

Meeting Summary
Lower Columbia Solutions Group
October 10, 2002; 10 a.m. to Noon

I. Welcome and Introductions

Greg Wolf, Executive Director of the National Policy Consensus Center (NPCC), opened the meeting and asked all participants to introduce themselves. He summarized the purpose and objectives of the Lower Columbia Solutions Group and described activities that had occurred since the last meeting of the Group in July. Tom Byler from Governor Kitzhaber's office and Ron Schultz, from Governor Locke's office, made introductory comments on behalf of the two Governors. Governor Kitzhaber joined the meeting at 11:30 a.m. (A list of attendees is attached.)

II. Corps of Engineers Presentation on Dredging Practices, Policies and Authorities

Davis Moriuchi, Corps of Engineers, explained the purpose of the presentation and introduced Sheryl Carrubba, also from the Corps, who made the presentation. Sheryl indicated that there are actually fewer beneficial use projects now than there were 10 years ago. (A copy of the power point slides is available at the offices of NPCC at Portland State University.)

Following the presentation, members of the Group asked questions and offered comments. There was interest in whether the "least cost" mandate would be changing to give more emphasis to environmental concerns. Davis Moriuchi noted that it would be useful for the Group to help identify cost sharing partners and sources of non-federal funds that could be used to match Corps funding for beneficial use projects. He also noted that pilot or demonstration projects can be an effective way to test new approaches without having to change existing policies and regulations. A member of the group referenced the San Francisco Bay Coalition as a possible model for cost sharing.

III. Review and Endorse Projects

Greg Wolf reviewed the list of potential projects recommended by the subcommittee and the project guidance and selection process that the Group agreed to use at its previous meeting. He then explained the five point Solutions Process that would be used to convene and run project teams for each of the projects. (A copy of the Solutions Process is attached.)

The Group discussed each of the potential projects. The project recommendations considered by the Group and a summary of the Group's discussion follows.

1. Bradwood: Continue to work on the Bradwood site for upland disposal by supporting marketing efforts, transporting materials by rail, and sump development. There was general agreement that this was a good Lower Columbia Solutions Group project and that a project team should be formed. The only concern raised was whether sump development should be pursued given potential environmental impacts.

2. Benson Beach: Expand Benson Beach pilot project, using dredge material for beach nourishment. An interagency working group is currently working on this project. In addition, \$1

million may become available through a federal appropriation. One question that needs to be answered is whether Benson Beach can be considered a long-term site for disposal on a sustainable basis. There was some concern that the Solutions Group process not duplicate the efforts of the existing working group. It was noted that the Group could help in pursuing federal funding for FY2004.

3. Puget Island: Determine the feasibility of placing additional dredge material along portions of the shoreline and inland on Puget Island. The Corps and NMFS both noted that they had worked for a number of years with the property owners that have residences located outside the levy. Several concerns were raised about beach nourishment, including that there is some critical habitat for salmon prey; and that material placed on the beach tends to quickly erode back into the river. In regards to upland sites, a small County sand pit exists with limited capacity and has taken some fill from the Bradwood site in the past. There was general agreement that it would be better to continue to assess this project and not form a project team at this point.

4. Ross Island: Support the use of Columbia River dredge material as fill for reclamation of Ross Island. Len Bergstein, representing Ross Island Sand & Gravel, gave a brief overview of the process used to develop the reclamation plan proposal that has been submitted to the Division of State Lands for approval. He noted that 4.5 million cubic yards of fill will be needed over the next 10 years and that Columbia River dredge spoils that meets DEQ standards clean standards has been identified as one of the primary sources. Representative Betsy Johnson mentioned that there might be other gravel pits that could also use fill material for reclamation. A concern was raised about whether this was a project that truly benefits the lower Columbia River area. It was agreed that this should be clarified in the language describing the project to reflect that the focus of the Lower Columbia Solutions Group project would be on how to use fill from the lower Columbia at Ross Island.

5. Klickitat County: Explore Klickitat County opportunities for cleaning, reselling and transporting dredge materials to other areas using excess rail capacity. Fran McNair from Washington Department of Natural Resources presented the concept for the project. She noted that it appears to have potential but that more investigation needs to be done. Additional assessment work is underway and the Group agreed that a project team should be formed if the assessment was positive.

