

MINUTES
WETLANDS REVIEW BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING

October 8, 2015, 5:15 p.m. Downtown Library Large Conference room

Meeting Summary

Roll Call

Board Members Present: Amy Sumner, Brenda Wright, Andrew Campbell, Lisa Hoferkamp
Hal Geiger, Dan Miller, Jerry Medina, Nina Horne

Board Members Absent: Ben Haight

A quorum was present.

Staff Members Present: Teri Camery, Allison Eddins, CBJ Planners

Public Present: Koren Bosworth and Richard Carstensen, Bosworth Botanical
Consulting; Dennis Watson, Vice-Chair CBJ Planning
Commission

Meeting called to order at 5:18 p.m.

II. Agenda approved

III. Public Participation on Non-Agenda Items.
None

IV. Board Comments.
None

V. **Agenda Items**

1) Review of Preliminary Draft Juneau Wetlands Management Plan

Ms. Camery apologized for the last-minute change on the meeting location. She said the software that keeps the doors open in the Marine View Building after hours had failed, so CDD could not hold the meeting there and still comply with public notice requirements.

Ms. Camery said that the purpose of tonight's meeting was to develop Board comments on the preliminary draft JWMP as a follow-up to the presentation on the JWMP by the consultants, Dr. Paul Adamus and Francis Naglich, at the Board's September 24, 2015 meeting.

She thanked Ms. Bosworth and Mr. Carstensen for attending and said that she had asked them to come so they could respond to any board questions regarding the JWMP field work. She said that she had received Dr. Geiger's analysis the previous evening and tried to send it to the board that night from home, but she could not access the WRB email list off-site, so she sent it to the board this morning instead. She said that she received Dr. Adamus' response to Dr. Geiger's analysis that afternoon and also emailed that information to the board. She provided copies of both reports to the board.

Ms. Camery said that she had written a memo for the board with the history of the board's review of the JWMP WESPAK-SE methodology. She said that the board had approved the WESPAK-SE methodology in January 2014 without objection after CDD staff provided a binder with the detailed history of scientific peer review, repeatability testing in Alaska and Oregon, and letters of support from resource agencies. She noted that a different version of the WESPAK-SE methodology has been adopted by the State of Oregon. She provided a binder with the minutes for each of the Board's 19 meetings on the subject.

Lastly, Ms. Camery referred to questions that she had sent to the Board to help focus their review on the preliminary draft JWMP, and read them as follows:

- 1) How do we want the JWMP Update to be used, and by whom? Do we want more coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and/or the Southeast Alaska Land Trust, or just use by the CBJ Lands Division? (CBJ Lands has already used the assessments on two major subdivisions, and the assessments address approximately 90 percent city property.)
- 2) Based on question number one, is it necessary to rank, average, and/or categorize wetlands, or are the existing scores sufficient as an information source? If we choose to rank them, are policies and/or regulations needed for implementation?
- 3) Are there areas of the plan that need additional explanation or additional information?
- 4) Are there ways to make the plan more user-friendly?

Ms. Camery said that CDD's current recommendation on an implementation option is to use the plan as an information resource to support city planning efforts. She noted that there seems to be tremendous complexity around the question of averaging scores. She said that the Southeast Alaska Land Trust is evaluating different wetland ranking/categorization options with its Inter-Agency Review Team, and though the Corps of Engineers strongly supports the WESPAK-SE methodology, it is unknown at this time whether the Corps will support SEALTrust's categorization strategy with the method. She said that CDD believes it is prudent to wait for more information from SEALTrust's process before developing categorization methods, and noted that categorization is not necessary for the information to be useful; she said that the CBJ Lands Division is actively using the information right now in the development of two major subdivisions. She said that it would make more sense to look at categorization options in the future after seeing the results and comments from SEALTrust's process.

Mr. Campbell thanked Dr. Geiger for his extensive analysis and invited him to present his findings. Dr. Geiger went through the 26-page written analysis that was emailed to the board, which he presented on screen.

Dr. Geiger referred to his discussion with Dr. Adamus regarding Principle Components Analysis at the end of the last board meeting. He said that dissimilar information should not be averaged. He said he looked for variables in the methodology that were similar that might make sense to average, and what did not make sense to average. He provided the example of not averaging dissimilar household uses.

Dr. Geiger said that it was essential to put the information into categories, but it should not be done through averaging. He said he had three recommendations. He said the board needed a greater understanding of the calculation of the values and functions, particularly the values rating. He noted that there were 22 function variables and 18 value variables. He said he was not happy with the value variables. He said that his other recommendation is that none of these variables should be averaged, particularly the functions. His third recommendation is to adopt a system to develop categories based on percentiles.

