

## Seattle – King County Acting Food Policy Council Meeting Notes, August 18, 2006

1. Introductions, in attendance: Sylvia Kantor, Branden Born, Laura Raymond, Linda Nageotte, Fe Arreola, Mary Embleton, Erin MacDougall, Steve Bauck, Pablo Monsivais, Trudy Bialic, Tammy Morales, Chantal Stevens, Laura Raymond,

Guests: Thomas Forster, Claire Dyckman

Staff: Jen Naas

### 2. Committee Updates:

**Strategic Planning and Resource Development Committee.** Sylvia K. presented the updates for the committee

- Presented the draft budget for the AFPC and FPC. Includes in-kind numbers for things like office rental, phones, etc. as well as actual costs. A range of numbers is presented.
  - In-kind and other numbers are based on WSU Extension's rates
  - Ask the AFPC to review the numbers, will email the electronic copy.
- Not everyone expressed an opinion for where to house the FPC. Sending around the voting sheet for where to house the council.
  - The five on the list have been discussed and placed on the list by the SPRD committee, vote for the top 3 (ordering the first, second and third preference)
  - If it is not on the list, it is not being discussed as a possibility
- Sent around copy of the "ask" document
  - This is for review only. Please send any comments on to the committee or Jen N.
  - The document is for a template and will be revised depending on the specific request and where it will be sent.
- Short introduction of the SPRD discussion of "fiscal agent"
  - SPRD Committee will schedule a meeting with a consultant about implications of fiscal sponsorship.
  - Consultant may help with resource development plan
  - Is being asked for advice on pro-bono status

**Council Development Committee.** Tammy M. presented the committee's latest work.

- Involving others with the AFPC: not the best time since it is not yet policy decision but a lot of process. Still important to make things clear on website for transparency
  - For those that wish to be on the agenda. Policy is to leave to discretion of executive committee
  - Requests should be sent to intern to email to executive committee for decision, may put on future agenda depending on the topic relevance and time available.
  - If request is asking for comment on a specific issue (like recent PSRC comment letter), recommend to allow week for comment. If less than a week, it is assumed there is not enough time for AFPC input and must decline. All of these requests will also be filtered through the exec committee
  - *Vote on recommendation: Executive committee to help filter public to put on agenda: goes to Jen and then to the executive committee. Accepted*

- Discussion of decision making process. Committee recommends majority rules using Robert's Rules of Order. Requires a quorum which is 50% plus 1, meaning at least eight people must be at the meeting.
  - Concern over Robert's rules and use for decision making process. May be a problem for certain community members. Majority rule might be difficult particularly for underrepresented groups.
  - Suggested an option of consensus-based process to a point that you can live with the decision... not strict by numbers
  - At Food Lifeline, voting is done by the "rule of five" in which each member holds up a hand with one to five fingers to show level of agreement. Five meaning yes and one meaning bad idea and cannot agree. This is followed up with discussion if there are any members using less than four fingers.
  - *Vote on using this system as a means to make decisions for the AFPC. Accepted*
- How to induct new members, both replacement seats and orientation.
  - This process is not fully formed yet. Thinking about a buddy system and other types of orientation procedures.
  - Question of who is serving the one year term and when do role-offs begin?
  - How to fill vacant seats on the council including replacing Rob Holland?
    - In addition to replacing ag commission spot which is deemed very important to representing food issues, representation is lacking in two sectors: distribution and philanthropy.
    - Committee recommends adding two seats. In this case Jeff Chester (next on list) represents distribution and Cat Taylor represents philanthropy.
    - Question of strategic replacement or in order of vote-getters or by sector?
    - Discussion about having dedicated seats. This strategy might be too rigid. What happens if AFPC is unable to fill the seat due to lack of people in the sector?
    - AFPC is staffed based on short-term need -- enthusiasm and willingness, but not by sectors.
    - Concern was raised over changing the process in mid-stream
    - Suggestion to add seats for FPC is a possibility, but use the next-highest voted nominee to keep in line with foundation of AFPC
    - Concern raised over keeping funders involved... suggested to have as an ex-officio officer not as a voting member
  - *Vote on adding seats; two seats to show representation of missing sectors: Not Accepted*
  - Vince is out and Trudy in, now Rob is out... how to fill this seat?
  - Comment that Vince's seat was filled with Trudy by using top vote getter who also filled needed representation.
  - Concern over filling a the representation for the farm sector ?
  - The current make-up of the AFPC does not have seats for specific sectors
  - Question on using sector strategy or vote getter and in what circumstance this happens? Does sector need always trump vote-getter?
  - For the Ag Commission position. Importance is keeping a relationship, not about the actual sector.

