

MINUTES

WETLANDS REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING

March 21, 2013, 5:16 pm, City Hall #224

Meeting Summary

Board Members Present: Brenda Wright; Dr. Lisa Hoferkamp; Jerry Medina; Nina Horne; Amy Sumner; Dr. Hal Geiger; Dan Miller, Planning Commissioner; Andrew Campbell (Board Chair)

Board Members Absent: None.

A quorum was present.

Staff Members Present: Teri Camery, CBJ Senior Planner.

Public Present:

II. January 17, 2013 Regular Meeting Minutes were approved with no objection cited.

III. Agenda

Chair Campbell asked if there was a specific order to follow. Ms. Camery said that Wetland Methodology would be presented first.

IV. No public participation on non-agenda items.

V. No Board Comments

VI. Agenda Items

Chair Campbell called for the Wetland Methodology update.

Teri Camery, Discussion on Wetland Methodology Scope of Work. Ms. Camery asked for the Board's input on it, which was in the top three of the \$1.6 million Habitat Mapping and Analysis Project and she outlined the major elements of that in the memo –

- New LiDAR and Imagery, the project is to be completed in Spring 2013, and they are finalizing the contracts with the chosen vendor.
- Stream Maps
- Developing a new Wetland Methodology Protocol for Analysis and Classification of Wetlands in the new draft Juneau Wetlands Management Plan – the methodology would be completed in 2013, the draft Juneau Wetland Management Plan would not be due until 2015 or 2016.

She stated that the Wetland Methodology Development would be the main focus of discussion. She explained that the Wetland Methodology Development that staff was looking at came out of a series of other grants through the Southeast Alaska Land Trust and after evaluating over 20 different methods, the resource agencies, chose the current wetland methodology that is being expanded and revised with CBJ's Habitat Mapping and Analysis Project.

Ms. Camery stated that they had approximately \$50,000-60,000 in city's grant to fund further revisions to this methodology. They would work with Southeast Alaska Land Trust. A key component of this Wetland Methodology was that it would work for estuarine wetlands as well as freshwater wetlands and would address both.

The grant is relatively open-ended in terms of what it funds for the Wetland Methodology work which basically says, "Continued site analysis culminating in free training at the end of the season."

The free training is a critical point because CBJ needs consultants to be trained in this methodology because CBJ needs the agencies and other interested parties to handle it very well because it will be the basis of their Juneau Wetland Management Plan. The Southeast Alaska Land Trust is interested in it as well because the same methodology is the basis for their In-Lieu Wetland Mitigation Program.

Ms. Camery reviewed an early draft of the Wetland Methodology Concept that was the outgrowth of two meetings with the Habitat Mapping Working Group, comprised of State and Federal Agencies and SEAL Trust. She also mentioned having extensive phone conversations with Dr. Adamus to make sure it didn't duplicate previous revision efforts.

Ms. Camery provided an overview of her very early draft of the Wetland Methodology Contract.

Task 1, Initial Consultation – She said was pretty straightforward.

Task 2 - Dr. Adamus would begin the site testing to apply the Wetland Methodology to 18-25 other sites. She referred to Figure 8 and said testing is when Dr. Adamus would begin the site testing to apply the Wetland Methodologyroughly 18-25 other sites. There is another line that states, "...Wetland methodology...allowing 18-25 Wetland Units Consultants on test sites, from a minimum of three properties, where scientific measurements had already been taken and compared the methodology results with scientific measurements." That specific point comes from the Corps of Engineers that the Wetland Methodology didn't have enough solid science behind it. She stated that Dr. Adamus could describe it much better with the scientific background on the development of this wetland methodology, his literature, and research etc. Corps of Engineers wanted to ensure that the results of the Wetland Methodology correlated with the hard science measurements of the site. She summarized that they were looking at doing measurements on some sites that are already being actively monitored and that they had active data on i.e. carbon etc.

Task 3, Methodology Repeatability Review, Phase I – Ms. Camery stated that the other things that the agency groups wanted to see were about ensuring that the results of the Wetland

Methodology were understood in a similar way by everyone, who was reasonably trained, who went through the methodology questions. She identified two different tasks (Task 3 and Task 4) that addressed that particular question; to meet with two consultants early on in the process to go over the questions and look at the wording to make sure it was interpreted consistently.

Task 4 - Peer Review Workshop, addressed the overall issue of making sure that the Wetland Methodology correlated with the current available science for Southeast Alaska. They were particularly concerned that the Wetland Methodology did not address salmon habitat. Dr. Adamus had originally developed this Wetland Methodology in Oregon where it was very different. The basic idea was that they would have a series of workshops with local experts in these different fields.