He said that the first thing he did was reformat the data. He recommends that the data be presented in this format in the plan for use by technical engineers. He said that his goal was to come up with the best way to summarize the data into categories. He said that all the data analysis he did was in support of that.

He said he looked at the functions without paying attention to what they meant, and just looked at the two-letter codes. Then he started graphing them in ways that were similar to what Ms. Bosworth did. He pointed to box plots on the screen and pointed toward the median point (different from the mean, which is what is typical), where 50 percent are above and 50 percent are below. He pointed to points below 25 percent and above 75 percent on a particular chart. He pointed toward “whiskers” and other points farther out on the edges. He stated again that dissimilar items should not be averaged.

Dr. Hoferkamp asked what the chart would look like if it would have been perfect to average. Dr. Geiger said that in that case, the chart would show correlations and the means should have been more similar, which this does not. Dr. Geiger discussed weighted averages involved in Principle Components Analysis.

He said he looked at the correlations, and pointed toward a matrix of plots. He said that the dark blue shows a correlation of plus one, while the area closer to red shows a negative correlation. He said that FA and FR are the only variables that appear correlated at all; many variables show no correlation. He said this shows that the variables measure things that are different and statistically independent, and therefore should not be averaged.

He said that he was looking for numbers that lined up. He said that he took the ones that had at least a moderate correlation, and he plotted those. He pointed toward another chart with the CS variable on a plot with everything else. He said that none of these lined up on a line, which again meant that the items should not be averaged. He said that he had found no variables that made sense to average. He said that these functions were capturing either random numbers or independent features.

He said he then looked at values and did the same analysis, and found the same pattern. He said the values did not correlate and therefore should not be averaged. He said that values were typically either zero or large, with no correlations and nothing lining up on a line, and therefore should not be averaged.

Dr. Geiger said that he understood the functions; however he said he did not understand the values. He said he thought that functions and values should be highly correlated and line up, but they did not. He said what he found was a banding phenomenon. He pointed toward a function. He said that if the function was zero the value was always zero, however with a function of two or eight, the values turned up as bands. He pointed toward a function score of four with a value of 10. He pointed toward other functions rated as 6.5 with a value of 0.

He said the one that he explored the most was the anadromous fish score, and referred again to the banding. He said he tried to figure out how it received the value. He said that the scores seemed to reflect Willamette Valley conditions with remnant pockets of fish. He said that the values show that it gets a higher score if it's in an administrative unit, not because it's more valuable spawning habitat. The other part of the score is based on proximity to or within a subsistence fishery. He said that the most important subsistence fisheries are sockeye, and sockeye are lacustrine species that do not utilize wetlands, so this seems misplaced. He said the other point that comes into play is evidence of fishing. He said that what's missing is an assessment of our saltwater fisheries. He said that this particular value has been calculated incorrectly, and he is waiting for an explanation of how he is incorrect.

He stated again that the relationship between functions and values is not intuitive, and that values should be placed on the shelf until we understand them better, and instead work on the functions. He said that he has only looked at one of the values, and it's possible that he would agree with the rest of them.

Dr. Geiger suggested using the functions as a basis for categories. He used the example of which shoes to choose for a particular activity, which can't be done through averaging. He suggested going through one function at a time to look at where 80 percent of values lie to show a high value wetland for anadromous fish. He suggested going through the first variable to find all the wetlands that can be called high value based on that variable, then go through the next variable and find all the high value wetlands for that variable, then take another percentile and continue to go through it one variable at a time.

He said that if we do this one variable at time, we might find that we put all the wetlands into high value, and that would not be helpful. If that happens, then we would need to go back and adjust the percentiles, and we might use different percentiles for different variables. He stated again that categories were necessary to compare one wetland to another.

Mr. Medina asked Dr. Geiger why he did not bring up his concerns earlier, noting that the methodology was approved by the Board in January 2014. Dr. Geiger said he had expressed reservations in the past, that this was the first time he had to look at the data, and that the board had not approved how we would develop categories. He said this was his first opportunity to look at the hundreds of calculations involved.

Mr. Miller asked Dr. Geiger to go over the values and functions again, noting that it's the value assessment that Dr. Geiger did not agree with.

Mr. Campbell said that Dr. Adamus has said many times that the values are subjective and based on the bias of the community, and therefore Dr. Adamus himself did not rank wetlands.

