



Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Thurston Regional Planning Council

2424 Heritage Ct. SW, Olympia, WA 98502

Meeting 12 — September 25, 2017

SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting Facilitator and Presenter: Michael Burnham, TRPC

In Attendance:

| Name | Organization |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| Amy Hatch-Winecka | Thurston Conservation District |
| Andrew Kinney | TC Emergency Management |
| Barb Scavezze | Resident |
| Candace Penn | Squaxin Island Tribe |
| Chris Hawkins | TC Public Health |
| Cynthia Pratt | Lacey |
| Dan Smith | Tumwater |
| Jason Robertson | Jason Robertson and Co. |
| Jeanne Kinney | TC Public Works |
| Kelsey Hulse | Puget Sound Energy |
| Mark Mauer | TC Water Resources |
| Rich Hoey | City of Olympia |
| Scott Davis | TC Public Works |
| Scott Morgan | The Evergreen State College |
| Wendy Steffensen | LOTT Clean Water Alliance |
| Barb Tope | Port of Olympia |

Greeting and Introduction

Mike Burnham acted as the facilitator for this meeting. Burnham opened the meeting by having each person present introduce him- or herself.

Presentation: Project Update

Mike Burnham gave a brief presentation updating the stakeholders on the plan's outreach efforts and what the next steps are. Public Outreach included meeting with The Olympian editorial board, presenting to 15 community groups, holding a community forum, posting an online survey, and promoting the project through a video, emailing, and social media. In all, information about the project reached more than 50,000 people.

In October, the project team will post the plan online and ask for feedback from the public; host "Art of Change" at the Arts Walk in Olympia (10/6); and present the board game that accompanies the plan, Resilience Road, at the Northwest Climate Conference (10/10). The final plan will be presented to TRPC on 12/1, with final adoption of the plan in January 2018.

Presentation: BCA Results

Maya Kocian, Senior Program Director at Earth Economics, presented the findings of the benefit cost analyses for two Plan actions:

- **Action 4 (now F-01).** Evaluate and secure sustained funding to restore and protect riparian vegetation along freshwater and marine shorelines
- **Action 58 (now G-12).** Increase incentives to improve the financial viability of infill and redevelopment projects in urban cores.

Riparian vegetation. To analyze the possible benefits and costs to implementing Action F-01, Earth Economics looked at the Deschutes watershed since there is a lot of data available for the watershed. TRPC used the shade allocation targets identified in the Deschutes River total maximum daily load to estimate the change in land cover. There is approximately 345 acres of land within 100 feet of the Deschutes River that is barren, cultivated, developed, or consists of grassland, pasture or scrubland. By modifying some of the existing land cover into riparian forest or wetlands, the watershed would see benefits in the following areas:

- Carbon storage (new vegetation sequesters carbon)
- Recreation (fishing, passive enjoyment, etc.)
- Habitat
- Water supply and storage
- Water quality
- Climate stability
- Soil retention
- Air quality

Costs associated with implementing Action F-01 include the cost of restoration and the cost to obtain land/easements. Over a 50-year period of time, Earth Economics estimates that the benefits to implementing will outweigh the costs, valuing the ecosystem services at between \$27 million and \$122 million. The costs to implementing Action F-01 total \$11 million. Overall, the benefit-to-cost ratio is anticipated to range between 2.4:1 and 10.62:1. In other words, for every dollar spent to implement this action, the region will see at least a \$2.40 return on investment and could be as high as \$10.62.

Incentives for Infill Development. To analyze the benefits and costs associated with implementing Action G-12, Earth Economics looked at the 'preferred land use' scenario for the Thurston Region found in Sustainable Thurston. The idea is to create vibrant centers, corridors, and neighborhood centers while protecting rural lands from being developed. In order to meet this goal, less than 5% of new growth should be located in rural areas outside the urban growth areas.

Increasing incentives for infill development would see benefits in the following areas:

- Carbon storage (preserving existing vegetation)
- Recreation (preserving rural areas)
- Preserving existing habitat
- Water supply and storage
- Water quality
- Climate stability
- Soil retention
- Air quality
- Reducing vehicle miles traveled

Costs associated with implementing action G-12 include reducing impact fees and providing services. Over a 50-year period of time, Earth Economics estimates again that the benefits to implementing will outweigh the costs, valuing the ecosystem services at between \$12 million and \$17 million. An additional \$1.04-\$1.28 billion would be saved by commuters (value of avoided drive time and the social cost of annual carbon savings). The costs to implementing Action G-12 over the 50 years total \$139 million. Overall, the benefit-to-cost ration is anticipated to range between 7.51:1 and 9.19:1. In other words, for every dollar spent to implement this action, the region will see at least a \$7.51 return on investment and could be as high as \$9.19.

Throughout the presentation, the stakeholders had questions about the dollar amounts and how things were calculated. Some typos in the information presented were identified, and Kocian and the project team indicated they would review the data more closely to correct typos and faulty assumptions implicit in the analysis and recalculate the BCA accordingly.