

Date/Time: Friday, September 21, 2012, 3:00 PM

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

Attendees: Kittitas County IWRMP Land Use and Economic Analysis Citizens Advisory Committee:
Jim Halstrom, Richard Low, Jason Ridlon, Tracy Rooney, Jill Scheffer, David Whitwill, Cynthia Wilkerson
Kittitas County: *Paul Jewell*
URS: *John Knutson, Will Guyton*
PRR: *Amanda Sullivan*
Cascade Economics: *Mike Taylor*

Subject: **IWRMP Ecosystem and Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Land Use and Economic Analysis Project—Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting No. 5**

Meeting Purpose: Review comment responses to the land use and economic analysis memoranda, discuss preliminary economic mitigation strategies, and develop preferred mitigation recommendation.

Welcome & Introductions

- John Knutson welcomed the committee members.

Meeting Purpose and Agenda

- John Knutson reviewed the meeting agenda with the CAC Members.

Review of Final Land Use and Economic Analyses and Responses to CAC Comments

- Mike Taylor summarized the more impactful changes that were made to the Economic Impact Analysis as a result of the CAC's comments.
- Jim Halstrom was concerned over the Economic Analysis's statement that, "...most of the agricultural benefits would accrue to irrigators in Yakima County, not Kittitas County." (5.0 Environmental and Ecosystem Benefits of the TWPEC, Ecosystem Services Benefits, ¶ 1). Cynthia Wilkerson agreed that the statement seemed odd in context of the analysis. The statement will be removed prior to the development of the Final Report.
- Cynthia requested that Table 10 within the Economic Analysis include a net total at the bottom that clearly shows the total cumulative annual economic impacts (including County revenues and expenses). This total should also be included as part of the Executive Summary.
- Paul expressed his concerns over the long-term availability of State and Federal PILT funds. Therefore, he believes the results of the analysis are understated in terms of the financial impacts to the County from the TWPEC. Jill Scheffer requested that the report contain information about the unreliability of PILT.

Review and Discuss Preliminary Economic Mitigation Strategies and Recommended Considerations

- Mike, Paul, and Jill provided a brief description of each of the Funding Options contained within the Economics Mitigation Strategies Matrix.
- The CAC agreed that the State and Federal PILT funding options would need to be included as part of the overall mitigation recommendation because it is assumed that the funding will automatically increase based upon the increase of Federal and State lands acquired as part of the TWPEC.
- The CAC agreed that an Investment Fund would be necessary for the County to achieve the economic benefits associated with the increases in recreation due to the TWPEC. Therefore, it should be included as part of the overall mitigation recommendation.
- The CAC agreed that an Investment Fund could be expanded to include the types of elements outlined in the Community Forest Operations and Forest Health Practices funding option. Therefore, the Community Forest Operations and Forest Health Practices option was removed from consideration.
- John provided a list of recommended considerations to help guide the CAC when selecting recommended Funding Options.

Consensus on CAC Recommended Economic Mitigation Strategies

- The CAC members completed an exercise where they ranked each Funding Option in order of preference. The results of the exercise showed that the CAC strongly agrees that the mitigation recommendation includes a Maintenance Endowment, along with State and Federal PILT and an Investment Fund.