

Engaging Fort Collins on Food

Preliminary Report from the Event on April 9, 2014

Compiled by CPD Director Martín Carcasson and the CPD staff

This report includes all the raw data collected from the event, including results from key pad questions at the event, notes taken during the table discussions, and written comments from participants on surveys and worksheets at the event.

For more information, contact Martín Carcasson at cpd@colostate.edu



Northern Colorado
Local
Food Cluster



CENTER FOR PUBLIC DELIBERATION

Table of Contents

Overview of Agenda and Contents of this report

	3
Keypad process results	3
Session 1: Progress since last meeting - Inventory and gap inventory	3
New items/organizations to add to the current inventory list	3
Gap analysis information	5
Session 2: Progress since last meeting –High impact projects	8
Session 3: Engaging the tension between top down and bottom up leadership	10
Notes from polarity worksheets	11
The Case from Strong Leadership/Top-down management	11
When Top down dominates bottom up too much	13
The Case for Strongly Democratic, Bottom up process	14
When Bottom up dominates top down too much	16
Wordles from the polarity worksheets	18
Notes on the application of the exercise to the food cluster	20
Session 4: Responding to the rules of engagement draft	22
Comments on worksheets	22
Table discussion notes on current rules	24
Table discussion notes on additions or overall reactions	25
Session 5: Membership structure process	27
Comments on worksheets	27
Student notes on discussion	31
Additional student notes not tied to a specific session	36

Keypad process results from beginning of the meeting

1.) In our local food economy, I'm mostly involved as a ___? (multiple choice)

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
Local producer	17.65%	9
Local food business	3.92%	2
Local restaurant	0%	0
Local government official	7.84%	4
Local non-profit	19.61%	10
Local food gardener	13.73%	7
Consumer	13.73%	7
Other	23.53%	12
	100%	51

2.) What is your age? (multiple choice)

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
25 and under	0%	0
26 to 39	55.77%	29
40 to 59	34.62%	18
60 and over	9.62%	5
	100%	52

3.) What is your race? (multiple choice)

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
Asian	0%	0
Black	0%	0
Hispanic	0%	0
White	96%	48
Native American	0%	0
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0%	0
Multi-racial	2%	1
Prefer not to answer	2%	1
	100%	50

4.) How did you hear about this meeting? (multiple choice)

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
Coloradoan article	5%	2
Coloradoan letter	5%	2
Email from Food Cluster	40%	16
Email from other org	17.50%	7
Forwarded email from friend	10%	4
Word of mouth	15%	6
Other	7.50%	3
	100%	40

Session 1: Progress since last meeting - Inventory and gap inventory

Cluster Steering Committee member Michael Baute reported out on the local food inventory that was initiated during the November 2013 meeting. At the tables, participants were provided with copies of the current inventory, as well as a worksheet to identify specific gaps in the inventory. Participants were asked to add items to the inventory, as well as explain the most important gaps that remain. Both the inventory and the gaps analysis were organized using ?? categories:

New items/organizations to add to the current inventory list

1. Agricultural Production

- Green Dog Farm
- Everyone from CSA fair should be on this list
- Raspberry Hill
- Grant Farms
- Lakeridge Farm
- Raindrop Retreat
- Ollin Farm
- Rock Soup Ranch
- Cozy Cow Dairy
- Fossil Creek Farm
- Sunray Natural
- Blue Barrel Farm
- Bayberry Fresh
- Integrity Farm
- Sunspot Urban Farm
- Laughing Buck Farm

2. Value Added Businesses

- Feisty Spirits
- Branch Out Cider
- Cave Girl Eats

3. Processing Facilities

4. Wholesale Aggregators and Distribution

- Yancey's

5. Local Regional Independent Wholesalers

- Multi-Farm CSA

6. Retail

- Sprouts
- Crunchy Grocer in Loveland
- Jax Outdoor Gear
- The Cupboard
- Compass Cider

- Lyric Cinema Cafe

7. Farmers Markets

- Northern CO Farmer's Market
- Windsor Farmer's Market
- Cheyenne Farmer's Market

8. Food Service and Catering

9. Restaurants

- Restaurants that walk the talk
- 415

10. Local Land Conditions

- Food and Water watch
- Northern Colorado Water
- FC Water Board

11. Education/Outreach Organizations

- The Growing Project
- Into Latino communities
- Food Finders
- PSD/ Thompson Valley
- Mountain Sage Community School
- Food Bank of Larimer County

12. Support Organizations/Foundation

- Private investors?
- Soil & Water Conservation districts
- Sauce Promotion and Productions
- Sustainable Living Association
- Mulberry Community Gardens

Blue worksheets—identifying gaps in inventory list

1. Agricultural Production

- Scale and long term farms
- They need to identify: organic, non GMO, conventional..etc
- I'd love to see companies of large acreage shift turf to food producing space
- Farmer training programs
- Apprentice farmer education/networking organization (such as CRAFT in NY)
- Formal incubator farm program (such as Interval in Burlington, VT)
- Perennialization
- Ecologically restorative systems (this requires long term vision)
- Swine

2. Value Added Businesses

- Those that operate at scale

- This is too broad of a category- need to distinguish things like product/shelf state. Manufacturing vs bakeries vs prepared foods
- Price points for “salsa workers” to buy local
- Simple frozen and canned produce
- Packaged meals
- Come Back to the Table isn’t a value added business. It is a cooking class school. It’s a great resourced but listed in the wrong place

3. Processing Facilities

- Those that operate at scale
- Need large animal processing and poultry for small volumes
- Need more processing/commercial kitchens
- Mobile slaughter, minimal processing facilities
- Community kitchens
- incubator

4. Wholesale Aggregators and Distribution

- Farmer driven distribution and aggregation (i.e. hopunion (sp?) farmer coops)
- Wholesale out

5. Local Regional Independent Wholesalers

- Should include national level, like retail below. For example, Sysco Food Service sells more Colorado products to Colorado companies than any other food service supplier. There are others as well
- Food hub where small farms can sell products for aggregation and sale to buyers who need large quantities. –also covers marketing/sale process (middle man, but at local/regional level to maintain locally grown benefits)
- Same as above (Farmer driven distribution and aggregation (i.e. hopunion (sp?) farmer coops)

6. Retail

- Need to expand beyond direct retail
- Distinguish special shops (e.g. spices) vs markets vs multi-product like-shops that sell food too, eg. The Cupboard
- National level (safeway)
- Permanent, year-long local market

7. Farmers Markets

- Cohesive markets
- Low income areas – North side, West side
- Cohesion of markets- less is more
- Lack of coordination amongst FM organizers
- Need better coordination, re: times, and vendor application, also need permanent winter market/year round

8. Food Service and Catering

- Waste management facilities (compost, food waste diverted to farms for livestock consumption) food packagers + packing suppliers-sustainable materials
-

9. Restaurants

- La luz, La Salsitas, Maya Cove, Tap n Handle
- need to have standards to say or claim “support local foods/farms”
- more local procurement for all restaurants

10. Local Land Conditions

- Long term ag leases
- Transitional support for Agland
- Long term land access near town
- Long term land/water leases; affordable farm land/water
- Working landscapes on city or county land
- Need some type of land bank/matching and farm incubator

11. Support Organizations/Foundations

- Investment \$\$ for land access issues
- We need more educating and marketing towards local foods. We need more of our population eating local foods

12. Education/Outreach Organizations

- Another categorizing; “Farm Stands”, (not all have them) and in neighborhoods
- Need a well-developed community relations plan to offset criticism from conservationists who will be quick to say Larimer County is not appropriate for food cultivation.
- Cohesiveness with all parties
- Sustainable ag practices in higher ed

Additional comments:

- Water providers and soil and water conservation districts need to have both of their own categories. Why isn’t water part of your supply chain?
- Output from development of the water supply demand management policy – a number of discussions
- Additional category- businesses that supply equipment, etc, to ag producers
- Is there a plan to engage with governmental /social service providers offering food assistance, such as SNAP (food stamps)?

