



11/5/2024

**East Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District
Board of Directors *APPROVED* Meeting Minutes**

Monday, October 7, 2024

6:01pm- Call to Order

Zimmer-Stucky called to order the regular meeting of the EMSWCD Board of Directors at 6:01pm on Monday, October 7th, 2024, at the EMSWCD Office in North Portland.

6:01pm- Introductions, Review/revise agenda, Review previous action items.

Zimmer-Stucky conducted introductions for the record. The following persons were present:

Board of Directors: Jasmine Zimmer-Stucky (At-Large 2 Director, Chair), Mike Guebert (Zone 3 Director, Vice-Chair), Laura Masterson (Zone 2 Director, Secretary) (virtual), Jim Carlson (At-Large 1 Director, Treasurer), Joe Rossi (Zone 1 Director)

Staff: Kelley Beamer (Executive Director), Dan Mitten (Chief of Finance & Operations), Heather Nelson Kent (Community Outreach & Engagement Program Supervisor), Julie DiLeone (Rural Lands Program Supervisor), Kathy Shearin (Urban Lands Program Supervisor), Jeremy Baker (Senior Rural Conservationist), Asianna Fernandez (Executive Assistant)

Guests: Daniel Newberry (Johnson Creek Watershed Council), Al Hrynshyn (SWCC/OACD), Kim Galland (NRCS)

Changes to the agenda: Move Item 8 to before Item 3.

Previous Action Items:

- **Fernandez** to send the Portland Tree Code comment and the public comment evaluation matrix to the Board. - Done
- **Fernandez** to scan Rossi's report and send it to the Board. -Done
- **Staff** to work on getting Rossi tech support to log back into his District email. -Done

6:02pm- Review/Approve September 2024 Board Meeting Minutes

Motion: Guebert moved to approve the September 4, 2024, Board Meeting Minutes. Rossi 2nd. Motion passed unanimously (4-0, Masterson absent).

6:05pm – Masterson joined the meeting.

6:05pm- Public Comment:

Newberry, Executive Director of the Johnson Creek Watershed Council, shared some of the work they've been able to do with funding from and partnership with EMSWCD:

- Removed two Dams on the Centennial School District's property that were blocking fish passage and creating a very warm lake to the stream. Includes environmental DNA testing on the site. – partially funded by EMSWCD
- Remove all seven fish barriers from EMSWCD's Headwaters Farm (HWF) Property
- Will be removing the next and final culvert that they've found leading to HWF, meaning the farm should start to see Salmon and Steelhead on our property by next year!
- Trinity Lutheran Church Green Infrastructure project – partially funded by EMSWCD.

6:10pm- Monthly Financial Reports – August 2024

Mitten The FY 24-25 Budget has been put into QuickBooks. The balance sheet for August is much in line with the month's prior. As of August 31st, our Assets and Liabilities are at \$18.5 mill, which is a 4.5% increase from the year prior at this date. Property Tax Receivables and Accounts Receivables look healthy



11/5/2024

as far as assets. Not a lot of outstanding Liabilities. For P&L by Budget Performance, there's not a lot of change. Refunds, rebates, and reimbursements are at \$15,000 when we projected \$18,000, primarily due to miscellaneous refunds and unused grants funds that get sent back. The percent of budget variances are all within acceptable margins and on track. Advertising is shown to be \$7,131, versus the monthly budget at \$4,100. The variance has to do with advertising for our new Urban Lands position. Program supplies are slightly over year-to-date, mostly due to HWF cover crops, but it's still on track for the year. P&L by budget performance looks great. P&L by class, July and August, shows that all programs are within the norm for this time of year.

6:15pm- FY 24-25 Q1 Work Plan Report

Beamer This is the first time we have presented a report that relates back to the District-wide Plan that the Board approved of in July. The report shows the work we are accomplishing in each program, quantitatively and qualitatively. Everything in the Executive Summary feeds into the three pillars that the Board approved for the Five-Year Strategic Plan: soil and water health, climate action, and equity. She then shared a few highlights from Quarter 1.

Al Hrynshyn arrived at 6:18pm.

Guebert This does seem like the right level of information for the quarterly reports.

Shearin shared a few highlights from the Urban Lands Program's Quarter 1. The District's partnership with Voz and the Day Laborers Association included incorporating an education component to the day laborers' daily work. Recently, in partnership with Portland Parks, they've been working with Native Gathering Gardens, doing work on their site and learning about Indigenous practices and native plants from the Indigenous community.