The Wetland Methodology looks at 15 different functions; the biggest focus on fish habitat and those scientists would go through the methodology questions, go through Dr. Adamus' weighting process with the functions and provide their best scientific expertise which would then be integrated into the method.

Task 5 - Basic Coordination to make sure that Dr. Adamus got periodic updates and then Habitat Mapping Working Group and the Wetlands Review Board as well as Ms. Camery as Project Manager.

Task 6 – A combination of all the efforts, the three-day training and the workshop. The grant stipulates that the workshop be free. They would have a maximum of 25 individuals, patterned on the Wetland Methodology Workshop that SEAL Trust had conducted with Dr. Adamus last summer (Format - One day of class work, one and a half days of fieldwork, and a half day of class work). This was just so that people understood the methodology and were reasonably trained in the methodology; this was not a certification, but a training workshop.

Task 7 - Methodology Repeatability Review Phase 2, bringing in consultants who have already taken the training and have a good knowledge of what the methodology is about. They could go out in the field along with other resource agency staff and make further revisions to the method based on their feedback.

Task 8 - Guide to the Wetland Methodology, a cheat sheet that gives an overall review of the purpose and intent behind the methodology, the general approach behind the questions and specific diagrams that would provide a detail for the elements of the Wetland Methodology that most people seem to have trouble with. Essentially a Wetland Methodology for Dummies guide.

Ms. Camery concluded by saying that they wanted this to be user-friendly and a widely accepted tool and asked if they were any comments.

Ms. Wright asked about Task 2 and if when they said that there would be 18-25 wetland units measured or reviewed, did that mean different people were going to do the same site.

Ms. Camery replied that was why the repeatability review was separate in Task 3. Dr. Adamus would go out and get a larger number of sites tested under this method. This was not strictly a

volume issue. You would have more and more background and a wider variety of wetland types that would be tested under the method as well as scientific measurements.

Regarding the repeatability, Ms. Camery stated it was a separate task where Dr. Adamus would go through the questions one by one with the other consultants to make sure they are viewing the questions separately. The repeatability was not to beef up the number of sites possible. The repeatability was to go thorough maybe one or two sites maximum with the consultants to make sure that they were interpreting the questions the way that Dr. Adamus intended.

Ms. Camery asked Ms. Wright if that answered her question. Ms. Wright said yes but she didn't like the answer. Ms. Camery stated that she was open to suggestions.

Mr. Geiger mentioned looking at the tasks and wondering what the tasks were for - it would have made sense if there was a goal and the tasks supported the goal. He understood it as two goals, one to study issues of repeatability and measurement errors (consistency of measurements from different people) and the other of running this through machinery once these were measured; but he questioned whether that really captured the values and whether it was the best use of resource to capture the goals intended.

Ms. Camery thanked Mr. Greiger for the suggestions and explained that the purpose of this task was to ensure that independent consultants interpret the Wetland Methodology questions in a similar manner, so that methodology results are consistent and repeatable.

Mr. Geiger suggested that they did think about money with respect to resources in these 18-25 sites and then make sure they were putting it in the best places – in essence capture the value of this exercise.

Ms. Camery explained that Dr. Adamus in almost every single meeting, made a very specific distinction between function versus value and he was always saying that values were essentially a community/political decision and that this research was not about values, the methodology itself does not determine whether it's a high value category A or lower value category C. Basically, categorization was a final step in the process that would take place to some degree at the level of the Planning Commission and the Assembly where they would say; for example that they place the highest value on wetlands to help with flood control and therefore they were going to weight that higher than all the rest. Dr. Adamus was always saying that he provided the science, he focuses on the function and then values were a political decision and ultimately the final category was a political decision.

Mr. Geiger suggested looking at the whole package and critiquing it correctly. He mentioned it was important to get all the goals of the analysis out on the table at once and that Dr. Adamus had to make sure that the functions were captured correctly as well. It was equally important to know whether people were getting the same measurements each time they went out following the field procedures.

Ms. Camery said she thought what Dr. Adamus would say was that this methodology was about function; they were not looking at the values at this stage. That was a limiting factor on what

was being done with this piece. The values assessment and the categorization are ultimately not part of the Wetland Methodology Development. That happens at the stage of developing the final draft of the wetlands plan.

Mr. Geiger said he saw what she was saying but when you go through and crank this machine and it states this wetland has this function; there is still the question of recapturing that correctly. Ms. Camery agreed that was a critical question.

Mr. Geiger said that then the larger question of whether or not they were getting the right values was still there and it should be mentioned somewhere. Ms. Camery agreed.

