

Previous Earthly Wilds
papers under this
one-planner
greenlight & initial
proposal

Earthy Wilds “Greenlight” Clarification

By Planners (Jac, Phoebe, Zi) in consultation with RET
October 18, 2025

Planners have been receiving lots of input regarding our Earthly Wilds “Greenlight” and contents therein. This paper addresses concerns regarding what “greenlight” means, distribution of hours, confidentiality, and Monacan Land.

Greenlight

We do not have the power to “greenlight” a project before there is a specific proposal. We simply meant to indicate that we support this project moving forward. The ultimate decision to allocate land to a new community/trust will be decided in the future by planners with input from the community.

RET will post more details about the proposal, but they also wanted to clarify their initial idea of land transfer to a trust:

The Earthly Wilds Land Trust would be a separate legal trust created to hold and protect land permanently for BIPOC-led communal living, and ecological purposes. The land would belong to the trust itself, not to any person, meaning it could never be sold or privatized. The trust’s mission and use restrictions would be written into a binding legal agreement, ensuring the land is always used for communal living, ecological stewardship, and BIPOC empowerment. If Earthly Wilds Community ever completely dissolves, the land will remain in trust and be passed on to another group with similar reparative and ecological goals. This ensures the land always serves its original purpose and can never be sold for private gain. If such a group cannot be found to steward the land within 2 years of the dissolution of Earthly Wilds Community, then the land title would return to Twin Oaks possession.

We wanted to acknowledge that there has been support for the project, and no major “blocking” concerns have been voiced in input or thought of by planners. The “greenlight” is meant to support the project continuing to be explored.

Hours

Several cos had concerns that we gave 500 hours of contingency (roughly a quarter of the budget) to this project without adequate community input. The number provided was rough, and we should’ve put more thought into it. There still seems to be broad community support for giving hours to this project, which we agree with. After more consideration, we are lowering the contingency hours to 200 and have asked RET to shift 200 hours from BIPOC hours to the new “Earthy Wilds” budget. If Twin Oaks

want to contribute more hours to this project once these hours are spent, we will consider allocating more labor later on.

There seems to have also been miscommunication between RET, planners, and the community about whether or not RET originally stated that no hours would be requested. Our understanding is that RET was saying between labor, money, and land, their main request is land, which is the most abundant of the 3.

Input and Confidentiality

RET will be posting more details and hosting meetings in the future to refine their proposal, and we don't think Planners should be very involved in reviewing input at those stages. Planners will be reviewing and making a decision on the final proposal. After receiving input, and further conversation with RET, we decided that any time planners solicit input on the project, confidential input will be allowed, but reasoning for confidentiality will be required to be given. We won't throw out or reveal confidential input no matter what reason is given, but the reasoning for confidentiality will be part of the evaluation of the input.

We are also requiring that if there are concerns, whether confidential or not, that some part of the input will be passed on verbatim to RET. If written in a way that is directly addressed to RET, this will hopefully make concerns more precise and understandable. We will be checking in with cos before passing on input verbatim.

We still request that cos attempt to write non-confidential input. We think that especially the reasoning in our original paper is important to keep in mind:

- It is likely that the reason for wanting confidentiality comes from the fear of being perceived as racist, which is a behavior that upholds white supremacy. Giving non-confidential input could help us work through these fears and build a healthier culture.
- Confidential input has been hurtful to POC in the past, and there is a general desire from RET and Planners to minimize confidential input.

Monacan

RET would like to start Earthly Wilds on Monacan Land (see their proposal). We've heard concerns about an agreement to leave Monacan Land undeveloped back when we bought it, but Jane4archives has clarified this does not seem to be the case:

Here's what I found re: Monocan Land. It appears that there were a few different paths for acquiring the land, and one of those was a potential land trust involving ^{member} Marione which would have some individuals associated with TO living on the land as a quasi-community, and the rest would be held without development for preservation.

However, planner notes from 1990 indicate we bought the land with the money from the Marion property sale, as well as dipping into health savings, and make no mention of a land trust, or preserving the land for non-development. I'm including the information I found about this potential land trust, in case it's useful.

This land was originally owned by the Martins, which is why these documents refer to "Martin Land". It did not become known as Monoccan Land until a naming party later.

I'm sending the documents via links to paperless (the digital archives). If you need to log-in, you can do so with the same username/password as the network.

If you recall any more information about this, please reach out to planners or RET.



Thanks for the update. I like the Land Trust proposal, very thoughtful and future-looking. So glad Earthly Wilds is moving forward! -Ari

Well, this is late October and this is the first I've heard of it. I hate this idea. What you're talking about is developing Monacan Forest, putting houses and other structures in there, cars and roads too, right? I love that Monacan has no buildings, no cars, only tractor paths for forestry, which has done an excellent job of stewarding the land. "Ecological" in this case really means doing the opposite. "Ecological" in the rest of Twin Oaks is completely unsatisfying to me: I walk Monacan as much as I do to escape the pressure that most other land is under to develop.

Monacan Forest (the name actually chosen at that naming party) was ^{earlier} called the "buffer land" and there was a conscious effort not to develop it - although the main reason to buy it was to avoid having potentially hostile neighbors across the street from EC. But I'm sure that there was a sense in 1990 and for the past 35 years that this land was special, it was going to be protected from development. Thus, it's very different than the rest of Twin Oaks. It's very special the way it is. AJack

"Pam" {

I might've missed something, but RET's proposal (behind this paper + the Planner greenlight paper) says "The exact parcel of land has not yet been determined" and also says "mix of forest and field" and "on-site potable water" are minimum desired features. This current paper says that RET is specifically proposing Monacan land, which is forested and no potable water. Is this the paper intended to solicit input/opinions on Monacan as possible Earthly Wilds site? It seems like that convo is starting because this idea was floated by Planners in this paper. Are Planners proposing this with RET? Thanks for clarifying.

-Mushka

Thanks for bringing the clarification issue to our attention, Mushka. Planners, in consultation with RET, were giving the most recent info in this paper. RET has walked & extensively discussed several possible sites, and those with fields were ruled out (land around the clearcut has little acreage; while land around the river is heavily used by Dairy & much of it is low-lying & flood-prone). RET will be posting a future paper on land once we've done a bit more internal process.

-Sage

The Sage!

-Mushka

I believe putting some small Amount of
Land into a Trust for BIpoc Community
is a good idea And a solid way for
Twin OAKS to show we do truly acknowledge
The generational harm done to Communities
of Color.

We can quibble about the particulars
LATER, but I hope we can agree to
a BIpoc Land trust in principle

-T. 9952 ^{11/1/21}