Guebert How much participation does this usually get?

Shearin They work in cohorts, so we're usually working with 6-8 day laborers at a time. We've also worked with them on projects at June Key Delta and Nadaka park too. It's a cool interaction as they bring a certain knowledge to the work site, we bring a different kind of knowledge to them, and there's language learning on both sides.

Zimmer-Stucky Any news on the Plant Sale roster for this upcoming year? She remembers that after last year's sale, the Urban Lands team was thinking about adding climate adaptive plants to the list.

Shearin We're still looking into that as well as who to add to our focused marketing. We might go into partnership with another organization so that those who are interested in purchasing a large amount of trees can do so at the same cost, but not limit our sale.

Guebert Any updates on the MHCC dam removal project since our last meeting?

Shearin We got the Resource Legacy funds, \$45,000, and they unofficially approved an additional \$200,000. We're still short \$100,000, so we're still shopping around for another grant to apply to.

DiLeone first shared that the culvert removal project on the North fork of Johnson Creek that Newberry talked about in his public comment is delayed until next season because Multnomah County Planning could not permit the project in time for the in-water work period.

DiLeone then shared a few highlights from the Rural Lands Program, Land Legacy Program (LLP), and the Headwaters Farm Business Incubator Program (HIP) for Quarter 1. We had one staff person on leave, so we were not able to do the outreach to enroll new landowners in the StreamCare program this quarter. All the maintenance will still be done but in the staff member's absence, one of the crews we contract with was able to take on some project management and continue their weed control work on those sites. We'll be ready for replanting soon, but we won't have any new sites this year. This also means our monthly water quality monitoring is on hold for now, but we may look at not continuing that in the future, due to lack of capacity. Additionally, the HIP Open House for new applicants went well and we're working on preparing and planting cover crops at HWF. We hosted an online info session for the Big Creek



11/5/2024

property, for about 30 attendees, so we'll continue doing this for other properties going forward. There are three CLIP projects in the works. The Eat n Greet is planned for November 1st, and the Board is welcome to join.

Kent shared a few highlights from the Community Outreach and Engagement Program's Quarter 1.

Zimmer-Stucky With two great marketing plans for HIP and LLP in the works, is there a timeline for other programs in the District to get similar comprehensive marketing plans?

Kent We do have a comprehensive communications plan for the whole District. The next plans we're working on are for our workshops, one program at a time, since they're both so different and so are their audiences.

Guebert Any updates on the website redesign?

Kent reminded the Board that the District awarded Hoopla Creative the contract for the redesign. Our internal project team consists of herself, Beamer, Mitten, White-Brainard, and Woolery. The team worked with the contractor recently to come up with recommendations for the architecture of the new site. CO&E is also working on a consistent copy-editing style guide for the entire District, and refreshing some of the design style guide, all with the same consultant.

Kent shared a highlight from the Grants Program's Quarter 1. She shared the list of grantees for the Partners In Conservation (PIC) Grants and what kinds of work they're doing. It's always amazing to see what people can do with the \$2,500 Special Projects And Community Events (SPACE) grants. Applicant demand for SPACE grants has been pretty steady.

Mitten shared a few highlights from the Finance and Operations Program's Quarter 1. The FY 23-24 budget year is closed. Shortly thereafter, the auditor sent their audit prep list and requests for various tests, receipts, processes, and schedules for analysis. This has been a great way for us to learn about our own processes and where we can make improvements. He recently mentioned identifying some underspending trends over the last several years. He has been compiling some reports that reflect the last three years of budget versus actual expenditures, for each object line within each program in the General Fund, in order to start understanding more about those trends to be more efficient with the budget going forward. F&O has also been working on the website redesign and are still working on further implementation of the CRM. We've also been working on simplifying technology uses for staff and started looking into the District's possible use of AI. More research and information will be shared on that as it develops.

Zimmer-Stucky Will all staff be using the CRM, or how is that being implemented?

Mitten There are currently seven staff (planning team) who are able to log in and use it, and the remaining Leadership Team (Mitten & Kent already have logins) and two additional staff members will be the next ones to onboard. This is a multi-year integration process, our next steps are Outlook (email) integration, events & workshop integration, additional data uploads, and other day-to-day contact uses.

Guebert congratulated the team on the office renovations.

