

# Mineral Resources Task Force

Progress Report  
to the  
Yakima County Planning  
Commission

December 13, 2001

## Table Of Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	3
<b>List of Terms</b> .....	4
<b>I. Introduction</b> .....	5
Mineral Resource Task Force Purpose	
Mineral Resource Task Force History and Approach	
<b>II. Goals and Recommendations</b> .....	6
Site Selection and Criteria	
Supply and Demand	
Site Designation Options	
Site Mitigation	
Incentives for Mineral Resource Use	
<b>III. Further Research and Recommendation Considerations</b> .....	16
<b>IV. Appendices</b> .....	18
A. Board of Yakima County Commissioners Resolution 69-2001	
B. Mineral Resource Task Force Purpose, Goals, Guidelines and Work Plan	
C. Reconnaissance Investigation of Sand, Gravel, and Quarried Bedrock Resources in the Yakima 1:100,000 Quadrangle, Washington	
D. Supply and Demand Analysis	
<b>V. List of Maps</b> .....	24
A. Proposed Sites Location Map	

## Board of Yakima County Commissioners

Jim Lewis, Chairman  
Jesse Palacios  
Ron Gamache

### Planning Commission

Larry West, Chairman	Cowiche/Tieton
Jim Allison	West Valley
Ed Burns	Zillah
Gene Gamache	East Valley
Lon Inaba	Harrah
Zella West	Selah

### Acknowledgements

The Board and Planning Commission would like to thank the following people who were instrumental in the development of this report.

#### Mineral Resource Task Force Members

Central Pre-Mix Concrete Company	Wayne Kalbfleisch
Citizen Representative	Effie Skinner
Columbia Asphalt Company	Len Sali
Alternate	Deborah Burksfield
Superior Asphalt	Randy Baer
Alternate	Bill Hordan

#### United States Bureau of Reclamation

#### John Merz

Alternate	Tracy Yerxa
Washington State Department of Natural Resources	Dick Wedin
Washington State Department of Ecology	Bob Raforth
Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife	Marke Teske
Washington State Department of Transportation	Troy Suing
Alternates	Bob Hooker, Doug Malsch, and Wayne Davis

Yakama Nation

Alternate

Yakima County Planning Commission

Alternate (both resigned from MRTF)

Yakima County Public Works Department (Non-voting)

Scott Nicoli

Tom Ring

Jim Allison

Gene Gamache

William Maggard

### Staff

Kelly Clark, Natural Resources Planner, Project Manager

Anne Knapp, Long Range Planning Manager

Maria Godines, Financial Specialist

John Marvin, Natural Resources Planner

Dean Patterson, Environmental and SEPA Division Manager

Elaine Taylor, Senior Planner

Richard F. Anderwald, AICP, Director

Steven Erickson, Assistant Director

## **List of Terms**

Floodplain: The geomorphic floodplain, or area where fluvial erosion has created a flat valley. This area is much larger than the “calculated” 100-year floodplain and is where sand and gravel mining typically occurs. The geomorphic floodplain is represented as Qa (quaternary alluvium) on surficial geology maps.

Upland Sites: Mineral resource lands located outside the geomorphic “floodplain” (as defined). These areas are typically higher in elevation than the geomorphic floodplain and can include floodplain terraces, hills, and ridges.

Mineral Resources “Designation”: Lands that are identified as having long-term commercial significance for the extraction of minerals including gravel, sand, and valuable metallic substances.

## Introduction

### Background

As a response from recommendations made by the Governor's Land Use Study Commission, the Washington State Legislature asked the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (WADNR) to map gravel and bedrock resources that could be used for the construction of homes and infrastructure during its 1998 session. The Study Commission sought this information to assess and protect mineral resources from urban development and other intensive land uses. The goal was to provide local governments data in which to implement better long-range planning strategies under the Growth Management Act (Revised Code of Washington [RCW] 36.70A; Lingley and Jazdzewski 1994).

In compliance with the Growth Management Act, under *Plan 2015* which identifies policies calling for the establishment of a Mineral Resources Task Force (MRTF), the Board of Yakima County Commissioners enacted the MRTF and appointed members (**see Appendix A**). Members selected to serve on the task force were chosen to represent and display various interests and concerns dealing with mineral resources issues. The MRTF met bimonthly from February through November of 2000, and reconvened in February 2001 to present.

