

Galena Aquatic Restoration Project Co-design Meeting #1

Meeting Summary

June 15, 2017, 1200-1500

Work Group Members Present:

Monty Bond (Landowner), Stacie and Glenn Brown (Landowner), Steph Charrette (Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon), John Collins (Landowner), Karen Coulter (Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project), Mark Croghan (Bureau of Reclamation), Althea Gibbs (Landowner), Billie Jo George (Landowner), Judy Kerr (Landowner), Vito Mosso (Landowner), Francis Preston (Landowner), Matt Rippee (Oregon Parks and Recreation Department), Marcy Rosenberg (Landowner), Jim Sproul (Landowner), Kristen Walz (North Fork John Day Watershed Council), Mark Webb (Blue Mountains Forest Partners)

Facilitators and Presenters:

Vernita Ediger (Facilitator), Bob Hassmiller (Forest Service), Mark McCollister (The Freshwater Trust), Allen Taylor (Forest Service)

Forest Service Technical Support and Advisors:

Sasha Fertig, Laurie Montgomery, Mary Lou Welby, Steve Namitz, Dave Halemeier, Don Hann

Meeting Overview and Introductions

Introductions from Allen Taylor. Key thing from agenda is that this is a listening opportunity for all of us. Information sharing. Stakeholder values. No decisions made today.

Core planning team introductions: Bob Hassmiller, Mark McCollister, Allen Taylor, Vernita Ediger facilitating this meeting.

Vernita introduction: Thanks for being here. Grateful to be invited, to help us have a conversation today. All are here because we care about this area. I love it when people are passionate about a place. Have opportunity to shape future. Lots of points of view; hope we can better understand each other and have a conversation about the ways we all care about this place, and design this project.

Forest Service (FS) does not have design already. Want to take input from others, take all concerns into consideration.

Facilitator Background

Vernita grew up in Oregon. Worked with the Federal government in recent years, watching changes in how they engage with stakeholders. Nice to be able to work with FS partners who are looking to work with community partners.

First meeting of three planned meetings, working toward project design. Design team taking input from first two meetings and generating a draft design, which will be presented at meeting 3. There will be a chance before process is over to see how that design went and give feedback.

Asking everyone to please commit to coming to all three meetings, stay involved. Encourage others to attend, and help them understand/get up to speed, by sharing meeting notes.

Rules for Meeting

Be respectful, ask questions, listen, no side conversations, share solutions/suggestions, get to know one another, have fun and be comfortable.

Introductions Around the Room

Name, community, organization or who you represent.

Galena Aquatic Restoration Project: Context

Objectives for this meeting

Get clarity about what the FS wants to accomplish. What does the FS have to do (because of Federal law, etc.) and where is the flexibility? Wiggle room includes things like scope, extent, specific locations, and safeguards – things we want to protect.

At end of the meeting want to hear from all of you. This is the start of the conversation, not the end.

Handout passed out: “Galena Aquatic Restoration Project: Context.” All handouts will also be posted on website.

Background of Project Area and Need for Project

Native American history of hunting/fishing/burning, beaver trapping, and evolving technologies implemented in pursuit of gold.

Tim’s Dredge Company, 1930-1939, dredged the Middle Fork John Day River then moved to other locations (such as DeWitt ranch, and what is now the Oxbow Conservation Area). Dredge mining description and consequences; spit out fine sediment, cobbles and gravels deposited, deep furrow behind it, substrate turned upside down and cobbles brought to surface, fine materials often washed downstream. Caused huge changes to river/creeks, and loss of productivity. Aerial photos from 1939. More detail later on some of the processes that got interrupted. One of the big ones was loss of floodplain connectivity (definition: Floodplain is flat surface on either side of stream. When river comes up, spills out across that surface and energy dissipates. Otherwise energy continues to be focused within that channel). River’s ability to access floodplain is important for various reasons and resources. Bear Creek downstream of Galena currently flowing along a mile and a half, trapped on far side of the river valley, cutting off fish access to over four miles of suitable fish habitat. ODFW spawning surveys have failed to detect MCR steelhead redds.

