

Seattle – King County Acting Food Policy Council Meeting Notes, December 15, 2006

1. Introductions, in attendance: Fe Arreola, Steve Bauck, Branden Born, Sylvia Kantor, Pablo Monsivais, Tammy Morales, Laura Raymond
Guests: Ralph Coolman, Heidi Broekemeier
Staff: Jen Naas

2. Ralph's introduction and quick background
3. Mission statement
 - Was originally drafted through Branden's class, a collection of other mission statements. The steering committee helped approve it
 - What is missing?
 - More mention of environment, health and community
 - sustainability somewhat addressed the environment part, but would like it to be more explicitly stated
 - Question about the purpose of the mission statement and concern that this one might be too much, too long.
 - Suggested that the purpose is to put out the big picture and invite people to participate and ask why?
 - Suggested to take out the rest after the first part "To lead and assist in the development of a local/regional food system" is a simple statement.
 - Concern that the revised statement nor original says nothing about policy
 - Suggested that there is a difference between vision and mission
 - Mission is how to get to the vision – how you do it and what you do.
 - Concern that some of the terminology are difficult and mean different things to different people: jargon
 - Discussion of other councils' statements. Looked at Toronto, Portland
 - Suggested to focus on two things: the format and the wording.
 - Agreed that it should not be too long
 - Suggested that the current What if... statements from work done by steering committee should be the vision and then build a mission off of the vision
 - From current mission, seems as if AFPC thinks its role is policy and program development –
 - Suggested it should also be making connections, integrating policies
 - Responding to problems
 - Suggested that like the use of fair (or just) in the wording
 - Suggested that equitable is better
 - Read Toronto's again –
 - Question the use of environmental health
 - Does this cover who we are?
 - After much discussion:

Seattle KC AFPC partners with community, business, agriculture and government to develop integrated policy and action for a food system that supports healthy people, communities economies and environment.

- The above wording was voted -- all voted 5
4. Discussion of changes for Operating Procedures
- Mission statement – see above
 - Other issue is attendance
 - Propose that instead of three meetings or five in a year grounds for removal, add in attendance of committee meetings – total absence from 25% of all meetings shall be grounds for removal
 - Executive committee will have conversations with those in jeopardy. this means a change to have the exec committee be in charge of removing those in violation of the OPs
 - Question of what 25% means? Means both committee and full meetings, subcommittee as well. Must make ¾ of all events as they accumulate over the year
 - Concern over changing the rules midstream
 - Went through and discussed who might be in jeopardy (Mary, Rosalinda, Chantal)
 - Discussed the need for some flexibility since this is a volunteer group
 - Concern that a change of rules may not keep people involved. Maybe step away from rules and start conversations with those who are not participating and ask why and how the group might work to make it more reasonable to attend
 - Executive Committee will contact those with lagging attendance and discuss their needs and how the AFPC might fit into their availability and skills.
 - Vote to include executive committee’s role to include tracking attendance and removing members “may be grounds for removal based on conversations with the individual”
 - Voted to make changes
 - Follow up of executive committee to discuss with those who do not have great attendance
5. Skipped committee roles and moved onto the organizational goals
6. Exercise on top ten priorities using the “Issue Evaluation Sheets” in the Luce Report
- All present members looked at the sheets and placed “dots” on the sheets that were in their top ten for the AFPC to tackle.
 - Removed those ideas that didn’t get any votes
 - Next steps: take the ones with the most votes and give them to a working group to put together into a coherent format

NOTE: These were my rough notes. Someone will compile a narrative with the priorities as voted to send out.

-top vote-getting ideas (general category)

5 votes

- EBT (farmers markets enhancements)
- Permanent site for FMs (FM enhancement)

- Be leader in localizing food (#13) (localizing food)
 - Processing, storage facilities, and such for farmers (infrastructure)

 - Filling gaps in food access information (assessment)
 - City facilitated help for food related businesses (infrastructure)
 - Data collection (assessment)
- 4 votes
- Make an FPC (implicit, so this dropped out of official priorities)
 - City response to outside organizations –work with researchers (assessment)
 - Track greenhouse gas emissions or food miles (assessments)
 - Farm to school
 - Low income CSA (differential access)
 - City/county employees getting health food (institutional buying with farm to school)
- 3 votes
- Urban ag
- 2 votes
- Food safety
 - Composting/waste reduction
 - More urban ag
 - Increasing access to local fish
 - Marketing and outreach for FMs
 - Support local ag
 - Low-income
 - Food stamp outreach
 - Improve city work
 - Improve infrastructure for food banks
 - Food pickup and delivery

General categories and those sheets which fell into them. Categories were constructed as the ideas were voted on. Some are the numbers of the issue evaluation sheet or the idea if there was no number

- ◆ Low income access : low income CSA, #18, food stamp outreach, #17
- ◆ Farmers markets : #26, #11, fishing, #25, #16, #15
- ◆ Localizing infrastructure: #13, #5, processing storage facilities, transportation for farms and production, composting and waste reduction/diversion, #10 ,
- ◆ Assessment: #21, #9, #4, #8
- ◆ Farm to school/institutional buying: #14 and farm to school
- ◆ Urban Ag (noting that this was introduced with a lower priority), #27, #29
- ◆ Food safety (noting this was introduced with an idea gaining only two votes)
- ◆ Food system work in the city and county (noting this was introduced with a lower priority and only a few votes)

7. What's next:

- Votes and ideas are sent to strategic planning committee to focus the ideas
 - Suggested to talk about each of the categories at each meeting

- Concern over what we're trying to accomplish, what is the goal?
 - To make a list of recommendations (who is the audience?), identifying projects to work on?
 - Maybe this is key thing to present to city as a proposal to show examples of what an FPC will do?
 - Are these priorities for action? For who?
 - Question that the goal for this was to take this to the govt?? Are these actions, recommendations, etc.?
- Strategic planning committee is tasked with cleaning up the things and sending them out to the group? Suggested that it needs to be in a narrative and a document