### Role of the Task Force

The MRTF was charged with assessing and making recommendations to the Planning Commission and Board of Yakima County Commissioners on the following items:

1. Review the WADNR inventory of areas where the geology indicates a presence of commercially exploitable mineral resources.
2. Analyze the demand for mineral resources, based on expected use and adopted population estimates.
3. Discuss mineral industry characteristics in Yakima County.
4. Identify various types and uses of mineral resources.
5. Develop criteria for assessing suitability of specific sites in the inventory based on existing goals and policies.
6. Identify specific areas necessary to meet 50-year demand (including a review of all the existing designated sites) for designation.
7. Develop protection policies/regulations for designated but non-zoned sites.
8. Review temporary mining policies.
9. Develop a public outreach process.

The initial overview containing the purpose, goals, guidelines, and work plan for the MRTF can be observed in **Appendix B**.

### Status of the Work

To date, the MRTF has reviewed all nine goals stated in the "Mineral Resources Task Force Goals" mission statement. While all nine goals have been addressed, further research and consideration for particular goals are identified in the "Further Research and Recommendation

Considerations” portion of this report. It will be asked that the Planning Commission and or subsequent MRTF efforts address these topics through further review.

The role that the County should play in identifying and protecting mineral resources lands for the next 10, 20, and 50 years is the ultimate goal anticipated from these initial recommendations. Thus the findings and recommendations reflected in the body of this report are items that should be considered for potential policy changes in the 2002 Comprehensive Plan update.

## **Goals and Recommendations**

The MRTF and Yakima County Long-Range Planning staff addressed the seven of the nine goals within five key categories that were subject to comprehensive analysis. Recommendation options within the categories “Site Selection and Criteria,” “Site Designation Options,” and “Site Mitigation” were developed by the group in its entirety, while “Supply and Demand,” and “Incentives For Mineral Resources Use” data and options were devised by sub-groups based on interest and expertise. Refer to **Appendix C** to review industry characteristics in Yakima County, the types and uses of various mineral resources, and state laws and regulations concerned with mineral resources activities.

### Site Selection and Criteria

#### **DNR Criteria**

The site selection process for identifying lands of long term commercial significance for the needs of Yakima County is based on WADNR reconnaissance reports, which identified, mapped, and quantified mineral areas located within both the Yakima 1:100,000 quadrangle and the Toppenish 1:100,000 quadrangle (excluding mineral resources on Yakama Nation lands). Mineral resources mapped by the WADNR are subject to four standards:

1. The thickness of the sand and gravel or bedrock deposit appears to be in excess of 25 feet (7.5 meters).
2. The ‘stripping ratio’ (ratio of overburden to gravel or bedrock) is less than one to three (1:3).
3. The strength and durability of the rock meets the Washington State Department of Transportation’s (WSDOT) minimum specifications for asphalt-treated base, and a rock product used to construct some lower layers of asphalt roads.
4. The area of the deposit exposed at the surface exceeds 160 acres and measures at least 1,500 feet across the minimum dimension of the deposit, or the reserves exceed 10 million cubic yards. However, a few exceptions were included where unusually thick deposits or resources of special local importance were present (Weberling, Dunn, and Powell 2001).

#### **Mineral Resources Task Force Criteria**

Using the WADNR information and initial site selection criteria formulated in the first meetings of the MRTF, nine sites were identified and mapped as potential resource extraction locations (**see Map A**). However, the MRTF is recommending that these sites should be subject to review under the revised criteria before final recommendations and policy decisions are made.

Notably, the criteria concerned with “Environmental Sensitivity” and “Cultural Resources and Aesthetics” are important issues (see **Table 1**). These criteria would be used as a general filter to gain meaningful information about the various physical landscape attributes related to proposed sites. Thus, the criteria are not exclusionary in nature.

**Table 1. Site Selection and Evaluation Criteria**

<b>Original</b>	<b>Revised</b>
1. Quality of the resource	1. Quality of the resource
2. Volume of the resource	2. Volume of the resource
3. Topographic characteristics of the site	3. Topographic characteristics of the site
4. Access suitability	4. Access suitability
5. Compatibility with land use patterns in the area	5. Compatibility with present and planned land use patterns in the area
6. Proximity to urban and rural settlement markets	6. Proximity to existing and planned markets
	7. Environmental sensitivity
	8. Cultural resources and aesthetics

For further information contact: Anne Knapp or Kelly Clark

***Recommendations:***

1. The MRTF recommends that the revised site criteria be used as a basis to determine future potential/prospective mineral resources sites (including the nine proposed sites identified by the MRTF) throughout Yakima County.
2. The MRTF strongly recommends that specific definitions of each of the eight site selection criteria be developed before they can be implemented as useful management tools.
3. Review, define, and incorporate recommendations 1 and 2 into the **2002 Plan** update process.

