

# Marion Soil and Water Conservation District

## BOARD MEETING

### 10/07/2020

Location: Marion SWCD Conference Room  
 338 Hawthorne Ave. NE, Salem, OR 97301  
 Date: Wednesday October 7, 2020  
 Time: 7:00 PM to 9:00 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	Fields, Mark	Keppinger, Jane		Alexander, Catherine-
Koch, Rochelle	Budeau, Dave	Bishop, Brandon		Straub Outdoors
Hsu, Terry	Hardy, Leland	Ammon, Meisel		McCoun, Rebecca -
Olson, Darin		Ortiz, Susan		N. Santiam WSC

**1. CALL TO ORDER / INTRODUCTIONS / ANNOUNCEMENTS – Chair Hsu:**

Keppinger advised the Board, that the District's Black CRV and the Toyota Truck were both vandalized over the past two weeks, and both exhaust systems were stolen. We are not going to have them repaired until a more secure place to keep them at is located. We are working with ODA who has a fenced in and gated area nearby, to see if they would allow the District to keep its three vehicles housed there. The thieves are after the titanium within the catalytic converters, she said. She was not sure why the culprits had not touched the Gray CRV.

**2. FOUNDANT GRANT PROGRAM PRESENTATION – Susan Ortiz:**

Ortiz narrated as she ran a visual presentation, explaining the processes an applicant will take to enter an application for Grant through the new on-line program "Foundant". Ortiz pointed out how both written and video instructions are provided to the applicant via links - on how to navigate through the system, and that her contact information is also listed for them, should they have any difficulties. The qualifications needed (as set forth by District policy) and terms of agreement are clearly defined. Applicants can preview the forms prior to completing them, she advised. Once the application has been completed, the applicant can review their information and loan status via the "Applicant Dashboard" and (assumed) can check back in at any time to see how the application is progressing. She pointed out how the applicant has the option of disclosing if their Organization is a 501( C ) 3 as designated by the IRS, and how the Foundant Program is linked to "Guide Star" which will confirm if the applicant is current on their filings with the IRS or not. The applicant is made aware of the processes and how the completion of a W-9 Tax form will be required. If the applicant is already working with a Tech Staff member, they can indicate that, otherwise the system will assign their application to one of several Technical Staff members. Ortiz explained the entire process, how Technical Staff conduct a review, upload maps and other details needed, in preparation of the evaluation. Evaluators then access the information from this platform as well. Once a grant is approved, the applicant is contacted and sent an Agreement to sign. Actions made, trigger necessary next step responses by processors/staff.

**DISCUSSION:**

Budeau asked if Ortiz felt the new system was saving staff time. Ortiz explained how over time she feels it will be a time saver, but currently staff are working out the bugs, still creating new forms and she noted how COVID restrictions have had an overall affect as well. At this time, she guessed, Staff may be spending about the same time they had devoted to the tasks in the past – simply doing things in a new manner. Hsu thanked Ortiz for the presentation.

**AGENDA APPROVAL/CHANGES (if items are added, include under Discussion or Action Items) – Chair Hsu:**

Walker asked that an item be added to the agenda, a letter of recommendation to the Oregon Department of Water Resources pertaining to a Grant application being filed by the City of Mt. Angel and the City of Silverton, relative to a feasibility study wanted. Hsu asked if this was something one of the Committees could review. Walker replied, there is an October 15<sup>th</sup> deadline, so we must act now. Basically, a letter is wanted that would say the District is in favor of the feasibility study and that it supports approval of the grant to the Cities of Silverton and Mt. Angel. Walker advised. It will not cost the District any money, except for the paper and time. Hsu voiced he was a little reluctant about such action, as it was a bit on the fly. Olson suggested the item be added and discussed. So be it, Hsu replied. It was added as Action Item G. Keppinger asked that a

brief discussion be held about the Annual Meeting which would be affected due to COVID-19 restrictions. It was added as item D under Discussion Items.

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT - Public:** (Moved from item 2 to Item 3)  
No comments made.

