



**Land Legacy Committee (LLC) Meeting Agenda**  
**East Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District**

(March 21, 2022)

Monday, March 28, 2022, 4:00 – 6:00 PM

To be held via videoconference: (US Toll Free: 1 877 309 2073 Access Code: 993-088-381 OR log in on your computer, tablet, or smartphone at <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/993088381>.)

**AGENDA**

Item #	Time	Agenda Item	Purpose	Presenter	Packet
1	4:00 5 mins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome and Call to Order</li> <li>• Review/revise agenda</li> <li>• Previous action items</li> <li>• Approval of November 29, 2021 and January 31, 2022 meeting minutes</li> </ul>	Information/ Decision	Zimmer- Stucky	<a href="#">a) 11/29/2021 LLC Meeting Minutes</a> <a href="#">b) 1/31/2022 LLC Meeting Minutes</a>
2	4:05 5 mins	<b>Time reserved for public comment <sup>1</sup></b>	Information	Public	n/a
3	4:10 60 mins	<b>Farm Access Equity Advisory Group</b>	Information/ Discussion	Malcolm Hoover / Megan Horst / Duane Lane / Geoffrey Van / LLC Members	n/a
<u>Overview:</u> Members of the Farm Access Equity Advisory Group will share stories and information regarding farmland access inequities, setting the stage for a dialogue with LLC members.					
4	5:10 35 mins	<b>Land Legacy Program Strategic Planning Discussion</b>	Information	Caldwell/ Dozier / LLC Members	n/a
<u>Overview:</u> Caldwell/Dozier will lead the Land Legacy Committee in a facilitated discussion about the relevance of farm access to EMSWCD's mission and potential roles for EMSWCD to consider as we advance through strategic planning.					
5	5:45 15 mins	<b>Project Development Pause</b>	Information	Shipkey	<a href="#">a) Memo re: Project Development Pause</a>
<u>Overview:</u> Staff will provide information regarding the soft pause on new project development, driven by capacity, existing project work and strategic planning considerations.					
6	6:00	<b>Closing Items:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Announcements and Reminders</li> <li>• Action Items</li> <li>• Adjourn</li> </ul>	Information	Zimmer- Stucky	n/a

<sup>1</sup> Each member of the public who wishes to speak shall be given approximately 3 minutes.



**Land Legacy Committee (LLC) Meeting Agenda  
East Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District**

(March 21, 2022)

Monday, March 28, 2022, 4:00 – 6:00 PM

To be held via videoconference: (US Toll Free: 1 877 309 2073 Access Code: 993-088-381 OR log in on your computer, tablet, or smartphone at <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/993088381>).

**EMSWCD Board Members, Officers and Meeting Dates:**

EMSWCD Board			LLC	Year	FY21-22 Schedule	Board	LLC
Members	Positions	Officers					
Joe Rossi	Zone 1 Director		X	2021	July	12 <sup>th</sup>	26 <sup>th</sup>
Laura Masterson	Zone 2 Director	Secretary	X		August	2 <sup>nd</sup>	
Mike Guebert	Zone 3 Director	Chair	X		September	13 <sup>th</sup>	27 <sup>th</sup>
Jim Carlson	At-Large 1 Director	Treasurer	X		October	4 <sup>th</sup>	
Jasmine Zimmer-Stucky	At-Large 2 Director	Vice Chair	Chair		November	1 <sup>st</sup>	29 <sup>th</sup>
					December	6 <sup>th</sup>	
				2022	January	6 <sup>th</sup>	31 <sup>st</sup>
					February	7 <sup>th</sup>	
					March	7 <sup>th</sup>	28 <sup>th</sup>
					April	4 <sup>th</sup>	
					May	2 <sup>nd</sup>	23 <sup>rd</sup>
					June	6 <sup>th</sup>	



11/29/2021

## ***East Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District Land Legacy Committee Meeting Minutes***

Monday, November 29, 2021

### **4:01pm - Call to Order**

Zimmer-Stucky called to order the regular meeting of the EMSWCD Land Legacy Committee at 4:01pm on Monday, November 29, 2021, via teleconference.