Mr. Campbell agreed with Mr. Geiger that it was an important analysis of the process that they were going through but wondered if Dr. Adamus was indeed capturing the function because they were giving a full force contract. Mr. Campbell thought a valid concern was the repeatability, “are we getting what we can from him and is it being delivered in a package that can be duplicated by other professionals.”

Ms. Hoferkamp referred to Task 2, where it said that it was going to the Consultants Self-Test Guide to get results and then compare them to those already obtained for accuracy and it was a valid question as to how well this method captured the actual situation.

Mr. Geiger felt there were two parts to biologists going out and repeatedly getting the same measurements from the sites; one if the measurements agree and two, whether they are accurate.

Ms. Hoferkamp assumed that these sites already had scientific measurements obtained and those measurements were correct as much as they knew. She agreed that they should have better ways to measure how well the method captures important data.

Mr. Geiger suggested that they could use five properties instead of four. Ms. Hoferkamp wondered if increasing the sample size would be better. Mr. Geiger questioned if this was the best use of their resources.

Ms. Wright questioned about using all the existing scientific sites around Southeast that were appropriate.

Ms. Camery said she thought they had come up with three sites based on what Mr. D’Amoree had said. She added that Southeast Alaska Land Trust was evaluating Southeast wide, and the grant had to focus on sites within CBJ boundaries.

Ms. Horne wondered about the number of attributes and parameters that they were looking at. In order to get a good sampling, they need a bigger variety of sites to ensure that they hadn’t left anything out when putting this methodology together.

Ms. Camery said that was the point behind the 18-25 numbers, to get the broadest possible variety of wetland types within the Borough tested under this method.

Ms. Horne mentioned about US Fish and Wildlife being involved and Mr. Neil Stichert doing a lot of work with Wetland Assessments and trying different methodologies in various areas of Juneau. She said that they could use those as well for the different parameters needed for the methodology.

Ms. Camery mentioned the different working groups currently involved - Fish and Wildlife Service, Corps of Engineers, Southeast Alaska Land Trust, National Marine Fisheries Service, and some involvement from DEC. Fish and Game had not been involved.

Mr. Geiger raised the point that it stated that there would be 18-25 wetland units, but it sounded like those were going to be selected to maximize the variation among units. Ms. Camery agreed and said she would add that in.

Chair Campbell asked when Ms. Camery needed to have the Wetlands Committee's final input on the proposal. Ms. Camery answered preferably by that evening.

Mr. Campbell suggested they go ahead with the Statter Harbor application review for USE2013 0005 before completing the wetland methodology discussion.

Statter Harbor Staff Presentation

Ms. Camery referred to the summary memo she had sent them. She stated that it lists the Land Use Code Policies that were under review and projects that have undergone a full environmental assessment. The main habitat policies that they were looking at include the Special Waterfront Area Policies. She explained that Special Waterfront Areas, under the original Juneau Coastal Management program, were areas that are good for development and generally have lower habitat value on and were exempt from the prohibition on intertidal fill, provided that it complies with the policy

49.70.960(2). Fill proposals within the special waterfront areas are not subject to the fill prohibition of subsection 49.70.905(13) relating to coastal development. Each fill proposal shall be individually reviewed to ensure that configuration, timing, composition and construction practices will minimize impacts on habitats and meet the water quality standards and other Juneau Coastal Management Plan provisions. The size of any fill shall not exceed that necessary for the use unless a larger fill is needed to maintain integrity of the fill, maintain or enhance habitat values, or to fulfill other enforceable provisions of this section.

The project also needs to comply with these policies:

49.70.950 (C)(3) Wetlands and tideflats shall be managed so as to ensure adequate waterflow, nutrients, and oxygen levels, to avoid the adverse effects on natural drainage patterns, the destruction of important habitat, and the discharge of toxic substances;

49.70.950 (C)(7) Rivers, streams and lakes shall be managed so as to protect natural vegetation, water quality, important fish or wildlife habitat, and natural waterflow.

Ms. Camery stated that in her staff report to the Planning Commission on this Conditional Use Permit, she would provide a summary of the Board's discussion, the Board's final motion, and encourage the Board to specifically relate the motion to whether the project complies with the three policies and any measures that the Board could suggest to further minimize impact to the project. The board's minutes would also be included with the staff report to the Planning Commission.

Applicant Presentation

Gary Gillette, CBJ Docks and Harbors, City and Borough of Juneau, presented the application that they had put forth to the Community Development Department for a Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Gillette went into some of the background of the Statter Harbor Project.

Phase I - Removing DeHart's Float which the city bought in 2005 and replacing it with some new floats, mooring floats at Statter Harbor and some maintenance that was under contract.