Session 2: Progress since last meeting –High impact projects

Food Cluster Steering Committee member Dawn Thillamy explained the results from the November 2014 meeting concerning the criteria for choosing high impact projects, outlining the rubric the committee will be using to evaluate potential projects.

	Economic Impact			Broader Public Benefits			Feasibility			Total
Selection Criteria	Small Farms and Food Biz	Invest in Food System Infrastructure	Public Spaces in Food Production	Health Food Access	Environmental Implications	Conserve Farm and Ranch Lands	Potential Effectiveness	Resources - Financial	Resources - People	Weight
Weighting Scale	5%	20%	10%	20%	10%	15%	10%	5%	5%	100%

After Dawn’s presentation, participants had an opportunity to complete worksheets responding to the template, reacting to each selection criteria by saying the weight was just right, should be more important, or should be less important, as well as provide additional comments. Below is the data from any worksheets that were turned in to the facilitator.

1. Small Farms and Food Biz

- Should be more important—1
- Weight just right—1
- Should be less important—1

Comment:

- 5%
- 10%
- 10%

2. Invest in Food System Infrastructure

- Should be more important—2
- Weight Just Right—9
- Should be less important—4

Comment:

- 20%
- 15%
- 15%
- Since 1 and 2 are nested we do away with 1 and make 2 25%

3. Public Spaces in Food Production

- Should be more important—2
- Weight just right—9
- Should be less important—2

Comment

- 10%

4. Health Food Access

Should be more important—1
Weight just right—7
Should be less important—6

Comment:

- 20%
- 10%-15% / In the absence of anti-poverty
- 15%
- Health(y) Food Access

5. Environmental Implications

Should be more important—5
Weight just right—7
Should be more important—2

Comment:

- 10%
- 15%
- 15%

6. Conserve Farm and Ranch Lands

Should be more important—3
Weight just right—10
Should be less important—1

Comment:

- Must have land and water to have any local food
- 15%
- 5 & 6 also tied together

7. Potential Effectiveness

Should be more important—1
Weight just right—13

Comment:

- 10%

8. Resources – Financial

Should be more important—3
Weight just right—10

Comment:

- 5%

9. Resources - People

Should be more important—2
Weight just right—11

Comment:

- 5%

Any additional comments, questions, or suggestions:

- Polled audience here for group consensus of reasonable weights

- I think it's interesting that the community is so focused on more food when so much of what we are growing is wasted or not used locally because it can't be processed locally. If we could process locally, we could use it to help with food needs/shortages in the community. PSD/PVTT & other. Institutions would buy more local/minimally processed produce if it was available.

Session 3: Engaging the tension between top down and bottom up leadership

For session 3, CPD Director Martín Carcasson explained the concept of polarity management, which involved a situation where there is a natural tension between two positive poles that needs to be managed rather than “solved.” Organizations often bounce back and forth between the two poles, rather than recognize the inherent tension and seek to find the best way to negotiate that tension. Applied to the food cluster, the tensions between having a strong “top down” leadership was contrasted to more organic, bottom-up management, particularly as the cluster continues to organize and become an official 501c3. Participants were provided a polarity management worksheet, and led through the process by the CPD student facilitators. The worksheet provided the template below:

<p style="text-align: center;">The Case for Strong Leadership/Top-down management When it all goes very well...</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">The Case for Strongly Democratic, Bottom up processes When it all goes very well ...</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">When Top down dominates bottom up too much...</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">When Bottom up dominates top down too much...</p>

Participants were given some time to jot down their initial thoughts on their own worksheet, and then the facilitators collected responses and led a discussion to complete an overall worksheet for the entire table. Below are the comments collected from all the table worksheets:

The Case from Strong Leadership/Top-down management—when it all goes very well

- "If you build it, they will come"
- Ability to focus on tasks
- Able to motivate
- Accomplishments
- Accountability
- Active
- All can unite behind
- Anticipate problems and interventions (2)
- Avoids confusion
- Better possibility for higher level of organization
- Boundaries, etc. are clear
- Builds community through having engaged members
- Charismatic leader can draw people/funds to project
- Clarity (2)
- Clarity about who is the leader
- Clarity on roles/responsibilities
- Clear "Boss" division of work
- Clear and goal setting can lead to focused energy to accomplish tasks
- Clear direction (4)
- Clear expectations (2)
- Clear expectations/direction
- Clear goal
- Clear goods to seek
- Clear message
- Clear sense of direction
- Clear vision, message
- Cohesiveness
- Comprehensive, among all of community
- Concise and deliberate
- Consistency, clarity, and organization
- Decisive (2)
- Defined course
- Determine resources needed and make sure they are obtained
- Directed and effective organization
- Direction
- Easier time getting things done possibly
- Efficient/efficiency (3)
- Cohesive, predictability
- Efficient and effective (2)
- Efficient processes
- Energy
- Equal, practical distribution of tasks
- Establish vision for organization guidance in following mission/vision
- Everyone has clearly defined roles-all goals have a responsible party and less risk of duplication
- Everyone knows his/her role in the larger picture
- Focus
- Focus on deliverables
- Focus, vision, organized efforts
- Focused action (3)
- Folks held responsible
- Get projects done
- Get some done
- Give direction without threats
- Goals & direction/expectations
- Goals known by all
- Good communications of goals and expectations
- Good direction
- Good organization for crisis situation
- Great and predictable
- Have solutions

- High morale/strong teams united behind dynamic leaders
- Incorporate the democratic bottom up process of glacial movements and long-term goals
- Lead by example
- Leader can direct goals to take advantage of common strength
- Leader keeps vision at forefront of decisions
- Less conflicting power play/easier to manage group
- Listen
- Measurable accomplishments
- Meet goals, strong products
- Momentum
- More decisive
- More productive
- Need clear leadership in a collaborative effort
- Obtain outcomes more quickly/efficiency and decision making
- Organization
- Organized
- Organized
- Organized efforts where folks know what their role is
- Outcome driven
- Outcomes attained, but many not have everyone on-board
- Passion
- People know what to expect
- People know who to go to (point person)
- People trust and are inspired (2)
- Positive role model
- Positive role model/accomplishments
- Potential for faster action with direction from management
- Potentially Consistent funding and leadership in terms of accountability, meetings/forward momentum
- Power through pitfalls
- Progress
- Quick decisions-crisis management
- Resources
- Rules and responsibilities
- Someone to take responsibility. Small winds to take charge
- Strong service of direction
- Strong/clear motivating message
- Success
- Take responsibility
- Team can move together
- They develop mechanism for real time feedback
- Things get done (2)
- Things happen quickly (efficiently)
- Transparency and act as catalyst to advance member/community initiatives
- Transparent goals
- Unified voice, clarity
- Very efficient (makes consistent progress with resources)
- Vetted through city comp. plan/ \$ process
- Vision (inspirational leader)
- Vision achievement
- Well spoken, likeable, fluid
- Work gets done
- You have someone to go to an expert

