

State Board of Agriculture
November 29 - 30, 2017
Food Innovation Center, Portland, OR

Board members present: Barbara Boyer, Tyson Raymond, Bryan Harper, Stephanie Hallock, Luisa Santamaria, Marty Myers, Tracey Liskey, Laura Masterson, Sharon Livingston (phone) Dean Dan Arp, and Director Alexis Taylor.

Others present: Lisa Hanson, Stephanie Page, Ray Jaendl, Nellie McAdams, Gabrielle Redhead, Karla Valness, Kathryn Walker, Jason Barber, Dave Losh, Helmuth Rogg, Anna Scharf, Kathy Hadley, Mateusz Perkowski, Terry Fasel, Craig Ostbo, Yelena Nowak, Erick Garman, Lindsay Eng, Ann Colonna, Scott Dahlman, Gary Neuschwander, Jerome Rosa, Jim Johnson, Ivan Maluski, Mary Anne Cooper, Karen Lewotsky, Jeff Stone, Lauren Henderson, Angela Crowley Cook, Angie Smith, Nancy Sage, and Josh Sequential.

Meeting was called to order at 8:30 AM by Chair Barbara Boyer. Introductions of board members, followed by staff and guest introductions.

Minutes

Tracey Liskey motioned to approved the minutes as presented. Stephanie Hallock seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Director's Report, Alexis Taylor

Director Taylor recently participated in the governor's trade mission to Hong Kong and Japan. During this trade mission, the delegation met with Cathay Pacific to formalize their air cargo service to Portland. Eight out of the 11 companies that participated on the trade mission were part of Oregon's agriculture, food, and beverage sector. A few of the participating companies have already reported increased market opportunities as a direct result of the trade mission.

Director Taylor spoke about Japanese beetle. This year, the Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA) deployed 2,000 traps. 22,000 beetles were caught. This is good news as it shows that correct treatment area was identified. In 2018, ODA will increase the treatment zone to cover 5,800 properties, totaling 2,000 acres. The legislature has authorized \$1.6 million for this treatment effort. Complete eradication will take five years.

ODA received questions regarding the Secretary of State's audit of the food safety program. Director Taylor distributed a letter prepared by ODA that provided an update on the food safety program's activities. The program has either fully, or partially, implemented a solution to each of the areas of concern identified by the audit. The backlog of inspections has been reduced from 2,800 to 700. The audit has been helpful to the program and the department as a whole.

A question was asked about how this was achieved. Director Taylor reported that a combination of training, database improvements, reduction of federal work, and shifting

resources helped the program achieve these results. The program was also fully staffed with 38 inspectors.

Director Taylor reported that her county tour initiative continues. Director Taylor has five counties to visit. Director Taylor would like to continue these tours in 2018 but will look at a regional approach.

Director Taylor shared that ODA will be advertising for three jobs, Communications Director, Program Director for the Food Safety and Animal Health Area, and Marketing Program Manager. The recruitment announcement for these positions will remain open to the end of the year. Director Taylor asked the board to share these opportunities with their network.

Finally, Director Taylor introduced two individuals: Gabrielle Redhead, an OSU student intern, and Karla Valness. Karla will be joining the Directors' Office as a Special Assistant in January. Karla Valness will be staffing the State Board of Agriculture in the new year.

Oregon Food and Agriculture Brand, Craig Ostbo, Managing Partner, Koopman Ostbo, and Erick Garman, Trade Manager, ODA

Erick reported about the successes of the Celebrate Oregon Ag (COA) campaign. Launched in 2010, COA has had 100s of millions of television impressions supported by industry partners and has increased social media awareness over the last two years (grown from 1,500 Facebook likes to 17,000).

There have been conversations with the agriculture and food community about developing an Oregon brand. Oregon is one of four states in the nation that does not have a food and agriculture brand. States with brands have reported that branding programs provide a return on investment. As such, earlier this year, ODA released a Request for Proposal (RFP). The purpose of the RFP was to (1) determine if the State of Oregon should have a brand that represents agricultural commodities and value-added brands, and (2) if a brand is needed, what should it look like. The firm Koopman-Ostbo was selected. The project started six months ago. Phase 1 of the project wrapping up.