Supply and Demand

A sub-group of the MRTF, comprised of both private and agency representatives, was formed to analyze both existing mineral resources sites and potential sites. In order to quantify the current supply and status of existing sites, each of the private industry sites were re-evaluated by aggregate type and quantity, and were subjected to a rating system of a 10-, 20-, or 50-year designation (based on anticipated use). Though existing sites have subjected to this rating system, the group suggests that existing permitted sites should all be designated and zoned if they are not already. In addition, the group suggests that future sites identified as 10- or 20-year sites should be designated and zoned for mineral resource use and that at 50-year sites should be designated, but not zoned.

Using 2000 Census data provided by the Office of Financial Management, and 1990 Census data from Yakima County GIS; 10-, 20-, and 50-year estimates were made for aggregate quantity and type used per capita for existing private sites. One hundred percent of the demand was calculated on the private resources side due to the fact that nearly all of the mineral resources utilization throughout Yakima County is derived from private rather than agency sites.

Therefore, all existing agency sites, which include Yakima County, WADNR, and Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) pits, were all classified as 10-year sites. The Washington State Department of Transportation's position is that State owned sites should all be given the 10-year status due to the fact that the mineral aggregate can only be used for public roads and or benefit and is not available for resale to the general public (per RCW 47.12.063).

*Note:* The information regarding the resource quantities listed below were was derived from data provided by site operators, or in cases where information was unavailable, estimates were calculated using the total acreage x 32,260 cubic yard per acre of available resource.

### **Current Status of Agency Sites**

#### Sand and Gravel

The existing 10-year supply for agency sand and gravel resources totaled 380 acres of resource land with an approximate quantity of 12,064,798 cubic yards.

#### Quarry

The existing 10-year supply for agency quarry resources totaled 156 acres of resource with an approximate quantity of 5,039,012 cubic yards.

### **Current Status of Private Sites**

#### Sand and Decorative

Approximately 462 acres were identified for the 10-year supply of sand and decorative rock resources. The estimated cubic yardage totaled 14,904,120. The need/demand for sand and decorative aggregate resources is not a critical factor at this point in time and therefore has not been calculated.

#### Sand and Gravel

The 10-, 20-, and 50-year supply and demand summary for existing private sand and gravel resources throughout Yakima County is as follows:

*10-Year Supply and Demand (cubic yards)*

Demand: 18,568,424  
Sources: 11,245,004  
Sources reduced 20% for reclamation setback: 8,996,003  
Balance: 9,572,421  
Deficit: -52%

*20-Year Supply and Demand (cubic yards)*

Demand: 38,626,274  
Sources: 46,085,804  
Sources reduced 20% for reclamation setback: 36,868,643  
Balance: 7,238,372  
Excess: 19%

*50-Year Supply and Demand (cubic yards)*

Demand: 122,994,626  
Sources: 58,054,264  
Sources reduced by 20% for reclamation setback: 46,443,411  
Balance: 76,551,215  
Deficit: -62%

Quarry

The 10-, 20-, and 50-year supply and demand summary for existing quarry resources for private sites throughout Yakima County is as follows:

*10-Year Supply and Demand (cubic yards)*

Demand: 11,141,054  
Sources: 18,726,900  
Sources reduced 20% for reclamation setback: 14,981,520  
Balance: 3,840,466  
Excess: 34%

*20-Year Supply and Demand (cubic yards)*

Demand: 23,175,765  
Sources: 0  
Sources reduced 20% for reclamation setback: 0  
Balance: -8,194,245  
Deficit: 35%

*50-Year Supply and Demand (cubic yards)*

Demand: 73,796,776  
Sources: 28,566,200  
Sources reduced by 20% for reclamation setback: 22,852,960  
Balance: 50,943,816  
Deficit: 69%

Further information related to this analysis can be observed in **Appendix D**.

