



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

(April 10, 2023)

Monday, April 17, 2023, 4:00 – 6:00 PM

To be held at the EMSWCD Office (5211 N Williams Ave, Portland, OR 97217)

Or join virtually: <https://meet.goto.com/EastMultSWCD/landlegacycommitteemeeting>

Access Code: 993-088-381 United States (Toll Free): 1 877 309 2073 United States: +1 (646) 749-3129

AGENDA

Item #	Time	Agenda Item	Purpose	Presenter	Packet
1	4:00 10 mins	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome and Call to Order• Review/Revise agenda• Previous Action Items• Approval of January 23, 2023 meeting minutes	Information/ Decision	Guebert	a) 1/23/2023 LLC Meeting Minutes b) 2/9/2023 Gresham Outlook article on Mainstem Farm transaction
2	4:10 5 mins	Time Reserved for Public Comment	Information	Public	N/A
3	4:15 30 mins	Oxbow Well	Information / Discussion	Guests / LLC	N/A
4	4:45 10 mins	Working Farmland Protection Program Initiatives	Information	Shipkey	a) Program challenges / possible interventions overview table
<u>Overview:</u> As the Land Legacy Program resumes its proactive development of working farmland projects, Shipkey will provide an update on current program activities.					
5	4:55 30 mins	Outreach Plan	Information / Discussion	Shipkey, Nelson Kent / LLC	a) Preliminary Working Farmland Protection Program Outreach Plan
<u>Overview:</u> Staff will review past working farmland protection program outreach efforts. Review of past efforts will help set the context for the purpose, goals, information needs and potential next steps of outreach work going forward. The Land Legacy Committee will be asked to share any input or suggestions they may have.					
6	5:25 30 mins	Executive Session under ORS 192.660(2)(e) held for real estate negotiations	Discussion/ Decision	Shipkey / LLC	Executive session materials to be sent separately.
<u>Overview:</u> Shipkey will review potential disposition options for District property. The LLC will discuss the proposal and be asked to decide on an option for Staff to advance.					
7	5:55 5 mins	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Announcements and Reminders• Action Items• Adjourn	Information	Guebert	N/A



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

(April 10, 2023)

Monday, April 17, 2023, 4:00 – 6:00 PM

To be held at the EMSWCD Office (5211 N Williams Ave, Portland, OR 97217)

Or join virtually: <https://meet.goto.com/EastMultSWCD/landlegacycommitteemeeting>

Access Code: 993-088-381 United States (Toll Free): 1 877 309 2073 United States: +1 (646) 749-3129

EMSWCD Board Members, Officers and Meeting Dates:

EMSWCD Board			LLC	Year	FY22-23 Schedule	Board	LLC
Members	Positions	Officers					
Joe Rossi	Zone 1 Director		X	2022	July	6 th	25 th
Laura Masterson	Zone 2 Director	Secretary	X		August	1 st	
Mike Guebert	Zone 3 Director	Vice-Chair	Chair		September	x	x
Jim Carlson	At-Large 1 Director	Treasurer	X		October	3 rd	17 th
Jasmine Zimmer-Stucky	At-Large 2 Director	Chair	X		November	7 th	21 st
					December	5 th	6 th
				2023	January	4 th	30 th
					February	6 th	
					March	6 th	
					April	3 rd	17 th
					May	1 st	22 nd
					June	5 th	



1/23/2023

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

Monday, January 23rd, 2023

4:30pm - Call to Order

Zimmer-Stucky called to order the regular meeting of the EMSWCD Land Legacy Committee at 4:30pm on Monday, January 23, 2023 at EMSWCD's Office.

