

Date/Time: Thursday, May 10, 2012, 3:00 PM

Location: Manastash Room, Kittitas Valley Event Center, 512 N Poplar Street, Ellensburg, WA 98926

Attendees: Kittitas County IWRMP Land Use and Economic Analysis Citizens Advisory Committee:
Jill Arango, Tony Aronica, David Gerth, Jim Halstrom, Brian Lenz, Pamela McMullin-Messier, Jason Ridlon, Tracy Rooney, Jan Sharar, David Whitwill, Cynthia Wilkerson
Kittitas County: *Paul Jewell, Kirk Holmes, Doc Hansen*

URS: *John Knutson, Will Guyton, Julie Blakeslee*

PRR: *Amanda Sullivan, Amy Danberg*

Cascade Economics: *Mike Taylor*

Special Attendees: *Representatives of AFH, Eaton Ranch, and Daily Record*

Subject: **IWRMP Ecosystem and Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Land Use and Economic Analysis Project—Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting No. 4**

Meeting Purpose: Review and discuss the land use and economic analysis results, receive property owner input, discuss preliminary economic mitigation strategies.

Welcome & Introductions

- John Knutson welcomed the committee members and guests, and the attendees provided a roundtable self-introduction.

Meeting Purpose and Agenda

- Will Guyton reviewed the meeting agenda with the CAC Members.

Present Summary of Land Use and Economic Analyses Results

- Julie Blakeslee provided a quick overview of the results found in the Land Use Analysis Memorandum. This included a summary of the total acres analyzed for each option within the TWPEC and anticipated changes that could occur to land use within each option area.
- Mike Taylor defined the process he used to develop the Economics Impact Analysis Memorandum and provided a summary of its results. This included the types of impacts that were measured, the assumptions and scenarios considered, the anticipated summary of economic impacts to the local economy and County revenue and expenses within each option area. Also provided were summaries of impacts on annual sales, income, and employment; changes in spending; and changes in tax revenue.

Opportunity for Land Owner and Lands Subcommittee Input on Analyses

- Amy Danberg provided some introductory information to the guests from the Eaton family and AFH (David Bowen) regarding the purpose of the CAC. John Knutson provided additional information and some example input topics for discussion. The floor was then opened for the ownership groups to discuss their feedback or bring up any questions that they may have regarding the Land Use and Economic Impact Analyses.

Opportunity for Land Owner and Lands Subcommittee Input on Analyses (continued)

- David Bowen confirmed the range of lots that would be lost in the Teanaway and gave a quick status of the current timber market for the area and the current grazing activity/market. David stressed that one of the talking points during discussions of the sale of the land was that snowmobiling would be allowed to continue. David also mentioned that the Teanaway Solar Reserve site would not be included in the sale of the property.
- The Eaton family expressed concern over the amount the Economic Analysis showed in annual expenses associated with their ranch (grazing and farming). They also expressed their concern over how this project and the overall IWRMP are going to affect them and their ranching operation.

CAC Discussion and Feedback on Land Use and Economic Analyses Results

Land Use Analysis Comments and Feedback

- Jim Halstrom asked how analysis concluded on the number of developable parcels (theoretical vs. real) in the Teanaway. Paul Jewell explained the formula used to generate the number of parcels in the analysis. Jim was concerned over the lack of water available to provide for the potential parcels. Paul explained that there were other options for obtaining water rights, and that the consensus was that the analysis needed to consider the impact to the County due to the loss of these potential lots.
- Cynthia Wilkerson pointed out a discrepancy in the amount of acres of land analyzed under the Plum Creek land acquisition option between the land use analysis (~63,000 acres) and the TWPEC (~10,000 acres). The Land Use and Economic Impact Analyses will be edited to reflect the proper acreage.

Economic Impact Analysis Comments and Feedback

- Tracy Rooney commented on his concern that the memo shows a decrease in snowmobiling within the Teanaway. David Bowen stated that the use of snowmobiles is the only motorized vehicle usage that is currently permitted within the Teanaway and it would continue to be allowed under the acquisition for the TWPEC. Mike Taylor will change the analysis memo to reflect no changes to snowmobiling in the Teanaway.
- Jim Halstrom asked how the cost to the County (in services) was mitigated when considering the loss of developable land. Paul Jewell explained that the economic analysis assumed that the revenue in property taxes was approximately equivalent to the cost for the County to provide services; therefore, they would cancel each other out. Jan Sharar and Jill Arango asked that the assumptions be defined more within the analysis and some documentation be referenced to justify the assumptions. Mike Taylor stated that this assumption was based upon the relevant literature that he reviewed for this analysis.
- Jim Halstrom asked that an executive summary be provided to show a bottom line for all the costs and benefits. John Knutson stated that a final report will be generated that includes both analyses, the CAC process, and the mitigation strategies and recommendations. This final report will contain an executive summary.
- Jill Arango would like to see language within the documents revised to be less assumptive that the concepts will have a negative impact on the County (e.g., use more “might”, “could”, “if”).
- Jill Arango asked if the total cost of anticipated expenditures to the County is additive when considering all of the project components of the TWPEC (costs and FTE); the concern is whether this number is defensible.

CAC Discussion and Feedback on Land Use and Economic Analyses Results (continued)

Economic Impact Analysis Comments and Feedback (continued)

- Cynthia Wilkerson commented on how the analysis lacks information on the benefits of salmon recovery. She would like to see some analysis in these areas, or, if not, some narrative as to why they are not being analyzed (in particular, the Teanaway). Paul Jewell stated that he thinks that the salmon recovery piece is more related to the entire IWRMP and not the TWPEC; therefore, it is difficult to carve out the financial benefits of salmon recovery within the actions of the TWPEC just to Kittitas County. John Knutson stated that without quantifiable data showing the actual benefits to salmon (EDT model) within the TWPEC, all that can be done is provide a statement that the TWPEC actions could result in improvements to salmon productivity. Jill Arango would like to see some language added to the analysis that discusses the approach and assumptions used to consider the benefits of salmon recovery.
- Tracy Rooney asked for more clarification as to why such a difference between the results for with public investment and without public investment. Mike Taylor talked about the process he used to come up with these numbers and the factors that affected them (e.g., participation capacity, potential for visitation).
- Jill Arango would have more discussion on the recreational economic benefits associated with the Yakima River Canyon Scenic Byway, the conservation of the Eaton Ranch, and the construction of the Wymer Reservoir. Jill offered to assist Mike Taylor with the assumptions on how to come up with that information. Cynthia pointed out that the dam is not a part of the TWPEC and is not being considered as part of this analysis.
- Jason Ridlon asked about what the benefits are to designating land as an NRA. Paul Jewell stated that the NRA designation is being used to memorialize the recreational use of the land through an Act of Congress to ensure recreational activities are permanently available, and to provide flexibility for how the land is managed, operated, and maintained.

Next Meeting Dates & Topics

- The next CAC meeting was tentatively scheduled for early June in Ellensburg; however, this is being delayed until the completion of a mitigation matrix. At this next meeting, the Committee will be reviewing the Mitigation Strategies Matrix and discuss a final mitigation recommendation.