Dr. Geiger said that Dr. Adamus created the 18 values through some process, and we are tripping over this, and said that he feels Dr. Adamus is off-base on the values for anadromous fish. He said that the Board needs to talk about how we want to place value on functions when we develop a categorization scheme.

Ms. Camery noted that Dr. Adamus had addressed the functions and values issue in his emailed response to the Board that afternoon, and that he had spoken about the values issues extensively in many presentations to the Board and SEALTrust in the past. She said that Dr. Adamus had been clear that these were not his values, that these were values widely accepted by society. She said that she would be happy to compile information from the presentations and from SEALTrust's evaluation of the method, and that the information was also noted in the board minutes.

Dr. Geiger said that board members should determine for themselves how the values were calculated, and that it was not sufficient to defer to other groups who had endorsed the method. Ms. Camery noted the board itself had endorsed the method in January 2014, and the contract for the 360 assessments had gone forth based on that endorsement. Dr. Geiger said that the board had never gotten into the details of how those values were calculated.

Mr. Campbell said that it was difficult because the Board had limited time at the meetings. He thanked Dr. Geiger for his analysis. He said that the Board needed to achieve the result of either recommending a ranking system or not. He said that Ms. Camery's questions were helpful for keeping the board on track to generate the comments needed from the board within the limited time frame that evening. He said that it was important to provide the Planning Commission with something helpful to their review of the plan. He asked for board responses on how to rank wetlands or responses to Ms. Camery's questions.

Mr. Medina asked Ms. Camery when the project was scheduled to go to the Planning Commission. Ms. Camery said that the Planning Commission would have a presentation from Bosworth Botanical Consulting on October 13, and would have a second meeting to develop comments on October 27. Mr. Medina said that the Board needed to come up with a recommendation. He said that he appreciated Dr. Geiger's work, however he said that the Board did not have time to revisit the methodology, that it's too far past to go back and re-evaluate everything and it was necessary to move on.

Mr. Campbell noted that tonight is not the Board's only opportunity for comment and said that he would be willing to spend more time in the future with an appropriate meeting framework.

Dr. Geiger said that he recommended that the Board go forward with a firm recommendation to develop a categorization system based on ranks of the individual functions. He said it would take time to come up with that system and he didn't intend to come up with that system within an hour. He said the system should not be based on averaging.

Dr. Hoferkamp asked about including the values. Dr. Geiger said that the values should not be included until the Board is certain that the values are doing what the Board wants. Mr. Campbell confirmed that Dr. Geiger wanted a more in-depth discussion of the values and then if the board could come to some agreement on their role in the ranking system then we would use them, and if not we would just use the functions. Dr. Geiger said that was correct.

Ms. Wright said she was unsure of how to use values and preferred to review the functions first and review the values later.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Watson said that he understood that the Board would make a recommendation and then come back and re-visit it. He said if that's the case, it would come to the Planning Commission on Tuesday October 13 and then come back on October 27. He said that it didn't seem that the Commission would have anything to look at or talk about on October 27 if the Board was still evaluating and coming up with categorization.

Mr. Campbell said he understood that the Commission would hear the same fine presentation that the Board had heard from the consultants regarding the huge amount of data, and the Commission would have the opportunity to ask questions. He said that from what he heard so far, people had different views on where to go with that. He said that he doubted that the Board would finish their review before the Commission's second meeting. Mr. Watson said that he didn't know if this was the best use of time for the meeting on the 27th.

Ms. Camery said that Dr. Adamus would be back in town to attend the Planning Commission on Tuesday, and the 27th was reserved for in-depth discussion and development of Planning Commission comments.

Ms. Camery noted that CDD comments on the preliminary draft are due to the consultant on November 15. She said that the consultant would provide a second draft of the plan in February. She said that the grant expires in June. She said that CBJ did not have to have the plan finalized and approved by the end of the granting period. She said that the more thorough the comments are to present to the consultants by November 15, the more CDD would get from the consultants during the grant period. She said that the review could continue as long as necessary, however she noted that this is the primary period to get additional information from the consultant before the grant expires.

Mr. Watson noted that the Commission gets a lot of consternation from the public regarding wetlands. He said that if the public can understand it, it makes life a lot easier. He said that he was still confused about what the Commission would talk about on the 27th, and he didn't want to go over the same thing two weeks in a row.

