

**Applegate Sustainable Aggregate Project
Core Team Meeting – Oregon Solutions**
Meeting Notes

December 11, 2008

Present: Geoff Becker for Steve Rouse, Gary Gnauk for Jack Shipley, Chuck Wheeler, David Haight, Jeff Griffin, Pete Dalke (by phone), Lin Bernhardt, Bill Peterson

Next meeting: TBD; conference call

I. Background

The majority part of the meeting was spent on clarifying the ASAP objective. Other agenda items covered were:

1. Press Release - any response?
2. Project Timeline
3. Jan 8th Agenda
4. Potential working guidelines
5. Updates to contact list
6. Documentary idea – Bob Shaller

Handouts included:

Handouts only made available to people who weren't here last time.

II. Discussion

We have no verification that any of the media outlets that the County sent a press release to actually ran the article. If time allows, OS will make some calls, but it is a low priority for the moment.

Chuck Wheeler, NOAA NMFS, provided some background about NMF concerns about the project are, especially with respect to in-stream gravel operations. The group discussed fully and acknowledged that the scientific information may show that there are places where gravel mining may not be appropriate.

In general the group confirmed that we would be open to scientific information as it becomes available and as it applies directly to the Applegate.

Stakeholder List Updates

New Contact: David Haight mentioned this one:

At the last ASAP core team meeting, I mentioned that the Rogue Flyfishers were interested in participating. The best contact for the group, if you choose to include them, would be John Ward. He is on their Board of Directors and a member of their Conservation Committee. He also expressed interest in this project. His address is 1525

Baldy Creek Road Ashland, OR 97520, phone number is 541-482-2859, and e-mail is E_JOHN_WARD@MSN.COM.

Pete Dalke heard from DEQ that Jean Mount, from a group in Williams, could be interested. Gary G will verify.

We reviewed that this is a stakeholder process and that each stakeholder group on the OSPT must be able, willing to sign the Declaration of Cooperation. We want to be sure that we have wide representation while managing the numbers of people that participate. Where possible, we advise types of groups to work together so that they can be represented through a single person.

We don't need to shake the trees for stakeholder groups to participate while we want to strive for a balance of open, inclusive, and solution-oriented, committed people. The process will be transparent.

Documentary

We discussed the idea that Bob Shallard had for working with students or a professional videographer to document the process. Bob would want to be able to interview stakeholders, etc.

In general, the project team thought it could be a distraction and that stakeholders might not speak up or participate fully if they are concerned about how they come across.

- ⇒ Note: Did we reach a decision on this? I think we said we would check with Dwight and C.W. in the first place, were there other comments?

Project Scope Clarification

The group clarified that the project scope was to investigate the potential for finding out if/how gravel mining can be done in a way that is beneficial, or at least does not harm, the environment, in the Applegate Watershed, not just looking at one regime (i.e., "instream", etc).

This clarification seemed to get everyone on the same page, though the expectations for some regimes (i.e. instream) may be lower than others.

Given that clarification, the line of inquiry (or overall frame of the process) look something like this:

The questions the group wants to answer are:

1. Is gravel mining instream in the Applegate River appropriate? If so, how, when, where and to what level? If the answer is no, are there ways to get to yes?
2. Is gravel mining in the Applegate River floodplain appropriate? If so, how, when, where and to what level? If the answer is no, are there ways to get to yes?

3. Is gravel mining in the terraces of the Applegate River appropriate? If so, how, when, where, and to what level? If the answer is no, are there ways to get to yes?
4. Is gravel mining in the uplands (quarry) appropriate? If so, how, when, where, and to what level? If the answer is no, are there ways to get to yes.

To answer these questions, the Oregon Solutions Project Team (OSPT) should identify the following:

1. What do we know about the Applegate already?
2. What do we need to know?
3. What is a reasonable amount of information to obtain with respect to costs and potential benefits, etc?

In other words, what is the data gap? From NMFS perspective, we need to determine if the stream is degrading or aggrading.

Once the OSPT identifies the data gap, agreements surrounding the following will be made:

1. How do we leverage resources to fund whatever studies are needed?
2. How do we agree to use the information obtained from studies?
3. Who should do the studies?