A variety of conservation plans have identified some of these factors as major factors for ESA recovery plans (for listed fish). There are also Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) factors for water quality, (this is a 303’d listed stream), including indicators such as water temperature. Disturbance in the Middle Fork John Day River affects the ability of hardwoods like cottonwood to get established, and the resultant quality of shade from those species. DEQ has run models of the Middle Fork, which show the potential for cooler water for several miles below the completed project reach.

Handout states the goals and objectives of the project. The Malheur National Forest’s accelerated restoration program and large scale projects include vegetation treatments, fuels treatments, wildlife habitat restoration, and watershed restoration. The Big Mosquito Project identified this area for potential restoration, and the Galena aquatic restoration project was considered in the cumulative effects of the Big

Mosquito Project (signed in 2015). Comments from the public regarding that project were varied – strong opinions for or against. However, these comments identified the need to do a deeper look and get more stakeholder input and ideas to incorporate with the project so we can meet restoration goals and objectives and also meet some of the interests from stakeholders. Lots of flexibility to do this.

The FS submitted a project proposal along with Freshwater Trust for project funding to accomplish project designed. Also applied for a grant with CTWSRO, and were awarded these funds.

One of the pieces of information the FS needed before they moved forward was heritage surveys – starting next week. Will have this information prior to second meeting.

Francis Preston: Q: Money from the tribes? Allen: Grant to complete the design for the project. Francis: Even if individuals did not contribute, will we have equal standing for input? Will there be any due advantage given to a donator?

Allen: In our grant application we made it clear we would be gathering stakeholder input in the design process. Don't see that as competing interest. No advantage will be given.

Marcy Rosenberg: Question about historical research? How far back did you go? This history is important to us, because of how long we've been there. Not everyone was contacted. Where is the history coming from on these projects? Where is that coming from? The river used to be a beautiful place before they paved the road.

Vernita: It seems that you are concerned with where the FS is getting its historical information, and also willing to be a source of history, is that accurate?

Marcy: Family history yes, photos.

Allen: We would love to have that. As for historical research, some was online, museums, talking to folks. Did some research on the aerial photography photos available from 1939. Unfortunately, the dredging had begun in 1930. Some photos from Oxbow Conservation Area provided before and after photos, but we don't have any before photos from our area.

Bob Hassmiller: there are very detailed field notes from areas where Government Land Office employees walked while setting up the township/range/section grid system.

Allen Taylor: The last way is from heritage folks...

Don Hann: Can talk forever on this subject... For understanding the history, National Preservation Act requires we do an inventory, starting from 1970. Includes standards we have to follow, how we survey, what we look for, how we document. The first documentation we have for the dredge mine tailings was late 1980s, early 1990s. The archeology program then was biased toward Native American influences, and they did not recommend the dredge mine tailings as eligible for registry to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). SHPO agreed with this determination, and the FS did not have to protect it.

Early heritage folks got bogged down, didn't have enough time to finish surveys. Instead of granting more time, Forest Service management would simply take area out of proposed timber sales, and historical surveys would not get completed. Thus there was no clear picture of what was going on in these areas.

Management changed, and Middle Fork John Day River became a priority area for heritage surveys, but crews needed more time to figure out what had happened in these areas. This time they were given more time. LiDAR sped up the process, helping to narrow the search area to 10,000 acres. In 2014 Don Hann

put together a comprehensive plan for how to streamline this survey of the history of mining, and how these sites are networked together.

Vernita: Sounds like there was a complicated history of gathering information, and until recently it wasn't done thoroughly. Now there is community interest. Is there an opportunity for people in the community to work with Don Hann to contribute?

Don Hann: Certainly. Would like to get your information and have a follow up discussion.

Jim Sproul: SHPO looks at sites 50 years back?