### **Introductions, Review/revise agenda, Review previous action items**

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

Land Legacy Committee: Joe Rossi (Zone 1 Director), Laura Masterson (Zone 2 Director), Mike Guebert (Zone 3 Director), Jasmine Zimmer-Stucky (At-Large Director 2)

Absent: Jim Carlson (At-Large Director 1)

Staff: Nancy Hamilton (Executive Director), Andrew Brown (Conservation Program Supervisor), Matt Shipkey (Land Legacy Program Manager), Dan Mitten (CFO), Julie DiLeone (Rural Lands Program Supervisor), Monica McAllister (Community Connections Liaison), Suzanne Easton (Grants Program Manager), Asianna Fernandez (Clerk of the Board)

Guests: Chris Wallace-Caldwell, Jamila Dozier

### **Previous Action items**

- LLC members to provide to staff any suggestions they may have for desired topics at future meetings, and what information could be developed to best inform a discussion about LLP emphasis.
- Shipkey to keep LLC members apprised of key developments with Farm Access Equity Advisory Group.

### **Approval of minutes**

**MOTION: Guebert moved to approve the September 27, 2021 LLC meeting minutes**

**Rossi 2<sup>nd</sup>**

**Motion unanimously approved (4-0)**

### **4:07pm - Time reserved for public comment**

n/a

### **4:07pm – Land Legacy Program Strategic Planning Discussion**

Wallace-Caldwell and Dozier, consultants, presentation regarding how to leverage the time the board spends together during LLC meetings as part of Strategic Planning for the Land Legacy Program.

Questions:

1. When you think about the future of Agriculture in our service area, what are the challenges that need to be addressed?
  - a. Guebert: Climate change - how people will go about looking at agriculture and how farmers continue farming. Supporting infrastructure for farmers, and our unique needs being situated in an urban area. Cost of labor vs. farm revenue. Perpetual risk of wildfires. Cost of farmland for new farmers.

11/29/2021



- b. Masterson: Land base, which is limited in East Multnomah - preserving undeveloped agricultural land for farming instead of being developed for other purposes. Equity component - composition of farmers on the land is not reflective of our demographics, e.g. Black urban residents and Black farmers not leveling out, Mexican farm workers prevalent but not Mexican farm owners.
  - c. Zimmer-Stucky: Cost of farmland, how do we create opportunities for farmers from Headwaters Farm to continue on to owning land. How do we connect farmers to affordable farmland?
  - d. Rossi: Market forces - farms in Multnomah County lack scale, pay grade for labor is higher, topography complex, high cost of farmland, compliance with government programs can be challenging. Labor reporting burdens. Supply Chains. Does Multnomah County have enough sizeable, farmable land to maintain a successful agricultural industry?
2. What do you see as the district's role in addressing these challenges? (Not prioritizing challenges)
- a. Guebert: Role for this committee to address farm access, ownership and protection. Closing equity gap (at Headwaters and elsewhere). Work in the Gorge to mitigate wildfire risk may have positive impact on reducing fire threat to farmland. Some of these might be out of our purview, but with climate change we can have impact on the local level and encourage neighboring districts to act as well. We can affect soil and water in a way that mitigates climate impacts.
  - b. Zimmer-Stucky: EMSWD has a role to play in addressing some of these problems. Finding niche that East Multnomah farmers fill and supporting that niche, East Multnomah farms are not going to look like the rest of Oregon's farms. Local government doing best for greater good. Also see value in supporting non-farmland projects in urban areas. Using funds strategically to support a defined vision (and what is that vision?).
  - c. Rossi: Finding a niche – there are many kinds of farming, no dairy farming or orchards in the area because they are no longer economically viable in our area. Targeted for our taxpayers and supporting people in the kind of farming that can be successful in East Multnomah. Mission Statement - emphasis on helping people. Cautioned against mission creep. Do we have the ability to impact climate change?
  - d. Masterson: What kind of producers are we going to need/want/be profitable in the future? Let market forces dictate, but create opportunities for entrepreneurial farmers to have access to farmland. Easements help with securing the agricultural land base. Also see role for the district in educating next generation of farmers.
  - e. Wallace-Caldwell: Sees a lot of commonality in the comments shared. Suggested we center our mission and consider what our niche is.
  - f. Easton: We have and can advance many of these issues by supporting and collaborating with other organizations through the Grants Program (EcoTrust, Zenger Farms, etc.)
3. How do we ensure that we are incorporating the perspectives of our constituents in this process?
- a. Zimmer-Stucky: 2 minutes for public comment during public meetings is inadequate. Advisory committees, targeted focus groups, deep dives into difficult/complex topics are all great tools.
  - b. Dozier: Who are your constituents?
    - i. Masterson: All taxpayers in East Multnomah, current farmers, next generation of farmers, but overall, those who are most interested in agriculture are key constituents we want to be talking to moving forward. Organizations working on similar issues.
  - c. Guebert: Targeted focus groups, maintaining relationships with other groups, intentionally interacting with Farm Bureau/Friends of Family Farmers, listening to those who have other views for more ideas.