Mr. Campbell said that he was trying to figure out how to make this information and analysis more useful to planners and developers. He said that if a person was looking at development in a specific area, they could go to that area in the plan and look at the functions and values and get that information out of what has already been done. He said that ranking would be nice at some point but he did not feel it was essential at this time, and that a lack of rankings would not diminish the work that had already been done. He said that if the Board rushed into a ranking system that it hadn't thoroughly considered and developed consensus on, it would not be useful to anyone. He said that he shared Ms. Camery's view that we do nothing at this point except to say that we do see potential value in a ranking system but it will take us awhile to develop it. He said that the Board needs to work through the values and whether or not those should have any contribution to the ranking system, then work on how to use the function analysis that has been presented to correlate that. He concluded that he didn't know if the Board should do anything.

Dr. Geiger said that he did not want to get into an examination of who said the values were okay. He said that the board needed to do an analysis of how the values were determined, and he said he wanted someone to look at this very complicated calculation and see if it passes muster.

Mr. Campbell noted that would take more time than the Board has.

Mr. Miller said that even if every board member agreed to take one value each, it would take a long time. He said that maybe a subcontractor could do that work, to come back and legitimize each value. He said that the methodology had been approved on a conceptual basis, and that it was hard to understand the methodology in narrative form. He said that Dr. Geiger's analysis was helpful. He said he agreed with Mr. Campbell that we didn't necessarily need to have wetland categories to move forward. He said that categories could be an implementing action of the plan as a next step. He said that the plan has true and valuable information, and the question is what to do with it. He said the Board could develop implementing actions regarding whether a ranking system was necessary, and if so, how, and then determine if values would be part of that ranking, or just functions. He said that would be two or three implementing actions.

He said that the Planning Commission would not pass the plan off to the Assembly after two meetings without firm approval from the Board. Mr. Campbell confirmed that he was talking about the ranking system, and Mr. Miller agreed.

Mr. Miller said that the Board should take more time and as many meetings as necessary to get information from the contractor, and then forward to the Planning Commission with a firm recommendation. He said that if the plan is good right now, the Board could pass it along with implementing actions and work to be done after it's adopted. He said he would accept that, noting that's how the Comprehensive Plan and other plans work. He said that the work doesn't need to be done before the plan is adopted. For example, the Juneau Economic Development Plan was an implementing action in the Comprehensive Plan, and it was completed that way. He said that the Board needs to tell the Planning Commission that this is ready to go to the Assembly to be adopted.

Ms. Camery thanked the Board for the discussion. In response to the Board's concerns on values, she said she could look into the possibility of a contract amendment to ask Dr. Adamus to come

back for additional board meetings. She noted that Dr. Adamus had been working on these issues for 40 years and said that it was not realistic to expect even the most knowledgeable board members to address these issues themselves. She said there were additional funds left in the grant, and she would check into using those funds specifically for an in-depth discussion of the values and how those are determined, and how the formulas are used. She said she believed that this information had already been presented to the Board, but noted that not every board member attends every meeting and that it is sometimes difficult to consolidate the information. She said that she would put together all the paper documentation that she could find regarding the values issues.

She said that she supports what Mr. Campbell and Mr. Miller said regarding moving forward with the plan in a format similar to the Comprehensive Plan with goals and objectives and implementing actions. She noted that this is standard practice with many plans including the existing JWMP, rather than having everything finalized. She said this would give the city the time to see what happens with the SEALTrust proposal for working with the information, and said that the city could learn a lot from their process. She said that plans are always a work in progress and CDD could continue to update the plan along the way as more information was obtained.

She said that the plan has already proven itself to be useful in the form that it is currently presented. She said that the CBJ Lands Division has already used the assessments for two major subdivisions. She said that Lands presented the assessments to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and it has been a useful and needed tool for them even without the categories. She said it was important to keep in mind that the plan was approximately 90 percent city land.

Ms. Horne said that there seemed to be a need to discuss the issues in more detail. She suggested a subcommittee meeting in a workshop format to meet on the weekend to write down questions that needed to be answered. Dr. Geiger agreed with Ms. Horne and said that it was impossible to get into the nuts and bolts within two hours. He said that the Board needed to have a focused group of people at their computers looking at the issues. He referred to the sparse material he had received regarding values.

Mr. Campbell said that the information was called a plan, however he viewed it as data, an analysis of the wetlands. He said that the recommendation could be not adoption of a plan, but could be adoption of data so it could be used by staff and professionals to benefit the community. He said that this document does not have the elements of a plan. He said it has good value, but it's not a plan, and it's not management. He noted the objectives on page 45, and said that that is not what the plan has done. He said the plan is an assessment, a fantastic assessment, and the information is useful. He suggested that the board stand by the assessment that was done and put it forward to the community with a strong recommendation as a valuable document. He said that the board may or may not agree on values, and the board could use that discussion to move forward with a future ranking. He said he would be willing to spend more time doing that.