Phase II - Launch Ramp Project.

Phase III - Boat Haul-Out and Kayak Launch Ramp, which they had funding for, but would not build until Phase I was complete.

Phase IV - Loading float for the whale watching and charter fishing boats [shown in the Master Plan].

Attachment B - Concept Master Plan developed in 2005. A committee of Parks and Recreation, Docks and Harbor, and some other agencies looked at that.

Attachment C - Refined Attachment B as dimensions were added. This was the first plan proposed under the Environmental Assessment. He explained that Alaska Fish and Game had given them money for the project. That money was from the Federal Government and because it was a federally funded project, they had to go through an Environmental Assessment. Environmental Assessment looks at the impacts of the project and makes a determination; if there was a finding of no significant impact [FONSI], then no full Environmental Impact Statement process was required. It took about 2-3 years and generated a lot of reports which are in print as well as on the website. They received a favorable FONSI at the end.

Attachment C was where they had started originally, there was some retail space and some park space, it was reflective of what the community expressed they wanted in 2005. The agencies

looked at it and said in the first meeting that they would not allow them to fill tidelands for retail and park space. The plan area was a little over 6 acres.

So, they went back through the process and addressed all the issues which could be found in Attachment A - Proposed Action Alternative which basically pulled the project back to 4.29 acres of fill as opposed to 6.8 acres. They removed the retail, removed the park area, and pulled back along Bay Creek. They were building a marine structural wall as opposed to a fill flow because it brings back the footprint, and there were concerns about the impact to Bay Creek.

The critical elements of their project were the water-related elements, the two Launch Ramps and parking. The parking for boats and trailers, they used nationwide standards, Fish and Game called for fifty spaces per ramp, they ended up with 99 spaces for the two lane launch ramps, one space was lost to the DOT's roundabout. They also used other standards for vehicles other than boats and trailers. He noted that was how they came to the size of the fill for the project.

Regarding storm water management, Mr. Gillette stated that because they had to pull back any kind of park element, there wouldn't be any kind of natural vegetative swale type capturing, so they plan to use oil-water separators as they had recently completed at the Auke Bay Loading Facility outside of the Ferry Terminal. It is a regular maintenance item.

A lot of work was done at Bay Creek, the original plan actually had re-channeling of Bay Creek and there was a lot of discussion with the agencies as they went through the environmental process and the concern that by re-channeling they might channel it into the eelgrass bed. The agencies were adamant that it not be rechanneled, so they pulled back and created a wall to leave Bay Creek in its natural, meandering state.

The City had a 50-foot setback from the streams and they were not doing anything from the point where there was existing fill that had been there from the late 50s-early 60s; if anything they were going to put a little pathway and maybe raise the elevation, but there was no plan to change the embankment. The 20-foot tide line, generally used for the intertidal zone [depicted in red on the plan] goes up just before the highway and up across the highway, so they weren't getting into the jurisdictional area for the setback and also weren't changing the existing fill.

Mr. Gillette mentioned that they had purchased a piece of property [Mr. Lanehart's] there, which was how they were able to bring the project back and put some of the parking. He then went on to say that DOT is doing a roundabout at DeHart's; DOT also had another project that would continue on to View Drive, which is outside the church and that would put in a center turn lane in this area to help turn it into these facilities which would also help the traffic pattern into this facility as well.

Ms. Hoferkamp asked about Attachment E.

Mr. Gillette explained that they have incorporated an easement for the driveway to the **Deems'** property, there was some parking space and vegetation there but DOT's roundabout project could not allow for that; he noted that it would be before the Assembly soon to be finalized. Mr.

Gillette said that they have tried to keep as much landscaping as possible within the constraints of the fill that the agencies would allow to pursue.

Mr. Geiger pointed to an area of the plan where there was a lot of change in elevation.
Mr. Gillette said there was going to be a lot of fill but it would not be level to the highway.

Ms. Wright asked about the green areas on the map.
Mr. Gillette answered that it was landscaping. He noted that this wasn't the final design, once they get the final approval, the engineers would go ahead and put everything together and work it out per the general parameters.

Ms. Horne mentioned another area of green.
Mr. Gillette replied that those were existing eelgrass. They are protecting the largest area of it. He added that in the EA, the FONSI identifies the habitat that they would be impacting; different values were placed for different habitats like the mud flats, the essential fish habitat for the eelgrass which was put into a formula for mitigation. They were doing an **in-lieu** fee through the Southeast Land Trust and were basically in negotiations on that right now, probably in the range of \$500,000 - \$700,000. The Corps permit that was issued identified four different value of land [referred to the Environment Assessment-FONSI document].