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, LLC Chair), Laura Masterson (Zone 2 Director) (4:37pm), Mike Guebert (Zone 3 Director), Jim Carlson (At-Large Director 1), Joe Rossi (Zone 1 Director) (4:37pm)

Staff: Nancy Hamilton (Executive Director) (virtual), Dan Mitten (CFO), Julie DiLeone (Rural Lands Program Manager), Matt Shipkey (Land Legacy Program Manager), Heather Nelson Kent (Grants Program Manager), Jeremy Baker (Senior Rural Conservationist), Asianna Fernandez (Executive Assistant)

Guests: Adam Segal (Member of the Public)

Changes to Agenda: Info on March LLC Meeting Content

Previous Action items:

Hamilton to send foundational documents to LLC. -done.

Staff to incorporate feedback into options presented to LLC in January. -done.

Fernandez to add a virtual option for January Meeting (Masterson will be out of town). -done.

Approval of December 6, 2022 Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Guebert moved to approve the December 6, 2022, LLC Meeting minutes. Carlson 2nd. Motion passed unanimously (3-0, Rossi and Masterson absent).

4:36pm – Appointment of LLC Chair

Zimmer-Stucky recommended Guebert for LLC Chair.

MOTION: Guebert moved to approve Mike Guebert as Land Legacy Committee Chair. Carlson 2nd. Motion passed unanimously (3-0, Rossi and Masterson absent).

4:36pm – Mike Guebert took over the meeting as Chair of the Land Legacy Committee.

4:36pm – Time Reserved for Public Comment: N/A

4:37pm – March LLC Meeting:

Shipkey announced that while the last few LLC Meetings have been discussing high level strategic planning efforts for the Land Legacy Program (LLP), at the March meeting, he will update the LLC on recent and upcoming program efforts regarding specifics of working farmland project development.

4:41pm – Recommendation on EMSWCD's role in Natural Area and Access to Nature Projects

Guebert Reminder that the LLC is making recommendations to the Board, looking for clarity on where we're headed on this program based on Board and staff recommendations.

Shipkey presented the 5 options for the LLP moving forward, and the staff recommendation.



1/23/2023

Option 1: Restrict Land Conservation Fund expenditures to agricultural projects only.

Option 2 (Staff Recommendation): Retain Status Quo – reactively respond to and fund compelling opportunities (District-wide) with high levels of community support. No hard cap on Natural Area/ Access to Nature projects/funding. Aligns with the Strategic Plan, community preferences and needs, District capabilities (resources and skills), and the District’s track record of success in this area.

Option 3: Continue with land acquisition grants as status quo and incorporate capital projects funding via the Land Conservation Fund (LCF) (restoration and passive development, agricultural investments).

Option 4: Retain status quo - reactively respond to and fund compelling opportunities (District-wide) with high levels of community support but develop a cap on the total annual number of Non-agricultural projects (ex. 1-2 Natural Areas/ Access to Nature projects annually).

Option 5: Agricultural projects, with Natural Area/ Access to Nature projects limited to urban areas only.

Guebert asked the Committee for a temperature check.

Zimmer-Stucky inclined to adopt staff recommendation. Doesn’t necessarily align with her direction from December but recognizes that the Board still retains a lot of authority over specific projects.

Carlson is also leaning towards Option 2. Option 4 is similar to option 2 since Board can continue to make decisions as projects come up.

Masterson was advocating for 100% agricultural projects at December Meeting. Thought the direction that the Board gave to staff was not status quo but was prioritizing agriculture a little more than natural spaces and limiting natural spaces projects. Happy to have staff respond to this understanding. Leaning more towards option 5. Staff capacity is a limitation on advancing natural spaces projects.

Guebert is in between option 2 and 5 but leaning towards option 5. He would like to see more urban projects. Would like to see after next meeting how Agricultural projects would be prioritized.

Rossi agrees more with Masterson because of who is already out there doing Natural Space work.

Carlson Just because a project for urban spaces is an opportunity, we don’t have to do it. If we see others doing it, we can choose not to. Leaves space open for options.

Masterson Would like to see more restraint. Her assumption is that staff time spent on non-Ag projects leads to less Agricultural projects being developed.

Appreciates narrowing the selection criteria and being more focused.

Guebert Nestwood is outside the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), how many other projects outside of UGB have we invested in?

