



Approved August 21, 2018

## ***Clackamas SWCD Work Session Minutes for July 17, 2018***

### **Present:**

**Directors:** Jeff Becker (Chair), Roger Fantz (Treasurer), Don Guttridge (Secretary), Jim Johnson, Jan Lee, Jesse Nelson (Vice Chair), Joan Zuber

**Associate Directors:** PK Melethil

**Director Emeritus:** Mike Weinberg

**Staff:** Nicole Ahr, Scott Eden, Jason Faucera (via phone), Tami Guttridge, Lisa Kilders, Sam Leininger, Jeff Lesh, Eann Rains, Jenne Reische, Tom Salzer, Nathan Tucker

### ***1 – CALL TO ORDER AND DISCUSSION***

- A. Call to order** – Chair Becker called the meeting to order with a quorum present at 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, July 17, 2018, in the Clackamas SWCD conference room at 221 Molalla Ave., Suite 102 in Oregon City. Chair Becker noted that the purpose of the work session was to discuss cost share on District projects.

Becker turned the meeting over to Staff Jason Faucera for a brief explanation

- B. Background** – Staff Faucera relayed to the Board some conversations that the staff has had with landowners regarding resources, knowledge, and needs. Cost sharing is one way the District helps landowners implement projects to protect natural resources. The District has in the past used a 75% cost share rate where the District pays for 75% of a project and the landowner pays 25%. Currently, the District uses a 50% cost-share rate in an effort to make funding available to more customers. Irrigation conversion projects are cost-shared at 1/3 grant, 1/3 loan, and 1/3 landowner investment.

Staff requested this conversation with the board to review cost-share rates as one rate does not fit all landowners' ability to pay, nor does it encourage all resource goals. What planners are finding is that landowners who have funds to meet the match are getting projects done, while landowners who may want to do a project, but do not have the available cash flow often do not

implement practices. Also, projects that may have a great public benefit but little or no benefit to the landowners are less likely to be implemented without additional incentives.

### C. Discussion points

- Board members noted that the District must be able to document and defend any funding decision regarding cost share.
- Categorizing projects regarding public vs. private benefit may be a measurement that can be used for exceeding the 50/50 cost share rate. Does the public benefit outweigh the limited benefit to a landowner?
- Currently, the staff brings individual projects to the Board for increases in cost-share rates.
- There needs to be a justifiable benefit to adjust funding.
- How does the District calculate landowner in-kind contributions? Staff responded that in-kind contributions are calculated at a rate of \$20.00 per hour for labor that the landowner provides or the rate that they pay for hired labor up to \$20.00 per hour. If the landowner has special equipment that is used on the project, it is credited at \$50.00 per hour.
- Would priority areas and selected practices make a good foundation for a pricing matrix? This is how the oak restoration program is being handled.
- Is there follow up on projects to make sure landowners are maintaining the practice? The staff does some checking on individual projects, but currently, there is no system in place to check all projects. Natural Resource Conservation Service practices have a life expectancy built into the specifications. If practices are not maintained the District can request funding be repaid.
- Easements and riparian restoration projects tend to have a greater public benefit than the benefit received by the landowner.
- Some Districts give only a set amount for any project. Would this work for Clackamas?
- Giving equal amounts of dollars to all landowners does not necessarily treat equitably those landowners who cannot afford the match requirement.
- Loans have been made by the District to help some landowners cover their match requirements, but they are negotiated on an individual basis, depending on the situation.
- Technical and multi-year projects are hard to get off the ground, especially if landowners see little or no private benefit. An example of this problem is the uphill struggle to get participation in our oak habitat restoration program.

Chair Becker thanked all attendees for their hard work on this topic, it was time well spent.


It was noted that the issue of equity (providing the resources and assistance needed to produce outcomes that are fair and impartial) versus equality (providing the same cost share to every landowner without considering the severity of the problem and impact on others) needs careful thought in the District's planning.

Staff Faucera thanked the Board and Staff for the great conversation. Faucera will start work on a flowchart and perhaps a committee of Staff and Board members will convene at a later date to work on this topic.

**ADJOURN and NEXT MEETING-**

- There being no further business, Chair Becker adjourned the meeting at 3:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Tami L. Guttridge  
Administrative Assistant