**4. AGENCY and/or MSWCD COMMITTEE REPORT**

a) **NRCS Report – L. Bachelor**  
Bachelor was not present. No report received.

b) **Admin Committee – Chong Kee Tan**

As Tan was not present, Hsu spoke on his behalf: We held our first meeting which was attended by Tan, my-self, Olson, Keppinger, and Ortiz. Though the Board has attempted each meeting to conduct a review of policies, they keep getting pushed back – and not addressed. The Admin Committee will take on the role, and we will likely begin with the Delegation of Authority, he advised. We reviewed the records retention policy and discussed the office move - which was a straightforward discussion. Keppinger will look to handle the move in the same manner of which it was conducted last round, as she feels it went well. DEI was discussed briefly. Updates to the employee handbook are needed, and Keppinger will seek someone out to assist with those updates. We are looking forward to holding a Communication Workshop, which was suggested during a previous Manager Review meeting, perhaps moderated by the Willamette Valley Council of Governments. And there was some discussion about establishing Employee Workplans for 2021 and 2022. We also briefly discussed payment distributions for LAP and other grants and then we adjourned. Those were some of the topics we addressed. Please let me know if there are any other items to be reviewed by the Admin Committee and we will try to work them in, he ended saying.

**DISCUSSION:**

Walker suggested, if we go ahead with this new purchase, and we are required to do some remodeling, he would like to see the Administrative Committee assign someone from Staff to be part of that effort. Hsu agreed they could look at that.

c) **ADHOC-Building Committee – Scott Walker**

Walker indicated he had been designated the point person for this Committee. If the Board votes positively for this move, then our next task will be to secure an architect he said and then go through the process to select a contractor. Those are items to be done following the vote.

d) **Education Committee – S. Walker, Chair**

Walker advised the Education Committee did not meet. No report was given.

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

Walker advised, as always it is important each of you review the disbursements each month and to voice any questions you may have. He pointed out that one of the disbursements made to himself this last month had to do with one of the inspections he was involved with. The District's credit card number had been stolen and it was necessary to secure a new card number. For the inspection to go forward, Walker paid for the service himself, he advised. \$375.00 was disbursed to him, as reimbursement for the fees he paid. He then asked Keppinger to provide an overview of the big numbers. She began with the balance remaining in the Local Government Investment Pool (LGIP): \$2,056,689.35 at the end of August. Our interest rate dropped to 1%, she said. Checking account balance for end of August was: \$167,993.35. The sheet following the Bank statement, shows all the checks that were written in the month of August. Monthly expenses: We did receive a tax payment of \$9,030.67. We also received grant monies and other things at \$55,275.94 for the month. Page 2 and 3 are operational costs, the only other activity is seen on page 4 which is the Building Reserve Fund which is the interest which we split with the General Fund: \$900.12. On page 4 is the Unanticipated Projects and Catastrophic Loss Reserve fund - \$349,319.00 estimated left in that account the rest of it was moved to the Building Reserve Fund seen on page 6.

**DISCUSSION:**

Koch questioned if the District's Office Rent had increased by \$500.00 this past month. Keppinger responded back, yes – as of July 1<sup>st</sup>.

**ACTION:**

Hsu motioned to accept the August 2020 Financial Report as reported. 2<sup>nd</sup> of Walker. No further discussion.  
**Motion passed by a unanimous vote.**

**6. DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

**a. Discussion/Decisions regarding Potential New Office Space – Chair Hsu**

Walker was asked to take the lead. We will take a vote to see if we move forward, if a positive vote we will have a lot of work on our hands. We will need to acquire an architect, who will then do design work, that product will then be used in selecting a contractor. As I stated earlier, it would be nice if a Staff member could be assigned to provide input for building remodeling.

**DISCUSSION:**

Koch would like to postpone making any such decisions until after the building is secured, and suggests it be reviewed by the Building Committee. Walker asked who is on that Committee? She replied, you and me – then asked “Dave” and you? Jane asked Terry Hsu, didn't you become a member too? Hsu responded, yes, I guess I did. He then suggested Jane (Keppinger) be part of the decision(s) as well. Next Committee/members established.

**ACTION:**

Hsu stated such questions will be kicked back to the Building Committee, and they can discuss these items later.

**b. DEI Follow-up/Information (Memo from Staff) – Chair Hsu**

Hsu gave a brief overview: Several SWCD's met to discuss DEI with Marion SWCD taking the lead. The thinking at this-point in time seems to be to continue gathering information and discuss it further during a later meeting.

**c. District Manager Evaluation Process Next Steps – Chair Hsu**

The 360-Evaluation has gone out to Jane, Staff, Partners, Associates and Directors when all responses are compiled, we will go forward with having an open session, advised Hsu.

**d. Annual Meeting – Jane Keppinger**

With COVID and fires, and maybe we will have a new building, etc. we are wondering if the Board will allow us to have a mini-Annual Meeting along with the Board meeting. We can then begin planning for next year, which will be the District's 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. Susan and I are busy putting things together for the audit. Your annual meetings typically celebrate the previous year. September of 2021 is our actual / real anniversary date, Keppinger advised.