Craig Ostbo, from Koopman-Ostbo, spoke about the discovery completed for the project.

Seventeen state brands from across the county were interviewed. From these interviews, the following was learned: long-term funding is critical, Oregon is in a unique position, and developing a stakeholder group is important to inform the future of the brand.

Erick Garman and Craig Ostbo met with commodity commissions and industry organizations. From these outreach efforts, the following was learned: food and beverage entrepreneurship drives innovation, creating economic value for the state and for rural communities. Sixty-three percent of respondents said that the program should include brands whose products are not

made with 100 percent Oregon crops, and the greatest opportunity for market growth lies out of the state, especially overseas.

A variety of manufacturers were also interviewed. Information learned from these data collection efforts was as follows: there are big opportunities for Oregon agriculture internationally, but the window is closing; a brand can be even more powerful/effective if done in collaboration with other agencies; and brands could have the greatest impact for new and small companies. Manufacturers also believed that a brand could encourage innovation.

Interviews were also conducted with retailers. Information learned from these data collection efforts was as follows: the retailers' customers like to connect with local/Oregon, most retailers would be willing to create/use in-store marketing materials to promote an Oregon brand - including in their out-of-state stores, and retailers liked the idea of an Oregon brand that helps bring new and innovative products to market.

Consumers were also surveyed as part of the data collection. When Oregon consumers were surveyed, results showed that Oregon consumers are already very aware of Oregon products and choose them when possible. When out-of-state consumers were surveyed, although 75 percent of the respondents had never been to Oregon, 60 percent of the respondents would like to buy fresh Oregon produce.

A review of existing research was also conducted. This included reviewing the Food and Beverage Manufacturing Industry Road Map.

In short, Oregon has a thriving, innovative, and unique entrepreneurial agriculture, food, and beverage community, and an Oregon brand could and should support that community. If there is a cost to participate in the brand program, new companies should not be charged. Finally, if a state branding program is to be successful, it must have financial support for multiple years from the state.

For next steps, Phase 2 proposes to form a stakeholder advisory group which would build the brand. An estimated \$250,000 is needed for Phase 2. Phase 3 is implementation of the brand with domestic and international support. This proposal would be a 10-year commitment and an estimated \$1 million investment.

There was a discussion regarding the budget for the brand project. Funding still needs to be determined. There is an expectation that this would be a shared investment (state and private partnership).

Erick Garman asked if the board would be interested in having involvement in the stakeholder committee. The board agreed.

There was discussion about the difference between a brand and certification. Challenges with a certification program is that these programs can be expensive and it would be difficult to generate uniform standards that cover all of agriculture.

A state brand was developed approximately 15 years ago, however, farmers, ranchers, and processors were not involved in the development of the brand, therefore it was not successful.

There was continued discussion regarding funding. A long-term state commitment is essential for program success. States with brand programs rely on grants as a funding source.

A question was asked about measuring return on investment. Other states have completed this through survey. Other suggestions such as aggregating data from retailers and media impressions could be considered.

The discussion about certifications resumed.

Stephanie Hallock moved that the State Board of Agriculture prepare a letter that supports the development of a brand stakeholder group, that two members of the State Board of Agriculture be part of the stakeholder group, and that the board support the department's efforts to explore funding for the brand initiative. Laura Masterson seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Canola: report briefing, Carol Mallory-Smith, Ph.D., Oregon State University (OSU)

In 2013, the Oregon legislature passed House Bill (HB) 2427. The bill prohibited the production of canola in the Willamette Valley Protected District, and directed OSU to conduct research on canola. The law is in effect until January 2, 2019.

Dr. Mallory-Smith acknowledged the growers' cooperation for this project.

Field monitoring was conducted to compare the compatibility of canola with growing other crops to the compatibility of other *Brassica* seed with growing other crops. This research was conducted to develop recommendations regarding whether and under what conditions canola is compatible with other crops.