6:52pm- 2025 PIC Grant Process

Kent proposed some refinement and changes to the PIC process before launching it for the 2025 process. The proposed changes are significant for specific partners, and line up with the trends within grant making, like the movement towards trust-based granting, which removes some power dynamics. For partners who continue to come back to us each year with the same program funding request, it's a lot of work for them to jump through the same hoops, especially since they always end up scoring so high in the decision process by being strategic. The PIC grant program hasn't changed too much over the years, but these organizations have kept up with us when it has. With this change, some of those organizations would get to pass the applications, but due to this, they won't officially get their funding until the end of the process. This idea is open for discussion though. Right now, we don't have any money officially



approved for the 2025 cycle, so we are waiting to let these organizations know about this change until then. The organizations would be awarded the funding as part of the full process, but these specific entities wouldn't need to submit a new application, as they're recommended funding by staff instead. We've identified six organizations who meet the proposed criteria: their goals and activities strongly meet our program mission and goals, they've been awarded at least three PIC grants within the last five years for the same project/program, they must be in good standing in terms of performance and have a demonstrated project need. Submission of this information would be through a documented conversation with or a letter to Kent, the Grants supervisor. If we were to fund them at a similar level to what they've requested in the past, that would be about 25% of the total PIC funding, based on last year's budget. We would reevaluate the organizations each year, and to see if anyone else could qualify instead or as well.

Zimmer-Stucky This incentivizes the organizations to align their proposed projects to the level of caring for soil and water health that's mentioned in our strategic plan.

Guebert Do we put a cap on it? How do we ensure that new grantees don't get overlooked as well?

Kent 25% seems like a good cap for now. Last year, 14 of the 26 grantees were new to PIC. Right now, we're getting new organizations their grants, which is due to the Board authorizing more funds for the program, getting extra funds from the People's Garden initiative, and recently reducing the max amount that grantees can receive.

Guebert Secured funding is huge! This idea makes a lot of sense. It seems very similar to the agreements we have with the Watershed Councils.

Beamer This cohort of the PIC grants is mostly for those who use the funding on programmatic work instead of projects, so it's helping institutionalize ongoing work that assists us in our own mission.

Masterson If these funds are going to be allocated ahead of time, where would it come from? Are we assuming that this will require additional funds to be allocated to the PIC program? Is this to be done instead of other grants programs that we've funded previously? If we do keep the total PIC program allocation the same, then some other new grant applications don't get funded.

Kent The formal approval would begin at the normal PIC approval process start time, in April.

Mitten This can be addressed as it's during the middle of the Budget cycle. The Board can make decisions about how the budget looks at that time during Budget Committee meetings.

Beamer There aren't any implications that the overall PIC grant amount will be more or less, but it's just assuming that a few particular grant recipients would be in a cohort of the program. This is only about the process for now, instead of the money.

Zimmer-Stucky These organizations are consistently funded each year anyways since they're often scored so highly on the scale. The remainder of the PIC pool is going to remain about the same. Being in the process last year, it was clear that there were a few organizations whose applications were consistently highly outstanding.

Zimmer-Stucky asked Kent to ensure that this change gets evaluated in two years, with feedback from the review committee as well.

Kent There are also some administrative changes, but with the PIC grant policy updates, we agreed to bring policy concerns to the Board if necessary, and to ensure that they were clear to the Board. This year, we asked about a legal review for third-party identification for contractors, which was a big thing to bear for the grantees and for us, as Kent had to decide which contractors needed to be identified further. Mitten helped her speak to the legal team, who agreed that it's not that necessary to keep up with, so that was removed for this upcoming year. Right now, grantees can request up front funding for 30% of their award, but she's recommending updating that to 50% of their grant up front, with an understanding that they can then request more once they've documented the use of that 50%. She's not suggesting a change to the 1-to-1 match requirement at this time, but she's going to remind grantees that it is only a 1-to-1 requirement, as over-matching is what most grantees are used to doing to get ahead of the rest of the applicants.



11/5/2024

Motion: Guebert moved to approve the proposed streamline PIC pathway with a two-year review, as presented. Carlson 2nd. Motion passed unanimously (4-0, Masterson unidentified)

Motion: Guebert moved to approve the changes to the contract and payment requirements for the PIC grant program as presented. Carlson 2nd. Motion passed unanimously (4-0, Masterson unidentified)

Kent The timeline and process: Launching the application process on October 15th and closing on December 17th. The review process is within February and March with the review committee, she'll present the awardees to the Board in April and make the funding available on June 1, 2025. She's close to having a grant review committee, and encouraged the Board to let their contacts know.