For further information contact: Deborah Burksfield or Kelly Clark

*Recommendations:*

1. Existing sites, as subjected to the 10-, 20-, and 50-year resource rating system, should be designated and zoned if they are not already (**see Appendix D**).
2. Proposed/future sites identified as 10- or 20-year sites should be designated and zoned for mineral, while 50-year sites should be designated, but not zoned.
3. Retain the Supply and Demand sub-committee to complete unfinished research identified in the “Further Research and Recommendation Considerations” section at the end of this report (within the “Supply and Demand” sub-heading).

Site Designation

The MRTF identified three site designation options to consider (**see Table 2**). These include the need to assess, and potentially rezone or re-designate existing sites within the Mining Zoning District; to allow small-scale mining in lands zoned other than mineral resource; and to encourage owner initiated designation for potential mineral resource lands (**see Table 2**).

To begin with, many of the existing sites zoned under the mining district are falsely represented or are void of adequate mineral resource quantity or quality. Thus, they should be removed from the inventory. The Supply and Demand sub-group has identified such sites and has composed a list of existing zoned sites that should be removed from the inventory and cites the reasoning (**see Appendix D**).

Secondly, the MRTF addressed the need to potentially allow small-scale mining (three acres or less) in Agricultural Resource, Forest Resource, Rural Self-Sufficient, and Rural Remote. The purpose would be to better facilitate the need for small specialty mines throughout rural portions of Yakima County. While this is a valid option to consider, further investigation is needed in order to target the specific needs and applications.

Thirdly, the need to protect mineral resources lands invokes a great degree of potential conflict with private landowners. Thus, appealing to private landowners to voluntarily want to be designated is the preferred initial method for mineral resource protection. The MRTF has identified areas that display the quantity, quality, and location of desirable resources (**see Map A**). The landowners located within these areas would be invited to participate in a public outreach program that would be performed by the MRTF and Yakima County Planning staff.

Incentives would be presented and public feedback would help refine the process (see the “Incentives for Mineral Resource Designation” section).

If the public outreach program fails to meet the needs for the 10-, 20-, and 50-year resources supplies projected by the Supply and Demand group findings, Yakima County would then designate mineral resource lands to meet the projected demand. As described in the “Site Selection and Criteria” section, both owner-initiated and Yakima County mineral resource lands selected for designation would meet or exceed the revised site selection and criteria standards.

In addition, another site designation option to consider is reviewing and revising current zoning ordinances to allow stockpiling on non-mining zone and non-mining designation locations in order to better facilitate the distribution of aggregate resources throughout the County.

**Table 2: Site Designation**

<b>Options</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Implementation</b>
1. Existing designated sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and evaluate existing designated Mineral Resource sites.</li> <li>• Redesignate and rezone exhausted sites to land use appropriate with adjoining land uses and zoning.</li> <li>• Calculate remaining supply within these sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protects current sites.</li> <li>• Establishes amount of remaining protected resource.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2002 Update and necessary zoning code update.</li> <li>• Work with property owners of exhausted sites to facilitate re-designation and zoning, w/o application fees.</li> </ul>
2. Add small-scale mining. Allow small mining/site operation (3 acres of less) in the Agricultural Resource, Forest Resource, Rural Self Sufficient, and Rural Remote plan land use designations and supporting zones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows use of resources throughout county.</li> <li>• Addresses specialty mines such as soil or clay mining or landscape rock picking.</li> <li>• Utilize Type III permit process</li> <li>• WADNR is preparing small site reclamation plan criteria, which we could adopt for the small scale mining</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2002 Update and necessary zoning code update.</li> </ul>
3. Owner initiated designation. Designations would be solicited through the 2002 Plan Update. Additional designations could be made through Plan update process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First choice, assuming adequate supply is protected.</li> <li>• Site evaluation criteria allows consideration of other, unidentified sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outreach during the 2002 Update, targeted at identified potential sites.</li> </ul>

4. The County would designate additional sites as needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Second choice, since property owners may not desire designation.</li> <li>• Pursue if additional supply needed to meet 10-, 20-, and 50-year supply.</li> <li>• Investigate potential zoning or land use designations to minimize impact of outright land use and zoning designations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outreach during the 2002 Update, targeted at identified potential sites.</li> </ul>
5. Allow stockpiling on non-mineral zoned lands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are some mining related operations (such as stockpiling) that need to occur at other locations, yet they do not necessarily need a mining zone or designation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and revise existing ordinances related to stockpiling on non-mining zone lands</li> </ul>