When Top down dominates bottom up too much

- Aggressive
- Authoritarian
- Bad single leadership can lead to disgruntled support teams, lack of buy in. Disengagement.
- Bossy people who alienate others
- Bottom up, not willing to share (have their voices heard)
- Bureaucracy in the bad sense
- Can get exclusive
- Change in leadership
- Charismatic leader leaving could cause project to collapse
- Community stakeholders feel disconnected and may quit seeing organization as a partner
- Concentrated power
- Creativity is squashed
- Creativity is stifled
- Creativity squashed
- Crumbles from within
- Dictatorship
- Dictatorship, power struggle, micro management
- Dictatorship, rigid, oppression, bossy people who alienate others
- Direction or focus on what is not needed
- Disagreement
- Disconnected from employees/project
- Disengagement
- Doesn't listen
- Exclusion, narrow focus
- Exclusive (leaves some people out)
- Fearful
- Get too entrenched in one "world"
- Go down the wrong track/missteps
- Goal may not represent general population
- Group think
- Hard to do job w/no direction
- Hostile work environment
- Inflexibility
- Inflexible
- Innovation motivates youth so top down approach can crush that
- Just another organization
- Lack creative, fluid solutions
- Lack of inclusion
- Lack of motivation and trust among the "bottom"
- Lack of ownership
- Lack of ownership, reduced interest
- Lack of pride
- Lack of respect with the organization
- Lack of team
- Leader becomes isolated from group
- Leader can direct group away from common interests
- Less open to other opinions
- Limits problem solving
- Little room for input, creativity and innovation
- Lose momentum, kills project
- Lose sight of goal/mission
- Lose touch with needs of stakeholders
- Loss of creativity (2)
- Low moral
- Low participation
- Low participation/morale/fear
- Micro management (2)
- Missed opportunity
- Missing opportunities
- More room for special interests/one track mind/playing favorites
- Narcissism, dominance of those in power suppression of other voices/ideas
- No room for improvement

- No sense of pride near "bottom"
- Not as collaborative
- Not as collaborative, less voices, people left out -might leave
- Not nimble enough to be responsive to groups
- Not the best use of individual talent
- One person can take down the whole operation
- One solution for all
- Oppressive (2)
- Oppressive and restrictive
- People are grustrate4d, feel unappreciated, like management, think they're "stupid"/incompetent
- People feel unappreciated
- People leave the group because they don't feel heard
- People lose the ability to think for themselves
- People turned off and not committed
- Personal agendas could take over
- Personal lack of respect
- Poor games
- Potential for missteps magnified
-
- Rigid
- Rigid (not best use of individual talent)
- Rigid-too stuck in one direction
- Shuts people down, doesn't open
- Single minded
- Single vision
- Slower to adapt, unwilling
- Some people left out
- Stifles creativity
- Too concerned with leader's interests
- Too directive
- Too focused
- Too much focus on theory vs practice
- Too rigid; too tired to political whims of council
- Tunnel vision (2)
- Unable to adapt to changing conditions
- Undermines community
- Un-inclusive
- Unsure about if you can become a member
- Unwelcoming culture, loses momentum (2)
- Wasted talent and unwelcoming

The Case for Strongly Democratic, Bottom up process –when it all goes very well...

- Accommodate all stakeholders
- All voices are heard (2)
- Autonomy (2)
- Avoid group think
- Balanced participation
- Balanced priorities
- Best representation of the peoples will
- Better buy in
- Born out of necessity
- Broader access and coverage of issues and effects
- Builds community
- Buy in form entire team, ownership over project and results
- Buy-in
- City advocates
- Collaboration (2)
- Collaboration and coordination happen
- Collaboration often breeds a better product--more creativity
- Collaboration, flow of ideas
- Collaborative
- Collaborative, attentive, flexible, adaptive
- Collective and common interest

- Collective organization/action
- Common interest can be amplified
- Common interest can be amplified
- Community
- Community buy-in (2)
- Community focused and reflective of priorities for those invested in food system issues and projects
- Consensus lends to long term commitment
- Cooperation
- Creative, flexible, wisdom of a group
- Creative, unpredictable
- Creativity
- Different background/diversity
- Diverse voices
- Drawing on peoples passion
- Egalitarian, input form diverse perspectives
- End result is robust, dynamic, has lots of variety and often is fair
- Ensure existing groups are involved and valued
- Environment collaboration and safety in debate-fair interest
- Everyone feels heard and involved
- Everyone feels welcome and included (2)
- Everyone gets to contribute
- Everyone has a place at the table
- Everyone has a voice
- Everyone has input
- Everyone leap into goals
- Fairness
- Feeling appreciated
- Feelings of investment or ownership (2)
- Flexibility (2)
- Focus on process, goals/visions
- Great if unified
- Great support, network
- Higher energy
- Idealistic-broader thinking
- Inclusive (2)
- Inclusive, diverse voices and perspectives means that more outcomes are examined, reducing the chance of negative unintended consequences
- Inclusive-everyone has a say
- Inclusivity
- Inclusivity, grassroots collaborative
- Increase collaboration
- Informs leadership in a unified way while keeping to those glacial decisions to long-term
- Innovation
- Innovative ideas (2)
- Involved in goals
- Justice oriented, privilege put aside
- Justice sustained
- Know what is needed
- Lots of background
- Lots of ideas generated, can let scream rise to the top
- More energy
- More ideas and quality of ideas
- More inclusive
- More inclusive of community values
- More people participate/feel welcome to participate
- Most voices are heard
- Multiple voices get heard
- Needs are identified
- Negotiation
- New innovative ideals to get the goal, not suck in original structure
- Open debate
- Open to other ideas
- Organized
- Outward show of strength (2)

- Participation
- Passion
- People are engaged
- People are excited, motivated
- People feel independent and important
- Potential for more ideas generated
- Representation of stakeholders
- Respectful to everyone
- Responsive
- Sense of common-sense of accomplishment team success
- Shared responsibility (2)
- Stays very relevant
- Strong partnerships
- Strong sense of community and inclusiveness
- Stronger foundation (pooling many folks experience into one)
- Sustainability
- They feel strong, appreciated
- Time management
- Uses the involvement and commitment of group voices
- Variety of perspectives
- Versatile, inclusive
- Wisdom of group

When Bottom up dominates top down too much

- All talk, no action
- Ambiguous
- Biases dominated
- Bosses become wimps
- Can talk in circles-never get anything done
- Chaotic and frustrating
- Confusion and paralysis
- Confusion and paralysis
- Constantly changing direction
- Crumbles from within
- Decision making is stalled
- Defuse energy
- Different ideas not coming together
- Disorganization
- Disorganized, fractured, chaotic, frustrating
- Distraction less focused
- Doesn't make progress in moving towards mission
- Each person's bias dominates
- Effort can never converge
- Effort never conveys
- Egos get in
- Employees don't know who to look to/if they can count on management
- Endless discussions
- Etsy to have mission creep
- Founding
- Fragmented activities and priorities may make some feel there is no unified mission
- Get off track
- Gets stuck in process
- Great ideas, poor execution
- Group think
- Harder to manage
- Inability to respond quickly
- Inefficient
- Inefficient
- Lack of action
- Lack of cohesion
- Lack of direction/focus
- Lack of expertise to set and follow direction
- Lack of focus, disorganization
- Lack of governance

