

Marion Soil and Water Conservation District BOARD MEETING 07/01/2020

Location: Marion SWCD Conference Room
338 Hawthorne Ave. NE, Salem, OR 97301
Date: Wednesday July 1, 2020
Time: 6:50 PM to 9:47 PM

Approved Minutes:
Recorder: Janice Calkins
Chair: Terry Hsu

TELEPHONE/VIDEO CONFERENCE (VIA PHONE & ZOOM MEETING) ATTENDANCE:

<u>DIRECTORS</u>	<u>ASSOCIATES</u>	<u>STAFF</u>	<u>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</u>	<u>GUESTS</u>
Walker, Scott (ph.)	Fields, Mark (no video/sound)		Keppinger, Jane	Slawik, Brandy,
Koch, Rochelle		Bishop, Brandon		City of Salem
Hsu, Terry		Ammon, Jenny (ph.)		Bachelor, Les
Olson, Darin		Hamilton, Sarah		NRCS (ph.)

- 1. CALL TO ORDER / INTRODUCTIONS / ANNOUNCEMENTS – Chair Hsu:**
Introductions were made by all in attendance. Brandy Slawik advised she is the Youth Environmental Educator for the City of Salem.
- 2. PUBLIC COMMENT - Public:** (Moved to Item 3)
No comments made.
- 3. AGENDA APPROVAL/CHANGES** *(if items are added, include under Discussion or Action Items)* – **Chair Hsu:**
Hsu indicated that Sub-leases to OACD and Network of Oregon Watershed Councils needed to be added and he would designate it as Action Item:0. Walker asked to add CLEAR grants as a potential action item. Hsu chose to add as C:1. Sub-Leases will be discussed first he said.
- 4. AGENCY and/or MSWCD COMMITTEE REPORT**
 - a) **NRCS Report – L. Bachelor**
Bachelor offered an apology for not having submitted Conservation Plans to the District in a timely manner (prior to the meeting). NRCS has quite a few contracts written right now, and we have received 52 applications he said. Tuff time getting implementation this year. NRCS is still without a Cultural Resource Specialist. There is quite a bit of construction going on right now, with a lot of projects from the last couple of years in process. We normally have until September 15th to write our contracts and obligate them, but it seems National wants to sweep the funds and take them back the middle of August, he said. We are in Phase II of the Sales Service Center. The NRCS office is still closed, but appointments only, are being taken – with social distancing adhered to. Unfortunately, we are behind on everything due to COVID-19, Bachelor reported. End of report.
 - b) **ADHOC Building Committee – R. Koch, Chair**
Unless someone wishes to add anything, Koch asked this item to be addressed under Action Items. No further comments made.
Keppinger announced she may have just lost everyone. Koch saying - technical difficulties. (26:29)

Bishop pointed out that both Doug Krahmer and Dave Budeau were not present to report for the **Program Committee** (d), and since the only discussion involved the Cover Crop program, can the item simply be addressed under Action **Item 7:E**. Hsu agreed that would be fine.
Keppinger advised Scott Walker was back on. Meeting can proceed (26:29)
(28:32 Walker on)
 - c) **Education Committee – S. Walker, Chair**
Walker advised that the Education Committee had met just yesterday and that they had discussed three items: Distance Learning, the Scholarship Program, and the CLEAR Grant Program. Regarding Distance Learning, we will

put a call out to potential new members of a new focus group (compiled of individuals with different backgrounds, educators and others) who will work together to evaluate what a new Distance Learning Program might offer. If anyone wishes to offer up any names of potential candidates, please let us know he said. We will work to establish content in alignment to the Board's directive in a recent Board meeting. There was also discussion pertaining to updating the Scholarship Program. As there is not an urgency to this matter, discussions will ensue later. With regards to the CLEAR Grant Program, there was a discussion about increasing the maximum dollar requested amount to \$2,000.00 per application. And the maximum amount allowed per applicant, per fiscal year to \$7,500.00. And a five- year number, based on a total of all programs offered. A subject worthy of conversation still, is who is the applicant. Is it the District? The School(s)? or the Teacher? Walker suggests it would behoove the District to define the goals of the Program relative to Education, specifically are the Programs being offered in accordance to the mission of the District. (33:01)

1. **CLEAR Grants Review/Approve**

None.

d) **Program Committee – D. Krahmer, Chair**

1. **Recommendation to Implement Cover Crop Program for FY 2020-21** See 7:E.