Ms. Horne agreed that the plan was a tool, not a management plan.

Mr. Miller suggested a Committee of the Whole meeting with the Board and the Commission on October 27 with Dr. Adamus, as another way to discuss specific issues and ideas. However Mr. Miller supported Mr. Campbell's recommendation to adopt the document as an assessment. He said that it has the foundation of a management plan but it's not one yet.

Ms. Camery said that the plan is essentially an information resource at this point. Mr. Miller agreed.

Mr. Miller asked Ms. Camery what she was asking the Planning Commission to do with the document.

Ms. Camery said she presented the same questions to the Planning Commission as to the Board. She requested that the Commission look at the implementation options; to look at the question on whether to accept it as is as a planning tool and information, or develop rankings; and if rankings or categories are developed, whether it's necessary to develop policies or regulations. She said that from staff's perspective categories and rankings are not necessary for the document to be useful. She said that the city could do that later, however that data could be actively used right now. She reiterated that there were benefits to waiting for the outcome of SEALTrust's process so the city could learn from those results and know what categorization system the Corps of Engineers would accept.

Ms. Wright asked for clarification regarding how the information had been used.

Ms. Camery said that the CBJ Lands Division had presented the assessment information to the Corps of Engineers for development of two major subdivisions, using the wetland scores for the two city properties. She referred to Volume II for an example of a WESPAK assessment score sheet, which shows the raw data without an overall ranking or category.

Dr. Geiger said that he was uneasy with a strong recommendation because he didn't believe that the plan had been evaluated with the care it needs. He said that chemistry was not his area of expertise, however he thought that some things that he thought should be correlated were not, such as carbon sequestration and organic export. He said that these two things should be strongly negatively correlated

Ms. Camery said that Dr. d'Amore had specifically worked with Dr. Adamus regarding the carbon sequestration function, and that this information was in the binder provided to the board when the board approved the methodology in January 2014. She said that she took notes for the peer review process under CBJ's contract with Dr. Adamus and wrote the minutes so she knew it well. She said that there was a large background of study on that topic and others integrated into the methodology. She said that the peer review process with southeast scientists, funded by federal grants obtained by both SEALTrust and CBJ, ensured that the method was tailored to southeast conditions. She said that this tailoring process was on top of the tremendous background of research with the previous version of the method, ORWAP, which has been adopted by the entire state of Oregon.

She said that she appreciated that that Dr. Geiger was looking at this from an outside perspective and understood that it did not correlate with how he looks at things. She said that from a public policy perspective, you would never have any absolute guarantees and you would never have 100 percent certainty. She said there is a tremendous amount of scientific research behind the methodology and a tremendous amount of support for the method by scientific researchers and agency representatives.

Dr. Geiger said he keeps hearing that someone else has done this careful review, but that he sees surprising results. Dr. Hoferkamp agreed that there were some missing correlations. She said that nitrate retention and phosphate retention should be positively correlated. Dr. Geiger disagreed with deferring to other experts and believed the board should do its own review.

Mr. Campbell asked Dr. Geiger if he had looked at the old wetlands maps, and if he could agree that what was presented here was significantly better than the previous version, and that this plan takes a big leap forward. He said that he did not want to see the information stagnate because the Board was not willing to put it forward to the community. He said that the Board does not necessarily need to go any farther than that. He said that the remainder of the existing plan could be left in place and the Board should recommend providing this updated mapping information for future analyses. He asked Ms. Camery if this approach would be useful.

Ms. Camery said that she agreed with Mr. Campbell but needed to make a clarification. She said that the existing plan is woefully outdated and inaccurate and CDD wants to get rid of it. She said the plan does not conform with federal regulations and that CDD therefore has a difficult time implementing the code. She said that the methodology and the code for the existing plan was developed in the 1980s and both are out of date. She further noted that the wetland assessments in that plan were done primarily from imagery, rather than the ground-truthing in the preliminary draft presented here. She reminded the Board that even though there are different versions of the old, existing plan—1992, 1996, and 2008—the wetland maps, assessments, and policies have not changed since 1992. Therefore CDD does not want to carry it forward. She said that the existing plan also reviews very different areas from the new draft plan, because it assessed the developing area of the borough in 1992. She said there are very few overlapping areas between the old existing plan and the new plan, which looks at developing areas along the road system where the city is likely to develop in the next 20 years.

Mr. Campbell said that the Board can't put forward what was presented because the plan portion isn't included. He requested confirmation that this wasn't what we hired the consultants to do; we hired them to do an assessment. He said that developing a plan is a separate process.