- Lack of organization
- Lack of overview
- Lack of productivity
- Lacks focus
- Lacks follow through
- Less focus
- Lose direction (no one in charge)
- Lose focus, get mixed in talk
- Lot of waste
- Lots of "flash in the pan"
- Low moral
- Low participation
- May not be in agreement--fighting
- Muddies the water
- No clear leadership
- No clear management
- No clear outcomes attainable
- No clear point person/leader
- No long term political will
- Not able to get anything done
- Not enough consistency
- Not getting anything done
- Not much gets accomplished
- Nothing gets done (3)
- Nothing gets done in a practical sense-lots of talk, no action unless someone takes the lead
- Nothing might happen
- People feel unclear and don't know what to expect
- People may wonder who is leading
- People work at cross purposes or inefficiently
- Perfection=enemy
- Perhaps not effective
- Potential for conflict (3)
- Progress is slow if at all
- Progress slow in bureaucratic ways
- Reactive
- Scattered
- Slow to move
- So many voices that nothing gets done
- Some participants end up dominating, no mechanism to check strong personalities
- Stalled decision making
- Stalled in discussion
- Takes longer
- Talk in circles
- Things get done
- Too many cooks (conflict, dissent)
- Too many cooks in the kitchen
- Too many directions
- Too many directions or too much group thought-no bigger picture
- Too many leaders not enough followers
- Too many voices (2)
- Tug of War (too many cooks)
- Unanchored
- Unclear decision making
- Undermines community

Application to the food cluster:

After completing the worksheets and discussion their answers, participants were asked to apply the insights of the exercise to the current state of the food cluster. The notes below were captured by the student facilitators regarding that discussion.

<p>Considering the pros and cons of each approach, what suggestions do you have for the Food Cluster leadership as they move forward? How can they best negotiate this particular tension as we work toward the Food Cluster’s overall goals?”</p>
<p>Create a strong, short-term (3 yrs) plan with strong leadership Distill a draft of public opinion that is then lead by a city consultant Focus on mid-level management or the connection between the public and the leaders Utilize committee work. Make the committee rotational and without centralized power "1 vote, 1 stakeholder"- no organization given more power than another, no organization's needs/opinions favored over another</p>
<p>have a strong leader and a board to serve as feedback loop and accountability If you don't have regular administrative stuff you're constantly reinventing things unless you have some leadership and consistency Short term people to make sure you're staying to mission - reason for board - not responsible for administrative piece which can be a burden A lot of boards don't function well because they haven't had that structure and they're constantly reinventing the wheel and don't know what their role is Training and education can fix this Need to respond quickly and be efficient and engage everybody Clear and everyone on board needs to understand from the beginning</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Inclusiveness is must for food cluster• Everyone knows what they need to be doing/role/why they're there• Manage admission• Agree to leave agenda 'at the door'• Need cheerleaders and energy to keep going; people may burn out• Needs a sense of accountability (Within committees)• Individual's involved need to have something at stake/motivation to go to meetings and be involved.• Overall good governance• Mix of Top Down/Bottom Up models
<p>Q: What do you see/ what suggestions do you have for food cluster leadership? - Stay on the top of the graph - A little of both</p> <p>Q: How do you think they can best negotiate tensions? - Get bylaws together, look at other successful organization's bylaws and modeling bylaws from that - Even flexibility needs structure, method of reaching consensus, everybody being heard, culminates in decision and action - Deadlines and clarity but along with flexibility - Needs to work from both ends - Momentum come from democracy, w/o leadership, structure nothing can happen - A good meshing is always checking the health of the group and synthesizing it into action - Make sure to include additional franchise, those who aren't missing at meeting; polling community not just to little cluster. Still need to bring in voices of low-income, - Broad based, not just a little bubble - Accountability to board of directors, that goes both ways, members are accountable as well. - Peer review, based upon some experiences in community so that there's not suddenly something bad happened and nobody knows why it happened/how it happened - Communication – board can only do as much as is communicated to them by their member - Responsibility to the whole organization to stay involved and communication what they want - Multi-model forms of communication, can't expect everyone to read an email; has to be diff ways of reaching out to people to be effective.</p>

- I'd like to hear discussions of brainstorming concrete possibilities of what might be produced. I've heard roles of group (general)
 - Generally steered away, building basis, allowing people to evaluate; not do the how (specific project), want to discuss the what. Applying, come forth with project to cluster; cluster evaluating based on criteria
 - Already a few ideas, but cluster says they're not ready, wants ideas to come back later
- Q: Are there any ways allow leadership not to be bogged down too much by bottom up?
- Different kinds of people involved
 - Have lots of different groups, have different liaisons to communicate in language of specific group, don't necessarily promote their own agenda; back-and-forth. Liaison is an interpreter between people who work together but don't have the same world.
 - Some group or some entity missing in leadership
 - Leadership needs to be very diverse. Sitting in table that have 4 who are from the same group. Have lots of diversity in leadership (based on key from the inventory.) Another group talking about policy, we're the only farmers even though project is related.
 - Underrepresentation of a group is a waste of talent.
 - Diversity. Afraid things in group will flourish in summer where people in farms are too busy/exhausted to help out.
 - Need to ask farmers
 - Make sure you call up, pointed recruitment of the people you know you need. Not just ensure friends are there
 - Make sure you don't lose momentum for this group. Tables were full at November, they weren't tonight. A lot of overlap with groups, sometimes everybody preaching to each other without anybody being heard (?)

Facilitator -- pros/cons?

- organization structure preferred to have both top and bottom
- + have leaders, revert back to community
- + allows to move forward
- fail to remember who is not at the table, involve more parties (possible outlet like online surveys)
- ~ outreach leads to participation
- ~ go out and meet w/ people especially when relates to lives directly, empowering to them
- * table member asked: figuring out who is represented?
- plan on how to take to next step because nothing is in place
- need transparency- how/why decisions are made, group makes decision and people ask why

Transparency was a big aspect of this. They feel as though as long as there is a strong leader with definite goals and a way to make sure all entities are working towards that goal then a bottom to top would work, but they did seem to feel as though that strong leader and organization of the top to bottom was a key aspect. They also seemed to feel as though it's important to have a diverse group of people with different backgrounds (economic, farming, production, retail) as part of the leadership team so that multiple perspectives were being considered.

Idea of president vs committees-need people to balance the structure
 Possibility of committee group so there are leaders but still open to group participation
 Idea of "servant leadership" where there is one "manager" in charge of and committed to the greater good and the voices of the people
 Where do "ideals" and "theories" break down to reality?
 Time constraints are better managed when there are leaders responsible for getting things done
 There needs to be a clear goal so everyone is working in the same direction
 There need to be deadlines so decisions get made
 Idea of visionary leadership where there is a strong vision with a leader who will get it done
 Can't wait for everyone to agree if we want to get things done
 Leaders with passion will get things done but passion has a flip side-double edged sword-not everything with passion behind it should be pursued

From the conversation, it sounded like a compromise between the top down and bottom up would be some sort of hierarchy. Like a management system or a board of different represented groups to help organize everyone and make goals.

Having a set process to resolve conflict would also be a necessary way to avoid the negative sides to the bottom up process.

But for this group I saw them leaning toward the bottom up process because of the collaboration aspect.