**DISCUSSION:**

Walker asked if the District might hold the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary event during the Summer of 2021. Koch suggested incorporating the event into a Summer Hemp celebration party.

**ACTION:**

For the 2019-2020 Annual Meeting (49<sup>TH</sup>), everyone agreed that it could be combined with the December Board meeting.

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

**a. Approve NRCS Conservation Plans (If presented) – Chair Hsu**

There were none.

**b. September 2, 2020 Board Meeting Minutes – Chair Hsu**

**ACTION:**

Olson moved that the September 2, 2020 Board Meeting minutes be approved. 2<sup>nd</sup> by Hsu.

**Motion Passed by a unanimous vote.**

**c. Providing Potential Funding for Watershed Protection / Restoration after Fires – Chair Hsu**

Keppinger advised that both Jenny Meisel and Rebecca McCoun are actively working to address the adverse effects of the fire on land to assist the victims in the control of soil erosion, to protect land and water. Meisel stressed the situation will require long-term assistance to restore vegetation, address soil erosion. Federal funding assistance will take several months before it becomes available. There is immediate need for help now, and we are asking for your

assistance to provide funding for erosion control and potentially for long-term needs as well. Working with Jane we have identified a few funding sources within our budget. We have two recommendations/options to consider: One, for immediate short-term funding to contract with the North Santiam Watershed Council and to provide funding through the Council. The Council has standing contracts in place with Engineers and other local vendors where they can purchase and provide services more quickly than the Marion SWCD. We also do not have the expertise needed to deal with massive areas and erosion control. They can hire a contractor, who has the expertise and qualifications to address soil erosion next /near to cliffs and steep slopes that lie adjacent to waterways and be able to handle liability and legal issues related to the work needed at hand. The other recommendation would be for the Marion SWCD to set aside some money for Grant Programs that would be specifically for fire victims and their properties. At the end of the document we have submitted, are some practices that would relate to the potential work required. Rebecca has been fielding many calls from victims of the fires and directing them onto various agencies that can assist them. Having advertised the free straw they are making available to the public, McCoun has been very busy trying to assist fire victims, determine if they are eligible for funding through FSA or NRCS and then directing them on to the proper point(s) of contact. If they are interested in LAP they are directed to Jenny Meisel, if they have erosion control issues, Rebecca will make a site visit herself and provide advice. So far, she has conducted between 25-30 site visits, she said. The Santiam Watershed Council received a \$10,000.00 grant from the City of Salem, for plant material that was to be placed above Geren Island, Rebecca advised. She contacted the City to see if they would consider using the money instead for erosion control purposes for victims of the wildfire living adjacent to waterways. She said the City of Salem is fully supportive of this, so they purchased \$7,000.00 worth of weed-free fine fescue/ straw bales from Shelly Boshart Davis (OR House of Representatives) and a local grower off of Fern Ridge Road - 550-pound rolls, and 55-lb.bales. The other \$3K was already dedicated toward a LAP project with Trexler Farm, she advised. Mill City residents are helping by making free deliveries of this material to those in need. We are providing technical guidance. We need a Geo-Technical Engineer to address many of the issues that abound, where large Douglas Fir trees must be felled, and stumps retained to help hold in the soil along the riverbanks. We have an existing contract with River Design Group, who in turn sub-contracts with Geo-Engineers. "River Design" has done three riverside property assessments for us to date for free, however it would be nice to be able to pay them and get them out to the various sites to advise the landowners whether or not the work needed will be an easy fix, or a budget buster and perhaps they (the landowner) won't want to actually build at that location again. We need more staff or contracted project managers, who can conduct site assessments, connect them with the right folks, and provide mid-term planning for restoration of these sites. This is being done down in the Eugene area by the McKenzie Watershed Council. OWEB is providing funding to them, to do this. They have created an extensive assessment conducted post fire, and they are willing to share that protocol and their computer app/ tablet app to help assess burn severity and provide a plan of action.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