5. Present Financial Report – S. Walker, Secretary/Treasurer

Walker allowed Jane Keppinger to provide numbers. Local Government Investment Pool (LGIP) Fund for the month of June: ended \$2,236,925.26. Checking account balance for end of June: \$58,329.34. Taxes collected for the Fiscal year ended up being 45,000.00 more for this current year's taxes than I had budgeted for. And we ended up with about \$4,000.00 more for the previous years amount than I had budgeted for. I expected about \$36,000.00 and we collected \$40,406.64. We collected about \$49,000.00 additional dollars from taxes that we had not budgeted in. Everything went pretty well, until March hit, she said. Walker added he wished the District to act with caution, as he feels this next year many people may choose to not pay taxes, based on current events and the District may not see the anticipated dollars received in November. (35:38)

ACTION:

None.

DISCUSSION:

Hsu questioned if the Board needed to approve the financial report this month. Keppinger responded it was a formality, and it was up to him whether he wished to accept the verbal report over the more formal printed report normally provided. **Hsu and Walker agreed approval could be provided next month with two months of data presented (June and July figures).** No action made. (36:21)

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. **Potential of New Office Space**

ACTION:

Koch made a motion for the Board to approve the new purchase price discussed with Hancock Realty for the property at 408 Third Street in Stayton, Oregon and allow Terry Hancock and Terry Hsu to represent us (the Board) and finalize a decision on our behalf. 2nd by Walker.

DISCUSSION:

None.

Motion Passed: 4 – 0 Vote. (39:23)

b. **District Manager Evaluation**

DISCUSSION:

Hsu advised that last month the Board reviewed the District Manager evaluation form created by Dee Rubanoff.(Attorney) Everyone seemed to feel it was acceptable he said. The only comment made was by Doug Krahmer, who felt the review should be conducted by the end of the year, so that all current Directors can provide input on the evaluation. As a group, I feel we all felt that would be a wise course of action. During this next round, Hsu expressed a desire that no Board member have any reason to not be prepared to complete the evaluation form prior to the Board meeting in which a discussion will be held. Therefore, he would ask Keppinger to contact all Directors by phone, in advance advising of the up-coming review and the urgency for all to be fully prepared. Koch commented that the evaluation should include direction to the District Manager to contact all Directors (by phone)

advising of the urgent need to complete the evaluation form and to be prepared for a Board discussion. Koch questioned item 2 on page 16 whereby it was noted under evaluation format it says the employee performance was not observed during the evaluation process – no score. If no score is entered, will it not throw off the overall scoring of the evaluation. Hsu did not feel it would affect it negatively. Koch also hoped to get Keppinger's take on this evaluation, since she (Keppinger) was familiar with multiple types done over the years. Keppinger responded that she felt the evaluation created by Dee Rubanoff is a good base, that it is very similar to the evaluation forms she herself has used for Staff evaluations. There are some good questions asked, and Dee based those questions along the lines of the District Manager's current responsibilities/job description. Like the 360 Review, the Board will simply have to use it and then decide if the evaluation included everything they needed, liked or if some changes/modifications would be needed to make for an improved process in the future. It seems a better process than has been used in the past, and I am in favor of it Keppinger advised.(44:03)

Hsu restated that they will include instructions to the District Manager in the evaluation form, that he/she will be required to contact each Director by phone prior to mailing out the formal District Manager Evaluation Forms, so that there will be no excuse available for any Director to attend the designated Board meeting, to not have completed said evaluation form, and not be prepared to discuss the matter. Walker added, each evaluation form should be mailed the Directors as Registered Mail pieces, and that a deadline date for its completion be clearly noted. If a Director fails to complete the evaluation, they will have no say in the final decisions made.