11/29/2021



- d. Rossi: Nancy to engage outside groups who may have ideas. Achieve mission statement with diverse ideas. Are we hearing all perspectives?
  - e. Masterson: Other staff already have great relationships within the community, how to leverage those as well as Nancy? As a board member, how do I leverage my networks to hear other opinions/needs?
4. With working farmland easements and acquisitions, what are the short term and long-term outcomes you would like to see?
- a. Guebert: Long term: sustainable farming community persists in our service area. Small properties make it hard to make a living. Short term: more work on equity to encourage and support a more diverse farming community, consider alternatives to farm ownership.
  - b. Zimmer-Stucky: Acknowledge difference between easements on a property vs. acquiring outright and where we are going to put our focus. Not as large an appetite for easement program as there is for outright acquisition in East Multnomah. Short-term: clarity on where we going to put most of our energy (easements vs fee) in strategic planning. Long term: evaluation of the choices we made, which could help us decide on budget priorities.
  - c. Masterson: Agreed with Zimmer-Stucky about importance of deciding whether the focus should be on easements or outright purchase (while acknowledging that outright purchase often eventually entail an easement). Long term: choosing best use of resources from a variety of proposed projects. Vibrant and thriving agricultural sector.
  - d. Rossi: Picking best options with staff help, focused on projects that help people. Quantify what success is. Hesitant on acquiring farmland if it means we are limiting our ability to help more small farmers. Long-term: best application of our budget.
5. What questions do you think we should be asking ourselves about the Land Legacy Program?
- a. Masterson: Is there a more efficient/effective way to protect our farmland base for the long haul? How do we help current and future farmers to be successful? How do we improve access to resources for historically disadvantaged communities?
  - b. Zimmer-Stucky: Are there any changes we want to make to this program to benefit the current and future farmers in East Multnomah? How can we learn from the past and apply it to the future? How does this program address historical inequities regarding access to land in East Multnomah and across Oregon?
  - c. Guebert: Who are the players in this field and how can we leverage our work with them, what areas are not being met by anyone else and how to we address those issues and achieve our goals?
  - d. Rossi: Where are there opportunities for collaboration, and where are there gaps?

5:07: Hamilton asked the board: Do you believe it would be valuable to take time at LLC meetings for strategic planning?

Masterson: Would be open to going back to a more agricultural focused Land Legacy Committee.

Zimmer-Stucky: Interested in finding a balance between agriculture and natural area preservation, suggested a gap analysis.

Brown: Let staff know if any information or analyses can help for these discussions in future.

11/29/2021



### **5:13 pm – Farm Access Equity Initiative**

Brown gave history of LLC’s commitment to work on farm access equity: In 2020 Board adopted additional LLP goal to “Completed transaction that address farmland access inequities by prioritizing access for members of communities negatively impacted by racial discrimination and dispossession.” In 2020 after the sale of the Gordon Creek property fell through, the LLC committed to creating farm access opportunities at the Gordon Creek property for members of communities negatively impacted by racial discrimination and dispossession.

The advisory group is made up of a group of smart, passionate community members who are advising EMSWCD staff on: (a) how to make Gordon Creek available to farmers and (b)? what additional investments in activities could EMSWCD make (in its work and the work of others) to help with broadening access to farmland. The advisory group will be designing a proposal, criteria, and evaluation to come up with recommendation for the use of Gordon Creek farm.

Shipkey shared a personal story of a community member around accessing farmland that spoke to the why behind the work of addressing farm access inequities. The story illustrated how that without credit or collateral (which is often not available to members of communities negatively impacted by racial discrimination and dispossession), the ability to actually obtain land is greatly reduced, even if farmers can demonstrate their ability to farm the land successfully and have impressive track record in farming.

