

ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING
JULY 14, 2010

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. PUBLIC COMMENT
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
4. DISCUSSION TOPICS
 - INTRODUCTION TO CITY COUNCIL LIAISON, BARRY PETERS
 - SHORELINE SCIENCE MEETINGS FEEDBACK
 - ETAC SUBCOMMITTEE PROGRESS REPORTS
 - UPDATE ON ANY SHORELINE ISSUES, PROGRESS, ETC.
 - IDENTIFYING SPECIFIC ISSUES AND ITEMS FOR ETAC TO ADDRESS
5. OTHER BUSINESS
6. PUBLIC COMMENT
7. ADJOURN

1. CALL TO ORDER

Ryan Ericson called the regular meeting of the Environmental Technical Advisory Committee (ETAC) to order at 3:05 p.m. in the Council Conference Room. ETAC members Greg Geehan, Kathy Peters, Mark Bryant, Chris Waldbillig, and Marc Boule were in attendance.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Charles Schmid announced that the Association of Bainbridge Communities (ABC) and the Bainbridge Island Land Trust (BILT) will have an educational event on shoreline processes on October 17th, starting at 1:00 p.m. and including dinner. More information will be forthcoming.

Charles also told the committee that ABC received notice about the formation of the Shoreline Master Program workgroups. He is glad to see that community organizations with different views will be represented on the workgroups and is looking forward to those starting.

Ryan explained that there will be three workgroups, each of which will work on a specific issue area (Native Vegetation and Definitions, Nonconforming Uses and Structures, and Shoreline Modifications). Each workgroup will have seven members and will meet four times between September and December. Each workgroup will select three members to be part of the Advisory Task Force. The Task Force will meet from October to March and will deal with overlaps between the workgroups and work on the general policies.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Chris Waldbillig made a minor correction at the bottom of page 2 of the June 14th minutes. Marc Boule moved that the minutes be approved as corrected. Greg Geehan seconded the motion, which then passed unanimously.

3. INTRODUCTION TO CITY COUNCIL LIAISON, BARRY PETERS

Council member Barry Peters introduced himself, saying that he had been elected by the full City Council to serve as the liaison to ETAC and noting that many of the city's committees and commissions have liaisons. He believes that he was elected because he knows relatively little about the topic on which the committee is working. Barry said that he had the pleasure of having

ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING
JULY 14, 2010

a couple of conversations with ETAC Chair David Sale and that he participated in the interviews for new committee members.

Barry also told the members that ETAC has great potential to be a very credible organization and lend a solid science grounding to the shoreline update process. The Council hopes the update process will be fair and balanced and talk to the state law without building a test case for the state law says.

The line graphs that were distributed represent Barry's suggestion about how the committee's work may be structured. The council members would benefit knowing the five or six conceptual drivers of the update process. The graphs illustrate a spectrum of potential policies for each of the drivers. He also thinks it would be interesting to have a Y axis showing how close each of the options comes to meeting the goal of no net loss. Barry said that he really looks forward to working with the committee to identify those driving policies and welcomes any suggestions on how to improve the graphic.

Marc Boule remarked that it's very useful for the members to have some understanding of what the City Council is looking for and how they can help the City Council move forward.

Barry said that another way that he can help the committee is take questions back to the full City Council for feedback from them.

Mark Bryant thanked Barry for the conceptual idea of how to address things. He feels that the committee's role is not so much to determine how far right or left on the scale the update should go, but to say whether or not the proposed regulation or policy can be supported by the available science.

4. DISCUSSION TOPICS

- *Shoreline Science Meetings Feedback*

Charles liked the Hugh Shipman presentation. Jola Greiner commented that she would like to hear an objective and an explanation of how the information will be used at the beginning of the meeting. Charles added that he also thinks that the facilitated questions work.

Chris Waldbillig remarked that he would like to see more people at the meetings, yet feels that the city is doing a good job of getting the word out. Ryan replied that people may be choosing to view the meetings online or on BITV instead of attending.

Some people don't know how to find the videos. Ryan told the attendees that the video is posted to the web calendar on the date of the meeting. Theresa added that clicking on any day brings up an option of entering Shoreline Master Plan Update and a date range to bring up links to the video, audio, and minutes for all the events. She added that the minutes from those sessions are basically transcripts, so that people have the option of reading what was said. After some discussion, it was agreed that those links will be added to the Chronology.

Ryan introduced Morgan Hauk, the city's Shoreline Intern who is working on the education series, arranging for the science forum panelists and other tasks. He also told the committee that

ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING
JULY 14, 2010

Ron Thom's presentation on the Nearshore Assessment has been rescheduled for July 27th and that the science forum has been scheduled for September 16th.

- *ETAC Subcommittee Reports*

Mark Bryant reported that the No Net Loss Subcommittee has been struggling with where is the line, how wide is the line, and how gray is that line. They've been looking at the newly released Chapter 4 in the Handbook and trying to establish the baseline. What inventories? Are they sufficient?

When the 2004 Nearshore Assessment and the scoring in that were mentioned, Ryan asked Steve Morse to speak briefly about how he is updating the information from that assessment. Steve said that all the permit information from 2004 until now has been entered in the spreadsheet and that there really hasn't been much change. Ryan added that the Battelle is preparing a new analysis similar to the East County assessment, which is expected to be released in November or December.

Mark said the subcommittee is looking if they can identify the ecological functions in sufficient detail to measure it and monitor it. They are also trying to put together a table of ecological functions specific for Bainbridge Island.

Barry asked if the committee will consider some sort of scale on impacts so that it can be offset for individual projects. Mark replied that under the Guidelines impacts are supposed to be balanced with mitigation and restoration. Whether you can tell when an activity is being fairly assessed all depends on whether or not you can identify and measure the ecological functions.

Ryan said that achieving that balance is part of the cumulative impacts analysis and noted that an RFP for a consultant to help with impacts analysis has been published. He hopes to have the consultant hired by August.

Greg said that he would like to do what Barry is suggesting but thinks it is seriously doubtful if they can come up with a defensible structure. He is thinking that it is important for the city to decide what measures to use.

Greg commented that a clear, short definition of ecological function is needed and hasn't been found.

Chris said that another issue the no net loss subcommittee has been discussing is on what scale to measure – lot, drift cell, reach, island wide? The problem is that the larger you go the more difficult it is to measure and he doesn't think the law will support looking at it from the standpoint of an individual lot.

Greg wrapped up the report by saying that the subcommittee will develop a draft discussion paper for the committee's review and discussion.

ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING
JULY 14, 2010

Marc reported that the vegetation buffer subcommittee has only had one brief meeting. They asked themselves what is supposed to be protected and have generated more questions than answers at this point.

Kathy added that the subcommittee spent a lot of time on “no net loss”, native versus non-native vegetation, and setbacks versus buffers, as well as the difference between a use and a structure.

Greg remarked that no net loss seems to be developing as an umbrella issue.

- *Update on Shoreline Issues, Progress, etc.*

As reported earlier, the RFP for a consultant on the cumulative impacts analysis closes tomorrow and staff expects to have completed the selection process for the consultant by August.

- *Identifying Specific Issues and Items for ETAC to Address*

It was agreed that designations will be a discussion topic for the next ETAC meeting. The committee asked staff to provide technical questions for discussion before the next meeting. They then decided to split shoreline modifications into two topics – overwater structures and armoring. Kathy and Marc will be on the overwater structure subcommittee and Chris, Greg, and Mark will be on the armoring subcommittee.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

Jola said that she got the impression that ETAC wasn't going to evaluate specific scientific documents and Greg responded that they will be reporting on an issue basis.

7. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.