Dr. Mallory-Smith reported that canola is a *Brassica* crop. There are a lot of other vegetables that are also in the same family, like radish, but it is difficult to compare. For this project, fields of canola, forage, turnip, and radish were monitored for diseases, insects, and volunteers.

Dr. Mallory-Smith shared a map of the *brassicaceae* seed monitoring. Monitoring took place for three growing seasons (2014, 2015, and 2016). Not every field was monitored for everything, every year.

A survey of diseases was also completed. Some of the biggest issues identified but not specific to canola were black leg (has been in Oregon for years), light leafspot (new to Oregon) and white leafspot. Weeds were also identified as disease hosts. With respect to insects, more flea beetles were found in radish, and more pollen beetles were found in radish and turnip. And with respect to volunteers, more volunteers were found in radish than canola and turnip. Under seeding of radish fields, usually with clover, made control more difficult. Spread from fields was not observed. Most of the spread along road sides was radish. Volunteers are treated as part of the crop production.

Results for the field monitoring were as follows: no parameter measured was uniquely different for canola versus the other species monitored for diseases, insects, or volunteers. These results led to the conclusion that prohibition of production of canola is unwarranted when other crops are not prohibited, however there should be caution against extrapolating results too far because of time of study and acres monitored.

The second part of the study was to provide recommendations. The following were evaluated: canola production in other areas, various isolation schemes used for the production of *Brassica* crops, and *Brassica* production in the Willamette Valley. With respect to protected districts, canola production districts vary by state and country. For example, Oregon and Idaho have protected districts where canola is prohibited. Washington does not prohibit canola production but does require that it be pinned. France, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom do not prohibit the production of canola or restrict its production to certain areas. With respect to isolation schemes, isolation distances are generally set by consensus within the industry and are not the same from place to place. With respect to mapping, due to business reasons the Willamette Valley Seed Association was unavailable to provide these data. Therefore, a map to determine areas that might be designated canola exclusion zones could not be produced.

In attempt to estimate acreage of *Brassica* seed production in the Willamette Valley, data from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) was used. It was estimated that neither the number of *Brassica* fields nor acreage has increased since 2012.

Over the last five years, the Willamette Valley has seen a decline in wheat and grass seed acreage (~40,000 acres). This could mean that there is an opportunity to grow canola on these acres and pin it without causing negative impacts to the specialty seed industry.

Based on the research, there are three potential options moving forward: (1) limit canola production on a set number of acres to be determined, (2) define canola exclusion zones, or (3) allow unlimited canola production. The report recommends option 1 and that all *Brassica* crops be pinned.

Recommendations were based on the monitoring results, *Brassica* production in the Willamette Valley, and evaluation of other systems. Canola should be treated as other *Brassica* crops in the

pinning system and there is no genetic or biological reason to treat canola differently than other *Brassica* crops.

Dr. Mallory-Smith reported that the report was submitted to the Legislative Assembly on November 1, 2017. ODA will provide a final recommendation by September 2018.

A question was asked if economic impact to the specialty seed industry was considered. Dr. Mallory-Smith reported that this was not part of the research focus.

A question was asked if GE (genetically-engineered) canola versus non-GE canola was studied. Dr. Mallory-Smith reported that the research did not focus on this, however, other research has not shown that they act differently.

There was further discussion on this topic.

Agenda item “*Future Meeting Format and Board Report Discussion*” was tabled due to time constraints.

Public Comment

Anna Scharf, US Canola Association board member and Willamette Valley Oilseed Producers Association President, expressed appreciation of the board and ODA for their work on canola. Anna Scharf reported that she and others look forward to continued engagement with OSU and ODA to develop a positive resolution for coexistence. Anna Schraf believes that the recent canola report submitted by OSU highlights that coexistence begins with equality of crops.

