

**Mineral Lands Task Force
Minutes Meeting #2
December 13, 2011
CalPortland office 18606 SE 1st St.
6:00 – 8:00 P.M.**

Attendees: Virgle Barnett, Richard Dyrland, Richard Fazio, Linda Rectanus, Barb Repman, Chuck Rose, Bob Short

Staff: Mike Mabrey

Minutes of the November 8 meeting were approved as written.

Classification system - Mike noted that toward the end of the first meeting there was a question about why the Rock Aggregate Resource Lands Inventory Map done by DNR contains three classifications of bedrock and only two classes of gravel. Mike contacted DNR and none of the geologists who worked on the map are still with the agency. He subsequently learned that Chris Johnson, one of the principal authors of the survey now works at the Dept. of Ecology. He is out this week, so Mike will continue to pursue an answer. The mapping criteria for sand and gravel deposits included having a close to ideal ratio of sand and gravel, so the lack of sampling data might explain the absence of a Hypothetical classification for sand and gravel.

Designating mineral resources on a map - The group reviewed the criteria used by DNR for identifying aggregate resources and classifying them for the purposes of generating the map; thickness, area, ratio of rock to overburden, quality and sand/gravel proportions. Bob explained that in Oregon there are different criteria for designating sand and gravel resources in the Willamette Valley than in the rest of the state. In the valley, deposits must be at least 60' thick and 2 million cubic yards to be eligible versus 25' thick and 500,000 cubic yards elsewhere. There is no sand to gravel ratio requirement, but deposits must meet ODOT quality specs. The rationale is the protection of valley farmland. Bob noted that areas with thick gravel deposits tend to have better soils because they are well-drained.

The group decided to use a filtering process to generate a draft surface mining overlay map. First, all Identified resources will be included. Urban growth areas and rural centers will be excluded initially based on the assumption that mining is incompatible with the existing and planned densities. Individual areas within UGAs could be designated at the property owners request if all the criteria are met. Virgle noted that most of the identified bedrock was on Federal lands or otherwise encumbered from commercial access and production. The group decided to include the Hypothetical bedrock layer on the draft map.

Bob pointed out that there would be almost no gravel designated outside of UGAs. The pros and cons of adding the Speculative gravel layer were discussed. Barb thought that designating a broader area would give property owners fair warning of future potential mining activity. Mike was concerned that it would confuse and cloud the title of many properties needlessly. The group requested that county staff generate a map of the Speculative gravel areas excluding government owned lands, UGAs, rural centers and properties zoned rural residential.

All maps and meeting notes will be posted on the project webpage:
http://www.co.clark.wa.us/planning/land_use/mining.html

The next meeting will be Tuesday, January 10 from 6:00 to 8:00 at the CalPortland office.