Don Hann: Technically only needs to be 100 years old, but we do look at stuff starting at 50 years. Started from scratch on a lot of the mining features. One thing I was told when I started working was that a lot of Chinese mining got destroyed by later mining. That is not true. About 70-80 percent of placer mining sites at the time were Chinese.

Vernita: We might have to set up another meeting for the history, because it's so important. There is a need for those interested to talk about it, to share what they know about it, and to exchange information with the FS. Different folks have different pieces of information.

Billie Jo: Bob and Allen: where did the DEQ take the temperatures?

Bob: Think there is a node every 10th of a mile along the entire Middle Fork system. More of the write up I can share...

Billie Jo: Bates Pond stuff, didn't they say they didn't do the Middle Fork?

Bob: [Hwy] 395 Ritter and discharge station? So much data on that stream I don't see how it isn't the entire stream.

Vernita: Let's hold this point to the end, question about data might be too specific for this meeting.

Karen Coulter: Define acronyms like SHPO. Also, what is "plan form variability"?

Don Hann: State Historic Preservation Office (under Federal Historic Preservation Act). Part of the Park Service. Any work that we do on the Forest needs to go to the SHPO office and be concurred with before we can move forward.

Allen: We are trying very hard not to use acronyms. Plan form variability: low sinuousness in valleys. If a river takes a more sinuous path, side channels, etc. this is higher plan form variability.

Galena Aquatic Restoration Project: Forest Service Objectives and Sideboards

Power point will discuss sideboards that have to be accomplished with this project, middle space for flexibility, and paint a picture of what the project could potentially look like.

Sideboards

Think of them as the framework that we have to deal with, or the box that we have to work with.

- Project has to restore aquatic process and function.
- Recognize historical values. We know these are one of the few areas where tailings have not yet been dozed. Mine tailings on National Forest

- Must comply with the Malheur National Forest Plan. Dictated by National Forest Management Act
- Endangered Species Act compliance.
- Comply with the Clean Water Act
- Comply with National Environment Policy Act
- National Historic Preservation Act
- General Mining Act – Five active mining claims within the project area. Identified grazing permittees, special use project holders, mining claimants, folks who commented on Big Mosquito, people interested in all projects on Forest, private land owners
- State Scenic Waterways Program
- Other laws, policies, directives.

Goals and Objectives

Overall goal is to restore characteristics of a naturally functioning, self-maintaining ecosystem within the area that has been dredged.

No design so far, only objectives that we can meet to differing degrees. If we can get to those, we can meet this overall goal.

Karen: Explain the difference between the two photos (power point, slide 2). Also, Indigenous Treaty Rights should be on the list of sideboards.

Allen: Side-by-side area photo that occurred on Resurrection Creek in 2002, mining berm that went straight down the valley, straight. Plan form variably improved in the after photo, meandering and using more of its floodplain.

Karen: Can you explain the significance of that for fish? Allen: Will get into that later, yes.

Francis: You said there is not a design. However, on the last paragraph: “submitted a proposal...to complete a design for this project.” So is there a design? Allen: No, no design.

[Return to power point]. Approach is more of a process-based approach, focused on restoring baseline condition. Want to restore the stream valley to a point where the stream can pick where it go after that (sinuosity). Within that valley not looking to take this back to pre-settlement era. We understand there is infrastructure and houses within that valley, those are some of the constraints. But we can work with that, and make sure that those houses and infrastructures are not at risk of stream meandering into them.

Bob Hassmiller: Description of source areas for sediment deposit area, depositional areas. Why here, why now? Because this is one of these deposition zones where gold fell out, also where gravels form for fish. Less of a big deal if the tailings were in other reaches with more narrow forms. But these wide depositional zones are critical for stream function and health.

Allen: Trying to convey this in a simplified way, but if folks are interested in the science or more details, please let us know.