7:19pm-Nestwood Grant Agreement Change – Property Line Adjustment

Shipkey in 2022, Columbia Land Trust closed out the protection of the 825-acre Nestwood property. At that time, there was an approach with a Christmas tree farm, which they worked on resolving after closing. They've now reached a resolution to the issue, resulting in a large net conservation gain. The encroacher will receive about eight acres, low habitat value, and the Nestwood property will grow with 37 acres of high habitat forest land, funded by the former owner. The Land Trust grant restricted this land from going to anyone else, so we need to amend the grant restriction for this transaction to process.

Zimmer-Stucky Did the encroachment of the Christmas tree farm not show up in earlier surveys by the former owner?

Shipkey No, but it did show up prior to closing on the property, and it was part of the Land Trust's due diligence, which they let us know would take time.

Motion: Guebert moved to approve Resolution 2024-10-01. Carlson 2nd. Motion passed unanimously (4-0, Masterson unidentified)

7:22pm- EPA Community Change Grant

Beamer received a call from 1000 Friends and EcoTrust, who are coming together to apply for Federal funding from EPA's Community Change grants, funded through the Administration's Bipartisan Infrastructure bill. The program is that's being to address environmental and climate challenges in local communities through building capacity. This project will encompass all of East Multnomah County, and the goal is to build human capacity through programs like the Land Use Leadership Initiative (previous PIC grantee), an environmental justice summit, and an East County climate action group. They've asked the District to be a supporting partner. The proposal would include funding for EMSWCD (a little under \$50,000 per year) over a 3-year period. It shows how our trusted community partners are leaning on us and thinking about unique ways to focus on our district. They should know about approval by December.

Zimmer-Stucky supports this and sees this as another way of us acting on our strategic plan.

Guebert When would the project start?

Beamer April and May 2025. Should it be awarded, staff will come to the Board with a budget amendment.

7:28 pm- CLIP Project Approval – Fiddlehead Farm

Baker This is our first rainwater harvesting project. Fiddlehead Farm is a woman owned and operated farm, growing over 200 varieties of Fall and Winter vegetables. The main issue is that they are on Corbett water, a municipal water system, and they've had issues with the flow of water, with landslides, and water shut offs, etc. So, there's a practical nature of putting together a source of water for their farm use.

Guebert In Corbett, there's been a lot of main breaks, and they just installed a new waterline near his house, and they forgot to hook his and a few other homes to the line and are now having difficulty resolving that. He's always had a problem with rain harvest in this climate, and to fill 50,000 gallons at current Corbett water rates is about \$300, but he still supports this project.



11/5/2024

Baker This is the cost for doing business for the work right now. As more people buy in, the easier it'll be. He asked the contractor why they're not going for larger tanks? They said the tanks are locally made, so they don't have the capacity to make larger bins, but it cuts down on the need for transportation and other factors. The Rain Harvesting Oregon company is a newer company, but they'll be able to properly hook everything up for the farm.

Masterson NRCS often runs a similar program, or they pay for tanks, so how are we thinking about that partnership? We should be careful not to do the same work that NRCS is doing.

Baker Fiddlehead Farms has been applying and waiting a really long time for this, and for some reason their applications through NRCS continue not to go through. There is a priority for harvesting rainwater, but NRCS's processes are different than ours. If they had a process already, they'd just be doing that, but the farmers aren't able to wait much longer.

Galland You wouldn't be doing the same as NRCS is, it would be at least another year before we could fund this kind of project, as it's only available during the organic initiative, and while we've been trying to place Fiddlehead in the ranking for it, it's geared more towards water quality and soil health than rainwater harvesting. It's been rough seeing their project fall to the bottom every year.