ACTION:

Hsu moved that the Board add to the evaluation form, that the District Manager is required to notify all Board members the schedule for the District Manager Evaluation, when this evaluation schedule is determined. And that it also be added that Board members who fail to meet the schedule will not be incorporated into the District Manager's evaluation. 2nd by Koch.

DISCUSSION:

None.

Motion passed: 4-0 Vote. (48:17)

District Manager Evaluation Process

Hsu reviewed the process stated with the Board, looking at page 1 of 16 the Board meets with the Manager to review the proposed evaluation form taking in consideration any changes made to the job description, objective, established for the board. He asked if Keppinger saw any need for revisions to this. Only question she had, was what is the review time? Are we speaking the last 12 months, 6 months, 24 months? What time are you going to look at? It was decided since the last review findings/discussion. Keppinger replied if memory serves me right that may have been back in March. Hsu reminded everyone how Dee Rubanoff had suggested to him that Vanessa ____ (last name forgotten) of DR Consults might be asked to assist the Board with matters related to internal communications. Personally, Hsu said, I do not feel her services with communications are needed at this time. He asked for others input. Olson suggested they move forward with this new evaluation of the District Manager, and if results require another step be taken, this option can be looked at later. Koch and Walker were okay with the direction stated. (53:03) It was discussed if the review would be done during Executive Session or public. Keppinger agreed she would prefer it be public. Hsu restated he would still include input from public partners and District Staff, and suggested that someone – perhaps Mark Fields, Associate Director act as checker to help assure scores and responses are tallied correctly for quality control purposes. Hsu noted the Self-Evaluation by District Manager would be due by next Board Meeting. Would there be any objection if I utilize something like Google Docs for an electronic tabulation? Hsu asked. Ways to survey people. Hsu will work to prepare something for the Board to review during their next meeting.

7. ACTION ITEMS (Motion to approve, accept or postpone an item)

0. Sub-Leases with OACD (Oregon Association of Conservation District) and the Network of Oregon Watershed Councils

Keppinger advised that the District received a letter today from the Network of Oregon Watershed Councils, stating that they and OACD had lost a good portion of their financial funding which comes from OWEB (Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board). Due to circumstances related to COVID-19, OWEB can no longer sustain their funding. They are asking that we release them from their obligation to pay rent and realize they may forfeit their deposit. Keppinger asked the Board to honor their request, stating that many other non-profit organizations have also lost their funding sources because of COVID-19.

ACTION:

Olson motioned for the Board to accept the termination of Lease agreements by both OACD and Network of Oregon Watershed Councils with no monies owed, and that they both be given 60-days to vacate the premises 2nd by Koch.

DISCUSSION:

Walker suggests two options: One, allow both entities to remain in the office, without having any financial obligation to pay rent. Second option, as Darin has suggested, simply release them from their lease. I believe we should offer them the choice to remain at no charge, based on them being a sister agency. Keppinger added, that would be a very generous offer, however, based on the onset of COVID-19 the fact is, neither agency has been working within our office. They have opted instead to work from their homes, which for many are outside of this county. Olson was asked if he wished to amend his motion. He responded he would prefer it stand, saying, Keppinger can discuss the options suggested, and if they wish to remain -a change can be made, and should they require additional time to vacate, we can extend the date.

Motion Passed: 4-0 Vote.

a. **June 10, 2020 Budget Committee and Board Meeting Minutes**

ACTION:

Olson motioned for the Board to approve the June 10, 2020 minutes as submitted. 2nd by Hsu.

DISCUSSION:

None.