For further information contact: Anne Knapp or Kelly Clark

***Recommendations:***

1. Eliminate the zoned mineral resource sites from the mineral resources inventory (“Excluded” sites) as identified by the Supply and Demand sub-group (see **Appendix D**).
2. Update the resource site information of the existing sites identified in **Plan 2015**, using the information stated in **Appendix D** (both Agency and Private sites by resource type).
3. Allow small-scale mining (three acres or less) in lands zoned Agricultural Resource, Forest Resource, Rural Self-Sufficient, and Rural Remote and require WADNR reclamation standards at stated in recommendations 3-5 in the “Site Mitigation” section
4. Have MRTF and current planning staff review zoning ordinances related to stockpiling and amend them to allow mining activities such as stockpiling on non-mining zones and non-mineral designation sites.

Site Mitigation

One of the biggest policy issues reviewed by the MRTF was the 1,000-foot setback imposed on adjacent landowners as stated in Chapter 15.45 of the Comprehensive Plan. In regards to mineral resources lands, section 15.20.085 (1d) specifically states:

Where any existing or proposed lot borders on agricultural, mineral resource or forest land, a building setback for especially sensitive land uses is required from the adjoining resource land or use as follows: . . . 1,000 feet from property designated mineral resource by the comprehensive plan.

The MRTF members agreed that imposing setback restrictions on adjacent property owners is unfair and that the potential legal ramifications could be a factor if the current policy stays in place.

As an alternative, the MRTF suggests that private industry, county, and state mineral resource extraction entities adhere to the setbacks currently imposed in Chapter 15.45.060 (6) in conjunction with “site by site” mitigation tools. Therefore, on-site mitigation for impacts such as noise and visual impacts can be mitigated in accordance with the landscape variables that characterize a potential site. For example, noise and visual mitigation tools include using:

- Natural topography to locate processing facilities.
- Visual screenings (individual or in combination) such as trees and vegetation, fencing, berms, stockpiles.
- Relocating equipment inside buildings or underground (if applicable) to reduce noise.
- Use of rubber and urethane in areas like screens, chutes, and transfer points to reduce noise.
- Installation of sound reduction panels and housings around various crushing and screening equipment.

The other site mitigation issue addressed by the MRTF was requiring WADNR site reclamation standards for “small-scale mining.” The MRTF defined small-scale mining as sites under three acres, which is below the minimum threshold of current WADNR reclamation requirements. While the “Site Designation” section recommends the facilitation of small-scale mining in remote lands, the MRTF would like to discourage haphazard extraction and development practices and to minimize subsequent environmental damage (especially near and within critical areas and other environmentally sensitive areas).

**Table 3: Site Mitigation**

<b>Options</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Implementation</b>
1. Allow site by site mitigation as needed (in conjunction with proposed setbacks and existing air quality and dust standards)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows for site by site mitigation and utilization of the landscape while using a standard setback.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2002 Update and necessary zoning code update.</li> </ul>
2. Adopt WADNR’s existing site reclamation standards for small-scale mining throughout the County.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows Yakima County the ability to ensure proper reclamation of small scale mining sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2002 Update and necessary zoning code update.</li> </ul>

For further information contact: Wayne Kalbfleisch, Kelly Clark, or Anne Knapp.

***Recommendations:***

1. Eliminate the 1,000-foot setback from landowners adjacent to zoned mineral resources lands.
2. Retain that private industry, county, and state mineral resource extraction entities adhere to the following setbacks (currently imposed in Chapter 15.45.060 (6) Setbacks) within lands zoned under a mining zoning district:
  - A. Mineral resource extraction from existing residences: 200 feet
  - B. Mineral resource extraction from property line (no residences): 25 feet (as required by DNR)
  - C. Crushing and processing from existing residences: 500 feet
  - D. Crushing and processing from property line (no residences): 25 feet
3. In addition to the proposed setbacks listed in recommendation 2, allow for the utilization of the site mitigation options discussed in **Table 3**.
4. Adopt WADNR’s small scale mining reclamation standards for all “small scale” (to be defined) mining operations to ensure the long term quality and of our natural resource lands is accounted for prior to and after mining occurs.

Incentives for Mineral Resources Use

Due to increasing environmental and economic concerns, an incentives sub-group was formed to supply options. The options identified by the group include facilitating water availability for upland sites; providing economic incentives by allowing mining in agricultural lands; and researching floodplain mining applications in a environmentally sensitive (mining designed for the benefit of fish and wildlife in conjunction with compatible development) via a sub-area plan. The sub-area plan would target the State Route 24 area in conjunction with the Bureau of Reclamation Reaches Project.