Walker asked if the Linn County SWCD was doing anything currently. McCoun responded that they have not been present. She defended them saying Deb Paul is pretty maxed out on her time, as she is likely only working part-time. Anyway, her capacity is very limited. McCoun has been working along with Amy Keizer, Linn-Benton-Lane NRCS, Les Bachelor of Marion County NRCS, and Jenny Meisel (MSWCD) conducting site visits. Is Marion County doing anything? Walker asked. McCoun indicated she has a meeting scheduled with them, and how they have issues with private versus public. They can do right-a-ways. She encouraged Marion County to set up straw-bale stations, but they did not respond positively to the idea. They did respond back, saying they are willing to assist with communication: Education through Facebook. Marion County is hanging on to that Public/Private divide, she advised. The City of Salem responded back to her, saying they do not wish to step on toes. They have suggested she submit a grant proposal like what she is asking of the District now. And yes, she will do so to help address these short-term needs that she feels will be on-going for the next 3 months, until such time FEMA, DEQ, EPA and other Federal Assistance Programs are in place and running. McCoun said she has learned through FEMA that it has been suggested to Marion County that they set aside at least \$70,000.00 per each privately owned property as a reserve fund for any/all property owners who simply will choose to abandon their land(s) in the near future – due to hardships (not having any insurance, unable to pay for costs related to removal/replacement of septic systems, etc.). Marion County has a lot of good information on their website, but they are doing nothing directly on the ground at this time, McCoun advised. Olson indicated that ODOT is gaining a bad reputation based on news being spread - about a house that was left standing after the fire. When ODOT's workers took down a tree, the house was destroyed in the process. McCoun stated hundreds of thousands of new trees will be needed. So, I guess the long-term need is plants. It is anticipated by many groups, there will be a shortage of tree/plants within the next few years. (1:38:40)

Koch asked, you are asking for \$25 to \$50K - will there be an application process that will require you to come back to us for our approval? Or are we simply handing over money to you? Please explain the process. Jenny Meisel explained for the short-term, \$25-\$50 K to be given the North Santiam Watershed Council so that they can contract out and get erosion control practices on the ground immediately. And to place an additional \$25K to \$50,000.00 into a Grant (perhaps LAP) whereby long-term assistance can be provided the victims of the wildfire (restoration work). McCoun explained how the Grant would be allocated to a scope of work, and the NSWC would in turn submit back a report to the District substantiating how the funds were used. This would be the same process they use related to any grant they receive, she said. She also advised that their work would target properties adjacent to waterways (Little North Fork, Santiam River, other). She tried to clarify for Walker whom the target recipients would be: Smaller property owners (1 acre or less), some larger acreage properties. Target areas based on the burn assessments/ severity areas. Little North Fork will be a concentrated area. If the property is next to a body of water and there are risks to the water and is situated within the boundaries of the Marion SWCD. If in Linn County, the City of Salem's funding source would be sought/used.

**ACTION:**

Walker motioned that the Board approve granting the North Santiam Watershed Council \$10,000.00 for the purchase of straw to be deposited at the appropriate places so that people can come an address their needs (properties affected by wildfire, for the purpose of providing erosion control). (1:53:43) Hsu 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

Olson would like to go \$25,000.00 saying \$10K will not go too far, and if people must wait until the next Board meeting, that will take forever. If we are going to help people, let us do it! Meisel asked if the amount given will be for the Council or the District to purchase straw? Olson replied, I would say however you each see fit to spend it. Hsu stated, I thought the suggested amount was for \$25K to \$50K. Meisel asked of Jane, if the funds go through the Council it would go through Contracted Services, correct? Jane replied yes, and there is a pool of money in several places we can use. If you look at page 3 you can take from the Special Projects funds, Sponsorship money, we could take it out of Contingency, from page 2 we can take it from Contracted Services- these are legitimate places we can access funding from. Keppinger agreed with Olson, saying within the course of a week Rebecca (McCoun) has already spent \$7,000.00 – so money is going to go quick. Though people are trying to be kind, others can also take the opportunity to gouge on pricing. I would like to see us give enough where we can affect positive changes within the next 2 to 3 weeks before the next Board meeting to help these people help to protect the watershed. The end goal is to help protect the water and the watershed to the best of our abilities – to prevent water contamination. McCoun asked that the District allow purchases to include wattles, jute netting and other erosion control materials. Could that be included in when you say straw? Hsu replied, I would think so. Concern was voiced by Walker, that he needed to know specifically what all monies would be used for. McCoun stated she preferred that receipts be provided the District for dollars spent, and then the District reimburse the Council after review of said receipts. Unlike Walker, Hsu felt the need for erosion control was very clear and necessary for immediate implementation. He holds confidence in the work of River Design. Leland Hardy voiced in he would like to see at least \$30K plus be allocated now. Hsu agreed. Walker would like to see the Federal Government reimburse for preventative actions taken now, and he felt the first initial rainstorm we had a week ago is the extent of erosion we will see. Not so, said Hsu and McCoun. Erosion will continue to occur with every rain/storm encountered. Without action taken now to put erosion controls into place, the potential for landslides and more loss of homes to occur are heightened. Hardy voiced the importance of placing seed into the existing ash for regrowth/ more erosion control.