Motion: Carlson moved to approve the pending CLIP grant for a rainwater harvesting system on Fiddlehead Farm, not to exceed \$63,000. Guebert 2nd. Motion passed unanimously (5-0)

7:39pm- Portland Prosper – Urban Renewal Projects

Mitten Portland Prosper has notified us in writing and by email, about the Urban Renewal Projects that impact our taxing district. Of the six projects identified in the letter, five are in our district. If you have opposition, you have an opportunity to chime in; however, in reviewing these projects and discussing the property tax impact with the TSCC, they believe that even though we'll forgo some property tax dollars up front, over time, it's going to appreciate the land value, leading to a longer-term impact on the tax values. These Urban Renewal Projects are beneficial to us, our mission, and the community itself, because all of these projects are community minded and are trying to lift up marginalized or underserved communities in many ways. In the next 5-10 years, the dollar amount of foregone property taxes is negligible compared to our entire budget. If the Board wants to oppose it, they have that right and may draft a letter of opposition. The Board showed no opposition to these Urban Renewal Projects presented.

7:45pm- Water Bureau Filtration Plant Update

Carlson and Beamer were at a meeting sponsored by Multnomah County Farm Bureau recently, with Executive Directors of Oregon Association of Nurseries (OAN), Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA), and a few other partner organizations, and toured the R&H Nursery that borders the PWB project and got the history of how the Portland Water Bureau filtration plant project came about. When the City of Portland condemned the land years ago, the farmers were farming it at \$0 rent. After the tour, the group met at the Multnomah Grange, including two candidates for Portland City Council. OAN invited a few news media to attend, but none showed. We were told that EPA mandated this project, but it was not exactly true. The City of Portland had a variance to avoid building this filtration facility if they continue to test the water for cryptosporidium, but they decided that it was too cumbersome to continue doing. In talking to Jim Johnson from ODA, he said if this project goes through, it could change land use planning the state. Beamer asked about the chance of the appeal prevailing, and he said there's almost no chance. If the project gets shut down, the financial ownership falls on the City of Portland. A former Metro councilor mentioned that the City of Portland is violating their 10+ year agreement with Metro to designate this land as a rural reserve.

Beamer The price has gone up from \$800 million to \$2.1 billion (same as the PDX reconstruction), which will be financed on the water bill of the City. The land is on a rural reserve, and EMSWCD fights to protect our prime farmland, and this type of land, with the best class soil due to rural reserves, is important and scarce in the entire nation. It was made clear that the District is not a co-plaintiff on the lawsuit, and that she was there representing the Board's letter of opposition, emphasizing the farmland protection aspect.



11/5/2024

7:51pm- Responding to Land Legacy 1-pager from Director Rossi

Zimmer-Stucky At the last Board Meeting, Rossi asked the Board to read his document and respond to it, and to see if they wanted to direct any staff time towards this.

Rossi The document is a result of people, mostly current and past historical farm owners or their families, contacting him regarding competition for farmland. He gets contacted by people a lot due to his place in the Farm Bureau and OAN communities. This is an attempt, for him, to have the District be seen taking a proactive stance, and not be seen as being competitive to some of the other farmers who are also trying to acquire land. His request is to have Beamer spend some time with the Farm Bureau, OAN, and another agricultural organization in the farmland competition field to meet and have a discussion.

Carlson would like to see the District move forward and improve. He's heard the same thing from some of the farmers that there is a perception that we're competing against them. There was a proposal from the Land Legacy Committee that seemed more cooperative than what we've seen in the past. A lot of it is perception, and we might need to educate people more, and work with them as well in acquiring property. If some of our historic farms want to acquire property, why wouldn't we help them?

Guebert Those services and opportunities are open to helping them now, and if there's a perception that we are competing, that's based on a lack of understanding of our work and how our easements actually work. We do have goals of helping new farmers acquire land, which may not coincide with an established nursery expanding their operation. This report also suggests offering voluntary negotiated easements to help reduce land prices, which we brought a motion for, and Rossi voted against it.

Rossi didn't vote against that specifically; it was a much bigger issue. For example, Rossi sold their farm to the District because a previous seller recommended the option to him for the best value, and the perception is that the government entity will overpay, but instead it iced out three other potential buyers, because Rossi's brother and sister immediately discounted any other offer. The perception is that EMSWCD will come in with more resources and ability to close properties, so it incentivizes people to work with us directly, instead of going to a realtor, where it's transparent and available to everyone, and the District still has the ability to buy it. Letting us be the buyer would allow properties to transfer to people who are really farming it, to go to easements voluntarily, and we can pick off the ones who don't/are in danger. This would add to our capacity because we could allow the market forces to take place for the ones that work out good and we could come in strategically to grab the important ones.