Motion Passed: 4-0 Vote.

b. **Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion (DEI) Presentation/ Funds Request – Sarah Hamilton (1:09:01)**

Hamilton provided a Power-point presentation to act as an overview of some of the things the DEI Committee has been doing for the last several months. The nuts and bolts to what we want to do is really in the memo I sent to the Board, she said, and hopefully you have each had a chance to review it. There are also a couple of proposals from other organizations which includes what we are looking at. About a year ago, you (the Board) set-forth Goal 7.5 in our District's 5-Year Strategic Plan to build the capacity of Board and Staff to deliver Diverse, Equitable, and Inclusive services and to develop a strategy. The DEI Committee also created at that time, has taken your direction, and run with it. **We have come up with a three-part process to work towards inclusivity. Part 1: Set up training for Staff, Board and Partners. We wish to include our Partners to increase awareness of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusivity in our region and to become a regional leader in that. Part II: To provide an assessment or audit to determine the needs of Diversity in our service area to determine what we are currently providing, and what is needed that we are not providing. Part III: The development of a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusivity plan.** As a governmental agency, it is our responsibility to serve all members of the District equitably. The development of a DEI plan will help us to meet the needs of our large and diverse county. Marion County is the most diverse County in Oregon by percentages: 27% of our population is LatinX and there is a large population of Russian. A DEI plan is highly regarded by some funding organizations and will only increase to be a requirement of other organizations going forward. We have been talking with some of our partners about DEI issues, and Catherine Alexander from Straub Outdoors provided us a great quote that talks about the impacts of what they are doing. (see presentation). The DEI Committee reached out to three other organizations and two responded back, she said. Viva NW and the Center for Diversity in the Environment. Both are willing to work with MSWCD. Their proposals are included in your packets. The Committee is recommending that MSWCD contract with both agencies. The **Center for Diversity and the Environment** to provide training and education around Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion to staff, board, and partner organization. The cost for this training: **\$13,500.00. Viva NW** will assist the District in assessing how we are currently serving diverse populations and what needs of those populations are not being met. They will focus on providing connection, dialogue, and feedback from and with the LatinX community in our district. The cost for this assessment and outreach: **\$13,950.00.** Upon completion of these, the DEI committee will recommend an organization to assist with the development of a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion plan for the district using information from the training and assessment.

DISCUSSION:

Koch questioned Hamilton, after you spend \$27,000 plus dollars, where do you feel the District will be with regards to programs and decisions made? Hamilton responded how the Committee members do not feel qualified to assess DEI needs and planning. Better to have someone/some agency trained in DEI principals to address this. Several Directors (Koch, Hsu, and Walker) revealed they were quite concerned about spending nearly \$30,000.00 and for what. Perhaps we could hire someone, even part-time to handle this matter and pay them \$30K Koch said. Hsu reminded

everyone that NRCS provides training on this/ or something quite similar. Perhaps NRCS can address additional training for us. Walker asked if there was a State or Federal mandate that required DEI training/ implementation. Both Hamilton and Keppinger responded back, no – however they would expect it will come one day – and possibly soon. Hsu asked, does Viva NW work with farmers? Or are they a group advocating more for getting fit through vehicles like biking, kayaking and whatnot. He pointed out how METRO is more about busses and transit, and they also do not necessarily work with farmers like we do, and ODF&W works little with farmers. Perhaps neither are truly in alignment with the District, I do not know - he said. Hamilton responded that Viva NW works with a large sector of those in Agriculture. Olson suggested an audit would make more sense to do first, and then training could be done which targeted the areas where needs were revealed. Discussions ensued. Hamilton indicated that the District's informational materials were in English only, Staff all looked virtually the same. Based on we are in a very diverse community, I think we could do better she said, Olson asked of Keppinger, did not we create brochures in the past in both Spanish and Russian. Keppinger confirmed he was correct saying it was a-number-of years ago and there were a variety of materials created thanks to assistance from a couple of translators. But those materials are pretty much gone and outdated now she added. Hamilton interjected, materials in various languages are great, however if we cannot provide technical assistance to those who speak other languages - we are doing them a dis-service. Hsu felt it would be beneficial to have George from Viva NW address the Board and answer questions. He asked the other Directors for their thoughts. Olson asked to table this matter until next month. Koch said she would like to personally hear from both organizations directly. Hsu again expressed interest on hearing directly from both organizations. Koch stated I think we are all in agreement to that. Hsu responded let us move on. (1:43:37).