Shipkey provided a recap of the first meeting with advisory group meeting. This focused on: why farm protection work, challenges to access farmland, introductions and team building, the identification of advisory group roles and scope, as well as space for comment and questions, and brainstorming group values and agreements.

Tomorrow’s advisory group meeting will cover: Review and adopt group values and agreements, discuss some district objectives for Gordon Creek Farm, collective wisdom activity around positive and negative aspects of other farm access projects the group is aware of, and responding to a query the group had at the last meeting about what consideration the board will give to the recommendations of the advisory group.

Asked the LLC members to respond to the following question the advisory group had: *Several of the Advisory Group members noted that they had served in similar positions in the past, and that there were unfortunate instances where the recommendations of the Group weren’t given much consideration or valued, and that it was apparent the purpose of the Group was to “check a box” towards the end of saying the “community was consulted.” Advisory Group members wanted to know from Board members “what will be different this time” and what do they say in response to these concerns?*

- a. Guebert: Excited to hear new ideas and recommendations that the board may not have considered before. Open minded and willing to accept recommendations, but would need to see what the recommendation is.
- b. Zimmer-Stucky: Wants this effort to be broader than just the Gordon Creek property. If there is value in or a desire to have a board member sit in and participate, she is willing to play that role so she can share that information back to the LLC and board.
- c. Masterson: Don’t want to be in the position of not being able to accept recommendations and so would like for the board to be kept up to date with all ideas and proposals and wants to stay on the same page by communicating early and often so that we avoid getting out of sync.

Rossi asked if any mortgage brokers or agricultural lenders are on advisory committee? He stressed the importance of having someone with this experience in acquiring agricultural land.

Easton mentioned the importance of letting advisors know where their questions and considerations are going in real time.



11/29/2021

Caldwell asked board to think about the barrier between them and the advisory group? Suggests the LLC do more than conveying comments through Brown and Shipkey to keep an open door.

### **5:48pm – Property Update**

Shipkey noted the Shaull property closed on November 15<sup>th</sup>. A stabilization and enhancement plan for the property expected from Gresham within 6 months, and Gresham will include EMSWCD in property planning efforts.

Corbett-Springdale Farm: lease extension with Cal-Farms anticipated soon, including the incorporation of practice improvements in the lease for 2022.

Rossi asked to be invited to site visit to Corbett-Springdale Farm between EMSWCD and Cal-Farms farm crew.

**Action Item: Brown to circle back with Rossi after meeting and set up separate meeting or site visit for further discussion.**

### **5:53pm - Executive Session under ORS 192.660(2)(e) held for discussion of real estate negotiations**

Executive session entered at 5:53pm

Executive session ended at 6:01pm

### **6:01pm – Monitoring**

Content for this agenda item included in the Power Point that was sent to the LLC. Discussion not needed at this time. Conversation moved to January.

### **6:02pm - Closing items: announcements, reminders, and action items**

**Action Item: Outgrowing Hunger partnership opportunity to be presented at January LLC meeting. (Brown & Shipkey)**

**Action Item: Monitoring presentation made at January LLC meeting. (Brown & Shipkey)**

**Action Item: Making time in LLC meetings for strategic planning conversation. Wallace-Caldwell, Dozier, and Hamilton to coordinate with Brown and Shipkey for future agendas.**

**Action Item: Looking through notes of strategic planning discussion and identifying potential information needs or analysis to help advance conversation. (Brown & Shipkey)**

**Action Item: Placeholder in future agendas to talk about Farm Access Equity Advisory Group. (Fernandez)**

### **6:06pm - Adjournment**

Zimmer-Stucky adjourned the meeting at 6:06pm.

1/31/2022



## ***East Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District Land Legacy Committee Meeting Minutes***

Monday, January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2022

### **4:09pm - Call to Order**

**Zimmer-Stucky** called to order the regular meeting of the EMSWCD Land Legacy Committee at 4:09pm on Monday, January 31, 2022, via videoconference.

