

CPPC Notes 11/24/2020

Attendees: Gary, Melissa, Brian, Phil, Patty, Judy, Jane, Jay, Nicky, Arden, Michelle, Nancy, John S, Darcy, Tom, Mitch

Draft Board

Gary wants to talk with Laura and see where the cities are at. Busy in their own arenas. What contacts has she made? Jay and Gary will take the lead on legislative. We need to get in front of senators and legislators. We reached out to Ibarra when he was starting up and said that it fell more into Dent and Warnick's camp. One-pager for legislative outreach, and to see projects presented in the same way. This is the Chamber's legislative day. Can we get info in CWU and city councils' packets?

Future Funding

RCO ranking, 5 out of 15. RCO has asked for 22 mil, we would have to get the projects funded at 12.2 million! Important to engage with legislation. More advocacy the better! Cathy put together a letter to support RCO's budget to Inslee. USDA grant due Jan 11. Nancy is doing a great deal of work on the draft application. The largest challenge is who would be the applicant? Draft doc is on our Drive. Need to set up weekly meetings with interested parties to finalize the application. Do not need to get the grant but RCO requires a match and would need to understand where to get it. We can resubmit next year if RCO is unsuccessful. If we cannot find a match for the RCO grant, will it impact our second year? Jane believes it will not. We ranked lower due to lack of governance structure, but it is good to get on their radar early. Q and A session next week on RCO grant application, we could understand more about the PDA structure.

Stewardship cost of land. TNC pulled together figures and its approx. 257k for 10k acres of management on the ridge; could be lower with contracting and overlap on list. Larry believes that it could fund itself with board feet pulled off the land. Mitch talked to TNC and carbon credits were also mentioned as funding measures for the forest. However, numbers that carbon credit programs come up with can go way down, but it is a possibility.

Outreach and Engagement

Closed out the survey and have nearly 700 replies! Have the initial data but need to understand priorities, Tonya will be working on over winter. Kate will be working on infographics on top line information and survey data, along with the crisis response material. Darcy has gathered video testimonials from folks and TNC will fund some video editing and outreach and will be making a spreadsheet to make edits to tell different stories aligning with goals of CPPC. Need folks to step up and make a video! Draft rapid response plan resulting from social and print media and misinformation. Reply to Nicky with edits or to sign up to be a subject matter expert. Need folks to be subject experts to contact on specific complaint:

- Gary B – Forest health, fire resilience and local politics
- Mitch – Habitat, community, conservation
- Phil – Forest health and management consultant
- Michele C – Taneum motorized rec and access
- Judy – Bird, wildlife, habitat and hydro/watershed
- Nicky – recreation
- Larry, Toni, Mitch - Local economics

- Jay, Gary, Nancy, Cathy – local governance

Continued discussion on Community Forest Models: See attached charts

Nicky -collaborative model ranked higher than KPRD model, so that says KPRD alone feels unfit, why not look at collaborative model with PDA? Nancy reached an opposite conclusion, KPRD is number one on her list. Existing entity elected and beholden to public. We do not have any say on who is on the board of KCD and MTS but would have a say with KPRD. Mitch, KPRD has said they do not have the capacity and would need a collaborative model. Would need this group to manage the land while KPRD can own. Gary – Know history of KPRD and has serious concerns. Not a lot of success, never managed anything other than mountain bike trail. This is quite a leap for this organization. Would need to see design of what the structure could be and how they could align better. KitCo is here to stay so I like the option proposed by Nicky, but still want to understand org, decision making, and finance on paper.

Phil – Conclusion was who is going to be the fee owner, key driver. Favors KCT as fee owner. If not possible could we make it possible. They could pull the people together to generate the management plan and execute. Let's see something on paper to narrow this down. Title holder can create vision and management plan. Fee owner can be passive or active. More inclined to think that fee owner should be very active. County and Rec dist don't have the experience. KCT can be a fee owner but their board at this point does not support this ownership at this point. They support county ownership (PDA or KPRD). Typically look at critical fish or wildlife habitat and board of KCT does not believe this aligns with that goal.

Phil: Need to know how we want the land to look in 20 years, then plan around that.