- Almost have to go with a loose structure because of the people involved in it
 - o Needs to be a board to figure this out
- Food cluster started from bottom up, should stay that way
- More consulting role
 - o Connect people together
 - o Mediator
 - o Facilitators help
- Have to be flexible
- Move Steering Committee to make sure they represent the groups present
- Seems more “organic” to do bottom up (pun was intended)
- Have to have a person to set up events, top down approach
 - o Person needs to be more of a coordinator than a CEO
- Temp position for coordinator
- Infrastructure for food will impact on the structure of the cluster
- Dealing with a bunch of “rebels” had to do top down approach
- Bottom up approach brings more people together.

It seems like our group was interested in having someone that is a good decision maker, timely, organized, and a great communicator. Our group did see the need to have a designated "leader" to ensure things get done in an efficient manner.

Session 4: Rules of engagement draft - Food cluster steering committee member Bobbie Kay explained the development of rules of engagement for how the food cluster will work, and participants then had a chance to respond to a draft of those rules. Below are the written comments provided by participants on the worksheets. The bold text represents the initial proposed rules, and the bullet points represent the student comments.

1. Listen carefully - respect everyone’s opinions and viewpoints

- Be respectful of time as well.
- Starred
- Should be #2
- define processes. Conflict resolution, voting?
- listen to understand
- How is this done?

2. Speak truthfully - be transparent and honest

- Should be #4
- yes
- Creating consensus creates community satisfaction
- With respect
- Safely

3. Remain open - be flexible with changes and allow for alternative points of view

- Starred
- Should be #3
- yes

- Respect yourself
- Does this include conflict?

4. Respect diversity - all populations, economic sectors, and community groups are welcome

- Seek out diversity, be willing to change. Flexibility.
- Actively seek diversity
- Ethnic representation here at initial meeting
- Encourage diversity
- Encourage diversity
- Encourage target diversity
- yes, could this be combined with remaining open?
- When engaging non-white groups avoid tokenism, don't put goals on them. Find out how they see their involvement, and what's important to them

5. Be inclusive - all voices, opinions and perspectives are of value

- Actively try to find new ways to include people
- Remain on target

6. Honor each other - consider totality of circumstances when making decisions affecting members

- and that you may not be aware of all circumstances affecting a member
- yes
- Favorite
- How?

7. Maintain commitment - fulfill your committed role(s) to the group to best of your ability

- Starred
- Should be #1
- yes
- Take action. Action is important

Additional comments:

- "Rules of Engagement" are aggressive or combative, perhaps guidelines of discourse. Think before you speak, Remain open and listen carefully, Maintain commitment (action based)
- Looks great, clear and concise
- Rules of engagement, and common courtesies (rename)
- Do not interrupt. Let speaker finish before you speak, or even raise your hand, etc.
- New title? "this is how we roll" "Ways to work together", "How to engage"
- Allow discussion, Disagreement, use negotiation, allow for creativity
- Work through conflict and develop ways to engage around issue
- Share the floor. All opinions need to be heard, there is time for all to speak
- Should be retitled the Spirit of engagement
- they look good to me
- How to make decisions?

- Rather than just identifying positive behavior, outline conflict resolution strategies. Consensus making. Compromise
- How is conflict actually going to be dealt with? Maybe use the "safe space" tool
- Decision making? Compromise? Consensus building
- Expectations of engagement instead of rules
- Crossed out "Rules" in title
- Transparency?

Student facilitator notes from the table discussions regarding the rules of engagement:

Reactions to current rules:
There were too many. Need to consolidate some.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contribute. All these are passive, speak up. (Maybe maintain commitment.) Be engaged, have a productive role. - 1 Is the hardest one. - 1 How is this done? How does someone understand their opinion is being understood? How does it get communicated that you're being listened to? If you don't feel respected, that doesn't happen. Have passive and active part. - Speak truthfully is active. - Use two-party. Listen carefully and express that you've heard it. - Listen to understand, not just to hear. Ask questions if you need to. - Is their safety in speaking truthfully? Needs to be in a safe environment? How is that going to be established that it's safe to speak? - I think that just having rules for engagement that has intention, in a lot of ways, isn't very... might have a lot of ways of being nice, just half the battle. Don't be a "turd". - The expectation to be nice - Shouldn't be rules, should be expectations. - Rules imply that you shouldn't follow it. - Imply that there's enforcement. - Always have food. Food changes the climate (at meetings) - Gluten free and vegan options – diversity of choices.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. use "common courtesies" instead of "rules of engagement" 2. constructive criticism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the rules use nice language, but there will be conflict so some criticism will happen 3. need for evidence-- based, evaluate 4. removes critical thinking: critical thinking should be on sheet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ideas for critical thinking: should have an agenda and room for questions that lead to discussion, there is always a grey area w/ critical thinking 5. combine some rules, make more succinct (maybe only 4 rules) 6. stay open with communication to help with responsibility and show it-- who is doing what <p>* table member asked: what should be added to the list?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - critical thinking - conflict resolution-- "nip it in the bud"/timeliness
<p>"looks great"</p> <p>"Reflects our previous discussion well"</p> <p>The goals are great for inclusion of ideas and people but also need to recognize constructive vs unproductive participation in order to be clear and make real progress</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -How will conflicts be resolved? Step by step, aside from simply incorporating the rules of engagement. -How do we make decisions? Consensus method (this was suggested) for example, roberts rules of order. We need a process of agreement. So far we have the thumb method (thumbs up, thumbs down, thumb to the side). -Compromise should be added to the list.

- There was strong agreement to a man who said, "this is just a list of playing nice"
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title is a military term, seems aggressive. • "Guidelines for Discourse" • Many of these rules can be combined into each other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Discretion of the steering committee • Should be 3 or 4 bullets points
Pretty basic, did not think anything was missing. Appreciated that the cluster was consulting them on the structure and expectations.
Favorites were 1, 3, and 7. One participant thought the rules sounded too preachy and commanding. They thought it should be worded more like, "As a group we should come together and listen to each other, be truthful, be open...etc."
Many people noted that many of these "rules" operated in one direction - it was more "passive" than active, and not reciprocal.
<p>4. Not enough to engage diversity. "Respecting" is not enough. Need to actively engage and recruit those populations</p> <p>4. In efforts to seek out diversity, be cognizant of different concerns and priorities, not just diverse people who offer similar opinions. Need to recognize that everyone's priorities are different. "Don't assume everyone wants to be part of our club"</p> <p>4. The region is not that diverse, this will be difficult</p> <p>4. This is not the priority of the life and discussion among all socio-economic groups</p> <p>4&5 are redundant</p> <p>4&5 are diversity or people vs. diversity of values and opinions--should be clarified</p> <p>7. like maintaining commitment</p> <p>7. Getting people to maintain commitment is a hurdle. It is easy to say you care, but hard to get them to participate long-term</p> <p>7. Need Strong leadership here in order to make everyone feel valued</p> <p>7. Individuals need to hold themselves accountable</p>
We didn't get many reactions to the rules. They all seemed to think they were good sentiments, but they were questioning their effectiveness when conflict will arise.
#4. There is a serious lack of diversity present at these events. Lack of ethnicities, cultures, socioeconomic classes, ages. Overall, there are MANY demographics missing at these events, and in the food cluster as a whole.
<p>There was a major focus on Hispanics missing from this conversation.</p> <p>The people that really need to be heard, and really need assistance are not aware of these events, and do not have the means to be at these events. Due to lack of transportation.</p>

