



*IWRMP TARGETED WATERSHED PROTECTIONS & ENHANCEMENT
LAND USE AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS PROJECT*

**KITTITAS COUNTY
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING No. 4**

Manastash Room, Kittitas Valley Event Center
May 10, 2012

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

- **Welcome & Thank you!**
- **Citizens Advisory Committee Members** *(Introductions)*
- **Kittitas County Participants**
 - Paul Jewell, County Commissioner, District #1
 - Kirk Holmes, Public Works Director *(Project Manager)*
 - Doc Hansen, Planning Official
- **Consultant Participants**
 - John Knutson, PE, URS Corporation *(Meeting Leader)*
 - Amy Danberg, PRR Inc. *(Meeting Facilitator)*
 - Will Guyton, URS Corporation
 - Julie Blakeslee, URS Corporation *(Land Use Planner)*
 - Michael Taylor, Cascade Economics *(Economist)*

MEETING PURPOSE & AGENDA

- ✓ **Welcome & Introductions**
 - **Present Summary of Land Use and Economic Analyses Results**
 - **Opportunity for Land Owner and Lands Subcommittee Input on Analysis**
 - **CAC Discussion and Feedback on Land Use and Economic Analyses Results**
 - **Discuss Need and Tools for Public Investments and Kittitas County Economic Mitigation**
 - **Next Meeting Dates & Topics**

LAND USE ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

- **Draft Memorandum Included Analysis of:**
 - Land acquisitions (~110,000 acres),
 - National Recreation Area designations (~155,000 acres),
 - Wild and Scenic River designations (~23,000 acres), and
 - Shrub-Steppe Habitat acquisitions/conservation easement (~14,000 acres).
- **Also included review of CAC concerns and benefits**

LAND USE ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Option Name	Current Zoning	Post-IWRMP Action	Estimated Acreage	Potential Use Considerations	Anticipated Change to Use Considerations
Upper Yakima River Basin High Elevation Watershed Preferred Option (Teanaway)	Commercial Forest	Acquisition as a Consortium/ Community or as State Ownership	40,179 acquired	Public Access and Use Recreation Access Environmental Protection	↑ ↑ ↑
	Forest and Range		6,113 acquired	Logging/Timber Utility Access Grazing Opportunities Dams (when federally-funded)	NC NC NC N/A
	Rural-3		846 acquired	Residential/Agricultural Development Solar Development	↓ NC

Notes:

↑ = improves or increases ↓ = degrades or decreases NC = little to no change N/A = not applicable

LAND USE ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Option Name	Current Zoning	Post-IWRMP Action	Estimated Acreage	Potential Use Considerations	Anticipated Change to Use Considerations
Upper Yakima River Basin Forest Habitat Preferred Option (Taneum and Manastash)	Commercial Forest	Acquisition for Public Land	63,005 acquired	Public Access and Use Recreation Access Environmental Protection Logging/Timber Utility Access Grazing opportunities Dams (when federally-funded) Residential/Agricultural Development	↑ ↑ ↑ NC NC ↑ N/A ↓

Notes:

↑ = improves or increases ↓ = degrades or decreases NC = little to no change N/A = not applicable

LAND USE ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Option Name	Current Zoning	Post-IWRMP Action	Estimated Acreage	Potential Use Considerations	Anticipated Change to Use Considerations
Upper Yakima NRA	Unzoned (public land)	Designation of Public Land as NRA and Wilderness	99,818 designated as NRA	Public Access and Use Recreation Access Environmental Protection Logging/Timber Utility Access Grazing Opportunities	↑ ↑ NC NC NC NC
			19,964 designated as Wilderness	Public Access and Use Recreation Access Environmental Protection Logging/Timber Utility Access Grazing Opportunities	NC NC ↑ ↓ ↓ ↓

Notes:

↑ = improves or increases ↓ = degrades or decreases NC = little to no change N/A = not applicable

LAND USE ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Option Name	Current Zoning	Post-IWRMP Action	Estimated Acreage	Potential Use Considerations	Anticipated Change to Use Considerations
Manastash-Taneum NRA	Unzoned (public land)	Designation of Public Land as NRA	35,000 designated as NRA	Public Access and Use Recreation Access Environmental Protection Logging/Timber Grazing Opportunities	↑ ↑ NC NC NC

Notes:

↑ = improves or increases ↓ = degrades or decreases NC = little to no change N/A = not applicable