ACTION:

Hsu directed Hamilton to arrange for both Viva NW and the Center for Diversity in the Environment to make a 15- minute presentation. One presentation to occur during the August Board meeting, the other during the September Board meeting.

DISCUSSION:

None.

- c. **Request of Match Funds to Support Orca Exhibit** – Brandy Slawik, Youth environmental Educator, **City of Salem** Slawik was present to answer any/all questions pertaining to her funding proposal submitted to the District. The City is requesting matching funds of \$5,000 from MSWCD for a life size (32 ft.) inflatable orca exhibit that will be used to educate residents about plastic pollution and how plastics are harmful to marine animals. Slawik also advised that the exhibit would also offer opportunities to include education about climate change, salmon decline and other environmental issues. She has been working with the environmental organization, NOAA up in the Pacific peninsula. They are willing to share curriculum they developed with the City of Salem pertaining to plastics, climate change, apex predators, and the food web in the eco-system. It was noted that NOAA has a hump-back whale on display. Hsu asked what the timeline was for the proposal. Slawik responded, they are only waiting to see if funding assistance can be obtained. She had indicated that she will pursue other environmental related organizations later, should MSWC not wish to help. Olson asked what is the likely longevity of the Orca? Slawik responded, indefinitely as-long-as it is taken care of. It comes in a protective travel case she added. She too had inquired about this, she said, and was told it was of high-quality vinyl and more durable than the material used in giant bounce-houses. Olson guessed that it might last 10-12 years, having any sunlight exposure. Slawik replied she did not have that information available, however, she will reach out to Landmark Creations to see if they might be able to provide the answer.

ACTION:

Hsu suggested that the Education Committee be asked to evaluate further into this matter, saying no pun intended, but take a deeper dive into it. He asked if that would be acceptable to everyone. Olson replied, yes. Let us move on then Hsu said.(1:54:29)

- d. **Clear Grants**

Walker asked the Board if they had any objections to raising the dollar amounts: to \$2,000.00 for application; \$7,500.00 for the fiscal year per applicant. Does anyone have any problems with that?

DISCUSSION:

Olson asked, are you going to do less projects with the monies we have available? Or are we going to come up with more money to do the same number of projects for a greater amount paid out? Walker responded, 1) in the past we have violated the \$1,000.00 rule numerous times. 2) we are attempting to bring the program closer into performance

with the program statement – and Jane can explain that. There are funds allocated to each program, and we are still not spending that much (1:56:16) per application, applicant year. The other thing I wish us to consider is who is the applicant, when speaking about schools, Walker said. Keppinger responded, that the applicant is defined on the application instruction sheet and that they are institutions, non-profits, schools, or tribes. Walker replied, then they are not the teacher, but the school represented. Right, Keppinger said. Walker then stated, we also want to fund programs that are in alignment with the mission of the District. And I would add the question, is it just any tangential portion (smaller supporting piece) of it or the primary purpose of the activity we are giving the grant for?

ACTION:

Walker moved that the Board approve increasing the maximum allowed application request amount to \$2,000.00. 2nd by Olson.

DISCUSSION:

Koch cited an objection saying she cannot understand what is being said. She has no paperwork in front of her, to fully understand what is being asked. Could someone please clarify. Keppinger explained how currently the maximum request allowed is \$1,000.00. However, in the past, schools have asked for amounts greater than that to cover the expense of busses (transportation) and substitute teacher costs – of which the Board has allowed those exceptions. By increasing the request amount limit, we can better serve the schools – assuming we will return to open session. It will eliminate the need to make continuous exceptions to the program.