Shipkey None.

Guebert Knowing that option 5 wouldn’t create any additional staff capacity.

Masterson This board operates more strategically if we make these decisions early on. Every Board has had trouble saying ‘No’ to projects that come through. This is the opportunity to be as strategic as possible. It’s easy to be reactive in LLC because there’s so many big partners who work on natural area projects all the time. We can get carbon, climate, and community impact through agricultural projects, hardly anyone out there is doing it.

Hamilton Staff recommendations don’t exclude the opportunity to help leverage projects outside of the UGB. We’re proactively pursuing agricultural projects, which we wouldn’t do inside or outside UGB without soil and water health merits.

Carlson Since we’re not actively pursuing Natural resources projects, do we want to put specific criteria on natural space projects?



1/23/2023

Shipkey gave the committee a handout of staff's current project assessment criteria. These have served us (staff) well in sifting through the numerous non-Ag projects staff didn't bring forward to the Board due to not meeting the criteria. The projects we did bring forward did meet the criteria, and in most cases were funded.

Guebert We don't know anything about the community support for most of the projects that have gone through. What level of community support is needed?

Zimmer-Stucky proposed a motion to recommend to the board: The LLC will proactively seek agricultural land opportunities and reactively respond to compelling natural space opportunities, Districtwide, with high levels of community support.

(sort of like option 2, but added proactively seek agricultural project opportunities)

Masterson Would the motion change anything that's already on the table. How does it differ from option 2?

Zimmer-Stucky What isn't written in option 2: proactively seeking agricultural opportunities. But this doesn't mean I will automatically support another Nestwood or Shaull project. Am ok voting no on projects.

Guebert Would like to revisit this issue if we do have a lot of ag projects coming to us.

MOTION: Zimmer-Stucky moved to recommend to the board: The LLC will proactively seek agricultural land opportunities and reactively respond to compelling natural space opportunities, Districtwide, with high levels of community support. Masterson 2nd. Motion passed 3-2 (3 Guebert, Zimmer-Stucky, Carlson - 2 Rossi, Masterson).

5:20pm – Next Steps for Gordon Creek Farm Access Equity Project

Shipkey Over the last few years, the District has looked at what opportunities we have for advancing more equitable farm access opportunities. There's been a general level of support for such work from the Board. We now have a specific proposal to advance that work via the Gordon Creek Farm site at this time. Advised that if the LLC feels like they need more discussion or information, Staff would prefer LLC not to make a final decision today, and instead defer until there is the opportunity for additional dialogue / information development.

Hamilton Understands that there are some variations of ideas from the Board about whether Gordon Creek is the right spot for the Farm Access Equity Advisory Group's (FAEAG) proposal, but in terms of the District's commitment to equity and the strategic plan, there seems to be an interest in seeing what can be done to right the farming playing field with consideration of generational wealth gaps and access to land for members of the BIPOC community who don't have a historical land base to work from, from family or other inheritance.

Shipkey explained the 3 options for the FAEAG project:

Option 1 (Staff Recommendation): Gordon Creek Farm Property: 5-year no cost lease to an organization that will make the site available to farmers from communities that have been negatively impacted by racial discrimination and/or dispossession. We would use the term of the lease to assess the capability of the organization to advance the work. We might choose to convey property at the end of the lease if the organization meets performance measures or defer the decision. What the property would be conveyed for would be a discussion for another day. Shipkey also identified specific strategies that address the Board's stated concerns about issues related to the residence (see below for details).

- This is an immediate opportunity to translate our equity focused words and values into actions.
- This is the product of deep involvement/ co-creating with community, we can seize that momentum.



1/23/2023

- This is a chance to build lasting partnerships with community organizations and show the community the value of EMSWCD resources.

Option 2: Big Creek Farm Property: This is only possible if the District does not receive the USDA Farm Access grant monies. Some considerations are the infrastructure extent and condition (not as desirable as Gordon Creek), it's not vacant, the lack of a house could be a positive or negative depending on different factors, there's more acreage at Big Creek, and the purchase price was less than Gordon Creek.