**Table 4: Incentives for Mineral Resource Designation**

Options	Comments	Implementation
1. Water Availability Establish a pool or “bank” of water rights for mining	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitate mining on upland sites.</li> <li>• Public benefit of removing operations from the floodplain would warrant priority water rights processing or perhaps the “pool” of water rights.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with BOR and DOE</li> </ul>
2. Economic Incentives. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mining designation in Ag Resource offers additional economic choices.</li> <li>• Mining in Rural Remote offers additional economic choices.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing property owner flexibility has been identified by the MRTF Task Force as a high priority</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outreach during the 2002 Update, targeted at identified potential sites</li> </ul>
3. Floodplain Mining Study. Conduct sub-area plan along Union Gap Reach to evaluate potential of on-site mining.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of resource on site for construction, landscaping</li> <li>• Incorporate fish and wildlife habitat restoration and enhancement</li> <li>• Coordinate with BOR project</li> <li>• Investigate upzones (industrial to mixed use) as incentive for floodplain mining</li> <li>• Pilot project could be applied elsewhere in floodplain</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Begin ASAP, incorporate in 2002 Update.</li> </ul>

For further information contact: Jon Merz, Effie Skinner, Tom Ring, or Anne Knapp.

***Recommendations:***

1. Develop a policy with local, state, and federal agencies which would allow and expedite the availability of water for private and government resource extraction entities that choose to mine upland sites (floodplain terraces, ridges) rather than the geomorphic floodplain.
2. Allow mining (not limited to small-scale mining) in Agricultural Resource and Rural Remote lands to supply economic alternatives for those land owners.
3. Facilitate and support a public outreach program that caters towards owner initiated designation. Have Yakima County, resource agencies, and industry present the incentives identified by the MRTF, and allow for public input workshops that would generate additional or alternative incentive strategies. Incentive ideas include:
  - A. Providing complimentary stock in mining companies to landowners seeking mineral resources designation and/or explaining the royalties associated with mineral extraction activities on private lands.

- B. Purchase of conservation easements (industry) to buffer activity.
- C. Allow opportunity for interim (prior to mining) and subsequent (after mining and reclamation is completed) public land uses for 20- and 50-year sites such as allowing for public access to hiking trails and wildlife areas.

In addition, use the public outreach process to help define the revised site selection criteria.

- 4. Initiate a sub-area plan for the State Route 24 Bridge area (Yakima County would work with USBOR, WADNR, WSDOE, WSDOT, WSDFW, industry, and other interested parties) in order to assess the feasibility of developing a mixed use plan that would facilitate the co-existence of functional wildlife habitat and anthropogenic needs (including floodplain mining).

### **Further Research and Recommendation Considerations**

Additional information and research is needed for the following tasks:

#### Site Selection and Criteria:

- 1. Develop specific definitions of each of the eight “Site Selection Criteria” to ensure that they are effective resource management tools.

#### Supply and Demand:

- 1. Conduct further research via a “planned market” study that would geographically identify and plan for existing and future supply and demand markets throughout Yakima County by mineral resource type and use applications (quarry bedrock, sand and gravel, specialty rock).
- 2. Delineate between government and private industry’s needs and utilization of mineral resources throughout Yakima County (this would be a desired outcome of the “planned market” research).
- 3. Create specific standards and policies for 10-, 20-, and 50-year mineral resource protection after proposed sites meet the revised site selection criteria stated in the “Site Selection Sand Criteria” portion of this report.

#### Site Designation:

- 1. Define the term “small-scale mining,” (beyond the less than 3-acre minimum requirement) as it pertains to the option listed in the “Site Designation” section.
- 2. Develop and define a process in which to refine and apply the Supply and Demand sub-groups recommendation for a 10-, 20-, and 50-year designation for existing zoned and proposed sites.

3. Develop specific zoning or land use designations for protecting 10-, 20-, and 50-year mineral resources lands identified by the MRTF throughout Yakima County.

#### Site Mitigation:

1. Review the WADNR reclamation standards and investigate how Yakima County could implement and enforce these standards on “small-scale mining” practices (as defined by its final wording) throughout the county.
2. Review WADNR reclamation standards for all “small-scale mining” (sites under three acres) operations throughout Yakima County and modify these standards to apply to various types of mining in different environmental landscapes (design an application for use by Yakima County for reclamation standards and mitigation requirements, if applicable).