Motion passed: 4-0 Vote. (2:01:36)

CLEAR GRANTS

Walker would like the Board to state they will support CLEAR grant applications as-long-as the primary activity supports the mission of the District.

DISCUSSION:

Hsu asked if this came from the Committee. Walker said no, he simply wished to pose the question to them now. Hsu and Keppinger felt the application does currently address it. Ammon also replied that the application asks the applicant to explain how/why the activity relates to the mission of the MSWCD. Walker again said, he would like to see that the primary activity/program aligns to the mission of the District, and that the word “Primary” be added to the application/instruction sheet. Hsu again asked Ammon for her opinion. The application asks the applicant to explain how their project meets the District’s mission she said. Hsu asked if we modify the application to include the word primary...would it adversely affect things. Ammon responded as we are about ready to go on-line with Foundant’s grant program, it could cause delays. Hsu stated Staff did a good job vetting applications out as it stands.

ACTION:

Hsu directed the Education Committee to hold a discussion on the matter expressed by Walker. If a change is warranted, they can submit their recommendation at the next Board meeting.. (2:09:46)

e. **The Stan Vistica Memorial Scholarship Awards for 2020-2021**

ACTION:

Koch motioned for the Board to approve the awards to the recipients as presented. 2nd by Olson.

DISCUSSION:

None.

Motion Passed: 4-0 Vote

f. **Implementing Cover Crop Program for Fiscal Year 2020-2021**

Brandon Bishop spoke on behalf of the Program Committee: As per the Board’s request, the Program Committee and Staff have both given their thought and attention to determine if the Cover Crop Program should be continued. It is our recommendation that it be continued this next fiscal year with the caveat that efforts be made to have participation be by new landowners who have not done cover cropping before. We wish to expand our marketing efforts to reach new/different landowners and to get their buy-in to implement cover crops into their agricultural practices.

ACTION:

Koch indicated she appreciated the time and efforts given to review the program and to address the concerns stated by the Board. She then motioned that the Board approve the continuance of the Cover Crop during the next fiscal year, in accordance with the memo presented by the Program Committee dated 6.24.2020. 2nd by Hsu.

DISCUSSION:

Olson questioned, as you have said - it takes 3-years to see the full benefits to cover-cropping, why do we not keep the program open for a 3-year period? Bishop responded he would be in favor of that, however the Board stated earlier there is a concern of landowners receiving payments for an extended period-of-time/ or in subsequent years. Whatever the Board chooses, he said. Bishop reminded everyone that studies have shown there to be great value in increasing the number of plant species grown in cover crops. Up to 18 species have been recommended by several valued educational/expert sources (Soil Health Academy and others). Our program currently will pay an additional \$10.00 if multi-species are grown. It was asked about including soil health into the program, like mulching and manure use (nutrient source). Bishop responded saying, currently LAP (Landowner Assistance Program) has covered those practices. The program could be updated if you like, however it will take time of both the Program Committee and the Board to work to modify and approve program changes. Hsu commented he wished to continue the program through the remainder of the fiscal year on the basis of work done, however he also wished to see changes made to the program in the future to include soil health matters, and to consider including some incentives to continue the practice for 3-years by giving out less and less money (the following 2-years). **Olson asked if a vote could be done at the end of the meeting, as he wished to give this matter more thought. Hsu agreed they could and would delay the vote. (2:26:28)**

g. **LAP Extensions/Cancellations**

ACTION:

Koch motioned for the Board to approve the two payments for LAP and accept the two cancellations as presented. 2nd by Olson.

DISCUSSION:

Olson asked about the two cancellations. Had either of the landowners begun their projects or purchased materials yet. Bishop knew one of the two had not begun, nor purchased items. The other landowner he said, he did not believe to have done either on the basis that the man kept changing his ideas around on what the project would be, and then opted to wait until later to apply again.