6. Rice Island: Develop options for increasing the capacity of Rice Island to handle additional dredge spoils by developing markets for dredge material currently on the site. The Group discussion revolved around the importance of identifying markets for the material, finding ways to reduce the unit costs, and the logistics of acquiring permits and making the material available when it is needed. It was noted that any examination of markets should go beyond the Pacific Northwest to the San Francisco Bay area and even Asia. A concern was raised about the relationship of this marketing effort to the relocation of the Tern population.

Governor Kitzhaber joined the meeting at 11:30 a.m. and thanked the Group for their willingness to participate in the collaborative process. He asked for group consensus on the project list, with the

understanding that the Puget Island project would not move forward at this time and that project teams for Benson Beach and Klickitat County would be formed after additional assessment was completed to determine appropriate timing. No objections were raised and there was agreement that the wording of some of the projects be clarified to reflect the group discussion on Ross Island and Bradwood.

The Governor also asked and received consensus from the Group on the proposed Solutions Process for forming and conducting the project teams. He asked the Group to suggest possible conveners and team members for the project teams and give their suggestions to Susan Brody or Abby White. Greg Wolf explained that funds would be required to conduct the project team process. The Governor thanked the Port of Portland and LCREP for their funding contributions and asked the other members to consider providing funding and other assistance.

The Group briefly discussed the four policy issues that had been identified for further consideration. Greg clarified that project teams were not proposed to deal with these issues.

The Governor asked if LCREP would look at the first issue relating to small in-water demonstration sites and report back to the group. He asked the Corps to research the second issue on redirecting commercial mining activities and report back. Peter Gearin with the Port of Astoria agreed to report back on the third issue relating to dike removal. The Governor pointed out that the fourth issue on sumps and rehandle sites would be explored, in part, through work on the Bradwood site.

Two additional issues were raised: (a) The need to explore and implement alternative ocean disposal methods and sites, for example by spraying dredge material; and (b) transportation logistics. Dale Beasley with Columbia River Crabbers, Steve Fick with Salmon for All, and the Corps agreed to work together and report back on ocean disposal. Matt Van Ess and the Port of Portland indicated a willingness to do more work on transportation issues.

IV. Next Steps

Greg Wolf recommended that the Group meet again during the first part of December. Staff will poll the Group for meeting times. Greg also acknowledged that Peter Gearin and Matt Van Ess had expressed their willingness to hold a public session in Astoria within the next month or so to inform people about the work of the Lower Columbia Solutions Group and solicit any additional ideas for projects and issues.

The meeting was adjourned at Noon.

List of Attendees:

Group Members

Dale Beasley, Columbia River Crabbers Association
John Fratt, (representing Larry Paulson) Port of Vancouver
Peter Gearin, Port of Astoria
Bill Wyatt, Port of Portland
Tom Byler, State of Oregon Governor's Office

Ron Shultz, (representing Carol Jolly) State of Washington Governor's office
Davis Moriuchi, US Army Corps of Engineers
Matt Van Ess, Columbia River Estuary Study Taskforce
Steve Fick, Salmon for All
Peter Huhtala, Columbia Riverkeeper
Jon Englund, Englund Marine Supply

Other Attendees:

Sheryl Carrubba, US Army Corps of Engineers
Doris McKillip, US Army Corps of Engineers
Fran McNair, Washington Department of Natural Resources
Representative Betsy Johnson
Keith Leavitt, Port of Portland
Ed Gallager, Community Development Office
Sebastian Degen, Port of Portland
Jim Bergeron, Port of Astoria Commission
Abby White, National Policy Consensus Center
Cathy Tortorici, National Marine Fishery Services
Len Bergstein, Ross Island Sand and Gravel

Solutions Process

1. A problem or opportunity defined by the community that addresses at least one sustainable community objective
2. A neutral community convener from the local community, appointed by the Governor, who can lead a team to address the challenge
3. A solutions team of federal, state, local, and other governmental entities, businesses, non-profits, and citizens who can contribute to a solution
4. An integrated solution that leverages the resources of the Solution Team to meet the challenge at hand and sustainability objectives
5. A declaration of cooperation that team members sign that commits their resources and time in an integrated action plan