[Return to power point]. Want to paint the picture of what this would look like on the ground: connected floodplain and water spilling out over floodplain dissipating energy, high wood, cottonwood. Cottonwood need scour events. Long term objective would be having abundant cottonwood out there, plan form variability, multiple side channels. The General Land Office survey notes would talk about 3 or 4 channels in this valley. Even the main channel would cross the section line up to three times, the river was so sinuous. End result would elevate the water channel to reconnect historical side channels. In areas

where similar treatments were accomplished (i.e., Camp Creek), we are already seeing a response in vegetation, storing the water; positive effect on the water flow in that area.

What has happened in the Middle Fork is the channel is incised, and the water table has dropped.

Other positive benefits include the biological response of hardwood vegetation and shading, preventing the water from warming further within the project area. More and bigger fish, big game, higher diversity of birds. Project would improve access for hunting, fishing, and recreation. There would be less flooding downstream. Positive effect on irrigators. These are actions that are identified in the species recovery plans (ESA listed species) so we can get them de-listed.

More detail on floodplain connectivity: where water spills out across the channel. Formula for slope and flows predicts that water would spill out onto floodplain approximately once every 1.4 years. Photo description from slide show and LiDAR showing historic flow paths and dredge mining paths.

Hydrograph showing high flow, and major flood event. Photo showing extreme flow events in May, 2011.

Bob: Floodplain connectivity is related to energy. White water is depicted in the photo, which indicates high velocity.

Francis: Without dredging, would that entire area be underwater?

Allen: Yes, from toe slope to toe slope.

Vernita: there were social concerns with flooding brought up in the previous scoping for this project as well.

Allen: Want to point out that the houses shown in the photo are not in the floodplain.

Marcy: How far from that hydrograph referenced river?

Steve Namitz: Hydrograph info also exists for this stream and was consistent with this timeframe.

Vernita: Can folks get this sent to the emails provided on sign in sheet?

Allen: Yes.

Allen: [Description of next photo in power point]

Jim Sproul: Dredge dumped tailings out the back. Trenches where they dug. Tailings were dumped out the back, not to the sides. Dredge kind of waggged its way down the stream, leaving them at angles.

Allen: Must not have filled in behind it?

Marcy: There is TV show on dredge mining, watch and it will show you exactly how it worked. Tailings came out the back. Sumpter has a movie. The dredge digs with big spike that goes into the ground, digs it out.

Allen: Need to learn more, thank you. What we were trying to convey with this photo is impacts of end result of where the tailings are now and how they are inhospitable places for plants to grow.

[Back to power point] Changed conditions from depositional to transport environments graphic. Piles on the sides of the main channel of the Middle Fork, and why the fine sediments haven't deposited. Graph

showing the potential historical look of the stream in comparison. Multiple stream paths (Slide 13). Substrate size this stream is capable of moving is low because energy is low.

Slideshow also contains 1939 aerial photo compared with 2016 aerial photo. River is still in same channel. The three main channels made by dredge?

Jim: They made long trips, yes. There were two dredges on the river. The one on Sumpter was actually on the Middle Fork.

Allen: One of the dredges (Tim's dredge?) is sitting on the Oxbow Conservation Area.

Marcy: We have pictures of what it looked like before and what it looked like afterward. My father took us to Sumpter and explained how it worked and what it did.

Vernita: Need to have opportunity for discussion and understanding shared history out there.

[Back to power point]. This has been great discussion, very helpful. Slide 15: From a recent paper, stream evolution model to help understand where this section of the Middle Fork used to be. Forested or grassland pre-settlement. Moved to a lowered floodplain, locked in that situation. Appears that the river does not have the functional capacity to restore itself by depositing those substrates.

Marcy: Description of difference between stream and a river?

Allen: Some streams down in Northern California and Alaska that are way bigger than "rivers" in Oregon. Somewhat subjective.

Karen: I get hung up on that also. Riparian sciences refer to everything as "streams." For me, stream is small, creek is bigger, river is biggest.

Allen: Yes, somewhat a size thing. Will try to do better at distinguishing between them.

Steve Namitz: River is more of the arterial vein, versus branches which are streams or creeks.

[Back to slide show]. Recent studies and scientific papers. Bigger and healthier fish when they have access to the floodplain vs being stuck in a channel.