Motion Passed. 4-0 Vote. (2:29:27)

h. **Ash Creek Forest Management Contract – Perform Knotweed Treatments in Salem**

Keppinger advised this is the group that will be doing the treatments. The money that will pay for their services will come out of the Grant Monies granted the District by the City of Salem, of which you the Board had approved - \$7,440.00.

ACTION:

Hsu moved that the Board accept the Ash Creek Forest Management Contract. 2nd by Koch.

DISCUSSION:

Motion passed. 4-0 Vote.

i. **Approve \$15,000.00 Seed Purchase for OWEB Restoration Project**

Keppinger advised that this was an OWEB small grant of which the District was the applicant. We are working with USF&W (U.S. Fish and Wildlife) at the Ankeny Refuge. We have already received 90% of the funding from OWEB, \$13,500.00 to purchase the seed for USF&W to use on a 35-acre parcel out there. They are continuing to do habitat and wetland restoration. Some of you may recall that about 3-years ago they worked with Salem Audubon to do a small 22-acre parcel restoration at the site where the new building they built was erected. This is another portion of that system. The area used to be goose habitat. The farmers that were trying to raise feed for the geese had failures due to excess flooding. They now want to go in and establish native habitat for threatened and endangered species, etc. It was easier for us (the District) to purchase seed than it is for the department of USF&W, therefore we were the applicant. We are asking for the Board's approval to purchase seed only, for the Ankeny Refuge project in the amount of \$15,000.00.

ACTION:

Olson moved for the Board to approve the purchase of seed in the amount of \$15,000.00 as needed for the OWEB Small Grants project. 2nd by Hsu.

DISCUSSION:

None.

Motion passed. 4-0 Vote.

j. **Office Lease Extension for Salem Audubon**

Keppinger advised that the Salem Audubon's lease agreement has expired, and that they are asking for an extension through such time that considered changes by District are made.

DISCUSSION:

Hsu asked, and the agreement would be extended until what time? Keppinger replied, she put it through August of 2021, which is the date in which the District's current lease agreement will expire. And that should the District make changes before that date, Audubon's lease will be terminated, and they can possibly negotiate a lease agreement with the property owner or do something different.

ACTION:

Hsu motioned that the Board accept the lease extension by Salem Audubon. 2nd by Koch.

DISCUSSION:

None.

Motion passed. 4-0 Vote.

k. **OACD (Oregon Association of Conservation Districts) Dues for 2020-2021 and SWCD Director Eligibility Survey**

Keppinger asked if the Board could address each item separately. She added that the dues to be paid for 2020-2021 was \$5,000.00.

1. **ACTION:**

Hsu motioned for the Board to accept and approve payment of \$5,000.00 to OACD for dues in 2020-2021. 2nd by Koch.

DISCUSSION:

None.

Motion Passed. 4-0 Vote.

2. **SWCD Director Eligibility Survey**

DISCUSSION:

Koch indicated she had read through the materials but questioned Keppinger, are we to complete the survey as Directors, or as a District? Keppinger responded she too was not clear on the answer, however she has assumed that Jan Lee, OACD is asking that the Board hold a discussion about criteria, and then have each individual Director complete the survey themselves. Keppinger clarified, on behalf of potential new legislation preceding Director elections/process which was challenged during the last election cycle in 2018 by a person who filed with Multnomah. The action was brought to the attention of OACD and the Soil and Water Conservation Commission, and they were tasked by a Legislator to go through and make appropriate recommendations and potential changes to how existing law is, or the requirements of becoming a Soil and Water Conservation District Director. In other words, if people feel that there is no longer a need to have the 10-acre rule, or have it required to be a landowner, to own or manage 10 acres within a zone, etc., etc. And/or if there is a change, to being able to be a write-in candidate. That type of stuff. That is the feed back they are trying to garner from all the conservation district directors, to see what type of changes would be acceptable throughout the State. The challenge made relates to upholding DEI (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) principles. Koch asked if the SWCD (individual) could enact such changes themselves. Keppinger advised no, it requires legislation (voice of all Districts). Koch indicated she had reviewed current criteria, discussed it with another Director and she personally feels the criteria as it stands is good. There are two At-Large Directors, and urban dwellers she knows and has spoken to, want to have ag land, ag buffers. They feel it is a benefit to their quality of life, she said. Hsu indicated he wished each Director to complete their surveys. If Directors wish to hold discussions amongst themselves regarding the survey, it was fine for them to do so. Let us move on.