Student facilitator notes on discussion regarding suggested additions or overall reactions.
Inclusion and diversity are a high priority. Would like to see the cluster actively pursuing representation from marginalized populations and local members/businesses as stakeholders.
<p>Do some training around negotiating/ how will we deal with conflict?</p> <p>Conflict resolution</p> <p>Will we be a democracy or what?</p> <p>Most afraid of is not that people will agree too much but that the wild card will try to hijack process</p> <p>Designed to prevent this</p> <p>Think more holistically</p> <p>Don't want to quiet voices either</p> <p>Build conflict resolution into organization structure</p> <p>Respect is not strong enough - encourage is better</p> <p>More aggressive</p> <p>Encourage to think outside the box</p>

<p>Some portion of every meeting is devoted to creativity We will keep doing same thing if we follow linear agenda Stronger than just maintain commitment - more than who keeps showing up and maintains assignments SWEAT EQUITY - show up and do the work</p>
<p>Be respectful of other time. Share the floor. Need ways to mediate conflict (tensions will arise). Need healthy ways to engage in conflict. Comes off preachy. Make a difference each time/do something worthwhile. Maintain commitment.</p>
<p>- Does anyone feel like we may already be starting with some lack of trust in the people who are leaders? - I don't know what the leadership is. It's been very quiet. - I don't know who the leaders are. There's a lot of overlap between certain groups, with their own interests. Want transparency. - Maybe there should've been more of an overview of the people who started it. - This is the first email I've received about something about the cluster aside from my own little group. Since November, wouldn't know that the cluster is doing anything if I weren't part of the policy group. - Sounds like a communication issue. - Not knowing who's being paid to do what. I'm assuming people are volunteers. Where is it going with that leadership? Where is it going? How does it work with the overlap?</p>
<p>none.</p>
<p>The big focus of our table (6) here was that diversity needed to be sought after, not just respected. They seemed to think that we needed to promote to the diversity and try and get as much as possible. One caution that came up though was make sure that "tokenism" was avoided so it did not feel as though the cluster was just trying to reach the "diversity status quo".</p>
<p>Guidelines during conflict, negotiation, and decision making seem necessary for the group to decide.</p>
<p>our tables thoughts on what could be added: -Honor people's time -Stay on topic -Actively seek diversity, not just respect and hope for it</p> <p>Broader comments: -These topics get political, which is not productive, we need to leave politics out of this. -People need to leave religious views out of it -There needs to be a better representation of groups -need to find some substantial common goals, not broad goals.</p>
<p>It needs to be more concise. They all like everything that was written down (besides the title) but felt like the list was too long.</p>

Session 5: **Membership structure** –

For the final session, Food Cluster Steering Committee member Chris Hutchinson explained the need to build some specific structure for membership levels, especially as the organization formalizes and becomes a 401c3. Participants completed a worksheet with included the following directions and the six categories below:

Please consider the following questions as you provide input for each area:

- *A. What does NCLFC most need/expect from people and organizations at this level? What should we avoid or be concerned about?*
- *B. What should NCLFC provide to people and organizations for their involvement? Not provide?*
- *C. What level of decision making / voting rights is appropriate? Not appropriate?*

Board of Directors – required for 501(c)3

Foundation Support – grant providers such as City of Fort Collins

Corporate Sponsors – organizations that want to be connected to and further our mission

Partners – organizations that function within and around our local food system

Members/Friends – individuals who wish to be associated with and support our mission

[Working on a NCLFC committee] – people at any level that are actively involved with making the Cluster function

Participant comments on the worksheets are below:

Board of directors

- Representative of diverse groups in the community
- Board should not get a seat by paying for it- that would stifle the democracy and make board too powerful. Qualities of board diversity.
- Not pay for seat- too much influence!! Have positions which represent different groups i.e. farmers, local business, whole
- Try BAC committee structure. Each member represents a larger group (i.e. farmers, processors, retail, subsidiaries)
- Many diverse skills/ perspectives needed- Ideally people with HR/ conflict resolution skills, accounting background, media/ outreach expertise. Also should include diverse socioeconomic backgrounds- at least one person living with food insecurity. Should provide structure, feedback, clout.
- Representation from all stakeholder groups- working hard to identify at least two low income, possibly Spanish speaking (likely can't buy a seat). Farms, institutions, consumers, university
- Membership on the board from those most in need of healthy food! The Hispanic Latino community needs to be involved
- Sweat equity- plays some key role in leading and securing resources for committees

- Need seats for types of constituencies- e.g. farmer, producer, retailer, health/ public health, low income, etc. etc.
 - Have staggered term lengths i.e. 1 yr, 2 yr, ""
- Certain commitment of time, voted in based on criteria recruited, then voted in
- Balance all stakeholders with "at large" members. Maybe mix of key organizations and elected members
- Provide strategic direction. Voting. Governance. Best fit for those who are interested in issue, person of influence, expert (organizational, industry, or other)
- Oversight- and direction. Time commitment needed but also time restraints
- By election!
- Diversity of professional background. Avoid- personal priorities overcoming group goals
- Representation from each of the sectors on inventory sheet (producers, wholesale, retail, community)
- How to influence policy with 501 © 3 status
- Consider a second certification to allow for political work/lobbying? Board should be directed by member and ensure projects are done in accordance with Cluster's mission and vision and specific goals/objectives
- Voted in. Guarantee representation from all facets of food production including farmers.
- No buy-in
- No buy-in

Foundation Support

- Should be sure to first and foremost pursue collaborative grants and partner with orgs with similar interests (food bank)
- The city's money could be used as onetime "seed" money but not to sustain this. Let the market place fuel this.
- Should be limited to local govt. grants
- Target those whose mission is focused on health, ag, food access, and environment/ ag interface
- Yes! Lots! Their control is through the conditions of their grant
- Sponsor directions
- Provide deliverables and outcomes based on set objectives (grants etc.)
- Be careful not to accept support from organizations who present contrary values (i.e. Monsanto, etc.)- set up rules ahead of time
- Government support-not members
- Vision not defined by Funders
- What control do grant providers have?

Corporate

- Support the goals of the org. i.e. local business, healthy foods, community support, etc.
- Donations of a certain amount in exchange for advertisement and public goodwill. Should be consistent with goals of group.
- Make criteria which describe what corporation's missions are those match clusters.

- Reflect mission statement. Support goals.
- Potentially a good idea, but be careful that powerful financial contributors don't subtly alter the mission of the cluster or use the cluster for their goals
- Somebody besides breweries
- Corp. sponsors should represent values of organization
- Not linked to governance structure. PR for those with aligned missions
- Yes we want them- but need to have some presence/ connection with community
 - Getting broad support from their people
- Stick to your principles. Take money from people that have interest in local foods (but doesn't have to be a local CO), but stay away from corporations using local marketing only aka Walmart/ Coca Cola
- Financial support= advertising space/ level
- Support mission but may want to be less involved (not sit at board level). Avoid taking money or resources from orgs that are in conflict of interest or against mission (slippery slope)
- No multi-national sponsorships
- Criteria for
- Corporate sponsorship should not be disclosed although values should be aligned
- Health oriented
- Make sure they are aligned with mission. Can be local organization (doesn't necessarily mean huge corporations)- so may overlap with Partners category
- Preference for local corporate sponsors (local up to the state level)
- Should not have decision making
- Match corporate sponsors with mission and vision; consider potential conflict in appearance of between local branches of national agri-biz with emphasis on local
- No influence in decision making of NCLFC

Partners

- Need to think about non-conventional local food partners such as national retail food chains who can feature local foods in their stores and help us reach new consumer groups. Larger scale ag. Producers who see the future of ag in newer smaller-scale producers in Northern Colorado
- This is good as long as no one org has too much power
- Reach out to as many diverse stakeholders as possible, nonprofit, for-profit, governmental and more.
- CSU- we are there!
- Yes. Need input but not so much control and decision making.
 - Information. B. Grants, resources, expertise
- Partner power/ involvement should be based on benefits the cluster plans on providing ex. Partners should aid in marketing and sit on committees if they gain marketing/ support for personal business from clusters
- Create farmer committee to do inventory of what is selling produced and what is missing

- Input to projects?
- Food producers, community
- Give partners recognition/ promotion (i.e. web badge, banner logo) hope to have them also promote us
- Happy Farm
- Not members
- Why would a local farm be a partner? Is there a RO1 for partners? What is the Value Proposition?
- Reciprocal membership opportunities. Partnering for legislative efforts. Joint marketing. Support with services in Kind Donations
- Lots of these! Great potential for collaboration on projects and funding. Any way to formalize these relationships? Reciprocal members?
- Farms
- What voting/decision?