Option 3: An alternative property: There isn't currently anything available, and this is dependent on if/when another property becomes available.

Masterson would be more comfortable if there was a higher degree of confidence from Option A first. Don't want to pull rug on someone, would prefer to guarantee longer terms.

Guebert Is Big Creek Farm approved for a home dwelling?

Shipkey No, it'd have to go through the qualified farm dwelling approval process.

Rossi Putting a house on Big Creek Farm is possible.

Shipkey We could address the Board's concerns regarding the house at Gordon Creek in several ways. If the Lessee indicated a desire to use the house for residential purposes, we would expect a property management company to be engaged to ensure the proper use of the asset. We would also require that the partner organization has a full and accurate understanding of the zoning, and what is or isn't allowed. We cannot rent it out separately. The value of the residence is about a third of the value of the property. We would take some value loss on the property if we decided to sell it due to putting an easement on it, and so the residence just represents an additional quotient beyond that known and accepted loss. Also noted that the return on dollar investment isn't something the District looks at in other programs.

Guebert Reminder that buy, protect, sell has been an expected assumption of this program.

Masterson For option A, would buy protect sell be easier? Concerned about precedent, what precedent are we setting? Option A is outside the box of how we've thought about this before. What does success look like for a project like this? Leaning towards Option C to look for properties once we've decided criteria first. Hesitant to move forward without more strategic thinking.

Guebert is struggling to visualize what success could look like for this down the road. Without a broad vision, struggling with envisioning the process. Supports the idea and grateful to FAEG for the work they did but needs more information about what could happen on the site.

Carlson How many times have we done buy protect sell before?

Shipkey 2 times. We previously listed Gordon Creek for sale and accepted an offer which fell through; it was at that time Staff asked the Board to consider utilizing the site to advance farm access equity.

Carlson What kind of access opportunities would we look at? Would like to get some financial profit from it to put into other future projects.

Zimmer-Stucky Still having a hard time putting pieces together for the project at option A. With the USDA grant possibly coming through, calling for staff capacity and time, and possibility of option 2 from last topic discussed (continuing to advance non-Ag projects), adding this project feels like too much work for 1-2 FTE. With the house on Gordon Creek, doesn't feel right to put a nonprofit on the land and get a property manager for the house. We will find the right property for the FAEG, with better farm-shop and other amenities. On the house, the questions haven't changed, and we haven't gotten any new answers since we started looking at the property. Leaning towards option C.



1/23/2023

Rossi Don't see the logic of EMSWCD owning property and managing it, or how it fits the mission. Had we not bought the property, a fruit grower could've bought it. Leaning towards putting it back on the market for a qualifying grower/farmer to buy. Open to putting easement on it first. Holding this capital is impoverishing other soil and water health initiatives. Buying properties without representation, and not allowing the market access to the properties, we have the potential of buying it undervalue or paying too much for it.

Carlson Agreed. We're looking at another growing cycle passing without it being used.

Masterson It takes time to figure out opportunities that advance equity goals of the District. Still open to an opportunity that aligns with Equity goals, would like staff to continue thinking about that, but still feels Gordon Creek Farm is not the place for that.

Guebert If LLC decided on option A, how do we see who is interested in the project and hear what their ideas for it might be, that might help us make a decision? This could help us find the right property for it as well.

Masterson That can be done without having a piece of land tied to it already. Suggested bringing this topic to a Work Session meeting.

Hamilton Is the LLC interested in fundamentally considering a project that helps advance farm access for farmers from communities that have been negatively impacted by racial discrimination and/or dispossession? Is this part of what we are considering as part of the program's success beyond fiscal profit?

Guebert This is shown in option C.

Zimmer-Stucky This discussion feels more honed in on the particular Gordon Creek property. Leaning towards option C. To Hamilton's question, does the board want to keep considering those kinds of projects.

Masterson Still looking for more discussion on what LLC sees as success.