Francis: What was red line? Allen: Think it was a road. There are lots of roads out there.

Marcy: Railroad tracks also. Came around on the top and above and crossed over. Went all the way down there, stopped at Galena.

Jim Sproul: Bear Creek is stream they want to get critical fish in? Can we dig a ditch to get fish into it, and leave the rest alone?

[Back to slide show]: Slide intended to share that floodplain connectivity is interconnected to other functions of the ecosystem (shade, bugs and leaf fall, wildlife, etc.).

Bob: Slide showing this project builds on other projects on the same river.

Stacie Brown: So upstream, the Oxbow Conservation Area, is that what this area will look like?

Bob: No. Not necessarily planning to restore it to a condition before, but restore some of the processes without necessarily changing everything.

Vernita: After break we'll spend some time listening. But will summarize now what Allen and Bob said. Highlights: Fish habitat, water quality, creating a landscape and vegetation across a floodplain that would store water and enhance hardwood vegetation like cottonwood and shrubs, benefits to migratory birds, fish, and people (less regulation if fish get de-listed). Long term benefits to the community. Change can be hard and will look different short term, medium term, and long term. Wanted to pause and make sure everyone heard where they were coming from, because we don't always digest "what's in it for me?"

Want to know what you like about the project, concerns, and solutions. Along the way want to track what some of these things are, since we'll be talking about them more in our second meeting. Will talk about what we need to do to make sure we're understanding the project and moving toward a good design.

Summary of Themes from Scoping

Note: several Forest Service personnel have departed to deal with Rainbow Family gathering issues.

Handout: Key Themes from Project Comments Received. Possibly 40-50 commenters and hundreds of comments to address.

Scoping highlighted a broad range of themes and people on both sides of the issue. Examples: We care about this area, its history, is meaningful to us, and part of our personal story. Concerns with aesthetics. Concerns about the impacts on people, for example, mercury contamination impacts to water, health problems. Flooding.

Environmental environment concerns: impacts to wildlife, native plant response, ecosystem function, interest in water temperature and doubts about the science.

Various other questions. Another purpose of this meeting is to resolve any lingering questions.

John Collins: Has the FS come up with a list of pros and cons? We heard the pros, but what about the list of cons?

Allen: At this point, we don't know what the project will look like. Those cons would be dependent upon what might happen out there. Similar to NEPA analysis, and the impacts haven't been analyzed yet. Could formulate a list of generalized cons? Engineers will get involved when project is developed to check factors like safety and whether it be successful.

John: Please look at corresponding risk upriver and downriver, not just at the site. And domino effects of the project like something drying up, not just flooding.

Stakeholder Values, Concerns, and Hopes

Vernita: Helpful for each of us to say what we value, anything you like about the concept, if you have concerns and question, and suggestions.

Vito Mosso: I want dredge piles to be left. They are history: I don't know how the fish went up the river years ago. Not putting project down. History to me is the most important. Made a huge impression on me. Family memories, and a legacy would like to pass down and explain to next generations. Acknowledges we don't have many cottonwoods, only pines and other trees. What they've done in other places is great for the fish, but it doesn't *look* great. Concerns: every year water rises on the other side of his place, but there is a dike. Water breaks through the channel. Lakes all over his property. Floods six lots up from him, and floods south side. What will reconnection of the floodplain look like?

Vernita: Can we answer this right now?

Bob: Later step in the process to look at elevated tables. And will look at structures, critical in the design. Engineering checks.

Vito: Would project activities stopping at the edge of the Galena property?

Allen: Area we're looking at includes public lands up to the Galena private land boundary and downstream past Bear Creek, but the project footprint will be a smaller area within that boundary. One of the suggestions as we move forward might be adding a buffer between the project area and Galena.

Vito: How does that change the issues upstream?

Bob: Can look at those under a hydrologic analysis.

Marcy: Hundred year old structures flooding might effect.