### **Introductions, Review/revise agenda, Review previous action items**

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

**Land Legacy Committee:** Jasmine Zimmer-Stucky (At-Large Director 2), Laura Masterson (Zone 2 Director), Mike Guebert (Zone 3 Director), Joe Rossi (Zone 1 Director)(4:25pm), Jim Carlson (At-Large Director 1)(4:34pm)

**Staff:** Nancy Hamilton (Executive Director), Andrew Brown (Conservation Program Supervisor), Julie DiLeone (Rural Lands Program Supervisor), Matt Shipkey (Land Legacy Program Manager), Monica McAllister (Community Connections Liaison), Asianna Fernandez (Executive Assistant)

**Guests:** Adam Kohl (Outgrowing Hunger), Blair Vallie (Outgrowing Hunger), Chris Wallace Caldwell (Consultant), Jamila Dozier (Consultant)

No changes to Agenda

### **Previous Action items**

- Outgrowing Hunger partnership opportunity to be presented at January LLC meeting. (Brown & Shipkey) – Completed (today's meeting)
- Monitoring presentation made at January LLC meeting. (Brown & Shipkey) – Completed (today's meeting)
- Making time in LLC meetings for strategic planning conversation. Wallace-Caldwell, Dozier, and Hamilton to coordinate with Brown and Shipkey for future agendas. – Completed
- Looking through notes of strategic planning discussion and identifying potential information needs or analysis to help advance conversation. (Brown & Shipkey) - Completed
- Placeholder in future agendas to talk about Farm Access Equity Advisory Group. (Fernandez) – Completed

### **Approval of minutes**

**Zimmer-Stucky** invited everyone to spend 5 minutes reading over the November Minutes to refresh their memory.

**MOTION: Guebert moved to approve the September 27, 2021 LLC meeting minutes**

**Masterson 2<sup>nd</sup>** Not passed at this time.

### **Discussion on the Minutes:**

**Masterson** expressed desire to discuss the minutes but would like to table discussion and decision until the end of the meeting due to technical difficulties with her connection.

### **4:18pm - Time reserved for public comment**

n/a

### **4:18 pm – Farm Access Equity Initiative**

**Shipkey** shared a brief overview of content of the last two Farm Access Equity Advisory Group meetings since the last LLC meeting:

- Defining Values and objectives of the Group's work



1/31/2022



- Collective Wisdom activity: Group shared positive examples and challenges they were aware of in other farm access work
- Some preferred EMSWCD objectives for the farm access project at Gordon Creek farm
- Shared feedback provided by the Board to the Group's concern about likely receptivity of recommendations from the Group.
  - The group is open to and thankful for having Zimmer-Stucky as a liaison for the board.
- Some Group members are interested in attending future LLC meetings and board meetings to learn more about EMSWCD's work, and to share stories with the board.
- The Group wants to spend more time on foundational work instead of moving right into action items.
- Staff and our consultant are letting the group set the pace for the work and set the agendas for the meetings.
- Adding an additional half hour and an additional meeting (total: 3 hours) to provide adequate time for robust conversations.
- The Group wants to create a road map for the remaining meetings to use time efficiently and understand the overall goal.
  - LLC to work with subcommittee of the Group to create this road map.
- Group supportive of bringing Rowan onboard in Brown's absence.

**Zimmer-Stucky** appreciated the opportunity to sit in on the meeting and shared her notes: Amazing perspectives from the members, many diverse views from different non-profits and organizations were great to hear, everyone seemed very passionate about and connected to land access. She agrees that the group is not yet ready to make suggestions on the Gordon Creek property as the Group finds it important to build a solid foundation understanding first. She is in support of Group members attending future LLC or Board meetings to share their own stories.

**Guebert** what is the timeline for when foundational work will be completed and when will recommendations be made?

**Shipkey** and **Zimmer-Stucky** agreed that the group is still in a foundational stage, and that we are honoring the Group and their work by letting the process determine the timing. **Brown** once the roadmap is in place, things may move more towards action-oriented work.

**Zimmer-Stucky** the Group was made aware that the current Gordon Creek Farm tenant still has a lease for another year for berry farming, and the house will likely be vacant soon.

#### **4:31pm – Monitoring / Management**

**Shipkey** shared an overview of the work that the Land Legacy Program does for working farmland easement monitoring and agricultural plan management. He also invited everyone to interject with questions as they may come up.