Ms. Camery concurred and confirmed the plan was a work in progress. She said that with the data the consultants provided to CDD, CDD would go forward with the public process with the Board, Planning Commission etc. and then decide if CDD wanted to develop the rankings and categories and regulations and policies that were not part of the contract. She said that ranking, categorization, and policy development was specifically not part of the contract because it was acknowledged that this is a public process and not the role of the contractor to decide. She said that categorization brings with it value judgements and what the community believes is most

valuable. She stated that it was not necessary to go that direction now, because the assessments could stand separately from categorization.

She reiterated that the plan is predominantly on city land, and that the city provides a good test case on how to use the information for development purposes. She suggested waiting to see how the assessment information could lead to identifying areas for mitigation; to see how the Corps of Engineers will use the assessment information; and then see how we might develop policies and regulations from there, and also see how we might expand the plan to include more private properties.

Ms. Camery said that the city could use the assessment information to identify a large target area for development and prepare a development and mitigation plan in advance with the approval of a new Corps of Engineers General Permit that would be used just for one specific area. She said that the General Permit could identify development sites with all the planning and mitigation established ahead of time for a large area that would be developed over perhaps a 10-year timeline. She said that with a General Permit there would be an agreed upon way of how the permitting would proceed ahead of time, and then the permitting process would be expedited and predictable and consistent. She said that the Board is most familiar with how the General Permit process worked with the Board's previous General Permit authority from the Corps to issue permits on low-value wetlands in the old plan, but there are many other ways to use a General Permit. She said this is explained in Option Two in the Implementation Chapter in the new draft Volume I. She said she is interested in researching this as a way to use the information for management, and said it could be another goal or objective to add to the plan.

Mr. Campbell said that before developing a new contract with grant funds, the Board would need to work on questions to ask Dr. Adamus before it would be worthwhile. He said that the leftover money in the grant would also be well spent to work more on the plan aspect of the update and how the information would be used.

Mr. Campbell asked if the Board wanted to replace the existing maps with the new assessments. He said he thought that would be a step in the right direction, but noted that the Board would be removing the categories from mapping, because right now we don't have categories.

Dr. Hoferkamp noted that all the current draft does is identify wetlands with the assessments.

Ms. Camery reiterated that there is almost zero overlap between the old and new plans, and said that CDD is not implementing the wetland regulations in the current plan anymore because they do not match Corps of Engineers mitigation regulations. She said that in the presentation to the Board, the consultant referred to the 2008 Corps of Engineers mitigation rule with the mitigation hierarchy, which requires mitigation to first go to mitigation banks, then to fee in-lieu providers, and that permittee-responsible on-site mitigation is the last item in the hierarchy. She said that is a direct contradiction to the Category A wetland regulations in CBJ's current plan. She said that the Category A wetland regulations, as just one example, directly contradict these requirements because Category A wetlands in CBJ Code require on-site, in-kind mitigation. She said that CBJ cannot and does not enforce these regulations anymore.

Mr. Miller said again that the plan is not a plan, but an excellent analysis of a bunch of sites and a testing ground of that analysis. He said that the Board understood that it would be proofed, and when the board had the results on the paper, the board would look at it to see if made sense. He noted that we have one board member who says it doesn't make sense. He said we need to have questions answered to make sure that Dr. Adamus is not incorrect.

Ms. Camery said she supports this but said that the board needs to be aware of timelines. She said that the CBJ's contract process typically takes two months even after the scope of work has been developed, and this assumes that Dr. Adamus has time for the work. She said that with that path she would need a list of questions from the board as soon as possible to ensure that the work can be done within the limited remaining grant period.

Dr. Geiger said that he moved to form a committee to look at a proposed classification scheme with Ms. Horne as the chair and leave it to her to schedule the meetings. Dr. Hoferkamp seconded.

Ms. Camery requested clarification and said that she thought that the committee purpose was to discuss values, not classifications.

Ms. Horne said that the workshop could be used to develop questions for Dr. Adamus or what needs to be clarified to make a recommendation, whatever that might be.

Mr. Medina said he wanted to hear from the consultants.

Ms. Bosworth said that she didn't develop the methodology or run the scores; she said she did the field work. Mr. Medina asked if they had concerns. She said there were a few issues, especially fish issues, and that Dr. Adamus had been good with dealing with those as they came up. She said that they were limited in changes that could be made.

Dr. Hoferkamp asked if the consultants assigned the scores. Ms. Bosworth said she answered questions in the field and the model assigned the scores in the spreadsheet. Ms. Bosworth said it's a rapid assessment method and there were not any measurements made.