Members/Friends

- Financial support, ability to participate in community discussion and events
- \$20 annually gets a membership/ get a shopping bag
- Ground swell of support
- Don't just wait passively for people to come to the table- if you see a perspective is missing (i.e. low-income people) seek them out; invite them to participate
- Focus can become on managing the membership base- takes away vital time and resources
- Fundraisers attendees. Membership for nominal fee about \$25-50
- Yes. Some type of affordable
 - \$, input. B. Named recognition
- Don't charge membership fees but maybe charge volunteer hours with some incentive to perform
- Get newsletter/ update
- Events- way to stay connected and contribute on an individual or community basis (even at neighborhood level)
- General public
- Reciprocal membership with RMFW
- Stay informed. What is the Value Proposition? Membership exclusivity. Tangibles
- Equal votes
- Money or volunteer time. Time equal money?

Working on committee

- Develop more than a mission statement but a goal! A farmer's market in low income areas. Local food in our schools! Processing plants to clean, freeze, store food!
- Implicit idea that it is a "stepping stone" to become Board or Leadership
- Experts, people of influence, passionate

Other comments

- What is the value proposition for members? Perhaps too early to say, but consider founding members to support cluster now with enhanced benefits and publicity as it grows. Don't limit member based on their business practices, but create clear guiding principles for the organization.

Student facilitator notes from the table discussions regarding the membership structure:

Member of the Board of Directors should not be able to buy their membership. Board should be comprised of a variety of experts with direct involvement in the cause
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask important people/people with sway/leverage points to be on the Board of Directors • Recruited and then voted in • Criteria for getting voted in (If cluster choses to vote for Board Directors) • Certain amount of time to commit required • Key function to provide strategic direction • Fiscal oversight
Need diversity of experience and knowledge on board. Possibly someone from each member stake hold.
no comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who decides who can be on the board?

Discussion comments regarding **Board of Directors**

Foundations should have no direct input. Too much of a foundational voice leaves room for bureaucracy and corruption.
Individual for the sustainability background wanted to make it clear that government funding and other forms of funding are two different structural components and that Government funding should be a sixth aspect of the structure.
Blocking income is not a good way to make a sustainable mission. It needs diversity. Should not rely on businesses and foundation support alone. Government support should NOT be included in foundation support. Needs its own group here
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much control will they have?

Discussion comments regarding **Foundation Support**

Foundations should have no direct input. Too much of a foundational voice leaves room for bureaucracy and corruption.
Individual for the sustainability background wanted to make it clear that government funding and other forms of funding are two different structural components and that Government funding should be a sixth aspect of the structure.
Blocking income is not a good way to make a sustainable mission. It needs diversity. Should not rely on businesses and foundation support alone. Government support should NOT be included in foundation support. Needs its own group here
How much control will they have?

Discussion comments regarding **Corporate sponsors**

Same thoughts as on foundational support.
Same individual with sustainability background wanted people to realize that most try to shy away from corporate sponsorship and avoid using it, but it is a necessity that can't be avoided and that it's not as "evil" as people make it out to be. There seemed to be agreement here
Need to be open to corporate money Corporate sponsors don't have to be huge-they can be local Could be great marketing for businesses Win-win with cluster and businesses. They can promote and support one another

Need to have transparency, contracts, and mission statement
Would we accept money from large corporate companies, like coco cola, because I wouldn't want them.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depends on the sponsor, maybe PC corporations o Have to support the goals of the community, have a stake in it • Cluster could impact the sponsor • Needs to be some restrictions

Discussion comments regarding **Partners**

Partners should have the largest voice comprise the bulk of the board and leadership positions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input to projects • Sit on committees • Advertise the Cluster? • Look at inventory and see what is lacking and have subcommittees tell local producers and give incentives to local producers to produce food that is needed around local areas.
Partners should be entities that make sense to the project. Not just random partners that really have no stake in the issue rather than just promoting their brand.
<p>-Currently 501(c)3 doesn't allow political activity. But we would want political activity eventually, 501(cc)4 would include that.</p> <p>-Will there be opportunities for reciprocal membership? Ex. groups like the rocky mountain farmers union would have one general membership instead of each individual. Would groups like this have the opportunity to have shares?</p> <p>-How will we formalize group engagement?</p> <p>-What's the value of being a member for a farmer? Is there a return on investment or an incentive for more customers?</p> <p>A food hub may give you access to more customers if that was incorporated.</p> <p>We could set it up like a CSA where founding member are given a voice and rewarded for being members.</p> <p>-Would there be a guy in? We must have a value for being a member.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • About 100-200 dollars • Can't be too high of cost

Discussion comments regarding **Members/Friends**

Various degrees of involvement. Members/friends should be sought out through focus groups and community meetings. Would like to see members/friends along with partners on the board.
More access to the current inventory of graded entities
<p>-Are there membership bi-laws? what are the rules or dudes of members?</p> <p>-Should there be stipulations to these bi-laws? could people lobby for their case?</p> <p>-If anyone agrees with the rules to the organization, they are welcome.</p> <p>-What if a member goes against the bi-laws?</p> <p>-There must be guidelines of clusters and principals. Guidelines will deter advocates against the bi-laws.</p> <p>-How will advertising play a role in who is target for the group?</p> <p>-Will members be expected to attend or have to participate?</p> <p>-Diversity, where will that come from?</p> <p>Political advocacy will create that diversity.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Just an association • Can't ask too much from this group • Something that shows you're a friend

Additional notes regarding Membership structure discussion

Suggest becoming a 501 (c)6 with a subsidiary of a 501 (c)3

* They never really spoke about these in specifics. I only got general notes and comments.

