interested in near the dam and how their project can be leveraged with the interests of this OSPT. The Forest Service is currently working on a feasibility study to determine if gravel augmentation in the main stem Applegate River below Applegate Dam is a viable fish habitat restoration project".

√Action: The concept of a learning or demonstration/restoration project may be discussed over the course of the Oregon Solutions process. We will work on clarifying what the goals and objectives would be of such project.

Chetco/Umpqua Process – Judy Linton, USAC, NWP, described the ongoing collaborative processes on these two rivers. These are agency coordinated processes that seek to find out if gravel extraction is appropriate in these streams. There are two phases to the process: 1) reconnaissance assessment (determining if the rivers are aggrading, degrading, or at equilibrium) and 2) sediment transport study (feeding the where, when, how much questions. These processes were initiated as a result of specific permit applications. A couple of the participants in the Applegate project have worked or are working on the Chetco/Umpqua process and we will be able to take advantage of their lessons learned and approaches.

Differences: OS ASAP project is community-driven (APWC sponsors) not agency driven. Because it is not in response to a specific permit action, there are several options for extracting gravel including that may be mixed and matched; recycled material, upland (hillside), Applegate Reservoir, abandoned floodplain terraces, active floodplains, and instream. This process has to account for the uniqueness of the Applegate River. Also, there are multiple operators on the Chetco/Umpqua versus just one (Copeland) on the Applegate.

√Action: Judy Linton and/or Chuck Wheeler will provide this group with the list of documents that the USGS thought was important and what questions they thought were important to address, as well as the scope of work for the sediment transport study. We will post on the Oregon Solutions website.

Declaration of Cooperation – Pete Dalke. . The Declaration is not legally binding; it's sometimes called “a handshake” of the parties. In this particular project the Declaration could also be important for leveraging resources, funding, identifying integrated solutions, and maintaining transparency.

√Action: Pete/Joan will send out a good sample for the group to look over so they can begin to craft one for the ASAP.

Existing Information: The group identified many studies and sources of data that could be collected for this project. Several commitments were made to send electronic copies or provide access to hard copies. Bill Peterson, Heather Tugaw, Frank Schnitzer, Chip Andrus, Anita Huffman, Chuck Wheeler, etc, have specific studies.

√Action: A data group or technical team was set up to help the group progress on the evaluation of available data and data gaps. Basically the team will help us understand what we have, what we need, and what questions are we trying to answer. Members are: Chuck (chair), Ian, Geoff, Chip, Rich, Heather, Anita, Bill, Bob. We hope they can build a bibliography of resource information and help frame the project scope.

√Action: Craig will ask USFWS about Janine Castro's participation. She is a fluvial geomorphologist. We'll need to figure out what the best use of her time would be.

Next Meeting: Meetings are every second Thursday from here on out and will always meet at RVCOG. The call-in number will also be the same.

General Timeline and Meeting Agendas:

Date	Agreement/Outcome Needed
February 12	What data/studies do we need
March 12	How do we pay for them?
April 9	Who do we want to do them? Who is going to do the studies? Who will manage the anticipated contract?
May 7	How will we use the information?
June 11	Sign Declaration of Cooperation