Allen: Want to stress that project will have overall positive effects toward flooding on Galena landowners.

Vernita: Other engineering, structure concerns that we need to identify now before moving into next meeting?

Mark McCollister: If there are specific features that's important for archeologists. Also important to us as we look at restoring functions of the river, while still taking into account areas that are important to you.

Allen: Aerial photo of project area. If folks do have specific areas, you can circle those on this photo. Draw it on with dry-erase markers, we'll take a picture and look at that.

Vernita: This will not be the only opportunity to do that. Might be able to look at this in more detail at the next meeting.

Can we dial in on what you mean by honoring and preserving history? Specific areas, structures, a timeframe, etc.?

Marcy: Galena itself. Almost became the Grant County seat. Very important structures, for example, the hotel, and my house which is almost 100 years old. Graveyards. Pertinent to Grant County, and Oregon. Mining, Chinese history, Native American history of hunting, picking berries.

Jim Sproul: Where else on the National Forest there are tailing piles?

Don Hann: East side of Dixie. Vincent Creek. Vinegar Creek. Mouth of Vincent Creek.

Jim: Those areas didn't have a floating dredge like the areas on the Middle Fork. Now endangered. Take a little bit maybe, but leave the rest of it. I understand what you're trying to do, but you want to check your science about the tailings increasing the temperature of the water. I measured with former Forest Ranger Brooks Smith, and temperature was one degree lower past the tailings. I don't think you will lower the temperatures; may actually increase it. Same situation of swamp cooler, with sheer factor, so I question the science regarding whether you will actually help.

Billie Jo: History of the tailings; those tailings are a symbol of what kept many people in that area going. It was their livelihood. To take that away is a significant loss. Lot of people in this area are from the Bates area. We know what it's like to lose. Once it's gone, you're not getting it back. Q for Allen and Bob: Are you planning on working on the tailings right next the river, or the entire floodplain?

Bob: I'm not looking at the whole thing, no, only the minimum to restore the processes needed.

Marcy: Walking on the tailings, going back to history. We have walked those tailing piles, watched them change and evolve, ridden horses and gathered cattle over them. We want to preserve our tailing piles to a degree. Does that make sense? “Leave our rocks alone.” Take some of them, flatten them, do your project...but keep them at the same time. Keep Galena protected, a sacred ground, at all cost. It’s our history, it’s our life, and we want to keep it. Keep the tailing piles, make it look good, but keep them. We acknowledge the fish have suffered. Used to be lots of fish...

Billie Jo: So what happened? ODFW poisoned the fish.

Vernita: To summarize, Galena is an important area, and you want to preserve it. Think I heard some willingness to compromise and give some up, but “Don’t take it all” and “there are some places out here I don’t want you to touch” correct? (Yes.)

John: Lots of critters that live in these tailing piles. Small critters, like bugs and birds. They are out there.

Vernita: Other issues people want to raise?

Karen: I represent an ecological protection group, and a list of concerns from their prospective includes: restoring fish habitat and ecological processes, as well as tribal rights. Some restoration is needed, and there is a lot of science backing what we do, but would be good to make it clearer – show us studies you have with similar project techniques and successful outcomes. When those techniques are done, what does it look like? I’m concerned personally with sediment pulses in immediate term, while acknowledging that long term result will be positive. Assuming no impacts for Columbia spotted frogs, since lack of suitable habitat, but sediment pulses might affect their habitats downstream. There may be impacts to other sensitive species as well. Economics – costs vs benefits analysis. Interested in mercury concern also, so would like to know more about where would it come from and how to avoid releasing it into the water. Project timeframe, and how is this project going to meet water quality restoration plan? Want more specific information on techniques used and actions taken, mitigation measures and effectiveness, and responding to sense of place concerns from community members. How would you improve habitat and ecology while retaining a sense of place and what would it look like on the ground? How is this different than the Oxbow Conservation Area project?

