



Heritage Farm Sustainability Plan Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

Monday, January 30, 2023, 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm
In-Person and Virtual Meeting Via Microsoft Teams

Committee Members: Matthew Baum, Teresa Meyer, Kristine Perry, Rob Freed*, Bill Cline, Zorah Oppenheimer, Ila Stanek, Mark Wreath, Marcela Venegas Munoz, Tanika Siscoe*, Jazlyn Faulstick

Clark County: Rocky Houston, Lynde Wallick, Amy Arnold, David Stipe, Zane Karver

Guests and Other: Clark Worth, Katie Wilson, Judith Ann Wait, Sandy Brown, Kirk Gresham, Judie Stanton, Chantel Welch, Amy Wooten, L Grell, Michael John Gaffney, 971-275-3074, Jude

* Not Present

1:00 PM Welcome

Katie asked the Steering Committee and people in the room to introduce themselves. Katie reviewed the Agenda and she and Lynde discussed the handouts. Katie also reminded people who are joining online to use the Chat features.

1:05 PM Recap December 14 Open House – Katie Wilson/Lynde Wallick

Katie, Clark and Lynde reviewed the Open House meeting listing the number of attendees and the feedback they received.

Ila indicated that the woman who spoke about the ADA compliance issues and enhancements needed at the property was helpful.

Zorah and Sandy indicated that they wished the public participation portion of the Open House was a longer session; that people had limited opportunities to share their feedback about the Farm. Lynde indicated that at our next session we will provide more time in the Questions and Answers section of the meeting.

Kristine, Zorah and Ila discussed the misconceptions that the community has about the Farm, noting there is a lot of mistrust. Zorah suggested that the County offer complete transparency with their plans for the Farm and be open to any feedback they may receive.

Ila suggested that the County host another Open House for the community, adding that she thinks a well-publicized tour offered by the Master Gardener's Foundation would be helpful.

Bill said he noticed the lack of trust from the community as well. He said he also heard references to the historical chemical applications that have been applied on the property, that certain people

didn't want the Farm to be turned into or referenced as a "park", and that he wished more of the Farm's historical value was mentioned.

Katie thanked everyone for their feedback.

1:16 PM Community Survey – Final Results – Katie Wilson

Katie reviewed the Presentation discussing the final survey results, indicating that 1,130 people participated, noting that the results were from people who were both familiar and unfamiliar with the Farm. Katie also listed a few of the top priorities for improving the Master Plan, listing the suggestions for new activities and the feedback received regarding its funding sources. She also reviewed the top recurring themes the community mentioned about the Farm.

Bill, Clark and Katie discussed whether there were any responses from the survey that wanted the Farm to be turned into commercial property. Katie indicated that most of the participants wanted to preserve the farm on some level and Sandy indicated that it's reaffirming that the results of the survey have been consistent with ones done in past years.

1:24 PM Community Leader Interviews – Katie Wilson

Katie reviewed the highlights of the results of the community leader's interviews noting that they met with various people, including site neighbors, farm users, community partners, and staff associated with the Farm. Katie and Lynde listed off those participant groups. Katie said the common goal from the leaders was that they wanted to hear more from the Farm users and the community to make sure the property reflects the community's values. She said participants generally concurred with the County Council's goals for the site.

Ila and Bill discussed highlight number five regarding whether the property is a farm or a park.

1:38 PM Financial Sustainability – Clark Worth

Rocky and Kristine reviewed the Farm's expenses handouts noting that the County's accounting system put any items that are Farm related into one cost center. Kristine further explained how the funds are leveraged so WSU Extension can provide the services they offer. Rocky discussed various revenue sources over the years that are associated with the farm's operations.

Zorah, Clark and Rocky discussed the goals of the cost recovery discussion – to discover feasible ways to identify better programming and business practices on site to generate a higher cost recovery. Rocky explained that there are many parameters for different types of properties and the PROS Plan references some of these costs. Rocky and David also explained the landscape on the farm indicating that some spaces are not tillable so the cost per acre calculation would not apply. Rocky also discussed the various other County departments that own land as well.

Clark indicated that the consensus received from the survey results was to find a way for the farm to continue its current uses. He reviewed how most of the funds get spent at the farm and where most of the revenue funds come from. He also reviewed several cost recovery strategies noting that not all of them are a reality, listing facts and examples of why a few of them would not work. Clark further reviewed options for contributions, alternate funding sources, or new management (a non-profit group) to assume financial responsibility for the farm.

Clark explained his financial worksheet exercise and handout, asking the Steering Committee to look through the cost recovery strategies and indicate what their top three priorities are, which

other options they think are worth considering, and to list any options they want to rule out. He said this will aid in how the County is going to make decisions about the farm as a group. Ila and Clark discussed questions about the definition of “compatible uses.” Clark explained that they can make suggestions about strategies that are not listed, and there is a section on the back of the handout for any of their additional comments, definitions, etc.

Various comments were shared regarding the farm’s sustainability. Sandy said regarding cost recovery, the farm also receives funds and donations from various groups in the community; that the contributions are helping to make the farm’s projects sustainable. Ila and Sandy discussed various options for cost recovery as well. Ila, Rocky and Clark discussed the financial transparency of the reports they were given and WSU’s costs in sharing the farm’s property. Matt also explained the reference to calling the farm a “park”, noting that the County’s department name is “Parks and Lands”; that we cover open space, and the farm qualifies as useable land. Bill and Rocky discussed whether designating the farm as a park changes its uses. Rocky answered indicating that the County must ensure certain attributes of the park classification are at the site. Rocky explained the three classifications the County has for parks – a natural area, a neighborhood park, or a community park.

2:28 PM Criteria for Shaping the Sustainability Plan – Lynde Wallick

Lynde explained that she has begun laying out the draft plan and focusing on the structure of the document. She said the next steps are to determine the best strategy for meeting the goals that were established by Council. Lynde explained the Alternative Analysis table indicating that it will provide a framework for their strategies and how they can align it with project roles to best benefit the community. Lynde also discussed the timeline for the next steps and the County’s plan to share its feedback with the community, the Parks Advisory Board, and Council.

Lynde reviewed the Steering Committee’s priorities for the Farm that were identified in the November meeting during the visioning exercise. She also explained how the community guiding principles from the 2020 Master Plan update should be included in the Alternative Analysis criteria and used to score the alternatives in the alternative analysis. Lynde also went over the homework that the Steering Committee needs to work on. Sandy and Lynde discussed the public comments that were submitted and whether the Steering Committee would have a chance to review them.

County Update – The public comments were emailed to committee members immediately following the meeting.

2:44 PM Committee Discussion

Zorah, Kristine and Teresa had questions regarding the Alternative Analysis table. Lynde and Rocky answered giving definitions for the alternatives, the criteria, and the strategies and where each would be placed on the table. Lynde gave a few examples of each and explained that their answers on the handout that Clark gave to them would help to fill out the table. Rocky indicated that the table would be scored, and Lynde explained that the Alternative Analysis would help to guide the discussion at their next meeting.

2:55 PM Next Steering Committee Meeting

Katie indicated the next meeting will be on February 13, 2023 and at that meeting, the Steering Committee will work together to further clarify the Alternative Analysis table and work on the criteria together.

2:56 PM Adjourn

Submitted by Amy Arnold, Secretary