**Brown** shared a PowerPoint presentation

**Action Item:** Asianna to circulate the Power Point after the meeting.

What the LLC does: Monitoring 3 working farmland easements and 4 agricultural management plans annually, owning 3 properties outright (4 including Headwaters Farm). The discussion today is exclusive of the other work associated with properties we hold outright (e.g. leasing and disposition). Shipkey noted the work includes:

- Developing monitoring plans and property's current condition documentation using "Landscape" Software package
- Easement Baseline Documentation Report: Documents what uses of land are allowed on site, what the site boundaries are, and what is not allowed on site. This document is written just prior to easement acquisition.
- Agricultural Management Plan: Identifies certain required and recommended agricultural practices to be used on site. This is a dynamic document, updated every time there is change in ownership, crop type, or every 10 years.
- Other ongoing management tasks associated with easements and agricultural management plans: approval requests, violation resolutions, maintaining relationship retentions, agricultural management plan updating, investments.

1/31/2022



Why the work is important: Ensures investments are being carefully stewarded and easements are being honored, creates structured dialogue that can lead to partnership projects, helps make ongoing adjustments to requirements and expectations.

**Masterson** asked Shipkey to clarify the difference between Easements and Agricultural Management Plans. (Represented above in bullet points)

**Zimmer-Stucky** asked Shipkey to explain the financial incentives between easements and Agricultural Management Plans. **Shipkey** replied that when entering an Easement with EMSWCD, the expectation is that an Agricultural Management Plan will also be implemented.

**Zimmer-Stucky** what other entities in the agricultural world do agricultural management plans? **Shipkey** responded that in many ways our approach is unique. While it is common for suggestions or recommendations to be given, there is often not much follow up and the easement holder is rarely the one developing these plans. He is only aware of a couple organizations in California with an approach like ours.

**Brown** the District's requirements are similar to those that may come out of an NRCS Conservation Plan, where partners who are willing to work with us are also willing to hear and receive recommendations and requirements.

**DiLeone** we are not using the same processes as NRCS which have more requirements. Our approach to agricultural management plans is informed by the responsibility which District's in the State have around Agricultural Water Quality rules.

**Masterson** is it correct that if the Oregon Ag Heritage plan goes forward, management plans will also be required within that program? **Shipkey** is unsure if that is a distinct funding stream (and voluntary) or if it's a requirement for someone entering an easement.

**Masterson** if someone is already organic, salmon safe, and/or under a NRCS plan, and we are proposing an easement/agricultural management plan, how are we ensuring we aren't overburdening the landowner? **Shipkey** this could be a good consideration going forward, but it has not happened yet.

[**Shipkey** conducted a time check, **LLC** agreed that it is appropriate to go over 6pm and to continue with this agenda item.]

**Shipkey** overview of the experience with our current agricultural management plans, touching on learnings and time implications. Working with large operators with many staff and complex operations can make compliance challenging. Simpler agricultural management plans have proven easier to manage. The underlying motivations for a landowner to partner with EMSWCD also have an impact on compliance. Most of our plans are in compliance.

**Zimmer-Stucky** how many conservation plans does the NRCS hold in Multnomah County? Are we the only organization willing to engage in this?

**DiLeone** conservation plans go to every person who gets Farm Bill funding, but they're not the same as agricultural management plans. We write conservation plans for farmers too, but agricultural management plans are different. Rural lands staff has more experience writing conservation plans than agricultural management plans. NRCS has a specific, holistic process to addressing sites in their conservation plans. Our agricultural management plans are to clarify requirements for farming on one specific property and how any natural areas are to be protected/managed.

**Brown** agricultural management plans associated with an easement are more site specific, prescriptive, and can be enforced and can change overtime. The definition of productive agricultural use is unique as well.

**Due to time limitations, any further questions should be sent to Shipkey..**

1/31/2022



### **5:05pm – Property Update**

#### **Shipkey**

Shaul Property: Gresham closed on the property Nov 15 (EMSWCD provided \$200k of funding for the purchase). Stabilization Enhancement plan expected in 6 months from Gresham. Gresham to include EMSWCD in planning efforts for the property

Corbett-Springdale: Extended lease with Cal-Farms, who has been operating on the site for 4 to 5 years. Incorporation of some practice improvements in the lease for 2022.

### **5:08pm - Executive Session under ORS 192.660(2)(e) held for discussion of real estate negotiations**

**Executive session entered at 5:08pm**

**Executive session ended at 5:25pm**

### **5:25pm - Land Legacy Program Strategic Planning Discussion**

**Guebert** started conversation by announcing the importance of board members engaging in conversation and discussion, and to not be afraid to speak up.