Dr. Hoferkamp asked if their results agreed with what they saw in the field. Ms. Bosworth said that she hadn't looked through the scores to analyze the results.

Mr. Carstensen said that final scores were not available until last month and he thanked Dr. Geiger for taking a look. He said that the mapping was magnitudes better than the previous plan. He said that we know where the wetlands are and we can stand behind the units and what kind of wetlands they are, and he said that the answers to the questions are valuable. He explained that they use a field form to fill out on site, then an office form to fill out off-site. He said that the GIS and geography on the project is very solid. He said that they fill out hundreds of questions for every unit and they go under the hood and churn through these formulas to come up with a score. Dr. Geiger asked Mr. Carstensen if he agreed with the metrics, and Mr. Carstensen said sometimes.

Mr. Campbell returned to the motion to request that Ms. Horne organize a workgroup meeting of interested individuals that she would chair, and she would select the members, who would analyze the data in an in-depth fashion.

Dr. Geiger said that we have many unanswered questions. He said that the board needs to look at values, come up with a more specific plan for categorization, and come up with questions for Dr. Adamus. He said that board should leave the terms of reference loose, let the chair capture key things from this meeting that need to be done, and then give it more focused time.

Mr. Campbell said it was hard for him to support the motion without a specific set of guidelines and not knowing what would be generated.

Ms. Horne said she was glad to schedule but did not want to appoint anyone. She said she wanted to have volunteers from the board who wanted to spend the extra time for a few hours on the weekend. She said that some people need more time to formulate questions and exchange ideas, and then as a full board we would look at it. She said she preferred a workgroup to leave it open to whoever wants to be there.

Dr. Geiger modified the motion to clarify that the terms of reference include the question on values, the potential for summarizing scores into categorization, and future questions for Dr. Adamus, and the workgroup would be open to any board members who want to attend.

Ms. Camery said that that sub-committee would need to comply with the Open Meetings Act, and the same requirements would probably apply to a working group. She said she would need to check with the CBJ Deputy Clerk regarding requirements.

Mr. Campbell said that the Board could vote for a working group/sub-committee if it was possible. Ms. Camery that the sub-committee recommendations would need to come back to the full board for approval.

Mr. Campbell asked for a vote on the motion.

In Favor: Campbell, Miller, Horne, Sumner, Wright, Hoferkamp, Geiger

Opposed: Medina

Mr. Medina said that he voted against the motion because no time frame was given. He said that he had no problem with the workgroup, and agreed that issues needs to be reviewed, and that the plan is a work in progress, however the next board meeting is not until November which is past the Planning Commission timeframe. He said that he was unsure that Dr. Geiger would be willing to make any kind of recommendation until the committee had answered these questions.

Mr. Campbell suggested getting back to that recommendation, and acknowledged that the sub-committee could not happen before the next meeting because the board needed to know what the rules were.

He said that if the Board were to recommend that the Planning Commission take this document and replace the current maps with it, then we might be using some of the value of the current maps because they categorize the wetlands, and there is not any overlap between the two documents. He therefore suggested that the Board could ask that this be added to the current maps as an additional tool for analysis for planning purposes.

Dr. Geiger moved the idea as a motion for further discussion. Mr. Medina seconded the motion. Dr. Geiger said he supported the motion.

Mr. Campbell said that they could mention to the Planning Commission that the Board would continue to analyze the document and modernize and update the plan and bring it forward at a future date.

Ms. Camery said she was unsure about adopting the document on top of the current plan and she would need to check into it how that would work. Mr. Campbell said it was either that or do nothing.

Ms. Sumner suggested using the WESPAK assessment for the remaining wetlands. She said that as an example, if someone was going to develop in one of the old wetlands using a category ABCD wetland, the owner would need to do a new assessment with WESPAK, since the city can't implement the ordinances. She said there would be no combination of the scores; no determination of a ranking, just a raw score for consideration if they were going to develop in the designated wetlands.

Mr. Campbell reiterated the intent of the Board of providing the information to the community as a useful tool.

Ms. Camery said she strongly supported using the information as tool but she was uncertain of the rest of the discussion.

Dr. Geiger said that he was in principle opposed to asking the public to go gather expensive data unless there was a clear and specific purpose for how the data would be used.

Ms. Camery said that Ms. Sumner's idea seemed to match Option Three in the Volume I Implementation Chapter that the consultant presented regarding regulation of all city wetlands and requiring WESPAK for all wetlands. She noted that this was described as an aggressive approach with a mandate for all wetland areas to utilize WESPAK. She noted that this approach was moving far from the Board's first comment of using the document as an information resource.

