

\*Two Port commissioners in attendance, Pam Petranek & Carol Hasse, just listening in

Eric Kicks off meeting & introduces his draft farm plan

- Goal of meeting is to let FSC discuss farm plan recommendations & determine what to do for next meetings
  - 6/5 meeting could be a presentation of the draft to the public, or time for further FSC discussion
  - Final plan will be presented to Port commission in 7/10 workshop (at that point they can decide if further public engagement is necessary)
- Katie Cote is going to facilitate discussion

David S. recommends following Eric's template of recommendations and discussing item by item

Martin F. wants to spend more time discussing the vision, mentions it could be handled with a sub-committee

- David S. feels like vision is pretty good as is
- Laura L. feels like the vision statement is long winded, mention of "multi-functional hub" might be a large commitment for the Port to release to public
  - Martin F. says it could be roughly defined in vision
    - Many agree they think of a "Hub" as a very specific model, maybe could be more generalized
    - "Space" is a suggested alternative to "hub"
- Al mentions vision should only address managing canary grass in *creek channel*, doesn't need to be the entire farm
  - Some of the farmers find they have to manage canary grass across their property
  - Language could be "manage canary grass, *especially in creek channel*"
- Al notes that throughout the 100 year history of the Port, cold storage has always been a goal

Discussion of challenges section

- Martin F. notes that topography will be a big challenge for improving riparian habitat
  - Shade is a challenge, has to be creatively addressed to manage temperature
  - Martin M is concerned about mowing the farm if there's unused plots (general need for consistent maintenance)
    - Clarifies that a big part of the maintenance is keeping up agricultural operations & status
    - Keith asks if the Port has maintenance staff
      - Eric confirms they have maintenance staff, but currently don't have the bandwidth. Management either needs to be tenants or staff (if need be)
    - David mentions he talked to Santos recently, and he showed willingness to stay on and work at the farm

- Martin mentions that Roger (or someone else) will need to transition some info to Santos and Jose (both current farm staff)
- Kellie thinks that asking lessees to maintain farm will be a big challenge (these may be new farmers who don't know all the ropes)
  - Martin thinks initially the farm will be only split between a few (3) farmers, so they might be able to handle a lot of maintenance of farmland (still need Port to handle some operations)
  - Keith notes that the farm won't be used to the same extent for farming (not squeezing out the max Agricultural uses)
    - Plots that "go to weeds" will become difficult to manage very quickly
- Martin M has a deal with Roger Short to mow plots that are mowable and take the hay/haylage
  - It won't be the entire farm, so lots of wet plots will go to weeds
  - 200 head of cattle to replace grazing capacity
- 

Eric summarizes that they will amend bullet points in the challenges section:

- Mention building maintenance in infrastructure needs
- Add new bullet point to address plots that will go to weeds (mowing need)

The FSC kicks off discussion on the "Opportunities" section

- Janet & Kellie adds that opportunity about farm incubator could be reworded to be "access to land for farmers & ag infrastructure"
  - Janet agrees that "incubator" basically means "nonprofit" which should be in partnership opportunities
  - Not going to mention water rights in this bullet point, but noted that it is a challenge & opportunity
- Martin M. mentions the opportunities might be a good time to mention the Port mission statement (or somewhere nearby)
  - Eric agrees they can add it in to emphasize economic & community goals
- Discussion of adding "habitat restoration, *land stewardship & food system development*" and striking "management challenges" from the partnerships opportunity
  - Eric clarifies "agencies" implies other levels of local, state & federal government
- 

Janet & FSC mentions that this is a really good draft and helpful to talk through! Thanks Eric

FSC moves on to discuss each goal & strategy one by one (section 3)

- Add language for "resiliency" to the goal
- Janet notes capital H "Hub" mentioned in strategy (Eric clarifies it is a point of research)
- Martin F notes that value add is really the key point of strategy 1.1
  - farmers would do value add if they have access to certified facilities for food processing (shared uses)