Chair Campbell asked if any of the attachments showed the existing edge to fill and where the new fill was going to go.
Mr. Gillette referred to the drawing and showed the fill area which goes back in towards the highway where the Lanehart house was, there used to be another house there which burned down and the City purchased that land and built a picnic shelter.

Mr. Geiger asked where Waydelich Creek would be impacted.
Mr. Gillette responded that it was off the road and wouldn't be impacting them.

Mr. Geiger queried about the number of fish there.
Mr. Gillette said they had done a survey a number of years ago and they would be doing another survey this year. So, he didn't have the most recent information. It was a relatively small run, but there was definitely evidence of carcasses on the other side of the creek. One of the things they had proposed was maybe mitigating the latter, but had been told that it didn't need to be enhanced. They had worked with U.S. Fish and Wildlife and National Marine Fisheries and that was one of the things they had proposed, but the agencies did not want them to do anything.

Ms. Hoferkamp raised the point of putting some restrictions or something where you had to have a certain amount of land to offset the amount of hydrocarbons that would come off the parking lot.
Mr. Gillette mentioned talking about it early on but some of the discussions said, you couldn't control it, and with the loading of trucks and trailers and stuff, it would be difficult. He mentioned they had tried it at the Juneau Empire parking lot, but the vegetation seemed dead.

Ms. Hoferkamp said they didn't want things to grow there, just wanted the water to flow through, and the sediments are a medium for attenuating hydrocarbons that fall through.
Mr. Gillette raised the point that it wasn't as close to the water, which could be an issue.

Ms. Hoferkamp agreed given the close proximity to the water.

Mr. Gillette added that because of all the fill they were putting in, there would be a lot of rock and such which could settle in and there might be some tidal action, though a study had not really been done on that.

Ms. Wright asked about snow removal.

Mr. Gillette responded that what they did now was they pushed it down the ramp. They understand it may not be allowed any longer. He anticipated seeing a lot of snow plows there considering the size of the lot and the use that they would have in the winter.

Chair Campbell recalled talking to Dick Deems about 10 years ago and Chair Campbell got the impression that Mr. Deems had been in negotiation to sell his property to the City. It seemed like a logical way to reduce the need for fill in the tidal area. He asked if that was something they had considered.

Mr. Gillette replied that they had had many discussions and Mr. Deems was no longer interested in selling.

Chair Campbell stated that they had just reviewed the Auke Bay School Renovation Project not too long ago and one of the values of the creek was the educational value, so he really liked the little pathway idea that would give access to the kids, because it was heavily used by the school.

Mr. Gillette said that was a specific comment they had heard during the first EA meetings. He also mentioned having sea walk all along the edge, and a couple of areas for benches for people to sit and look over the tidelands, they were also looking at trying to get one that was large enough to maybe have a cover and a picnic table.

Ms. Hoferkamp asked if there was a fueling facility on the dock.

Mr. Gillette answered that there wasn't but there would be a fuel port to replace the one at DeHart's. Ms. Camery commented that that project had gone through a separate Conditional Use Permit process.

Ms. Horne referred to Attachment D, Page 2 under Special Conditions and wondered about the enforcement of the removal of structures that tended to be left behind and if that would be put into writing and enforced at the conclusion of the project.

Ms. Sumner explained that when that happens, the permit would become part of the contract document, which is the agreement between the City and the contractor; the contractor is responsible for the clean-up.

Ms. Horne inquired if it was something that was left in writing for a certain number of years.

Mr. Gillette stated that they would put that into the contract. He said that they have not had that issue with any of their fill projects thus far.

Ms. Horne asked about the water quality in terms of any baseline measurements that would be taken and what type of monitoring would be done before, during, and after construction.

Mr. Gillette responded saying that there hadn't been any requirements for monitoring and they hadn't anticipated any need for monitoring.

Ms. Sumner added that the construction general permit will require that the site be inspected to make sure that there aren't any discharges, but there was no official monitoring required under the permit unless you were filling over 20 acres or dealing with an impaired water body.

Chair Campbell called for additional questions from the applicant. He complimented the CBJ on their maintenance program for the oil-water separators and noted that was the first time he had heard about that and was really refreshing to hear that it was being done.

MOTION:

Mr. Miller made the motion:

USE2013-0005 Statter Harbor Launch Ramp be approved with the positive recommendation from the Wetland Review Board to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Miller spoke in favor of the motion noting that all the applicant's permits were in place and had been reviewed by all the agencies including getting the Environmental Assessment. He concurred with the educational features of Bay Creek, pulling it back to minimize the fill from 6.8 to 4.9 acres, and the fact that the applicant had a mitigation plan for this fill and that they were negotiating with SEAL Trust which was all in good spirit.

