

# Kittitas County Impacts Analysis

Land Use and Economic Impacts Resulting from the  
Habitat/Watershed Protection and Enhancement Element  
of the Yakima Basin Integrated Plan

# Background

- Kittitas County Concerns with the Targeted Watershed Enhancements and Protections Component
  - Disparity Upon Kittitas County
  - Tax Burden Shifts
  - Future Land Use
  - Land Management/Ownership
  - Long-term Impacts



# Response to Concerns

Kittitas County began a study to consider the impacts of the TWPEC in November of 2011 with funding assistance of the Department of Ecology.



*John Knutson, PE  
Julie Blakeslee, AICP  
Will Guyton  
Marissa Gifford*



Cascade Economics LLC

*Michael Taylor, PhD  
Janet Baker, M.F.*



PRR Inc.

*Amy Danberg  
Amanda Sullivan*

# Citizen Advisory Committee

Tony Aronica  
*Central WA Resource Energy Collaborative*

William Boyum  
*DNR (retired)*

David Gerth  
*Kittitas Conservation Trust*

Jim Halstrom  
*WA State Horticultural Association*

Anna Lael  
*Kittitas County Conservation District*

Brian Lenz  
*Puget Sound Energy*

Richard Low  
*Teanaway Valley Resident*

Pamela McMullin-Messier  
*Professor of Sociology, CWU*

Jason Ridlon  
*Alpine Lakes Trail Riders*

Tracy Rooney  
*Teanaway Snowmobile Club, Teanaway Resident*

Jill Scheffer  
*Forterra*

Jan Sharar  
*Kittitas County Conservation Coalition*

Art Solbakken  
*Solbakken Company*

David Whitwill  
*Central Washington Homebuilders Association*

Cynthia Wilkerson  
*The Wilderness Society*

# Land Use Analysis

- Impacts considered on a per-action basis.
- Considered the existing land use designation and zoning.
- Assumed implementation of the preferred alternatives (including ownership).
- Assumed the principles of the lands subcommittee would be realized:
  - Historical “working land” uses would remain.
  - Recreation opportunities improved/enhanced.

# Land Use Analysis Results

**Table ES.1**  
**Land Use Analysis 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	NC
				Utility Access	NC
				Grazing Opportunities	NC
	Rural-3		846 acquired	Dams (when federally-funded)	N/A
				Residential/Agricultural Development	↓
				Solar Development	↓
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	NC
				Utility Access	NC
				Grazing opportunities	↑
				Dams (when federally-funded)	N/A
				Residential/Agricultural Development	↓

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



# Land Analysis Results Continued

Table ES.1 (cont.)  
Land Use Analysis 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 ↑ ↓ ↓ ↓
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
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 Continued

Table ES.1 (cont.) Land Use Analysis 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
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 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



# Economic Impacts Analysis

- Quantify impacts identified – positive or negative.
- Impacts considered on a per-action basis.
- Considered the existing land use designation and zoning.
- Assumed implementation of the preferred alternatives (including ownership).
- Assumed the principles of the lands subcommittee would be realized:
  - Historical “working land” uses would remain.
  - Recreation opportunities improved/enhanced.

# Economic Impacts Analysis

- Impacts are organized for consideration by major category (forestry, agriculture, recreation, land development, county revenues and expenditures, etc.)
- Results presented under two scenarios:
  - With Public Investment
  - Without Public Investment