Shipkey Option C has the strong potential of becoming option D – the District does not advance this work on any site – since so few properties become available in our District, and an even smaller subset will actually be appropriate for this work. We've heard from these communities that the site feels right for them. As to the suggestion to go out for a more generalized RFI, Staff wanted to be respectful of folks' time and the reality that they are so often consulted without seeing tangible results by offering a specific, actionable project to translate our words into actions. Regarding the comments on what would define success, Staff has prepped materials speaking to that issue for option A but didn't share pending a decision on which option the LLC was recommending.

Zimmer-Stucky The difference between RFI and FAEAG recommendation: people with RFI come to us with a tangible vision of what their org could do. FAEAG didn't have that vision in mind considering they couldn't profit from the decision. FAEAG's recommendation was something the Board probably wouldn't agree to/aren't ready for anyway. They'd be disappointed if we went with RFI or not. Remains committed to finding a property for FAEAG, forcing something that doesn't fit due to spending time on it already isn't a good way to operate.

Guebert Board is not ready to move forward with the proposal.

MOTION: Zimmer-Stucky moved to approve option C, Carlson 2nd. Passed unanimously (5-0).

Zimmer-Stucky Reiterated that her vote does not reflect a disinterest in the project and to put the project on hold, but to continue to double down on looking for the right acquisition for FAEAG's project proposal.

1/23/2023



Masterson Thought there was a lot of agreement from the Board on the FAEAG objectives. Would still like to understand more about what objective number 4 means.

Guebert There may also be more opportunities with the USDA Grant, and confident that there will be success with the FAEAG's proposal down the line.

6:08pm - Closing items: announcements, reminders, and action items.

March 27th: next LLC meeting.

6:09pm - Adjournment

Guebert adjourned the meeting at 6:09pm.

East County easement program cultivates young, motivated farmers



Full Cellar Farm purchased a 14-acre parcel outside of Boring thanks to a land easement that protects farmland, nature.
Courtesy photo: Full Cellar Farm

A program is cultivating a new crop of young, inspired farmers who are staking a claim throughout East Multnomah County to protect diminishing farmland and grow fresh produce.

In late 2022 Emily Cooper closed a deal with the East Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District for a 14-acre parcel that is now home to Full Cellar Farm.

“It’s truly a dream come true,” Cooper said. “I’m looking forward to getting to know the land better with every passing year.”

Learn More

fullcellarfarmoregon.com

The sale represents a new way for farmland to be secured in an affordable, open way, and protects the land for farming, water quality and wildlife in perpetuity, counteracting development that has been paving over East County’s natural spaces for decades.

The partnership with East Multnomah Soil and Water allowed Cooper to follow her dreams of becoming a farmer. It all started in 2008 when she fell in love with the profession during an apprenticeship in Joseph, Oregon. Full Cellar planted roots through the Headwaters Incubator Program, on the outskirts of Gresham, where she shared space, equipment and ideas with other young farmers.

She transitioned to farming leased land from East Multnomah Soil and Water next door, before making the purchase last November.

Now Full Cellar Farm is growing strong along the upper reaches of Johnson Creek outside of Boring. Cooper, and her partner Rachael Crane, grow more than 50 kinds of vegetables year round.

Part of the purchase was a working farmland easement — which necessitates the land remain a farm even if later sold. That ensures East Multnomah County does not lose valuable farmland to development, and lowered the cost for the

burgeoning farmers. It also protects the natural resources, including a portion of Johnson Creek.

“As current farmers approach retirement age, easements are a way to preserve their agricultural legacy and help the next generation of farmers,” said Jasmine Zimmer-Stucky, East Multnomah Soil and Water chair and part-time farmer in Corbett. “It’s part of a bigger strategy to protect land for agriculture, keep food production and farming local, and address past and current inequities in farmland access,”

The 2017 United States Department of Agriculture Census of Agriculture found 97% of farm producers in Oregon (about 65,000 people) were white, and the average age was 57. But by supporting farmers like Cooper, those statistics are changing.