Ms. Sumner said she was unsure of how it would be used for wetlands outside of that mapped area. Mr. Campbell said that we could discuss that in the board analysis of the plan. He said that the Planning Commission should have something from the board with some motion of support on how it might be used. He thanked Ms. Camery for her original questions to keep the Board on target.

Mr. Miller spoke in favor of the motion. He said that the information in the assessment is very valuable and a good example of the type of the information that WESPAK provides. He said that after further analysis by this board and others and SEALTrust and everyone we would be ready to include WESPAK in a JWMP plan that is yet to be written, so in the future all lands will be able to use this assessment tool. He said that this is the path we are on, and because of all that, he supports the motion.

Mr. Campbell asked to refine the motion. He summarized the motion to state that the assessment that has been completed should be added to the existing plan as an additional tool for analysis of wetlands during the planning process.

Dr. Hoferkamp confirmed that the intention is to later categorize wetlands

Mr. Campbell asked Ms. Camery to provide the recommendation to the Planning Commission with a note that the board is working on refining its analysis with the hope of coming up with a ranking system for the wetlands with WESPAK's tool.

Dr. Hoferkamp said that the board needs to look at the information in more detail in more depth

Motion unanimously approved.

Ms. Horne requested calling the subcommittee a workgroup. Ms. Camery said she would have to call it whatever the clerk's office tells her it has to be called, and she would let the board know.

Ms. Sumner said that she had had some wordsmithing edits to offer on the plan, and Ms. Camery said that would be very helpful.

Mr. Campbell asked Ms. Camery if we had answered her questions.

Ms. Camery said that she would like to know if the board felt that the information in the plan was sufficient. She said she would appreciate ways to make the document more user friendly, and she would like to know if there were sections that need more explanation or information, areas to be elaborated on. She said she would appreciate comments regarding the usefulness of the maps and the organization of the plan.

Mr. Campbell said he had more questions on values but did not find any errors in the document. Dr. Hoferkamp requested labeling the tables and to add an acronym list.

Ms. Camery said she would get a color copy of the preliminary draft to Ms. Horne and asked if any other board members needed a printed copy.

Mr. Campbell said that everyone agrees that the board would make recommendations on updating the plan.

Ms. Camery clarified said that the preliminary draft is the update and reiterated that CDD needed to throw the other one out because of its outdated methodology and policies. She said that it did

not matter to her what the plan was called, and suggested calling it a wetlands inventory instead. She said that CDD could not use the 2008 plan any more.

Ms. Horne said that it needed to be a management plan. Ms. Camery clarified that it's a question of order; she said that the management part could come after we develop categories, if and when we decide to develop categories. She said that it seems the board is in agreement of the resource inventory as an informational resource for the CBJ Lands Division to do subdivision planning and for the private property owners to utilize the information. She said that from there the city would go forward to see how or if we choose to categorize and rank, and based on that the city would choose how or if to develop policies or regulations.

Mr. Campbell questioned that this could happen before the grant ended in June 2016.

Ms. Camery explained that CBJ would see how far we could go with the contractors within the limits of the existing timelines and the budget and the contract. She said that after the grant expires it's up to staff, CDD, essentially herself, with the board to keep refining the plan unless another grant can be obtained. She said that virtually every plan is a work in progress. She said that the plan could be finalized tomorrow and then CBJ would continue working on it, because it would be laid out with goals and objectives. She said that it's a just a question of what point the plan is taken forward for approval. She said we could take the plan forward for approval after everything is figured out, or forward it with a list of goals and objectives, and as those goals and objectives are accomplished, update the plan.

She said that the Bosworth Botanical Consulting contract was to complete the assessments with a detailed explanation, and to provide implementation options. She said that BBC has met the terms the contract and confirmed that CBJ did not ask them to do the rest, understanding that categories and policies are regulations are part of a public decision making process and not the role of consultants. She said that she could check into contract options with Dr. Adamus for more details on how categorizing can be done and for more information on values.

Mr. Campbell asked if the granting agency expected a new plan with direction. Ms. Camery said that the grant calls for a draft, not final, knowing that the public process can take a long time. She said that the grant called for development of wetland policies, based on the grant applications that she wrote in 2009. She said that she would explain to the agency that the policies are developed through a public process that goes beyond the contractual period of the grant. She did not see any problem.

IX. Next meeting: Thursday November 19, 5:15 p.m., in City Hall room 224.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:30 p.m.