Dave Losh, USDA National Agricultural Statistic Service (NASS), reported that NASS has been working on developing their mailing list in preparation for the Census of Agriculture. Dave Losh requested assistance from the board to raise awareness around the census. Response rate is important as it is difficult to meet the threshold for county level data with the diversity of Oregon’s crops. NASS has added some new measures around veterans in agriculture as well as expanding operator options to better identify woman farmers. The census will be mailed at the end of the year and is due February 18, 2017. There is also an online version.

Mary Anne Cooper, Oregon Farm Bureau (OFB), reported that OFB provided four letters of support to candidates for the Oregon Agriculture Heritage Program.

Board Report Discussion

State law requires the State Board of Agriculture to report to the Legislative Assembly and the Governor’s Office on the status of the Oregon agricultural industry biennially, however, the statute does not explicitly say how the report must be completed. Director Taylor asked the board to consider a new board reporting format which would include a quarterly newsletter following each meeting and a condensed report that is more issue focused each biennium. A sample newsletter was distributed for discussion purposes.

There was question about surveying stakeholders, as it is important they understand this new approach. Director Taylor reported that this is part of the review of the larger communication strategy for the department.

In terms of process, board members will select newsletter topics at the end of the meeting and staff will prepare a newsletter accordingly. Board members will have the opportunity to review and edit newsletter before it is distributed.

Tracey Liskey motioned that the State Board of Agriculture publish a quarterly newsletter. Stephanie Hallock seconded. Motion approved unanimously.

Selection of Individuals for the Oregon Agriculture Heritage Commission and the Oregon Coordinating Council on Ocean Acidification and Hypoxia

Sharon Livingston joined the meeting by phone at 10:50 AM.

Oregon Coordinating Council on Ocean Acidification and Hypoxia: The board received two applications for the position that represents shellfish mariculture industry. There was discussion about the applicants.

Stephanie Hallock motioned to recommend Xin Liu to the shellfish mariculture industry position on the Oregon Coordinating Council on Ocean Acidification and Hypoxia. Laura Masterson seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program (OAHP): Laura Masterson announced to the board that she would like to remove name for consideration for the OAHP Commission but would like to be part of the OAHP Rules Advisory Committee (RAC).

Nellie McAdams, OAHP Coordinator, was invited to provide brief background on the OAHP. Nellie McAdams spoke to the intent of the legislation and the responsibilities of the commission. If individuals are not selected for the commission, there are opportunities to serve on a technical review committee and RAC. There will also be future opportunities to serve on the commission, as there are term limits.

Other agencies also have the responsibility to recommend individuals to the commission. Nellie McAdams spoke to these agencies' recommendations.

There was a question about funding for the program's grants. Nellie McAdams responded that the legislature has only authorized funding to get the program started.

The State Board of Agriculture is responsible for recommending five individuals: one person who has expertise in agricultural water quality and four persons actively engaged in farming or ranching. The board began discussing the applicants for the agricultural water quality position.

Sharon Livingston reported that she wrote a letter of support for Pat Holliday who applied for one of the farming/ranching positions. Sharon Livingston left the call at 11:04 AM.

The board discussed the agricultural water quality applicants. Individual board members expressed their recommendation. Lois Loop received the most support for this position.

The board discussed their process for recommending individuals to the OAHP Commission.

For the farmer/rancher position, each board member voted for four individuals. The candidates were then ranked based on the number of votes received. There was discussion about the rankings. Following the discussion, the board suggested sending a letter to the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) to ask them to consider individuals for the RAC.

Tracey Liskey motioned that the State Board of Agriculture make the following recommendations to OWEB for the OAHP Commission. For the agriculture water quality position, Lois Loop. For the farmer/rancher positions, Doug Krahmer, Chad Allen, Ken Bailey, and Woody Wolfe. Marty Myers seconded. Motioned approved unanimously.

Laura Masterson also motioned that the State Board of Agriculture recommend Peter Kenagy as an alternate for the OHAP Commission. Tracey Liskey seconded. Motion approved unanimously.

Tracey Liskey motioned that the board include a recommendation for the OHAP RAC which would include Laura Masterson and Pete Kenagy. Stephanie Hallock seconded. Motion approved. Laura Masterson abstained from this vote.