“We need new, innovative ways of structuring land access opportunities for our up-and-coming farmers,” Zimmer-Stucky said.



Full Cellar Farm grows more than 50 types of produce.

Courtesy photo: Full Cellar Farm

To pass it along, Full Cellar hosts other farmers on the property, especially newcomers to the profession, women and Black farmers.

“I’ve been lucky to farm alongside other people from the start,” Cooper said. “I wouldn’t have it any other way. I learn so much from other farmers and I feel supported.”

More than 45 local farmers and ranchers, including several from Headwaters Farm, are gathering for a showcase later this month.

The Share Fair will run from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. Sunday, Feb. 26, at The Redd, 831 S.E. Salmon St. There will be information about Community Supported Agriculture (CSA), local chefs preparing dishes using locally-grown ingredients, and activities for kids.

Learn more at pnwcsa.org/csasharefair

Christopher Keizur is a reporter based in Gresham, Ore.

Christopher Keizur

Reporter

Christopher Keizur is a reporter based in Gresham, Ore.

Issue	Response	Status
Low uptake in acquiring easements	Identify specific “pain-points” via a survey of priority farmers/landowners	Survey of farmers/landowners in progress shortly
Low easement values	ID alternative approach to valuing easements (may include carbon)	RFP for development of alternative easement valuation approach has been circulated
Unresponsive landowners	Potentially address via partnerships, leaning into peer referrals, Board connections	Will refine approach based on survey results
Resistant landowners (e.g. ag practice requirements, government oversight)	Potentially increase compensation, create exceptions, term easements, partnerships with non gov’t entities	Will refine approach based on survey results
Challenging family dynamics	Continue to offer farm succession planning resources, create new resources	Planning for fall 2023 farm succession event, also for possible pilot assisted farm transition effort
Limited availability of properties to purchase outright	Consider purchasing options we can exercise when folks are ready to sell	Have explored option purchase with several landowners, considering wider ask.



Working Farmland Protection Program Outreach Plan

East Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District

3/22/2023

Executive Summary

This document identifies the purpose, goals and information needs of an ongoing outreach plan for the working farmland protection component of EMSWCD's Land Legacy Program. Potential next steps – which will be refined as additional information is gathered – are identified. All of the preceding is first contextualized with a review of past outreach work. **At its April 17, 2023 meeting, The Land Legacy Committee will be asked to share any input or suggestions they may have.**

Outreach Efforts; 2017 – Today

Some substantive elements of the outreach work conducted to date are noted below. Consistent with the prior experience of the Land Legacy Program Manager and similar programs across the country, outreach efforts that lean into peer referrals and program participant experiences have resulted in the most productive outcomes.

Timing	Outreach Item	Reach / Reception
2017 (summer / fall)	Outreach / messaging plan developed	N/A
2018	1x1 conversations with leading farm operators about program offerings, design	Increased awareness with ~ 10 leading producers
	Website revamp to focus on program benefits	Increased traffic
	New program brochure developed and circulated	Sent to all priority ¹ farmland owners (~125), a few calls received
	Film screening @ Corbett Grange	A few priority farmland owners attended
	Kitchen table discussion with program participant	~ 10 attendees, engaging conversation

¹ Priority farmland owners are those folks in ownership of farm properties which we have identified and ranked via our internal prioritization analysis as having the most productive agricultural capacity.