- Suggested to focus on what process to use -- to solidify the ag commission seat for the FPC or keep in for the ex-officio capacity...
- Claire D. commented that she is committed to attending AFPC meetings. Would be helpful to have the AFPC reciprocate at Ag commission meetings.
- *Vote on using the top vote – getter to fill vacant seats. Accepted*
- Jeff Chester is next person, Pablo will contact
- Tammy passed out an example of by-laws, also have example of the KC Food coalition
  - Acting FPC will try to understand and generate some example by-laws, but the FPC will make decision on whether needed or to keep these

**Community Relations Committee.** Pablo M presented latest committee work.

- First issue is list serve : should the listserv name be changed to reflect the AFPC?
  - Text of the potential list serve was sent around
  - *Vote to change list serve use. Accepted*
  - *Vote on listserv name: Seattle- King Co Food Policy. Mostly accepted*
- CR Committee also discussed how to involve interested people.
  - Committees should offer up the “wish list” of activities and expertise to give the public concrete ways to participate in the AFPC.
  - Discussion of filling in gaps of sector representation on food policy council. Committee also suggested adding some additional sectors such as social justice, philanthropy, etc.
  - Good resource in representation by reviewing nominees for AFPC not elected.
  - Choices to involve: join existing committees, on advisory committee for addressing specific areas of food policy and partnering for communications.
  - Another way is helping to develop surveys and gather their input on specific surveys.
  - For transparency and attracting volunteers or engaging people in the AFPC – suggested improving the webpage to have facts and news items modeled after PCC “news bites”
  - Use AFPC members to find news items of interest and submit to the CR committee for inclusion on the web.
  - Question about getting people involved and the actual mission of the AFPC... how to involve but still get to the mandate.
  - Involving people could also help fill the role of the educational component for the AFPC.
  - Clarification for inviting people to be on committees.. formal or advisory capacity?
  - If not a voting member, they are an advisor.
  - Idea is to engage people that are interested in AFPC work or people that would be helpful to the work of the AFPC.
  - Discussion of the term “Ownership linkage” – seek out and engage various stakeholders to bring in specific skills and knowledge. Helps get people involved without a formal role in group, and still be beneficial to the work of the AFPC.
  - Suggested to be sure to have very clear process and policy to avoid issues of influence. Two roles : subcommittee member or advisor. May need to create guidelines to clarify.

- Concern over allow outsiders to be members of the committees? One concern to talk about is the demands of the committee membership. Appears to be a contradiction to allow people to be involved but not be allowed to vote. Suggestion to allow for one role. This means less commitment and a clear understanding of the role within the AFPC.
- *Vote to allow people on committees as advisory only: Accepted.*
- Will try to get op-ed piece in the paper this month

**3. Review of Work Plan.** Linda N. led short discussion on work plan update.

- New work plan sent around to review. All recent changes and suggestions included. New items added and timeline
- Please get back to Jen with any added items.
- Reason for discussion: SPRD Committee needs feedback for next decision making ... path is not yet clear.
- Should discuss preference of the formal recognition: who to address and the steps to get there
  - Approach which entity first? City or county? Etc.
- Does physical location affect where to get the mandate from? Example of being in city and how the county would feel about it.
- Locations and mandate must be discussed concurrently
- Discussions with key contacts may help clarify this
- AFPC must clarify the “mandate.” Resolution vs. executive order vs. ordinance, etc.
- Not all know the difference. Good information on conference phone call through Food Security for this.
- Discussion of relationship of survey for FPC location preferences and digesting the preferred mechanism for the mandate. One must inform the other.
- Top three places to locate the FPC -- depending on where the preferences are, need to know the process of actually housing the FPC there. SPRD committee will investigate each place and find the process through contacts. Important to remember both political and strategic realities in housing the FPC.
- Question of the location of each of the facilities and what the mission?
- Discussion that the five listed priorities will be used for where to explore first not be the end decision on where the FPC will be housed finally.
- Jen will send out notes on the SPRD committee to give more information on the process to get to the top 5 locations.

**4. New Business**

- Discussion on how to get good feedback.
  - Suggest to use Sharepoint to better organize information
  - Question on how information is disseminated? Where do comments go? Who reads them? This may be more apparent by using Sharepoint.
- Other new business: Luce project is going again next year. Richard Gelb is now with county.
  - FPC may help to steer the Luce projects? Branden and Laura will work this out.
  - Last year’s report is done, city and university will hopefully release it to the public. Will send out the link to the group.
  - Opportunity to bring out the farm to school and Luce report.

**5. Presentation by Thomas Forster** – Powerpoint included on the website.