LAND USE ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Option Name	Current Zoning	Post-IWRMP Action	Estimated Acreage	Potential Use Considerations	Anticipated Change to Use Considerations
Wild/Scenic River Designations for the Upper Cle Elum, Wapatus, and Cooper Rivers	Unzoned (public land)	Wild and Scenic River Designation on Public Land	15,719 designated as Wild and Scenic	Public Access and Use Recreation Access Environmental Protection Dams (when federally-funded) Residential/Agricultural Development	↑ NC ↑ ↓ NC

Notes:

↑ = improves or increases ↓ = degrades or decreases NC = little to no change N/A = not applicable

LAND USE ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Option Name	Current Zoning	Post-IWRMP Action	Estimated Acreage	Potential Use Considerations	Anticipated Change to Use Considerations
Wild/Scenic River Designations for the North, Middle, and West Forks of the Teanaway River	Unzoned (public land)	Wild and Scenic River Designation on Public Land	7,632 designated	Public Access and Use Recreation Access Environmental protection Dams (when federally-funded) Residential/Agricultural Development	↑ NC ↑ ↓ NC

Notes:

↑ = improves or increases ↓ = degrades or decreases NC = little to no change N/A = not applicable

LAND USE ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Option Name	Current Zoning	Post-IWRMP Action	Estimated Acreage	Potential Use Considerations	Anticipated Change to Use Considerations
Shrub-Steppe Habitat Preferred Option (Eaton Ranch)	Forest and Range	Land Acquisition and/or Conservation Easement	11,620 acquired	Public Access and Use Recreation Access Environmental protection Utility Access	↑ ↑ ↑ ↓
	Agricultural (AG-20)		2,211 acquired	Grazing Opportunities Residential/Agricultural Development Wind Farms	NC ↓ NC

Notes:

↑ = improves or increases ↓ = degrades or decreases NC = little to no change N/A = not applicable

LAND USE ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

SUMMARY

- **Future residential development could be reduced with:**
 - Land acquisition under the Teanaway option
 - Land acquisition under the Taneum and Manastash option
 - Shrub-Steppe Habitat Preferred Option
- **Public/Recreation Access and Use, and Environmental Protection would increase for most options**
- **Wild and Scenic River designation would result in minimal land use changes**
- **Wind Farm potential would not change under the Shrub-Steppe Habitat Preferred Option**

ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

OVERVIEW

- **What do we mean by “Economic Impacts?”**
 - Changes to Kittitas County commerce: sales and output, personal income, employment
 - Impacts to County government: revenues and obligations
 - Also urban and rural impacts
- **Not measuring “feasibility of the TWPEC,” as long-term benefits vs. costs**
- **Goal is to understand who is affected and by how much, and what mitigation would be necessary to compensate for the effects of the TWPEC**

ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

TYPES OF IMPACTS MEASURED

- Recreation
- Property Development / Construction
- Agriculture
- Tourist Accommodations
- County Revenues and Expenditures

ASSUMPTIONS AND SCENARIOS CONSIDERED

- Impacts of the Full Recommendation of the Land Subcommittee
- “Public Investment” versus “No Public Investment” in recreation facilities and infrastructure

ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Option Name	Current Uses	Post IWRMP Action	Affected Entities	Units of Measure for Impact	Anticipated Change to Use Considerations
Upper Yakima River Basin High Elevation Watershed Preferred Option (Teanaway)	Timber production	Public Acquisition for Conservation	Landowners	Timber revenues (\$/year)	NC
				Biomass industry development	?
	Grazing		Grazing	Grazing use by permittees	NC
			Recreationists		
	Recreation		• Hunters	Visitor days	↑
	Hunting		• Snowmobilers	Visitor days	↓
	Snowmobiling		• Nordic Skiers	Visitor days	↑
	Nordic Skiing		• Hikers	Visitor days	↑
	Hiking		• Campers	Visitor days	NC
	Camping		• OHV Use	Visitor days	↓
OHV Use	Property Developers	Residential development	↓		
		Solar Development	NC		
Solar development		Kitititas County	Property Tax Revenues	↑	
			Forest Health Management	↑	
Upper Yakima River Basin Forest Habitat Preferred Option (Taneum and Manatash)	Timber production	Public Acquisition for Conservation	Landowners	Timber revenues (\$/year)	NC
				Biomass industry development	?
	Recreation		Recreationists		
	Hunting		• Hunters	Visitor days	↑
	Fishing		• Alpine Skiers	Visitor days	↑
	Snowmobiling		• Hikers	Visitor days	↑
	Skiing		• Campers	Visitor days	↑
			Property Developers	Residential development	↓
			Kitititas County	Property Tax Revenues	↑
				Forest Health Management	↑

Notes:

↑ = increases

↓ = decreases

NC = remains about the same

? = uncertain; depends on new rules (see text)

ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Option Name	Current Uses	Post IWRMP Action	Affected Entities	Units of Measure for Impact	Anticipated Change to Use Considerations
Upper Yakima NRA		Designation of 80% of Public Land as National Recreation Area	Landowners (<i>adjacent private land only</i>)	Timber revenues (\$/year)	NC
			Grazing	Grazing use by permittees	NC
			Recreationists		
	Timber production		Hunters	Visitor days	↑
			Fishers	Visitor days	↑
	Grazing		Snowmobilers	Visitor days	↑
		Nordic Skiers	Visitor days	↑	
	Recreation	Hikers	Visitor days	↑	
	Hunting	Campers	Visitor days	↑	
	Fishing	OHV Use	Visitor days	↑	
	Snowmobiling	Kitititas County	Property Tax Revenues	NC	
	Skiing		Forest Health Management	↑	
	Hiking	Designation of 20% of Public Land as Wilderness	Recreationists		
	Camping		Hunters	Visitor days	↓
	OHV Use		Fishers	Visitor days	↑
			Snowmobilers	Visitor days	↓
	Nordic Skiers		Visitor days	↑	
	Hikers		Visitor days	↑	
	Campers	Visitor days	↑		
	OHV Use	Visitor days	↓		

Notes:

↑ = increases

↓ = decreases

NC = remains about the same

? = uncertain; depends on new rules (see text)

ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Option Name	Current Uses	Post IWRMP Action	Affected Entities	Units of Measure for Impact	Anticipated Change to Use Considerations
Manastash-Taneum NRA	Timber production	Designation of Public Land as National Recreation Area	Loggers	Timber revenues (\$/year)	NC
	Grazing		Grazing	Grazing use by permittees	NC
	Recreation		Recreationists		↑
	Hunting		Hunters	Visitor days	↑
	Fishing		Fishers	Visitor days	↑
	Snowmobiling		Snowmobilers	Visitor days	↑
	Skiing		Alpine Skiers	Visitor days	↑
	Hiking		Hikers	Visitor days	↑
	Camping		Campers	Visitor days	↑
	OHV Use		OHV Use	Visitor days	↑
Wild/Scenic River Designations for the Upper Cle Elum, Wapitus, and Cooper Rivers	Residential	Wild and Scenic River Designation on Public Land	Property Owners	Residential Development	NC
	Recreation		Recreationists		
	Hunting		Hunters	Visitor days	↑
	Fishing		Fishers	Visitor days	↑
	Hiking		Hikers	Visitor days	↑
	Camping		Campers	Visitor days	↑
			Kitititas County	Property Tax Revenues	NC

Notes:

↑ = increases

↓ = decreases

NC = remains about the same

? = uncertain; depends on new rules (see text)

ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Option Name	Current Uses	Post IWRMP Action	Affected Entities	Units of Measure for Impact	Anticipated Change to Use Considerations
Wild/Scenic River Designations for the North, Middle, and West Forks of the Teanaway River	Residential	Wild and Scenic River Designation on Public Land	Property Owners	Residential Development	NC
	Recreation		Recreationists		
	Hunting		Hunters	Visitor days	↑
	Fishing		Fishers	Visitor days	↑
	Hiking		Hikers	Visitor days	↑
	Camping		Campers	Visitor days	↑
Shrub-Steppe Habitat, Preferred Option (Eaton Ranch)	Cattle production Irrigated hay production	Land Acquisition and/or Conservation Easement	Grazing	Grazing use by property owners	NC/↓
			Hay Producers	Irrigation and hay harvest	NC/↓
			Recreationists		
			Wildlife viewers	Visitor days	↑
			Hikers	Visitor days	↑
			Campers	Visitor days	↑
Property Developers	Wind farm developers	?			
	Kitititas County	Property Tax Revenues	NC/↓		

Notes:

↑ = increases

↓ = decreases

NC = remains about the same

? = uncertain; depends on new rules (see text)

ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Teanaway

Summary of Impacts	
Economic Benefits	
◆ Hiking	\$196,719
◆ Snowmobiling	-\$109,802
◆ Construction	-\$500,000
Net Benefits	-\$418,083
County Revenue and Expenses	
◆ Tax Revenue	\$24,280
◆ Expenditures	\$100,000

Taneum and Manastash

Summary of Impacts	
Economic Benefits	
◆ Camping	\$83,183
◆ Hiking	\$262,059
Net Benefits	\$345,242
County Revenue and Expenses	
◆ Tax Revenue	\$100,662
◆ Expenditures	\$150,000

ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Upper Yakima NRA

Summary of Impacts	
Economic Benefits	
◆ Snowmobiling	\$43,921
◆ Non-motorized rec.	\$308,188
◆ Camping	\$83,183
Net Benefits	\$435,292
County Revenue and Expenses	
◆ Tax Revenue	\$0
◆ Expenditures	\$300,000

Manastash-Taneum NRA

Summary of Impacts	
Economic Benefits	
◆ Motorized Rec.	\$254,740
◆ Camping	\$83,183
Net Benefits	\$337,923
County Revenue and Expenses	
◆ Tax Revenue	\$0
◆ Expenditures	\$150,000

ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Wild & Scenic Rivers

Summary of Impacts	
County Revenue and Expenses	
◆ Tax Revenue	\$0
◆ Expenditures	\$100,000

Shrub-Steppe Habitat

Summary of Impacts	
Economic Benefits	
◆ Agriculture	-\$100,000
◆ Wildlife Viewing	\$39,126
◆ Resort Operation	-\$150,000
Net Benefits	-\$210,874
County Revenue and Expenses	
◆ Tax Revenue	-\$16,000
◆ Expenditures	\$50,000

ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Summary of Impacts on Annual Sales, Income, and Employment

Impact Category	With Public Investment		Without Public Investment	
	Direct	Total	Direct	Total
Employment (jobs)	13.0	14.7	-2.8	-4.7
Personal Income	\$422,025	\$471,301	-\$23,018	-\$75,623
Output (Sales)	\$556,054	\$739,688	-\$471,104	-\$644,358

ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Change in Spending in Urban and Rural Kittitas County,
Under "With" and "Without" Public Investment Scenarios
(\$ per year)

	With Public Investment		Without Public Investment	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Private Sector Spending	\$606,470	-\$223,276	-\$576,677	-\$223,890
Public Sector Spending	\$0	\$356,493	\$0	\$156,209
SUBTOTAL	\$606,470	\$133,218	-\$576,677	-\$67,681
TOTAL SPENDING	\$739,688		-\$644,358	

ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY

Change in Tax Revenue in Urban and Rural Kittitas County,
Under "With" and "Without" Public Investment Scenarios
(\$ per year)

	With Public Investment		Without Public Investment	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Sales Tax Revenue	\$9,353	\$1,651	-\$1,658	-\$293
Payment in Lieu of Taxes	\$0	\$108,942	\$0	\$108,942
SUBTOTAL	\$9,353	\$110,593	-\$1,658	\$108,649
TOTAL REVENUE	\$119,946		\$106,992	



LAND OWNER AND LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE INPUT

PURPOSE OF THE CAC:

- Not for or against Lands Committee recommendations.
- Participate in an analysis of land use and economic impacts that could occur if the preferred recommended actions move forward.
- Provide recommendations to the BOCC about possible economic mitigation strategies to pursue.



LAND OWNER AND LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE INPUT

EXAMPLE INPUT TOPICS:

- Are land uses generally correct?
- Are there any limitations on development options?
- Are land use projects considered feasible?
- What is the validity of a wind farm on Eaton Ranch?
- What is the status of the timber/grazing markets and their ability to grow?
- How do the recreational assumptions compare to actual activities?

CAC DISCUSSION AND FEEDBACK

- Looking for questions, suggestions to correct mistakes, make improvements, and/or add clarifications to final report.
- Preliminary Feedback
 - County's remaining issues: Shrub-Steppe development, timing of improvements vs. impacts, certainty of PILT, importance of investment
 - Jill Arango's thoughts on importance of recreation and public investment tools
- Need CAC concurrence to move forward (mitigation approaches).

PUBLIC INVESTMENTS & ECONOMIC MITIGATION

- Why is public investment in improvements needed?
- How will public investments be funded?
- Why is economic mitigation recommended for Kittitas County?
- What is an "economic mitigation" strategy?
- Several economic mitigation concepts:
 - PILT eligibility
 - Endowment Fund from IWRMP
 - Direct annual payments from sponsoring agencies
 - Contracts with land managers
 - Others

NEXT MEETING DATES & TOPICS

Meeting & Topic	Approximate Meeting Dates
✓ CAC Meeting 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review consultant team land use and economic impact analyses results• Obtain CAC feedback• Discuss possible economic mitigation strategies	<i>May 10, 2012</i> Ellensburg
CAC Meeting 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review mitigation matrix• Discuss and refine evaluation• Identify preferred mitigation approach(es)	early June 2012 (Ellensburg)

ADJOURN



