**CBJ Wetland Review Board WESPAK-SE Overview Meeting with Dr. Adamus – March 12, 2016**

**DRAFT - Facilitation Notes**

Presentation Highlights:

* Important Terms and Definitions used in WESPAK-SE
	+ Functions
	+ Values
	+ Indicators (Office and Field)
	+ Models
	+ Attributes
	+ AA – specific wetland or sub-wetland
* Validity of WESPAK-SE Method
	+ Method Limitations (based upon Rapid Assessment criteria)
	+ Assumptions (framing each of the functions and values used in the method, calculations, weightings)
	+ Repeatability (questions used in data collection, benefits of redundancy)
	+ Peer review/subject matter expert input (workshops used in development of method)
	+ Data Collection (used in refinement of the method)
	+ Goal for scientific integrity to be preserved through the public process involved in applying the method
* Method
	+ Desk and Field questions
	+ Data spreadsheets
	+ Spreadsheet calculations
	+ Normalization process
	+ Ranking process (Jenks Optimization)
	+ Documentation provided in spreadsheets and manuals

Items identified for further discussion:

* WRB meeting with Dr. Adamus (March 24th)
	+ Note – WRB needs to complete a previous obligation during this meeting
	+ Note – reason for follow-up meetings with Paul is to complete last requirements of contract
	+ Complete review of all calculations for functions and values used in the method (\*request for a cheat sheet of some sort to help WRB and others to easily see calculations for each of the functions and values)
	+ Review the unanswered list of WRB questions from the March 12th meeting
	+ Review confidence in metrics used to calculate each of the function and value scores to help inform options for rolling up the scores (homework assignments for Paul, interested WRB members, also part of the SEAKFHP sponsored Technical Review process)
	+ Discuss anadromous fish function and value scores specifically, how does the WRB want to include these in the final roll up summarization?
* WRB meeting with Dr. Adamus (April 7th)
	+ Complete any unaddressed items from March 24th meeting
	+ Discuss consideration of the CBJ AA selections and discuss implications (lack of reference to all wetland areas in CBJ/reference to other wetland sites in SE/comparison to other uses of WESPAK-SE in the region, such as SEAL Trust In Lieu Fee Credit/Debit proposal
		- Discuss WRB interest in looking at normalization process for current 332 CBJ AAs – is there interest in normalizing this differently?
		- Are their options for adding in additional data (example off site options; Tier II approach used in Alberta)
		- Needs to be a consideration for any future data collection contracts
	+ Discuss summarization process for the CBJ data
		- What is the role of the WRB for recommending a process?
			* Is there a charge for the WRB?
			* Teri noted the CBJ would like to have a scoring method that is acceptable to the ACOE
		- SEAL Trust presentation opportunity – by the date of this meeting, SEAL Trust (Allison) will be able to share an update on the summarization process they will present to the ACOE as part of their In Lieu Fee work
		- Review summarization options shared by Paul
		- Consider ranking option proposed by Chris
		- As needed discuss how rolling up functions and values may play a role in overall summarization. Are functions the priority? How do values contribute? How can weighting be applied? Discuss options for applying values
		- Discuss Jenks Optimization method used to understand how this impacted the ranking scores; others have used %; discuss as needed
* WRB meeting with Dr. Adamus (April 21st)
	+ Complete any unaddressed items from April 7th meeting
	+ Continue discussion on life of assessments (note language currently provided in draft CBJ Juneau Wetland Management Plan)
		- Should the plan note options for periodic checks?
	+ Discuss how future changes in the method may impact the current work completed by the CBJ
* Other WRB meetings
	+ Complete any unaddressed items from April 7th meeting
	+ Discuss and assign tasks as needed to address how the WRB will proceed in scoring the CBJ assessments
* SEAKFHP Sponsored Technical Review
	+ The WESPAK-SE method normalizes the data based upon the selection of AAs under consideration, is their interest as part of the review to consider a preferred process for developing a norm or standard for SE?