**ACTION:**

Walker wished to amend his motion to \$30K for purposes of erosion control. Hsu stated he would re-2<sup>nd</sup> that.

**DISCUSSION:**

Olson questioned the motion saying, is that everything we just talked about? Hsu then rephased the motion saying he would prefer it say erosion control and engineering services and the use of vendors as necessary with North Santiam Watershed Council, with the intent of stabilizing burned areas for erosion purposes. Olson asked Walker if he was okay with this. Walker replied he was a little concerned about the contracting. Koch asked if they needed to mention where the funds were to come from. Hsu asked Keppinger for her thoughts. If the Board wishes the funds to be taken from SPG (Special Projects Grant fund) or other sources discussed earlier, I will do as you direct me to, she said. Hsu then asked, it was noted in the proposal that the landowner portion be reduced from 50% down to 25%. What are the Boards thoughts on this? Jenny Meisel responded that item was related to existing MSWCD programs and not related to this – should the Board wish to take funds to support the work of erosion control via the sources discussed

earlier with Keppinger. Walker advised that the SPG fund holds \$67,000.00 currently, and this reserve fund is not used often. He feels the logical step to take is use the monies within the SPG fund to support this project. Hardy voiced he agreed. It was again discussed and agreed upon that funding will come from SPG and that next month they can review progress and needs again.

**ACTION:**

A vote was taken for approval of the revised motion granting the North Santiam Watershed Council \$30,000.00 for the purpose of addressing soil erosion post fire. Vote was taken.

**Motion was passed. (Unanimous).**

**DISCUSSION:**

Meisel thanked the Board for their support and indicated they can talk about existing programs again next month. McCoun thanked the Board as well, saying she knew many landowners will be grateful for their support. Keppinger added in she was sorry Les Bachelor was not present in this evenings meeting, as it is likely NRCS will put in a request for their Emergency Watershed Protection Program (EWP) which has a 75%/ 25% cost share. This program will go into the cities and assist landowners who do not qualify for other programs. NRCS will contact its partners and ask for sponsorship support of 25% - either through in-kind services or actual cash dollars. She was aware that to-date he had not secured any local sponsors. If NRCS were needing \$1 to \$2 Mil, our District does not have available that 25% they would be asking for she said. Keppinger advised NRCS to contact the County, and they responded back that the Counties were too tapped out to assist them. This program and sponsorship support- was used back when the 1996 flood occurred, she said. Both MSWCD and Linn Co. SWCD supported the program back then. NRCS has 60-days to respond to the availability of the program to secure funding, and I feel you need to be aware of it and be prepared to discuss the matter during the next Board meeting. NRCS may still have time to address this with us. McCoun wished to add to that, saying she had met with Les (Bachelor of NRCS) and a team of his engineers, and she felt they would be seeking assistance from both Marion and Linn, and it has to relate to things that impact life and structure. It would not impact any of the burned areas. If it were a matter of a potential landslide that could impact a building - it would apply. The purpose: to prevent the next disaster that can occur. Okay, Keppinger responded back saying they have since modified things since the day of the flood. Thank you, Rebecca. Walker asked when they (NRCS) say sponsorship – does that make you liable for the match? Yes, Keppinger replied.

**d. Conservation Cover Crop Applications- Chair Hsu/B Bishop**

Bishop reviewed three applications received (#2021023, #2021024 and Coleman Green Leaf Farms, LLC) with the Board, then asked if for their approval to fund each of them.

**ACTION:**

Olson motioned for the Board to accept and approve the funding of all Cover Crop three applications presented. Hsu 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

None.

**Motion Passed by a unanimous vote.**

**e. Special Projects Grant/Landowner Assistance Program-Payments/Extensions/Cancellations – Chair Hsu**

**ACTION:**

Walker moved that the Board approve payment to Richard and Victoria Tungate for streambank restoration in Claggett Creek. 2<sup>nd</sup> by Hsu.

**DISCUSSION:**

None.

**Motion passed by a unanimous vote.**

**DISCUSSION:**

Olson asked if the Board could make a motion as a total lump sum/group vote. Hsu said fine with me. Would you like to make a motion?

**ACTION:**

Olson motioned that the Board approve all extensions, LAP and SPGs presented tonight. Hsu 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.