Agreements relative to the above are expected to be obtained within the 6 month time frame of the Oregon Solutions process and are expected to result in the basis for the ***Declaration of Cooperation***. We will ask every stakeholder member of the OSPT to dedicate resources and/or make commitments on behalf of the organization they represent to supporting the "demo" project(s) and next steps laid out by the Project Team to complete a sustainable aggregate plan.

"Demo", "Experimental", "Learning" Project

This project is expected to be identified and completed as a Project Team collaborative effort. Still needing clarification is the role that a physical small project might play with regards to timing and desired outcome. This discussion needs to be fleshed out more, though there is interest in being able to formulate or design a project that makes sense. Lin pointed out that it didn't make sense to design a project that needed information from our studies before the studies were done! So, is there another type of project that would work?

Some of the questions that apply are:

1. What would it look like to satisfy the current guidelines (2006) and community? What would a good project that improves the habitat of the river

look like? Gravel can be a by-product perhaps, but the restoration, improvement is what we want to investigate.

2. Can we improve the habitat of the river with a specific process or method?
3. What would a community-based project look like that was technically, economically, viable?
4. Do we look at fish bars? Side channels? In-stream alcove? What can we learn from a small scale case study?

The group recognizes the need to clarify project purpose and timing. In general, given time for permitting, etc, 2010 seems the earliest that we could have a project going. However, the benefit of having all the key players in the room is really something we need to take advantage of and that should ultimately save time and effort, create cooperation, and be something we can learn from.

NOTE: ACTION ITEM: Geoff, David, Jack , Bill → will work on clarifying this field project goal.

Other thoughts relating to this topic:

(from Chuck) What kind of project can community and agencies support/approve to help Copeland get it (aggregate) moving into the economy?
How can we get gravel from the land to the facility?

What kind of project can we have for fish, neighbors, and gravel → experimental?

Can we define a project that can help an extraction-based company know what is acceptable to community and regulators? Can we collaboratively design it?

Perhaps what we can do during the Oregon Solutions process is to reach an agreement on layout, process, design.

January 8, 2009 meeting

The group brainstormed some ideas about the Jan. 8th meeting.

- CW/Dwight open
- Jack—overview
- Oregon Solutions Assessment – what did we learn that made us decide to work together? Are there areas of consensus to get to success? Oregon Solutions Process/Declaration of Cooperation
- Ground rules give examples, then ask for others, Gary to get APWC guidelines as a suggestion.
 - Speak @ the action, not at the person
 - We need the meeting to have clear, concise goals, objectives
 - ground rules for “scientific inquiry – nobody knows the answer, must be open to all possibilities
 - Commitment of the stateholder groups to participate, come to meetings.

- Each person should have an opportunity to say why they are here.
- Perhaps an overview of what we do and don't know about the Applegate by someone like Tim Franklin.
- How do we form a full picture of what we do/don't know? Everyone will have a different view on that? How can we capture the knowledge of people in the room.
- Overview of the Chetco process being developed by the "gravel technical team" (USACOE, NOAA NMFS, USFWS, USGS, DEQ, DSL). How did everyone come together? (Chuck's comment)
- Goals
- Time Frames (realistic/reality check)

Action Item Summary:

- ⇒ Joan will work with Jack and Pete and will put out a draft agenda asap for the January meeting. Core Group to review asap.
- ⇒ Gary will check on APWC guidelines/ground rules and forward those.
- ⇒ Gary will check on Jean Mount participation
- ⇒ David, Geoff, Bill, Jack – do some synthesizing of possible "learning" project outcomes.

The Core group agrees to review the Jan 8 meeting agenda and the general language about what we're trying to do so as to take into consideration all that was clarified in this meeting.

Some members began the discussion about what data collection might look like, keeping in mind that this really needs to be a consensus-based decision of the OSPT

- Copeland asked to provide history of gravel extraction in the Applegate Valley (at least what they have – others would like DOGAMI to verify).
- Applegate Dam data, studies, information – the USACOE should have this.
- Fish data, studies – Dave Haight

The group agreed that the list of questions provided to us via Jack is valuable, but too detailed to take on at the core team or OSPT meetings, more likely something to deal with at a technical team level.