Getting to the point where this project is more of an advocacy and trying to find investors for a particular project

Cluster could go and say this is what we need and this is what it looks like

Weights were chosen by a public process - dictates priorities of public food systems

Might not be giving money but time and expertise

Who is the lead (who is prime contractor) for the grant

- What is the corporate sponsor one? Corporation – I'm fine with corporate sponsors, but not if sponsorship dictates policy. Even if it's the city that's donating money, what are they using that money for?
- Corporate sponsor is the issue. "We want money for this, don't want your input."
- Can a corporate influence be connected to the idea that this is local? Is there a local requirement? Multination, multistate – not local
- There are people who want food security around the world. Why would we say no if someone gave money?
- Or like whole foods
- Example: new Belgium (corporate sponsor). Would New Belgium help local food system (tour de fat) potentially by paying farmers for taking away business. Corporate sponsors can be local.
- There are local corporations that are also international.
- Being really clear with what you're doing with the money? Not restricting who you're getting the money from.
- State when you pursue sponsorship, grant money, what the purpose is.
- If Walmart wants to give 1 million dollars for local food, why wouldn't we take it?
- It buys influence, even if it's not stated. It's true influence. Want silent, anonymous corporate sponsors. Walmart knows power they get from donating money.
- F: `Tie back to transparency – clear definition of who's soliciting money, who's distributing it.
- Transparency alone doesn't stop influence, esp. subconscious. Idea of goodwill, i.e. think Walmart is better bc they donated. Expectations can't be influenced by interpretation. Anonymous donorship for certain categories of corporate donorship is only way to ensure local community isn't influenced.
- Possibility of having board members buy in – I would not be in favor of that.
- Isn't it illegal?
- To be member of organization, companies have to pay = seat on the board. Buy a place on a board is fine when you're talking about huge tech companies. This isn't tech industry.
- Buying influence wouldn't work.
- Could never afford 2500 to pay dues (farmers excluded)
- Worried that farmers excluded from a lot. Only vocal participation; don't have capital or funding or time in summer to do it in other ways.
- If one or two farms buy into it, other farms feel like they'd have to do it as well.
- If you didn't buy in to be listed at local advisory – can't be listed. No money.
- Does the board of directors exist?
- There's a steering committee.
- Is the Board of Directors usually voted in?
- That's one way, it doesn't have to be. W/ a coop they usually are.
- Usually voted by other board members, not by the membership.
- Coop has voted board of members b/c people who own shares.
- Membership fees are fine, if it's on sliding scale. Something token – contribute 15 or 20 bucks a year, showing interest. Someone who can pay a lot more.
- Everybody have equal vote, capacity to pay to pay more. Sliding share of dues but everybody's vote would be the same.
- Don't need to reinvent the wheel, pretty sure there are other models who already do this. Do some research and figure out the best fit for our community and tweak it. Don't waste leadership's time doing that.

- What involvement is just the regular folks have in this? Seems like this meeting was just directed to those who were here in November, and passed on to friends. Aren't there more people who might be interested in this who don't know about it?
- Where are people?
- The reach committee is talking about it next week. When it's more real there'll be press release, send things to newspaper.
- Premature to announce something that's not exactly created yet.
- Needs to establish structure, goals, priorities first before including the whole population.
- Plans to start a website, social media.
- Foundation of it all – consumers of the food. If they don't understand why it's important and believe in local food. "Why should I buy your strawberries, not King Soopers?"
- More taste tests
- Huge education issue
- Food festival – creating the base.

The table looked at this sheet more as an entire sheet than specifically by each section. We looked at the questions individually, however.

Question A. *(A. What does NCLFC most need/expect from people and organizations at this level? What should we avoid or be concerned about?)*

memberships-- make sure those involved share the same mission or something similar, take money from them if interest is the same

- (ex. coke) can handle product placement, would like a corporate sponsor without expectations and no strings attached (in the name, place on the board, local means state, etc.)
- but, anyone who gives money wants a say even if it's through banners and pictures
- decide what cluster is comfortable with

Trace-- what would be in it?

- + propose value statement in relation to what we're doing goals/mission math food cluster's
- + see how organization is run, what they take into consideration
- + how to reign in outside competition (like breweries who aren't necessarily local, but sell their beer locally)

+ things you want to encourage (figure out main priorities and go from mission/values)

Trace-- do you like the idea that if a donation is given it earns spot on BoD?

- excludes people
- do they want to be on the board?
- heard at earlier meetings, lose some groups that would want to be at the table
- doesn't seem appropriate
- could it be mixed? non-profit needs voice and maybe doesn't have the money to pay for spot on BoD, could be given through anonymous donation
- would there be dues that come up later?-- just something to think about

Question B. *What should NCLFC provide to people and organizations for their involvement? Not provide?*

** this question brought up specifically by a table member

- community structure
- network
- convening groups, connecting people
- eventually advocacy at state level
- makes others more eligible for other grants
- collective vision for food, reflects community outcomes
- water crisis-- how it affects cluster, get group together--> says a lot to have food organizers ahead of those problems

Need a mission statement-board of directors need to do this

Who should have voting rights? Maybe members/friends, maybe board of directors?

A lot of these decisions can't be made until there is a clear structure
Open communication is important in all categories
Transparency is essential. Where is money going? Where is progress? How can individuals get involved? Corporate sponsors?
Could be issues if there are conflict in relationships. There need to be clear contract
It's all about relationships
Schools need to be involved. They are a huge consumer of food and producer of food waste
Need to think about compost too. There is currently no compost in FoCo but there is talk of starting a center. The cluster should form a partnership if/when this comes to fruition
The process is great but it is going to take time to manifest
Need to work through details of roles and functions of all these groups. They need to be clarified
Clearer criteria

Our table did not talk about the break downs of the membership structure. They felt there was work to be done before we tackle this. These are their thoughts:

- It is so important to establish a mission statement/goal before funding issues are dealt with
- so many programs get added, and it just becomes too much
- we need people from all different sectors
- There are so many things we need to address before we talk about this(meaning, membership structure as a whole)
- Is this just creating jobs to create jobs, or are we REALLY working toward something?
- Is this a good cause? Is this a waste of money?
- People aren't sure what it takes to be a corporate sponsor, or some other member. so who should get involved? why?

- We are still missing so many communities, and we need them to be present before we can talk about this.

- the farther we get along in this, the more we leave them behind, until it becomes too far.

- how are Hispanics included?

- how are people who shop at whole foods included?

- people want to know what the food clusters plan looks like

- what needs will be served?

- What do we actually need?

School districts will NOT allow raw meet in the kitchens, they get precooked meat

- Schools are the ultimate market, and a business plan is needed

- We need collaborative grants, not duplicative services, fill in the missing gaps, pursue grants, funding, and to recognize big and small partners

- food cluster needs more leadership designation. who is really going to do it? not just talk about it

- do not want government involvement. we need farmers, but still using a capitalist approach with CLEAR direction.

- there is a lot of crash and burn going on, there does need to be a strong board of directors with diverse interests.

- restaurants, farmers, need all voices and all having equal say

- some gov. members, lots of agricultural members, need business members, people who can build financial, intellectual capacity.

We need the people we intend to serve to be a part of the planning.

example: people who do not have access to food, are not heard

Additional student notes not tied to a specific session:

<p>Would like to see focus groups around marginalized populations and an effort to get these populations as members on the board.</p>
<p>The leadership should be transitional as the project moves forward. Having stronger foundational/corporate support as the project starts out is needed to get it off the ground. However, as the project takes shape and stabilized, the foundational/corporate support should have less voice/leadership.</p>
<p>Probably the biggest point that came up throughout the event was that there is a lack of communication between the cluster and the people at the events. Furthermore, there was the perception that the group was losing momentum, as it appeared less people attended this meeting than the one in November. People also looked for more transparency (going back to communication) so that they could be updated about the progress on the food cluster more consistently. They also were very wary about the leadership, since they didn't know who was in charge and how the leadership was treating different issues.</p>
<p>Guests talked amongst themselves more about their individual relations with the food cluster and how they may eventually have an impact on the cluster or what it will do.</p>
<p>My group talked about the need for improved communication and community outreach from the Food Cluster.</p>