**Motion passed by a unanimous vote.**

f. **Approve USGS 4<sup>th</sup> Qtr. Payment of \$6,675.00 – Chair Hsu**

**ACTION:**

Walker motioned that the Board approve the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter payment to USGS in the amount of \$6,675.00. 2<sup>nd</sup> by Olson.

**DISCUSSION:**

None.

**Motion passed by a unanimous vote.**

g. **Letter to State of Oregon Water Resources Department – Scott Walker**

Walker indicated that the Cities of Silverton and Mt. Angel are applying for an ASR (Aqua Storage Retrieval) feasibility study on October 15<sup>th</sup> to the Department of Water Resources. He proposes the District write a letter in support of the proposed study.

**DISCUSSION:**

Olson asked if Walker himself was asking for this letter, or is this a request of the two cities? Walker responded, there has been a communication issue.

**ACTION:**

Hsu moved that the Board approve a letter of support to the Cities of Mt. Angel and Silverton, in support of an ASR feasibility study. . 2<sup>nd</sup> by Walker.

**DISCUSSION:**

Keppinger asked who has not asked for this? The City of Silverton's people have not yet been reached, Walker said. It is a joint venture with both Cities. Walker responded: if people are uncomfortable with this - we will let it slide. Olson replied, if a letter is received requesting our support, we respond to this at that time.

**ACTION:**

Hsu amended the motion to; the Board gives Chair approval for a letter of support to be written in support of an ASR feasibility study for the Cities of Mt. Angel and Silverton, if/when an official letter of request for the District's support be received. 2<sup>nd</sup> by Walker.

**Motion passed by a unanimous vote.**

h. **Stayton Property: 408 N. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street – Scott Walker**

Walker said I feel it is time to make a motion as to whether-or- not we make a purchase of the property at 408 North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street in Stayton, Oregon.

**ACTION:**

Walker motioned for the Board to approve the purchase of the building at 408 N. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street in Stayton, Oregon for the agreed upon price of \$487,500.00. 2<sup>nd</sup> by Koch.

**DISCUSSION:**

None.

**Motion Passed by a unanimous vote.**

**ACTION:**

Walker moved that the Board authorize expenditure of \$20,000.00 for earnest money for purchase of 408 N. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. 2<sup>nd</sup> by Olson.

**DISCUSSION:**

None.

**Motion Passed by a unanimous vote.**

**ACTION:**

Olson made the motion that the Board make Secretary/Treasurer, Scott Walker the authority to sign all documentation required for the purchase of such building. 2<sup>nd</sup> by Koch.

**DISCUSSION:**

None.

**Motion Passed by a unanimous vote.**

**ACTION:**

Hsu moved that the Board set aside funds for the purchase of the building in Stayton at 408 N. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and pay cash for the sum as described in the real estate documents. 2<sup>nd</sup> by Walker.

**DISCUSSION:**

None.

**Motion Passed by a unanimous vote.**

**DISCUSSION:**

Olson said, we should also contact our current landlord to advise him we will not be renewing our contract.

Both Koch and Walker, agreed that until the transaction for purchase of new building is finalized, they would prefer the owner of the 338 Hawthorne Ave. property not be advised. Both agreed this can be discussed further during the next ADHOC Building Committee meeting. This was then agreed upon by all.

**8. Board Member Reports/Meetings/Updates – All Directors**

Susan Ortiz suggested the Board may want to consider insurance on the new building as things progress, as this may be beyond Jane's (Keppinger) authority. Walker replied, that is a good point. Is this something that is covered by Special Districts? Keppinger replied, yes. So, at the conclusion of our contract we should get a binder for insurance on the building, Walker stated. Hsu asked, we are authorizing Staff to do that, correct? He then added, I guess this need not be a motion, we will simply ask Staff to look-into this. Okay. Thankyou Susan, Hsu said. Koch said she had no comment other to say she was happy to see Lee (Hardy) present. It had been a long time. Hardy advised Hsu he had not yet received any information pertaining to Keppinger's evaluation. Hsu said he might check his computer's Junk folder, he then recalled he had neglected to send out a reminder e-mail to the Associate Directors. He advised Hardy he will resend the information to him as needed.

**9. MEETING ADJOURNED** by Chair Hsu: **Time: 9:00 PM**

*Minutes submitted by Janice Calkins, Office Coordinator.*

**UPCOMING MEETING DATES:**

Next Regular Board Meeting:

**November 4, 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](mailto: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.*