

## **CPPC 9/28/2020**

**Attendees:** Brian, Darcy, Melissa, Mike H, Judy, Nicky, Mitch, Gary, Andrew, Chris M, Jay M, Martha

**Chris Martin concerns:** KPRD1 Commissioner, adjoining landowner, personal vision for the ridge above Roslyn for quiet recreation. Concerned about land management, stewardship and fire. TNC is doing fantastic job.

Concerned with new quasi-municipal entity acquiring land with tax money, landlocked without fully established permanent legal access other than Teanaway, taking off tax role, money to manage, no public process to prioritize of land acquisition. Fully supports idea of community forest, lots of other community needs. If Community forest is established today, the easements on private land would drive up cost of lands. Need to do concurrently with this project. Alliance Rd easement is for land management and timber, not public access. Simply wants to make sure that access is permanent, out of Cle Elum and Ronald. Need to acquire land to do so? Expand your scope to look at holdings down the ridge. Managing land is expensive, need a continuous flow of cash.

Jay: Priorities and how much money comes into the public. Forest is long term, most important to prioritize

Money is specifically set aside for community forest RCO program, 20 other applications. PDA was established as the best route with many public and private partners. Non taxing entity. There is not legal recreation access across our land but TNC has public documents which allow access. As it transfers to community, they can address the access as it will be public land as TNC is only the manager, so we have not established. There is however permanent access, not just an island: Alliance Rd easement, RUF via Bambrick, Towns to Teanaway is working on easements. Mitigating threat to access would be working with Chris to detail access on private land, including his land. Is this committee willing to expand their scope to other private land including Chris's? We have limited time to hand off TNC land, immediate threat this group has rallied around. This RCO grant is perfect to apply for other land acquisition so expanding scope. Perhaps a memorandum of agreement/understanding can be forged between the two entities to pursue recreational easements.

Gary: Agrees with Chris, challenge is to find a solution which adds value to everyone's land. We can jointly find a way to do this.

**Jill Schaffer's concerns:** Andrew reached out to Jill; Jill posted publicly on many Facebook posts

Jill disagrees strategy of temporary holding the land then divesting. Stated that TNC said they would not be using public funding to transfer the land. Upset that TNC should just buy the land or do private fundraising and keeping the land and managing in perpetuity. Land should be donating and TNC has the means to do so. Melissa responded to Facebook post which eluded to a longer comment. James Schroder and Martha are reaching out.

Opportunity to have a good long talk with Jill. Her view for how conservation land is now managed is a little old-school. Fortera held on to ownership model longer than others so it makes sense that Jill would be against using it to transfer land. Disappointed that she chose to

vocalize concerns in public forum with out going to people she knows. Gary agrees that TNC never espoused what exactly they would be doing in the future, other than working to protect it. Need to close educational gap of landowner/manager scenario for the group. Nancy Lilliquist has reached out.

### **PDA needs to be established**

Darcy is scheduling public hearing, might need to step backward and look at messaging and pathways to showcase better. Otherwise, it could buckle under misconception. What is the timeline for this meeting? Established narrative and public perception is critical for this project. A negative narrative is hard to overcome. Given the grant app and KCT sponsorship we can take our time with the PDA meeting. Mid November. Can future funding look at endowment and management strategy to be ready for BoCC public meeting? Brainstorm creatively on structure which evolves over time. KPRD1 is set up to own and manage land, provides municipal indemnification for TTT. BoCC appointed PDA board, could take focus from upper County. Chris believes we could get a levy passed with proper strategy.

Would KPRD1 be suitable to take on and manage this land? Yes, structurally. But the current KPRD board lacks the expertise. Transitional, working on moving forward.

Is KPRD separate entity? Yes, separate insurance so not beholden to the County if structure fails. PDA can potentially be transferred to KPRD. Would need to move quickly

Concerned that the county commissioners appoint board, could drain focus to lower county.

Can Chris talk to KPRD about this? – Struggling to get the work done, need some bandwidth. KPRD pull together a special meeting to discuss this. Look into municipal structure of parks and rec district. Chris believe this is a better structure than a PDA.

Rec is just one of the focus of this CF. Terrestrial and aquatic health, timber and resilient landscape and communities. KPRD would need to manage in this way, which might not be in their scope of work. – King County PR does burns and land management. Would need to be inserted into the charter.

Currently have gap between CPPC and KFACC, who is moving forward on strategies and priorities on Cle Elum Ridge. Chris could be that conduit.

### **Create video!**

Set up a date in which folks and meet and record videos.

### **Sign the RCO letter of support!!!**

<https://createmysignature.com/>