Future Meeting Format Discussion

Discussion about future meeting formats was revisited. There was discussion about the role of subcommittees and membership of subcommittees. It is important to make clear the involvement of public during subcommittee meetings.

There was discussion about having the full board meeting the evening of the first night to discuss emerging issues that the department needs guidance on. There was also a discussion about having a program directors' panel.

The board did not have enough time to finish this discussion and tabled the discussion.

The board recessed for lunch at 12:10 PM. Following lunch, the board toured a cannabis growing and processing facility and received a presentation about the Port of Portland at Terminal 6.

The State Board of Agriculture reconvened at 8:28 AM on Thursday, November 30, 2017.

ODA Strategic Plan, Ron Sarazin, Olympic Performance, Inc.

Ron Sarazin distributed the most recent draft of ODA's strategic plan. Fine tuning is still taking place. Since the board's last meeting, the executive team met to review the metrics and tactics. Additional work was also done on Key Objective 6: Connect & Promote Oregon Agriculture.

Ron Sarazin walked through the draft document. Board members provided edits and feedback.

There was a question about how the plan will be updated. Since this is a rolling strategic plan, the document will be reviewed and updated each year.

Director Taylor shared how the strategic plan will be distributed to employees, stakeholders, and the Governor's Office.

Public Comment

Mary Anne Cooper, OFB, reported that they are seeing an increasing interest from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) in ODA's Agriculture Water Quality Program. Mary Anne Cooper encouraged the board to consider a joint meeting with the Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) as the State Board of Agriculture could help with the EQC's understanding of Oregon agriculture.

Stephanie Hallock reported that the EQC had a liaison to the State Board of Agriculture. This was Jane O'Keeffe. This effort was dissolved. Perhaps this should be reconsidered.

Mary Anne Cooper also reported concerns about proposals that relate to cap and invest. OFB is concerned about downstream impacts to family farms and ranchers; for example, increased costs for farm inputs such as fertilizer and fuel. This will cut into the farmer's ability to reinvest into the farm. There is also concern that this will make Oregon agricultural commodities less competitive. Oregon agriculture are price-takers and counterparts in other parts of the country will not have to deal with these costs. Mary Anne Cooper also commented about California's program. Due to burdensome application processes, offset and mitigation opportunities are inaccessible. California farmers and ranchers only receive credits for additional projects. There is no consideration for current practices. This penalizes early adopters. Finally, there is concern about how this might impact young farmers and ranchers as they tend to have the smallest margins.

A question was asked about opportunities related to cap and invest. Mary Anne Cooper reported that "the cap" is the most problematic part. OFB is supportive of incentives for investments in technology and innovative practices, but worries that the program could be inaccessible. OFB feels that this concept will be a net loss for agriculture.

Karen Lewotsky, Rural Partnership Director at Oregon Environmental Council, shared information with the board on ways a cap and invest program can benefit Oregon agriculture. In terms of how the cap will affect Oregon agriculture, only a couple of food processors will be affected. Revenue generated by auctions can be used for innovation in agriculture. There has been an on-going workgroup meeting on this topic since the last legislative session. The group has been thinking about how to make the program inclusive and workable for everyone.

Jeff Stone, Oregon Association of Nurseries, reported agriculture wants to be part of the solution; however, it should be incentive based. Concerns for agriculture include fuel, energy, and fertilizer costs. It is difficult to compare Oregon's potential program to British Columbia and California because these programs have not yet been fully implemented. There are also concerns about cumulative impacts.

A comment was made that it is important for all operators to have access to credits. There needs to be a way to collect and coordinate credits for agriculture so no one is left behind.

The board recessed at 9:43 AM and reconvened at 9:50 AM.

Cap and Invest Discussion, Kristen Sheeran, Carbon Policy Advisor, Office of Governor Brown, and Jenny Lester Moffitt, Deputy Secretary, California Department of Food and Agriculture
Kristen Sheeran reported that in the 2017 legislative session, Senate Bill (SB) 1070 was introduced. This bill would have created a structure for carbon reductions in Oregon through a cap and invest model.