**Rossi** added that he appreciated Guebert's announcement and that he will have to log off (5:30pm).

**Brown** shared a PowerPoint presentation of the LLC Strategic Planning discussion surrounding Agricultural Land Protection in terms of budget and staff allocation, and easement complexity.

**(Presentation to be circulated after meeting).**

Land Legacy Program (LLP) equates to ~16% of EMSWCD's revenue. This includes funding from the Land Conservation Fund (LCF), which is only used for capital expenditures of the LLP. Brown suggested other uses for the funds within the LLP could be a consideration.

Staff Capacity: 2/3 to 3/4 of full-time employee (FTE) time is used on agricultural land protection projects with support from Rural Lands, Facilities, and Supervisors. Most other programs do not have just one individual carrying both the transaction and management work as we do.

**Masterson** how much on an annual basis vs over time have we allocated for the LCF?

**Brown** about \$1M was put into the LCF from the general fund until 2018 when it was reduced to \$500,000 annually. Expenditures on land projects have also resulted in the LCF balance decreasing in recent years (previously, allocations to the LCF had been exceeding expenditures from the LCF).

**Masterson** do we have the means to allocate more capital to the LCF to take advantage of opportunities? **Brown** there aren't presently additional unallocated District funds.

**Masterson** is supportive of additional allocation into the LCF in order to create a balance for future potential property purchases.

**Brown** Contributions into the Land Conservation funds and Grants funds has been static through the years since 2018, even though overall, District revenues have increased.

**Guebert** when the District started the LLP, we expected that we would acquire easements but not hold and manage them for as long as we are now. What is Shipkey's total time that he spends managing easements? **Brown** it was about 14%, which is exclusive of the additional time spent on other land management tasks for properties we own.

**Masterson** thinks the District pivoted to being a long-term easement holder some time ago. What strategies are we putting in place for staff so we can ensure that the program is successful and strategic enough? Will this require more staffing?

**Wallace Caldwell** suggested the group discuss resourcing only after focusing on desired goals.

1/31/2022



**Brown** continued with his presentation: Since the program started in 2008, the District has acquired 6 farm properties, 3 working farmland easements, and some small easements associated with the DPNA at Headwaters. Our easement acquisitions to date have been a condition of the sale of property, leveraged via the sale of District property or donated. If there is not a residential opportunity on a property, working farmland easement values may not be compelling. Our easement / agricultural management plan requirements can also be a hurdle.

**Brown** shared a graph that shows how the complexity of an easement and the area protected or number of easements acquired has an inverse relationship. As easements get more complicated, the quantity of easements likely decreases. Complexity results in greater easement value, improved soil and water conservation outcomes, more capacity/ resources required, and less landowner receptivity. The LLP's current approach focuses on quality over quantity.

**Wallace Caldwell** asked the committee if they found this visual helpful?

**Masterson** thanked Brown and Shipkey for making the presentation very straightforward and wanted to emphasize that there's a huge conservation benefit in putting properties in easements and protecting them in perpetuity even if those easements are simple and not multi-outcome oriented.

**Masterson** how much of a barrier is it when constituents don't know much about EMSWCD and the LLP? When the LLP is thinking about farmland access, we're doing a good job at Headwaters with urban, non-experienced folks. How can we access other folks, like the Hispanic workforce who are already working out in our agricultural lands?

**Brown** our farm access work endeavors to reach a broad demographic of folks. Do we have a compelling proposition?  
**Shipkey** the LLP's objective is to reach all demographics, and we are aiming to build awareness through peer-to-peer connections but are currently limited in that regard

**Masterson** is not totally convinced that valuation is the biggest barrier and is hoping there are still more opportunities to reach more people.

**Zimmer-Stucky** added her own personal story about seeing EMSWCD partner signs in front yards as a way to create recognition, at least in Corbett.

**Wallace Caldwell** there are unanswered questions that can be brought into future discussions around community awareness and outreach.

**Brown** finished his presentation by identifying 3 potential scenarios for how LLP approaches working farmland protection: simply limit conversion, current multi-objective, access & affordability.

**Masterson** is there a time frame on the scenarios? **Brown** it depends on what 1 FTE could finish in what amount of time. The LLP can look into updating the projections after strategic planning work advances.

**Wallace Caldwell** the committee should get a copy of the presentation in order to reflect on it further before the next meeting. She asked what would be helpful to add to this information for the board's understanding?