I. **SWCD Health and Dental Insurance for 2020-2021**

Keppinger indicated her comments about the insurance changes were noted on the documents provided each Director – that there is a 9% increase, \$80.00 and some odd dollars a month. Total impact to the budget is less than \$8,000.00 for eight employees, and with COVID-19 it would be nice to stay with our current insurance and not make changes. As we have all had many changes to contend with to date.

ACTION:

Hsu motioned for the Board to approve renewal of the current Medical and Dental plans as seen in the packets from Premier Northwest Insurance. 2nd by Koch.

DISCUSSION:

Koch commented how she has seen a continual increase on her personal insurance by 8-9%. Don't we wish we could do that increase for ourselves each year? Keppinger pointed out that the District saw this same increase two years past, but the following year it dropped by the same percentage. So technically we are back where we were two years ago.

Motion passed. 4-0 Vote.

8. Board Member Reports/Meetings/Updates – All Directors
None.

RETURN TO 6. Implementing Cover Crop Program for Fiscal Year 2020-2021

Hsu reminded everyone that a motion had been made and seconded, and a discussion was held earlier this evening. Is there any further discussion about the Cover Crop Program, he asked?

DISCUSSION:

Hsu then directed a question to Bishop. You have a reduction to 12.5% reduction in year two, and a 25% reduction in year three. Was that reduction made to appease the Board, or do you really think this to be a good idea to reduce the numbers? Bishop responded it was done to address the concern stated of people using the program for multiple years. If the Board felt it fine to leave it as it is, I think the Program Committee would support that. The Committee was simply attempting to address the concern stated about someone using the program and receiving funding support for three years in a row, Bishop said again. Hsu was sorry to put Bishop on the spot, however he asked what Bishop's opinion, or preference would be on the issue. For simplicity sake, Bishop replied, he would like to see it maintained as is. He then provided the following figures to show what changes in payment might be seen:

Currently in 3rd Year:		With Proposed Percentage Change:
No Till	\$40 - \$70.	\$20 - \$50
Conventional	\$40 - \$60	\$20 - \$50
Broadcast	\$30 - \$50	\$12.50 - \$44.50

I think landowners would still do it - however, we are slowly creeping down to not covering seed cost. I like it the way it is, Bishop said. Discussions ensued, Hsu and Olson voiced disappointments that changes discussed over the past months had not been suggested or incorporated in the Program Committee's proposal.

Motion failed. 3 -1 (Walker)

9. MEETING ADJOURNED by Chair Hsu: **Time: 9:47 PM (2:57:03)**

Minutes submitted by Janice Calkins, Office Coordinator.

UPCOMING MEETING DATES:

Next Regular Board Meeting:

August 5, 2020 beginning at 6:30 PM

Location:

Marion SWCD Multnomah Falls Conference Room
338 Hawthorne Ave NE, Salem, OR 97301

Note: The District expects to continue using online meetings until Marion County modifies their requirement for social distancing, as a result of- COVID-19. The number of individuals within the Marion SWCD meeting room will be limited to six, and each attendee will maintain - a distance of: six feet between themselves. Advance notice for attendance is required. Please contact: office@marionswcd.net. Thank you.

The Marion Soil and Water Conservation District complies with the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, and marital or family status. If special physical, language, or other accommodations are needed for this meeting, please advise the District Manager at 503-391-9927 Ext. 304 as soon as possible, and at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.