#### Incentives for Mineral Resource Use:

1. Identify and review specific laws, policies, environmental criteria, and geographic parameters in which water resources availability could be pursued for upland mining.
2. Investigate, with permitting agencies, irrigation districts, and other involved entities specific policies for establishing a water bank or pool of water rights usable for mineral resource extraction in suitable upland areas.
3. Investigate the viability and value in purchasing (Yakima County) resource conservation easements for mineral resource use and environmental enhancement.

### **References**

- Dunn, Andrew B., 2001, Reconnaissance investigation of sand, gravel, and quarried bedrock resources in the Toppenish 1:100,000 quadrangle, Washington: Washington Division of Geology and Earth Resources Information Circular 93, 23 p., 1 plate.
- Lingley, W. S., Jr.; Jazdzewski, S. P., 1994, Aspects of growth management planning for mineral resource lands: Washington Geology, v. 22, no. 2, p 36-45.
- Weberling, K. D.; Dunn, A. B.; Powell, J. E., 2001, Reconnaissance investigation of sand gravel, and quarried bedrock resources in the Yakima quadrangle, Washington: Washington Division of Geology and Earth Resources, Information Circular 92, 34 p., 1 plate.



**Yakama Nation.....Scott Nicoli**  
**Alternate.....Tom Ring**  
**Alternate.....Tom Ring**  
**Yakima County Public Works Department (non-voting).....William Maggard**

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that should any of the appointed members be unable to serve on the task force, the Board may appoint an alternate without adoption of a new resolution.

Done this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_  
James M. Lewis, Chairman

Attest: Sylvia E. Cervantes

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jesse S. Palacios, Commissioner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of the Board

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ronald F. Gamache, Commissioner  
Constituting the Board of  
County Commissioners  
for Yakima County, Washington

## **MINERAL RESOURCE TASK FORCE PURPOSE, GOALS, GUIDELINES AND WORK PLAN**

### **INTRODUCTION**

In 1997, the county adopted plan policies regarding the designation of Mineral Resource Lands. In 1998 over 4,000 acres were initially proposed for designation as Mineral Resource Lands by staff and adopted by the BOCC as part of *Plan 2015*. This work was an initial step in developing the overall County approach to mineral resources. Additional work is necessary to address plan policies and the long term mineral resource needs of Yakima County. Plan Policy LU-ER-MR 1.2 calls for a task force to complete specific tasks:

**LU-ER-MR 1.2** *Establish a Mineral Resource Task Force comprised of citizens, mining industry, Yakama Nation, State Agency and County representatives to develop inventories of commercially viable sites. Evaluate mineral resource inventories to determine adequacy for near term (1-10 year), mid-term (10- 20 year) and long-term (20-50 year) mineral resource needs.*

### **GOALS**

The task force will be charged with developing the following items:

- Review of the DNR inventory of areas where the geology indicates a presence of commercially exploitable mineral resources.
- An analysis of the demand for mineral resources based on expected use and adopted population estimates.
- Discussion of the mineral industry characteristics in Yakima County
- Identification of the various types and uses of mineral resources
- Criteria for assessing suitability of specific sites in the inventory based on existing goals and policies
- Identification of specific areas necessary to meet 50-year demand (including a review of all the existing designated sites) for designation
- Develop protection policies /regulations for designated but non-zoned sites
- Review temporary mining policies.
- Development and participation in a public outreach process.
- Review the setbacks and operational standards of the Mining Zone.

### **GUIDELINES**

In order to complete the work in a reasonable period and in order for the task force members to have a shared understanding on the scope of work the following guidelines are proposed:

- The task force will work within the existing policy framework provided by *Plan 2015*. Policy changes may be made for exceptional circumstances.
- Consensus approach will be used in making recommendations. Where consensus can not be reached on an issue majority and minority opinions will be developed.

### **WORK PLAN**

The times and dates of meetings will depend on the availability of task force members. Meetings will be held every other week. The first task force meeting will convene approximately the second week of February. The total number of meetings will depend on how fast the task force

works and the information required. This time frame will allow the task force to complete its work by mid-year in time to carry forward changes to the 2000 Plan Amendment Process.

*\*\*\*Due to resource and land sensitivities Appendices “C – D” and “Map A” have been excluded from this report.*