Zimmer-Stucky There are potentially other buyers, but it's not concluded that those other buyers would continue to farm the property. For those who farm along the urban edge, their biggest competitors are not SWCDs, it is usually amenity buyers who move out there for the view, a different school district for their kids, to be outside of the city with a short commute still, etc. If you look holistically at where farmers are losing out, it's to the amenity buyers. If the Gordon Creek property had gone on the market, there was no guarantee that the highest bidder would have been a farmer. If you look at the trajectory of farmland in Corbett, it's safe to say that the highest bidder for that property would not have been a farmer.

Rossi Our land wasn't going to go on the market with the realtor because people were approaching us directly. We can still prevent what you're saying. We didn't have to go through that process or spend all that money to accomplish a goal, it could have gone to a farmer, and we could have prioritized that money for something that's more in danger.

Guebert disagrees. We didn't force anyone to sell to us or buy from us.

Carlson also voted against that sale as well, because that property had existing restrictions that would have prohibited a lot of activity on it. It was EFU 40, so you could only build one house on it. It's outside the UGB, and if you took it out of the EFU, the tax burden is huge due to paying back on real market value, so there were always other issues that would've hindered that one out of agriculture. For other farmers closer to the UGB, he gets it, but he voted against the Gordon Creek property because it had issues that were bigger than being developed.

Guebert If there are people who think we're in competition with them, then maybe we need to be better in messaging and ensure that they understand how our Land Legacy Program (LLP) works in protecting farmland and the farming community as a whole.



Carlson Getting that information out is important. There was another project we talked about recently where the landowner didn't want to put it on the market, they came directly to us, and it's important that these other farmers know this. Because, when that word gets out, it could further the perception that we're in competition.

Rossi We're a government agency, we should be more transparent. When we're buying property like a house flipper, and doing what we want with them, we're not letting them become available to the farming community.

Masterson reiterated that we could continue to do more education, but across the country, easement programs like this are often started by and overwhelmingly supported by farmers because it ultimately reduces land prices for farmers and protects farmland. The competition really is amenity buyers. She and the majority of this Board agrees with the direction of the program, and at some point, we need to move on and keep going.

Rossi We can take an active or reactive stance on this. He is holding the group back from talking to Beamer about this concern. We should be viewed as being proactive instead of a reactive group. He wanted to make it easier for Beamer and get it all onto one page to make it easier to start a discussion, because hearing from different people at different times requires you to talk to different people in different ways.

Beamer can do her job better, the more constituents she can speak with. She saw the word amendment on the document, but that's different from what Rossi is saying, which is he's conveying what he's hearing from constituents. She's had a few conversations with individuals who have experienced this and has carved out the time to hear directly from them as she finds that important so that she understands the firsthand experience. She has an open-door invitation to who want have those conversations. We can't do this without our farmland partners, it's about forever farming and protecting the resources we have. Acknowledging how we can move forward on this issue together is the end goal here.

Masterson is thrilled to hear that Beamer is out talking to constituents, and Shipkey always is. There's no reason to change the program, it's working quite well how it exists currently.

Zimmer-Stucky To Rossi, please do not be the backstop to all of these comments. It's more helpful to hear from people directly so we can understand that everyone has a unique relationship and situation with land access and so far, the examples he's brought forward are not compelling enough to make her reevaluate the direction of the LLP. If there are people who are holding back from speaking to the District, we should correct that, and she'd like to encourage them to continue moving forward with communication with Beamer and the District. These are probably people we've asked for feedback from before with surveys or otherwise, and if they've refrained from giving it, or felt unheard, we should clarify that.

Zimmer-Stucky Moving onto some of the other points in the document:

- Create and share a list of farmers interested in purchasing or leasing land with sellers and realtors: This is a practice of the LLP already. It was demonstrated in one of the acquisitions we did. We learned about the outreach to farmers before voting to place an easement on the property.
- Offer voluntary negotiated easements to help reduce land prices and assist farmers in land acquisition: That is a great summary of the entire LLP as it currently stands.
- Ensuring the transition of landownerships are sustained through support services potentially in collaboration with OSU Extension services to enhance early economic success for new farmers: we are working with Barrett on that evaluation. We helped support the small farms program. We are working in this capacity already.
- Expanding access to land acquisition opportunities to a wider range of agricultural operators: Last year we removed the ball and burlap restrictions on nurseries for our easements, which opens up the LLP to a lot of agricultural operators.