**Table ES.2**  
**Summary of Annual Economic Impacts, County Revenues, and**  
**County Expenditure Obligations**

Option Name	Category	With Public Investment	Without Public Investment
Upper Yakima River Basin High Elevation Watershed Preferred Option (Teanaway)	Hiking	\$196,719	\$0
	Snowmobiling	\$0	\$0
	<u>Construction</u>	<u>-\$500,000</u>	<u>-\$500,000</u>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>-\$303,281</b>	<b>-\$500,000</b>
	County Revenues	\$24,280	\$24,280
	County Expenses	\$50,000	\$0
Upper Yakima River Basin Forest Habitat Preferred Option (Taneum and Manatash)	Camping	\$83,183	\$0
	<u>Hiking</u>	<u>\$41,539</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$124,722</b>	<b>\$0</b>
	County Revenues	\$6,922	\$6,922
	County Expenses	\$50,000	\$0
Upper Yakima NRA	Snowmobiling	\$43,921	\$4,392
	Non-motorized rec	\$308,188	\$30,819
	<u>Camping</u>	<u>\$83,183</u>	<u>\$8,318</u>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$435,292</b>	<b>\$43,529</b>
	County Revenues	\$0	\$0
Manastash-Taneum NRA	Motorized rec.	\$254,740	\$25,474
	<u>Camping</u>	<u>\$83,183</u>	<u>\$8,318</u>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$337,923</b>	<b>\$33,792</b>
	County Revenues	\$0	\$0
	County Expenses	\$150,000	\$50,000
Wild/Scenic River Designations	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
	County Revenues	\$0	\$0
	County Expenses	\$100,000	\$100,000
Shrub-Steppe Habitat, Preferred Option (Eaton Ranch)	Agriculture	-\$100,000	-\$100,000
	Wildlife Viewing	\$39,126	\$39,126
	<u>Resort Operation</u>	<u>-\$150,000</u>	<u>-\$150,000</u>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>-\$210,874</b>	<b>-\$210,874</b>
	County Revenues	-\$16,000	-\$16,000
<b>TOTAL ECONOMIC IMPACT</b>  By Major Sector	County Expenses	\$50,000	\$50,000
	Agriculture	-\$100,000	-\$100,000
	Construction	-\$500,000	-\$500,000
	Recreation	\$1,133,782	\$116,447
	<u>Accommodations</u>	<u>-\$150,000</u>	<u>-\$150,000</u>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$383,782</b>	<b>-\$633,553</b>
	County Revenues	\$15,202	\$15,202
	County Expenses	\$600,000	\$250,000
<b>NET TOTAL</b>		<b>-\$201,016</b>	<b>-\$868,351</b>

# Economic Analysis Results Continued

**Table ES.3**  
**Summary of Impacts on Annual Sales, Income, and Employment**

Impact Category	With Public Investment		Without Public Investment	
	Direct	Total	Direct	Total
Employment (jobs)	9.9	10.8	-2.9	-4.9
Personal Income	\$295,393	\$332,003	-\$62,157	-\$117,996
Output (Sales)	\$336,932	\$440,860	-\$495,209	-\$680,072

# Economic Analysis Results Continued

**Table ES.4**  
**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	\$441,401	-\$223,450	-\$552,535	-\$223,944
Public Sector Spending	\$0	\$252,909	\$0	\$96,406
SUBTOTAL	\$441,401	\$29,459	-\$552,535	-\$127,538
TOTAL SPENDING	\$440,860		-\$680,072	



# Economic Analysis Results Continued

**Table ES.5**

**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	\$7,913	\$1,396	-\$1,093	-\$193
Payment in Lieu of Taxes	\$0	\$15,202	\$0	\$15,202
SUBTOTAL	\$7,913	\$16,598	-\$1,093	\$15,009
TOTAL SPENDING	\$24,512		\$13,916	

# Economic Mitigation Strategies

- Key Considerations:
  - Analysis predicts new service-related costs associated with the TWPEC of the integrated plan unique to Kittitas County.
  - Relying on PILT revenue as mitigation is risky.
  - Investments in recreation infrastructure are necessary to receive the predicted benefits.
  - Funding will be needed to implement the preferred alternative for the Teanaway acquisition as a Community Forest.

# Mitigation Recommendations

- Federal PILT – Increase of \$17,666.80 per year.
- State PILT – Increase of \$36,296.00 per year.
- Maintenance Endowment Fund
  - \$15 million one time payment recommendation
  - Earnings utilized as a revenue source for ongoing expenditures.
  - Annual 4% ROI, \$600,000 per year in earnings.
  - Principle to remain in perpetuity.

# Mitigation Recommendations Continued

- Community Forest Operations and Forest Health Practices Fund
  - Support the implementation and operation of the Community Forest Board and forest management upon Teanaway acquisition.
  - Model is to be self-sustaining, but considering the current state of the land, significant time will be needed to achieve that goal.
  - Amount not quantified at this time.
- Investment Fund
  - Utilized for recreational improvements/enhancements.
  - \$5 million initial investment.

# Next Steps

- Kittitas County Board of Commissioners Action.
- Incorporation into the Integrated Plan.