Gary: Agree – need to identify the desired future condition. Need to reflect on that. If it is in Parks & Rec's hand, uncertain if forest health will be the driver.

Melissa: Things are fuzzy. Might need to pull together a committee to dig deeper. If a group is formed to dig deeper, would you want to include a legal analysis of the options? The group agreed that legal analysis would be beneficial. The question was asked if the governing board needs to be elected. Arden - elected is less important to me than having a governing entity capable of having operational capacity. Judy - Elected with the caveat of one appointed position from the Yakama Nation

KPRD is supposed to be elected, but they have no funding to hold elections, so they just appoint. Nicky: We originally liked the PDA model because of the high level of public accountability. This isn't as strong with a KPRD model. The election requirement doesn't necessarily increase accountability. Jane - Accountability can inhere in the public participation process adopted, too. Even if the board isn't voter-elected.

Tom: The county would have ultimate oversight of the PDA – keeping it from going off the rails. Otherwise they do the business laid out in the charter. County doesn't usually sit in on conversations. They have better things to do.

PDA can only operate in their charter, gives it great management control, doesn't exist in other models. Elections will not play as much a role. Commissioners are elected. Stakeholders would have ultimate say

on board. Tom believes he has seen that counties have better things to do than nick-pick PDAs. Jay is okay with it but concerned with county governance. Nancy is fine with PDA if they would remove commissioners from the board that are inactive or divisive.

Darcy asked if we would like a legal analysis if a group digs deeper on this. That could be with Preston, Gates, Ellis, which is now Pacifica - they are the experts on PDAs. Gary: as we go forward, we need the best foundation going forward or we will keep stumbling and winding back up here. Need a legal analysis. Nancy: Legal review of charter would be needed as well

Darcy: Nisqually land trust went through a similar review and it might be worth it to have a conversation. They landed on a land trust but did not have PDA on there for consideration

Tom: Would encourage the group to gather stakeholders and take another stab at the charter draft before going to Preston Gates. True up a document with representatives and show to Preston Gates. This group needs to stay in the driver's seat, with course corrections from experts. The way I look at the collaborative model, it seems to be a non-profit. Need a leader and a board, a non-profit under the collaborative approach has not been explored.

ACTION TAKEN:

- **Voted to move forward with USDA Grant**
 - We need \$400,250 to add to our match for the RCO Grant
- **Voted to move forward with Legal Review**
- **Can live with having an elected board**
- **Cannot be KPRD on its own**
- **Need another meeting to discuss ownership of land**

CORRECTION

In regards to Phil Hess' comment on the Forest Health Vision:

It is important to convey to our constituents/supporters that there is more to Forest Health than Stands of Healthy Trees!! (we can fill in the details as needed). Rather we want to emphasize that our DFC/HRV (or whatever term (s) we wish to use) involves all the components of a healthy forest ecosystem -- soils, standing and forest floor decaying wood, etc.

ADDENDUM

Phil Hess requested the following be added to the meeting notes:

My comments reflected my opinion that I believe KCT would be the best fit for the fee owner. One of my primary reasons is that KCT in a NGO and therefore any wood products would not be export restricted -- which is the case of any govt owner including the County.

To me, this is important because I believe, in order to be successful long term, the community forest should be as much as possible financially self supporting. I don't believe it is realistic to expect entirely outside public (or Grant) funding in the long term. In order to be financially self supporting (or even partially) we will want to have access to ALL markets - domestic and export.

Since we have no or very limited local domestic markets we should not hear any objection from domestic processors for our relatively small amount of wood that will enter the market.

If for whatever reason, KCT cannot or is unwilling to be the owner, then I believe we should pursue other ownership options that would not be export restricted. or alternatively seek some political fix.

Now, Having said that, I realize that we do not want the Community Forest to be managed primarily for income from the harvest of trees but rather tree harvest considerations should be primarily driven by desirable forest health outcomes -- but then preferably if there will be a positive financial return -- although this will not always be the case in the development of the desired healthy stand structure and values. Gary B referred to this as DFC, which is ok but is also sometimes elusive to describe. I think this should be defined in our Vision Statement.