Kristen Sheeran spoke about Governor Brown's support to decarbonize Oregon's economy. The state is not on track for meeting its greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals for 2020. Governor Brown's carbon policy principles are as follows: adopt a flexible, market-based approach to achieve reductions most cost-effectively; prioritize equity and benefit all Oregonians; position Oregon's economy for growth by protecting existing jobs/industries while investing in new technologies, job training, and natural resources; and coordinate with other regional efforts, like those in British Columbia and California.

Kristen Sheeran provided more details on SB 1070. This concept has been around since 2007. Since the 2017 legislative session, workgroups have been meeting to prepare a bill for the 2018 session. The bill sets a declining cap for GHG emissions, it would create a cap and trade program for compliance, and revenue generated would be dedicated to four areas: Highway Trust Fund, Rate Relief, Just Transition, and Mitigation and Adaptation Projects.

Kristen Sheeran described a graphic that demonstrates cap and trade. The proposed cap would apply to entities that exceed 25,000 Mt of carbon dioxide annually. This includes electricity generation and imports, natural gas generation, fuel imports, and large industrial sources of

emissions which would include food processors. Forestry and agriculture are excluded and can supply offsets to the carbon market.

Jenny Lester Moffitt, Deputy Secretary at the California Department of Food and Agriculture, spoke about the history of California's Climate Action Program which started in 2006. The first auction took place in 2014.

Entities that cannot reduce emissions below the cap purchase offsets at the auction. Most of agriculture is not part of the capped entities. Some of the large food producers are over the cap. The cap is facility by facility, not companywide.

Jenny Lester Moffitt spoke about the auction. Typically, \$2-2.5 billion has been generated annually. However, as industries reduce emissions, there will be less participation in the auction, thus less revenue.

A handout, Climate Smart Agriculture, was distributed to the board. This document provided information about programs and technical assistance available to agriculture to reduce GHG.

A question was asked about how California identified leakage. Jenny Lester Moffitt reported that California did not want business to relocate out of state. This would not achieve climate goals nor does it support the state's business goals. California developed a "leakage factor" tool that is used to evaluate the risk of the business leaving versus a reduced/discounted cap.

In Oregon, Kristen Sheeran reported that the state is aware of leakage. The proposed bill will give these businesses differential treatment under the cap. Allowances will be made available based on cost and competitiveness.

There was question from the audience regarding the consideration for conversion of irrigation pumps from diesel to bio diesel since electricity is not available in some locations.

A question was asked about tracking who has received funds for projects. Jenny Lester Moffitt reported that California is required to publish a list of who receives funding.

A question was asked about revenue generated by Oregon's auction. Kristen Sheeran reported that Oregon is a smaller economy and has a smaller carbon footprint than California. DEQ estimated that the auction could generate \$700 million. Thirty to 40 percent of these dollars would need to be deposited to the Highway Trust Fund (constitutional requirement), another 30 percent would be used for rate relief, 10 percent for the transition fund, and the rest would be used for mitigation and adaptation.

There was a discussion about the Western Climate Initiative market. If Oregon joined, Oregon offsets could be purchased by out-of-state markets.

Marty Myers reported that he has been participating in the workgroup. Marty Myers stated that it is important to figure out how to sequester and co-op activities so that no one is left behind. It is also important to figure out how the board can play a role in this.

The board recessed at 11:13 AM. The meeting resumed at 11:19 AM.

Board Business- Subcommittee Reports

Land Use: Jim Johnson shared a map of Oregon that shows the locations of proposed solar facilities. Each of these sites is 12 acres in size. If solar facilities are 12 acres or less on high-value farmland, the applicant is not required to go through the exception's process. North Willamette Valley and Central Oregon are popular locations for the siting of solar facilities. The Land Conservation and Development Commission will be doing rulemaking on this issue but not until after the 2018 legislative session.