Steph Charrette: I represent the CWSRO. Sorry you don’t like what we did on the Oxbow. Let’s agree to disagree on value of mine tailings. There are other restored areas you could go out and look, such as the Middle Fork Forrest area. Looks much better than Oxbow does. We’re kind of hoping to get the Oxbow to that point. Took some time for them to create the dredge tailings, will take some time to get back. Some of those cottonwood groves still exist in Galena, want to mimic those, similar to Ragged Creek. Native American history: the tribes are supporting restoration. Big council meeting recently, and they are happy with what they saw. Mine tailings are not part of Native American history. Treaty of Middle Oregon means they can retain the right to hunt, gather, fish, and it is the role of the U.S. Government to uphold that treaty. Multiple issues playing into problems with salmon, not just Galena, but the goal is to restore fishing levels of salmon, not just for tribal members but for everyone. The Treaty of Middle Oregon is a very powerful document, established a government-to-government binding agreement. Fishing is extremely degraded. Science claims that the more wood you put in the better it is for fish.

Vernita: Appreciate these viewpoints. Important to hear lots of viewpoints. We’re all here because we care about a place and all points of views, working together to achieve our goals.

Did you have anything you liked about the concept?

Steph: Like the idea of doing full restoration. Tribes do not value mine tailings, but I think we can come to a compromise. Restore habitat, return function, make it suitable for fish, yet preserve some form of history and property safety.

Vernita: A lot of common ground, people care about each other's history, and values.

Judy Kerr: Fish data, haven't the fish migration been established? Does water temperature continue to fluctuate? Or is it seasonal? Where are we moving tailings to? What about the road stability of that County road? The land might shift when we move big rocks. Are you in communication with the County?

Allen: Yes.

Francis: I like the forum and discussion. Positive opportunity. My value has to do with history, specific to Galena and mining history and the Chinese. For steelhead redds and Bear Creek, is it only Bear Creek of concern? What is the count above mine tailings, and below? Is the true intent of this project talking about fish, or about people? Bob, you stated that DEQ did a study in 2012, but what were the models that were used? Local or projected modeling system from elsewhere (such as New Mexico)? For flooding: Is there any flooding going on in the city of Galena, and will there be flooding, and to what capacity, after the design is created and the project is complete? What level will flooding be in Galena specifically? I'm concerned with that County road; it is a safety connector out of Austin, open year around and people use it on a daily basis. Will road remain open? In the Handout: "Context," there is a section "overall goal of the Galena...self-maintaining system in the Middle Fork." What I'd like to see in the next meeting is a guess that will give us an idea of where we need to go to accomplish what we need to do as far as resources.

Vernita: Did we miss any important issues that are not addressed? (No)

Summary and Next Steps

Meeting #2 scheduled for July 12. Potential to meet on a property out closer to Galena, and/or spend time looking at the area in a field trip situation.

Allen: The potential downside would make it channeling to work through some of these issues.

Vernita: Have it here again? (Yes) Will have it here for now.

As we move forward, will use email list to get information out to folks. Some of these answers may be more efficient to answer via email vs next meeting, as soon as we can. That way we can have more of a conversation clearing things up.

Using maps at next meeting. Between now and next meeting, be thinking about what you would draw on a map, i.e., places that are important and values associated with these locations.

What does a successful project look like here? Keep in mind other voices in the room when you think about this project? We need to do this project together.

Don Hann: If you have history information willing to share, please give me your contact information. The heritage folks will be out there Monday and Tuesday. Can arrange a conference call, or another meeting.

Karen: Third meeting date?

Vernita: Meeting #3 will be August 29th. Location TBD. Can potentially do that in the field, will decide at Meeting #2.

Stacie Brown: Same time?

Allen: What time works for folks? Same time.

Jim Sproul: Want to complement Allen and Bob for coming and bringing the public into the discussion. Much needed and refreshing.

Francis Preston: Some of the persons missing from today's meeting are Grant County Court representatives. Galena is a gem in this county. Would like to see them be involved in future meetings.

Vernita: Larry Blazing tribute: "The world is run by people who show up."