Friendly Amendment: Mr. Geiger seconded the motion and asked if Mr. Miller would consider a friendly amendment to specifically add the comments that they appreciated the maintenance of the oil-water separators as part of the motion.

MOTION

Mr. Miller restated the motion:

USE2013-0005, Statter Harbor Launch Ramp, be approved for recommendation to the Planning Commission with the Board's comments that the oil-water separator maintenance program and use of the oil and water separators are appreciated and appreciate the path that allowed school children to access Bay Creek safely.

Chair Campbell recapped that USE 2013-005 was being approved with the positive recommendation of the Board and that they appreciated the oil-water separator as well as the long-term planned maintenance of the oil-water separator and the pathway into Bay Creek for educational purposes.

The Board unanimously approved the motion.

Ms. Wright asked if they would be using local rock for the fill.

Mr. Gillette stated that they didn't specify where the rock would come from but suspected it would come from Stablers Point since it was close to the site.

Chair Campbell called on Ms. Camery to continue discussion of the Wetland Methodology Sole Source Contract.

Wetland Methodology

Chair Campbell raised the issue of repeatability as being an important attribute of the plan because he has heard from frustrated contractors about the duplicable results. Chair Campbell spoke regarding the adding of a deliverable in Task 2. 'Something that might be useful at that stage would be to have the consultants that Dr. Adamus is meeting with fill out some type of a brief on what their impression of what Dr. Adamus said was. Dr. Adamus could look at the briefs and see what the consultants got from the presentation, what he was trying to deliver to them. The same process could occur at the end where you have the Methodology Repeatability Review Phase 2 that the initial reports done by the consultants as to what Dr. Adamus had given them would be useful in that secondary review and you could compare what was achieved during the process'. Chair Campbell suggested that it might be a deliverable that Ms. Camery could get from the process.

Ms. Camery agreed that it was a good suggestion.

Chair Campbell added that she could blend that with what Mr. Geiger had suggested, that she could give them some guidelines in what they were writing and what had they gained regarding the topic and target the commentary that she was getting towards whether or not the functions were adequately addressed.

Mr. Geiger brought up may be included formal statistical analysis that could or should be done with regard to "Rater Agreement".

Ms. Camery clarified that she was referring to Dr. Adamus as the consultant and then to the other consultants that were being brought in. Ms. Camery said she needed to change those terms to make that clear. The consultant who is doing the 18-25 sites is just Dr. Adamus who wants to include the maximum wetlands diversity. In Task 3, Dr. Adamus, the consultant, for the grant would be bringing in other consultants, so he can work with them on the questions and get their feedback on how they were interpreting the questions.

Mr. Geiger said that he would like to see different people go out there and get the same answer. How the results are evaluated could get more complex and formal like the kappa statistics used for Rater Agreements and such.

Ms. Hoferkamp agreed that it seemed like a pretty easy approach to have different groups to assess the same wetlands and compare their results for consistency.

Chair Campbell raised the point that it was a Sole Source Contract and they were saying that Dr. Adamus was the expert that they wanted to look at these different wetlands.

Ms. Camery opined what Dr. Adamus would say was that you need some level of training before you could go out. Dr. Adamus would go through it question by question, and then work with different consultants who have taken the training and then do a second level of repeatability review with people who have a broader knowledge of it at that point and get feedback on it at different levels.

Mr. Geiger wondered if he being skeptic could give feedback to give Dr. Adamus.

Chair Campbell responded saying that where Mr. Geiger could be the skeptic was in asking did or did they not achieve what Dr. Adamus had achieved. 'Have we learned how to go in and apply this wetland methodology to a specific site and come up with results so they are similar enough to what Dr. Adamus did, and that's where the repeatability aspect of this comes in'.

Ms. Camery added that Dr. Adamus said there were anywhere from 5 to 10 questions or more related to each function that he was looking at; if you get a different answer among consultants on one of them, it wouldn't change his analysis; if you get different answers on all 5-10 of those questions that relate to that function it would change the results, but there was a margin of error built into it that would still get you to the same result.

Mr. Geiger said that for it to be really science, it needs to be demonstrated.

Ms. Camery asked what Mr. Geiger what was necessary to be demonstrated.

Mr. Geiger replied that he thought there needed to be trained independent people to go out and look at sites and those units should be selected for maximum variation among them.

Ms. Hoferkamp felt that people should receive the training. Mr. Geiger agreed.