11/5/2024

Rossi We don't have to buy property to do these things; we can help people buy property and do those things for them, instead of tying up our capital to acquire land ourselves to accomplish these goals. There are things we could expand on, especially if we expanded capacity by not spending a lot of money on buying property and tying it up for periods of time. He's not saying we don't do these things.

Guebert agrees that we can accomplish these goals by not buying property, but buying property is also a tool in the toolbox that can help us advance our goals in certain situations.

Rossi But it's a tool that we don't always have to use.

Motion: Rossi moved to have Beamer engage in a conversation with Multnomah Farm Bureau, Oregon Association of Nurseries, and one other agricultural organization that Beamer recommends. Carlson 2nd.

Zimmer-Stucky acknowledged Motion was made and seconded and asked for any discussion.

Discussion:

Masterson is not opposed to this in concept but is opposed to the motion as it seems out of character for how the Board usually does business. These are things that seem irrelevant, as it's what Beamer is already doing.

Carlson Beamer is having discussions already, but the perceptions are out there, and we need to work more on getting the message out to them.

Zimmer-Stucky has seen Beamer's monthly updates to the Board include an exceptional amount of outreach to these organizations through attendance of their events or sitting down one-on-one, almost since day one. This doesn't seem like the way to go, and it seems unwise to place this kind of motion on the table.

Rossi She's having general conversations, he is asking Beamer to have one single conversation with all of these organizations on one topic. We ask Beamer to engage with different groups for different reasons, she suggests what she does, it's not a big ask, it doesn't take any director time or staff time.

Beamer Whenever Larry Bailey or Jeff Stone calls Beamer to voice a concern, she is in practice of coming to their locations or meeting to discuss it further. She had an individual come to her asking about a farm retirement situation, and she did let that person know that the District's mission through decades has been committed to protecting agricultural land and making sure it remains active and available for future farmers. It was about creating clarity and understanding, and then she did get to pass this person's name to the LLP so that we could add them to the list of contacts who are interested in buying land to share out opportunities we find.

Carlson The big thing feels like having more conversations like that, to let them know what we can and can't help them with.

Zimmer-Stucky Instead of creating a motion for this, she would suggest for the farmers who are coming to Rossi with concerns, for Rossi to instead direct them to reach out to Beamer to discuss these topics instead.

Rossi That puts us in a reactive posture. He is not willing to retract his motion, so that the District has a proactive posture instead of reactive.

Zimmer-Stucky Seeing Beamer's monthly updates on her workplan, directing her to go and do this all again feels unprofessional and unnecessary. That doesn't close the door to conversation, but this feels like the improper way of moving forward.

Carlson How do we move forward to change the perspective? By not reaching out to these groups, we're fostering mistrust.

Masterson We are already moving in that direction. This specific type of motion seems like it sets a bad precedent. Of course we should continue to educate farmers.



11/5/2024

Rossi It shouldn't have to elevate to a motion, but it seems like it does. He's been telling people that he's going to start having the District start engaging in conversation with Larry Bailey, Jeff Stone, and one other person. It's a conversation with industry people who are competing for farmland with us, so that we understand how we can work together and maybe improve and add to capacity.

Zimmer-Stucky Rossi started this conversation by saying that he had been holding people back from contacting the District. She thinks this motion is unnecessary, and instead Rossi can go back to the farmers he's been holding back and let them know that he spoke to the Board and Beamer, and that they were interested in talking to them.

Rossi is only doing this because Zimmer-Stucky said it was required he do that, that it has to elevate to a Board discussion, so it is completely necessary. It's not really a motion, it's an outline to be in conversation, and it's unnecessary that the Board wastes time on this, if the Board wants to vote no, they can be on the motion voting no.

End of Discussion.

Motion on the table was voted upon after discussion.

Motion declined (2 in favor, Rossi & Carlson – 3 opposed, Zimmer-Stucky, Guebert, Masterson).

Zimmer-Stucky Rossi also sent out an email to the rest of the Board, around 4pm today. He is available for questions on his email.

The Board didn't have any questions.

8:24pm- Announcements, Action Items, and Adjournment

Beamer reiterated some key dates:

- October 15th: PIC applications open
- November 1st: Eat n Greet
- November 4th: Next Board Meeting
- November 30th: HIP applications are due

Carlson will not be able to attend the November 4th Board Meeting.

Action Items: N/A

Zimmer-Stucky adjourned the meeting at 8:26pm.