Working Farmland Protection Program Outreach Plan

East Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District

3/22/2023

2019	Farm succession workshop offered exclusively for subset of highest ranked priority farmland owners (~70); program opportunities reviewed in workshop	10 attendees
	Program update newsletter featuring closed projects and participant quotes	Sent to all priority farmland owners, a few calls received
2020	Farm succession workshop offered exclusively for priority farmland owners, program opportunities reviewed in workshop	18 attendees, 7 from EMSWCD service area (collaborated with Clackamas SWCD)
	Program update newsletter featuring closed projects and participant quotes	Sent to all priority farmland owners, no inquiries
	'Forever Farm' signs installed @ EMSWCD working farmland projects	
2021	Farm succession workshop offered exclusively for priority farmland owners, program opportunities reviewed in workshop	~30 attendees, 6 from EMSWCD service area (collaborated with Clackamas and Tualatin SWCD's)
	Updated Land Legacy website to include quotes from past program participants	
2022	New project development pause due to workload, reduced capacity and strategic capacity	N/A



Working Farmland Protection Program Outreach Plan

East Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District

3/22/2023

2023	Outreach letters to priority farmland owners highlighting examples of completed projects	1 response from landowner interested in exploring sale
	Outreach event at Corbett Grange	Scheduled for April 19 th

In addition to the above, the following outreach strategies have also been utilized on an ongoing basis:

- General and targeted outreach and conversations (letters, emails, calls, face to face)
- Introductions and referrals to priority farmland owners by program participants
- Press releases and social media posts on (successful land protection transactions; these have resulted in 6 newspaper articles)
- Meetings / discussions with various key influence leaders (e.g, Oregon Association of Nurseries, Multnomah County Farm Bureau)

Purpose of Outreach Plan

To improve the return on our outreach efforts with farmers and landowners in the district by rethinking who we reach out to, how we reach out to them, and how we implement successful next steps that will result in more participation i in EMSWCD's Working Farmland Protection program. .

Outreach Goals

- Understand what motivates potential program participants to consider and then ultimately pursue working farmland protection for their property
- Increase positive awareness of EMSWCD's working farmland protection program
- Increase participation in EMSWCD's working farmland protection program
- Raise awareness of other EMSWCD programs and services



Information Gaps

In 2017, there was an informal effort to assess the perception of working farmland protection efforts via conversations with the leading growers. The scope of that outreach was limited, was not designed by survey professionals and was 5+ years ago. As we move forward with refinement of an outreach plan, we are looking to collect better and more comprehensive information via a survey of key landowners, including information about:

- What motivates potential program participants? What “turns folks off”?
- How do they get their information?
- Who are the influencers in their community/circles?
- Are there certain times of the year / times of the day that are best for this type of engagement?

We are currently in the process of working with a professional survey firm to secure answers to the above questions and more. We are targeting conversations with ~20 - 30 farmers/landowners associated with the very highest priority farmland properties in our District.

A secondary benefit of this landowner survey project is creating an opportunity to further publicize the program offerings and open the door to additional engagement, and to possibly correct some common misunderstandings (such as: easements are designed to phase out agricultural use, provide for public access, etc.).

Next Steps and Future EMSWCD Board Input

The next steps will be driven to a significant extent by the findings of the survey and will be guided by input and assistance from EMSWCD’s newly formed Community Outreach and Engagement Team. Some of the preliminary ideas we have include:

- Short video testimonials with program participants that reflect the learnings of the in-progress landowner survey. These videos would be screened at small, casual “kitchen table” sessions with priority farmers/landowners.
- Identify and follow through on any additional referral opportunities that may exist with the Board, Rural Lands staff and others.
- “Lunch and learn” with real estate professionals and other individuals (e.g. lenders, attorneys) in a position to make program referrals.
- Collaborative outreach efforts with Oregon Agricultural Trust and/or trusted members of the local agricultural community.
- Easement workshops – including videos created by Oregon Agricultural Trust and new EMSWCD videos and co-hosted with them
- Farm protection / access Advisory Group that would provide input, conduct outreach, etc.



Working Farmland Protection Program Outreach Plan
East Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District

3/22/2023

- Continue with:
 - General and targeted outreach / conversations (letters, emails, calls, face to face)
 - Regular newsletter updates
 - Press releases
 - Weaving program awareness into farm succession planning workshops
 - Website and social media updates
 - Discussions with influence leaders
 - Monitoring real estate listings

Going forward, staff will provide the LLC with a summary of the survey findings, the updated outreach plan and significant milestones of the plan implementation.