Ms. Hoferkamp said that after the training, go out and see how their results agree with those that perhaps Dr. Adamus comes back with.

Mr. Miller was confused regarding Tasks 2, 3, and 4 and opined that he would like a daylong briefing on WESPAK. Mr. Miller continued to say that there were 15 different functions and every function has 10 to 15 questions to it. He saw this as Dr. Adamus going out there and making sure for himself that it's going to work and making sure that he is going to get the right answer with the way the questions had been written out. He suggested that may be at the end of it all, they could send a completely independent person out to do their own little test run to see what results they come up with.

Mr. Geiger reiterated that it pointed to setting the goal before the task.

Ms. Sumner spoke about the repeatability on Task 3, in reference to the two other consultants that would be working with Dr. Adamus, it sounded like he was working with them at the same time for two days of field work, but not giving them a chance to go out there by themselves and seeing how the results would compare. They could add language so that the two consultants get trained on field day 1 and then on day 2, they go out by themselves to one of the 18 sites.

Ms. Camery clarified that Dr. Adamus did not believe someone could go out and do this without training. He also wants to get some early feedback. She said that it's meant to be rapid assessment, for use by a qualified biologist and that he would have to do the training

Ms. Sumner asked then if the first repeatability was Dr. Adamus looking at the questions himself, not seeing if it's actually repeatable.

Ms. Camery elaborated that Dr. Adamus would go over the questions with the consultants first to see how they understood it.

Mr. Miller queried if Dr. Adamus might end up changing the way some of the questions were interpreted.

Ms. Camery said he might change the questions at this early stage.

Ms. Sumner continued to Task 2 -18 out of 25 Wetland Units were to get the range of the diversity of the wetland habitat, she thought they should also specify that the three properties with the scientific measurements are not of the same type.

Ms. Camery replied that she wasn't sure they could do it, because not many sites have a history of scientific measurements.

Ms. Horne asked if it would be useful in Task 2, to have the consultants go out without the training and look at the two or three properties and then go with Dr. Adamus after the training to see what the results looked like. Ms. Horne wondered if that could help the discussion regarding repeatability for reviewing the questions.

Ms. Camery said she appreciated the point but reiterated that while it was straightforward, one could not go out there without the proper training or background for it.

Ms. Wright questioned if the goal was to see how well the methodology would work and if the tasks were to increase the database by doing 18-25 Wetland Units, check the questions, then have the training and at the end make sure that there are some kind of tests on data that's collected after training.

Ms. Camery responded saying that they already knew at this point in time how the wetland methodology worked because Southeast Alaska Land Trust has already had two previous grants and there was a lot of investment done last summer. Ms. Camery said that they knew that it worked because they had done about 40 sites so far and the goal of this study was to continue building on the study that had already been done and on the diversity of sites.

Mr. Miller said he didn't know enough about WESPAK even though he had worked on quite a few wetland delineations for his contractor as well as on the developer side. He didn't know if Ms. Camry needed a motion but appreciated knowing what's coming up. He liked Ms. Wright's idea of the goal to see if it worked but if it already works, why spend 60 grand; he suggested that they should first probably do more homework about it. .

Ms. Camery stated that the discussion has been very helpful but a motion was not necessary. She went on to say that they knew that the Wetlands methodology worked but wanted to expand more and build further scientific credibility for use in Southeast Alaska conditions and to ensure that it's repeatable. The reason that Mr. Miller hadn't heard about it was because it was under

development. The SEAL trust is working on refinements and that's why they need a lot more use out of this method. They know it's suitable, it's credible and that consultants from R&M or whoever could be trained to go out there and use it and implement it. It's meant to be a rapid assessment method. There are a lot of different wetlands assessment methods out there, some of which are very arduous and very extensive. The whole process with the methodology is relatively straightforward, user friendly and repeatable. There were a lot of questions and the SEAL trust was looking to make it more refined. She thought it still needed to be a trained scientist who could use it. Ultimately, they could get predictable mitigation, predictable impact assessments from the Corps of Engineers, the Southeast Alaska Land Trust, and depending on the final outcome of the Juneau Wetlands Management Plan, this methodology provides a lot of information to the CBJ and this discussion would help make it more consistent.

Mr. Medina suggested for clarity sake, she should refer to Dr. Adamus as, the contractor, and then the other people as, consultants. Ms. Camery agreed. Mr. Medina said that would be a little bit easier to follow.