**Zimmer-Stucky** supports this program and land conservation generally and that she feels like this is one component of all what EMSWCD does. Are there opportunities for synergy with other District programs? In thinking about the staffing needs for the LLP, would want to know if there are any programs considering any staffing changes? Would moving to the less complex plan get us to where we need to be and make our program more attractive?

**Carlson** asked for some examples with each approach to see which way would be best to go towards, or if a hybrid situation is a possibility.

1/31/2022



**Guebert** would like to spend more time looking over the presentation.

**Wallace Caldwell** suggested the board consider climate resiliency and equity in their thoughts about this work.

**Masterson** thanked the committee for their work, and asked whether we're considering ideas that are outside the box? What would staffing look like if we went only pursued agricultural projects? She also offered to send questions about the minutes from the last LLC meeting to Hamilton and the minutes could be approved at the next LLC meeting.

**Action Item: Masterson to send minutes comments to Hamilton from November '21 meeting.**

**Guebert** agreed with Masterson on considering whether we focus only on agricultural work as many other organizations are focusing on non-farmland projects.

**Zimmer-Stucky** can we make Agricultural Management Plans less time consuming, so we could do more while keeping the same number of staff? No answer, just aimed to take into consideration.

### **6:30pm - Closing items: announcements, reminders, and action items**

Minutes to be approved at next meeting.

Action Items:

- Asianna to send LLC Meeting recording to all LLC members.
- 2 presentations from LLC to be circulated to the Board after the meeting.
- Any additional questions about agricultural management plans and easements to be sent to Shipkey.
- Masterson to send minutes comments to Hamilton from November '21 meeting.
- Shipkey to share PSU / Outgrowing Hunger study.

### **6:35pm - Adjournment**

**Zimmer-Stucky** adjourned the meeting at 6:35pm.



## East Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District

# memo

To: Land Legacy Committee  
 From: Matt Shipkey  
 Date: 3.21.2022  
 Re: New Project Development Pause

As noted in the March Budget Committee discussion, the Land Legacy Program (LLP) has **modestly** scaled back the projected conservation transactions for the coming fiscal year from 3 to 2, which is consistent with what the LLP has been doing in practice for some months in recognition of the following circumstances:

- **Focus needed to close out / develop existing, complex projects, including:**
  - The Mainstem farm access project, which is 2 transactions – the sale of the property and the acquisition of a working farmland easement. The multiple objectives of the project (affordability and ownership by a bona fide farmer in perpetuity, access for farmers from communities whom have faced negative impacts of racial discrimination / dispossession) are complex and pioneering in several respects.
  - The Gordon Creek farm access project. We're fortunate to have brought on board some of the most passionate and skilled local minds to help plan for the future of this EMSWCD owned farm property. We want to ensure there is adequate capacity available to resource the work with this Advisory Group, and then for the potential outreach, assessment, selection, placement and programming associated with new users. We are working towards having a vision implemented for the site by the 2023 growing season.
  - The ~900-acre Natural Area partnership project with Columbia Land Trust. While Columbia Land Trust is leading on this project and responsible for most of the work, EMSWCD staff will remain involved in order to ensure that the EMSWCD desired objectives for this significant grant will be secured.
- **Capacity needed for non-transactional work:**
  - Managing EMSWCD's properties (e.g. leases, improvements, future use planning), working farmland easement and agricultural management plans requires a significant commitment of time – currently taking between 30-40% of the LLP manager's time.
  - Time spent on strategic planning for the LLP has been significant and is expected to continue throughout much of the rest of 2022.
- **Reduced Capacity:**
  - Andrew Brown's absence through September 2022 means reduced staffing resources available to the program.



- **Strategic Direction Needs:**

- The strategic planning process is expected to identify whether the LLP places an emphasis on quantity (acquiring many simple working farmland easements) or complexity (richer multi-outcome projects that tackle affordability, access and natural resource enhancement), a combination of both or something else entirely. It's almost certain that whatever approach EMSWCD selects will require the consideration of and adoption of new tools (e.g. resolving the long-standing issue of making working farmland easement values compelling).

In practice, this means that the LLP will focus on the above tasks and put a pause on developing new conservation transactions. Exceptions may be considered for particularly compelling opportunities for which an EMSWCD failure to participate would mean the opportunity would likely be foregone (e.g. an important farm parcel listed for sale and at risk of conversion or a working farmland easement collaboration opportunity).