- Could edit second bullet to remove “food Hub” and specifically mention “licensed processing facilities”
  - Group agrees that “food Hub” carries a lot of baggage, the other points basically captures the model without committing to anything
- Keith thinks that some will jump to Commercial Kitchen as a probable use, which is going to be very challenging given water & sewage rights
  - Won’t be a DOE (Department of Ecology) permitted group A or group B well in the area (challenge to processing goals)
    - Even handwashing can be an issue with water
  - Martin F acknowledged that there is processing that is allowed without a commercial kitchen, don’t have to commit specifically
  - Keith clarifies that residential use is not consistent with commercial kitchens, may be zoning issue
- Kellie suggests changing wording in second bullet point from “grown” to “*locally produced*” to include non-food products
- Al thinks wording could be added to third bullet to include working with rental equipment companies instead of owning their own stuff
  - Conservation district has owned and rented out farm equipment, but stopped because it was in bad shape.
  - He recommends working with farm equipment rental businesses to create partnerships
    - Kellie mentions this has been done successfully other places
- Discussion of strategy 1.2
  - David mentions he doesn’t know if hunting fits in
    - Eric suggests changing wording to be more general than just talk about hunting: “continued use of land not being farmed that is consistent with agricultural goals”
    - Martin F mentions a hierarchy of goals should be identified, agriculture comes before any recreational goals
    - Eric suggests new strategy that is “allow public access to compatible non-agricultural uses”
      - Martin M mentions it could fall under “community access” in strategy 1.3
    - *FSC agrees that it could be moved under strategy 2.4*
  - Martin F suggests adding “*area that could be used as a farm incubator*” and removing “capital” in sub-bullet
    - Kellie suggests “*develop a land access strategy*” as a rewrite for the entire goal
      - there will be tiers of use based on level of farm ability
      - She thinks the committee has not discussed recommendations for broader farming community, could be a useful discussion
        - This addresses those who don’t currently have land access & a say in the process

- Martin M mentions there could be a 5th goal around “provide community access” and address land access strategy
  - Eric suggests “*encourage public access compatible with current uses*” and put it under the new 2.4 goal (prioritizes Ag still)
- Laura suggests moving “public access” points to a new Opportunities point instead of fitting into a goal
  - FSC agrees
- Back to hunting, Martin M. suggests discussion of hunting & birdwatching under Goal 3 about Port Investment
  - Eric clarifies they will add a strategy 3.4 to address community access as well
    - FSC agrees
- Heidi mentions she thinks they can add a strategy for public access to *each goal* to better contextualize and establish guard rails
  - FSC agrees
- Laura asks what else they want to edit/add to strategy 1.2?
  - Janet mentions adding “*agricultural practices manual*” to strategy
    - FSC agrees
  - Eric clarifies they will also add a bullet to create a guide for land leasing (who they will lease to, how long leases will last)
    - Kellie mentions they will have to be flexible to changing needs
  - FSC agrees both use manual & lease strategies should be under goal 4
    - Erik mentions conservation district or NOSC could help development farm management plan
  - Al mentions adding other stakeholders to the collaboration list in the last bullet point (missed names?)
  - Laura thinks Port does not need to investigate paludiculture, will be done by the farmers
    - Whatever they farm Port is open to, as long as it is consistent with use recommendations
  - Janet asks if they have any other ideas to include in strategies (possibly from David’s recommendations?)
    - David mentions language of ‘investigate’ opens up a lot of possibilities
    - Janet suggest adding more inclusive language under “arable crops and perennials” to explain list is not exhaustive
      - Heidi suggests Agroforestry can be added
      - FSC agrees to adding “*but not limited to, agroforestry, orchards, paludiculture, etc.*”

#### Discussion of Goal 2

- Al notes they can’t make substantial progress on goal 2 without Rebecca (agreement)
- Janet suggests under 2.1 to remove “regulators” and use border language that can also include tribal groups, maybe “*agencies*”

- FSC agrees, same approach for the last bullet under goal 2
- Janet suggests change bullet saying “potential to re-meander Chimacum Creek...” to be more broad
  - FSC agrees
  - Might be “*Research potential strategies to reduce summer water temperatures for migratory fish in Chimacum Creek*”
- Al suggests changing last bullet to not identify specific funding source, just say “*grant funding*”
  - FSC agrees

#### Discussion of Goal 3

- Eric clarifies strategy 3.1 acknowledges the complex nature of the ROI goals, FSC likes the wording
- Strategy 3.4 about lease agreements will be added
  - Public access will be mentioned as a sub-bullet (hunting, bird watching, walking)

#### Discussion of Goal 4

- General agreement with the strategies
- David notes that he is a big fan of strategy 4.2 - retaining farm worker to run operations
  - Eric suggests they strengthen the language since these are the FSC recommendations to the Port commission
  - Martin F clarifies that they could look further into what the “caretaker” actually would be doing day-to-day
    - Martin M suggests that they write language to allow Port staff to run some maintenance without hiring for specific role (it all depends on leasing situation)
  - Janet agrees that there is a big need for the Port to hire someone (short term & long term) who can maintain the farm and also help lessees
  - Eric suggests he can adapt the language to be more comprehensive and acknowledge ongoing need for “farm caretaker”
    - FSC agrees
- Kellie wants to add either a strategy, or something in the uses matrix to address unused existing housing & development rights
  - FSC agrees
  - Eric says he will add new items to the implementation matrix

Laura mentions they probably will not finish entire document, hoping to have a new draft to discuss on 6/5

Eric confirms that the next step is to make revisions based on FSC discussion and send a draft for 6/5

- Draft will probably not be available until 6/3