Ms. Horne spoke about necessary training in the long term, not just for now or in 10 years and not having to relying on Dr. Adamus because the City would be spending a lot of money on this methodology and she asked why not consider putting WESPAK for Southeast Alaska, not just CBJ because one should be able to compare results so that Southeast Alaska could use the same methodology. Ms. Horne wondered if there is a way to put those questions of methodology together and have the contractor do a write up of how to use it, so you would not always have to require training, that you could just look at those assessments, go out and do it, without having formal training. This way, they would not always be relying on putting together a training and paying someone to hold a training. Ms. Horne suggested instead of giving all the money to one contractor, have the contractor put together a "How To" document. Not that anybody on the street could then take it and do it, but someone with a scientific background could go out and do it without any training and this way, they could spread the methodology all over Southeast Alaska and then compare results.

Ms. Camery appreciated the comments. She stated that they have asked Dr. Adamus to develop a cheat sheet like the one Ms. Horne had proposed. Ms. Camery stressed that they wanted the method to be user friendly, but at the same time you could not simplify the science to the point where you could do it without training. You could simplify it to a point and the whole reason the agencies focused on development of this method was because it was the simplest one they could find without sacrificing scientific credibility. She thought that maybe one consultant could train another but couldn't really answer the training issue.

Responding another point Ms. Horne had raised about CBJ versus Southeast Alaska, Ms. Camery said that was where their coordination with Southeast Alaska Land Trust and some of the agencies was really important. Ms. Camery said the grant dollars in CBJ's project had to be focused on City and Borough of Juneau both for budget reasons as well as government jurisdiction rules. She said they were coordinating very closely with Southeast Alaska Land Trust to take a southeast wide perspective. SEAL trust has another grant which allowed for southeast wide testing of the methodology. Ms. Camery said that their work was very complementary to what SEAL trust was doing.

Ms. Horne responded that she was very positive that CBJ was using the same methodology that was being used region wide. It just sounded earlier like Dr. Adamus had made it clear that his methodology could not be used without training and that he was very strong about it.

Chair Campbell mentioned that it seemed like that but what the analysis is to be used for is an important part of the discussion, about training and level of education or ability when performing it. An analysis of a significant project should be accomplished by somebody with a higher level of training than himself (Chair Campbell) going out in his backyard and trying to decide whether he had a wetland there or not. There was a different range of people that they would like to be able to have these abilities on a different scale.

Mr. Miller understood and agreed with what Chair Campbell said about the scientific training, because he understands the process though not scientifically. He questioned if the three day training in Task 6 was meant to be for scientific people or for the lay person. Mr. Miller suggested a half-day training instead.

Chair Campbell noted that they had written under Task 5 that they would be met with twice and he thought that would be their opportunity to familiarize themselves with the results of the process.

Ms. Camery said that it was her hope and intention that this would not be the last grant that they would get on this issue; certainly they could have more training to whatever degree was necessary.

Ms. Sumner interjected that maybe they could have a concept about training the trainer.

Ms. Camery said that Dr. Adamus had made it clear he was retiring.

Ms. Sumner suggested maybe finding a way for Dr. Adamus to train people to train other people effectively which she thought was extremely important.

Ms. Sumner then said that sometimes the questions tend to influence thinking and wondered if the consultants could be separated out or figure out an objective way to look at how they were interpreting the questions.

Chair Campbell added that was why he had suggested that the written portion might aid in that context.

Mr. Geiger agreed and spoke to Ms. Camery's comments regarding the fact that the methodology works right now, saying that he needed proof, do some checks and then review the outcome.

Chair Campbell agreed saying that that was their role. He clarified that the Board was being asked what they wanted to see out of this process. They were going to spend \$50,000-60,000, and the Wetlands Board as one of the reviewing bodies was being asked what they wanted to achieve with this and what their criteria was. Ms. Camery was asking them what the Board wanted to see. Chair Campbell thought that Mr. Geiger's desire was something that could be achieved.

Mr. Geiger thought they needed to find a way to make sure that they were achieving the function and value through the process. Ms. Camery concurred.

Chair Campbell asked if Ms. Camery had received enough information at least an outline thus far. Ms. Camery said yes and that she might be calling them individually for any further input and asked that if anyone had further comments to let her know.

VII Next Meeting: Ms. Camery proposed April 11 for the next meeting.

VIII. Planning Commission Liaison Update

Mr. Miller brought up that they were reviewing the draft of the Comprehensive Plan. They had made it through the first five chapters for the third or fourth time and they would be continuing their work for the next two Tuesdays after the next. They were done with public comments, but if anyone on the Wetlands Review Board had any comments, they could e-mail them to Ms. Camery to get them included for one of the next two meetings. He said that everybody was getting excited about being done because this started off as a real short quick update of the Comprehensive Plan and they had spent two years in the process.

Chair Campbell thanked them for their efforts.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.