A question was asked about limiting a farmer's ability to diversify and add other income sources (i.e. solar) to the farm. The concern is that the solar facility is taking land out of production. Solar could be placed on buildings. In addition, many solar facilities are absentee owners, not farmers. Discussion about siting solar facilities continued. There are also concerns about rural land being used to meet urban energy needs, which then means transmission lines are needed to move energy back to the urban grid. The Land Use subcommittee will be drafting a resolution on this topic.

Jim reported that farmers in Hood River are concerned about the increased acquisition of rural housing for short-term rentals and how this activity will impact land values and the ability for their workers to find affordable housing. Sauvie Island farmers have the same concern.

Jim also reported that he has been overwhelmed by industrial hemp as it relates to land use, specifically right-to-farm and Land Use Compatibility Statements.

A question was asked if staff are tracking time for work related to cannabis and hemp. Yes, and there are on-going conversations about this topic. One of the challenges is that with a new program, like hemp, it is difficult to fully cover costs with fees without stifling the new industry.

Government Relations: Tracey Liskey presented the board with a draft revised resolution, Resolution 298 (Coexistence of wolves and livestock on Oregon's rural landscape) and motioned that the board accept the proposed updates. Stephanie Hallock seconded. During discussion, it was suggested to add language to the resolution statement to clarify that actions should be conducted '*according to the Oregon Wolf Conservation and Management Plan.*' The board approved the resolution as modified.

Tracey Liskey reported that the subcommittee proposes to make the following resolutions inactive and would ask the board to consider this recommendation at the next board meeting: Resolution 038 (Labor Problem), Resolution 133 (H-2A Provisions of Immigration Reform Act), and Resolution 288 (AgJobs Act).

The subcommittee is in process of updating Resolution 169 (Need for Documented Agricultural Work Force) which will become a more comprehensive resolution related to agricultural labor. The subcommittee is also updating Resolution 307 (Farmworker Housing Tax Credit Extension (ORS 315.163-315.172)).

The subcommittee also received an update on the hemp program.

Natural Resources: Ray Jaendl reported the subcommittee is updating resolutions. During the report, the board discussed the resolution approval process and potential changes to this process.

After this discussion, Ray Jaendl continued the subcommittee report. The subcommittee proposes to make the following resolutions inactive and would ask the board to accept this recommendation at the next board meeting: Resolution 145 (Fee Association with Agricultural use of Waters of the State), Resolution 299 (Water Quality Policy), and Resolution 311 (Agricultural Water Quality Management Program Strategic Implementation).

The subcommittee also updated several resolutions and will ask the board to accept these updates at the next board meeting. The resolutions that were updated were as follows: Resolution 313 (Improve water quality associated with agricultural lands and activities using outreach, assessment, and prioritization of geographic areas to address the most serious water quality problems and achieve agricultural TMDL load allocations), Resolution 024 (Insect Pest and Disease Control), Resolution 274 (Oregon Department of Agriculture Involvement in the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board), and Resolution 203 (Local Conservation Cost-Share Funds).

The subcommittee also received a briefing from the Plant Protection and Conservation Program area as well as an update on the Oregon Bee Project.

Food Safety and Marketing: Tyson Raymond reported that the subcommittee received a marketing update as well as a produce safety rule update.

The subcommittee also discussed two resolutions. The subcommittee has recommended that Resolution 142 (Animal Welfare) become inactive and will ask the board to accept this recommendation at the next board meeting.

The subcommittee also edited Resolution 301 (Farmer's Choice of Production Systems - Scale, Markets, and Technology, now called Minimizing conflicts of coexistence in agriculture). Tyson Raymond motioned that Resolution 301 be discussed by the full board at the next meeting. Stephanie Hallock seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

OWEB Report

Laura Masterson reported that OWEB met last month in Lebanon. This is a good location for a future board meeting.

The board set future board meeting dates and potential locations:

June 5-7, 2018, Hood River /Wasco County area

September 25-27, 2018, South Coast area

November 27-29, 2018, McMinnville

The meeting adjourned at 12:57 PM.