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Summary

The fourth annual meeting of the Agricultural Sustainability Institute’s (ASI) External Advisory Board was held November 2, 2011. Eighteen of the 25 board members were able to participate in the meeting in addition to ten ASI staff members and three guests: California Department of Food and Agriculture Undersecretary Sandra Schubert, who was sitting in for board member Karen Ross, Ron Strochlic, consultant for our farmworker initiative, and researcher Paulina Ying of Verliant Energy. The meeting was chaired by Howard-Yana Shapiro and facilitated by Nancy White.

Chairman’s Overview by Howard Shapiro

Howard Shapiro opened the meeting with a demonstration—quickly taking the group through a large stack of mainstream scientific journals from the past year (Science, Nature, etc) with cover features regarding some aspect of a sustainable food system. This simple demonstration gave evidence of a growing prominence and awareness about agricultural sustainability issues in the public discourse. This introduction was followed with brief discussion on the Clinton Global Initiative to genetically sequence key food crops in Africa, with the goal to use science to improve nutritional content of these critical-but-forgotten food crops in one of the world’s most challenged regions. The take-home point of this discussion was that: Solutions can’t be found in isolation. It takes a network of unprecedented partnerships to move towards agricultural sustainability. It’s all about collective impacts. And that: The key to progress is to recognize that the task of agricultural sustainability is daunting. How we understand stresses and shocks to a system is critical; robustness is limited. ASI’s responsibility is to convene discussions on controversial issues as a respected leader—Understand stresses and shocks. Understand the paradigm. Lead consensus.
Participants

Top Row: Courtney Riggle, Paulina Ying, Sonja Brodt, Sandra Schubert, Tom Turini, Barbara Allen-Diaz, Eve Hightower, Haider Nazar, Kate Scow, Howard Shapiro, Mark Van Horn, Dianne Stassi, John Diener, Neil Van Alfen, Cornelius Gallagher, Bev Ransom; Bottom Row: Gail Feenstra, Kase Wheatley, Rachel Surls, Ashley Boren, Craig McNamara, Meredith Niles, Jonathan Kaplan, Thomas Tomich; Not pictured: Michael Dimock, A.G. Kawamura, Jennifer Ryder-Fox, Amparo Perez-Lemos, Judith Redmond, Ron Strochlic, Nancy White

Director’s update—A year of growth and change (Tom Tomich)

External Advisory Board

2011 transitions

- New undergraduate representative: Kase Wheatley
- Ex officio transitions
  - Barbara Allen-Diaz for DANR
  - David Wehner (Cal Poly SLO)
- Other new board members:
  - Michael Dimock
  - Haider Nazar
  - Karen Ross (represented at this meeting by Sandra Schubert)
- New Emeriti:
  - Dan Dooley
  - Mabel Everette
  - Michael Pollan
  - Jennifer Ryder Fox

New board members to join in 2012

- Nita Vail (California Rangeland Trust)
- 3-4 others to be announced
Some Highlights of the Year

- **SAREP’s 25th Anniversary** celebrations
- **SAREP funded grants to 14 projects** totaling $150,000 in 2011
- More than $7 million in SAREP grants to 350 projects since 1986
- **New crosscutting initiative on Farmworker Wellbeing** launched by SAREP
- Our first global project in partnership with MARS

Selected milestones

**Education and Leadership**

- New **undergraduate major**: Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems
- In anticipation of the new major, the **Student Farm launched a program planning and development project**
- **Bixby Endowment** will fund the base budget of the Student Farm

**Food and Society**

- Growing out of SAREP’s work on a CDFA-funded Farm-to-School project, **Fresh Point (part of Sysco)** began source identification of family farms
- Two **peer-reviewed articles** published on SAREP’s Farm-to-Institution and Farm-to-School research in the Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems and Community Development

**Agriculture, Resources & Environment: SAREP**

- Energy use and greenhouse gas emissions studies for almonds and processed tomatoes
- Two major reviews for the leading journal **Annual Review of Environment and Resources**: "Energy Intensity of Agriculture and Food Systems" and "Agroecology: A Review from a Global-Change Perspective"

**Agriculture, Resources & Environment: Russell Ranch**

- New **science plan**: “Can we increase sustainability as we increase food production?”
- Nine **scientific papers** based on Russell Ranch research.
- **RUSSELL RANCH DRIED TOMATOES!**

**Funding Goals**

- **Goal 1**: Increase annual expenditures to $6 M (from about $1.5 M in 2007/08) through $50 M in ASI endowments and philanthropic gifts
- **Goal 2**: Secure two or more large program grants each year, totaling $1 M or more in extramural funding per year
- **Goal 3**: Sustain state support at $750 K or more per year

**News on Staffing and Affiliates**

- **Dianne Stassi**, Executive Assistant
- **Eve Hightower**, Communication Coordinator
- **Recruiting, INFAS Network Coordinator** *(UPDATE: Joanna Friesner started early 2012)*
- **Regularized employment for Everardo Salsedo and Everardo Aguilar, field workers at Russell Ranch** (improving their take-home salaries and benefits, while cutting operational costs)
10 Fellows of the Agricultural Sustainability Institute announced
- Fellows of ASI are faculty affiliates who are significantly engaged in ASI research, education and outreach. They include UC Davis professors, UC Cooperative Extension specialists, and colleagues at other UC campuses and other universities. For names and bios of these important colleagues, see: http://asi.ucdavis.edu/about/affiliated-faculty

Agricultural Experiment Station Affiliates of the Agricultural Sustainability Institute
- It is planned that a new category of Agricultural Experiment Station Affiliates of ASI will be created, with the CA&ES Dean’s Office, and linked to the SAREP Solution Centers, recognizing UCCE specialists and advisors who contribute significantly to project design, development of science-based materials, and service as technical interpreters, resource people, and network facilitators.

DISCUSSION
- Main concerns: overextending ourselves, burnout
- Funding question – trending up, but state support trending down; less than average cuts in current reduction cycle is positive indication of support from larger institution
- Institute’s growth in current fiscal climate impressive
- Question: How has ASI touched outside world, how is work being used?
  - Response: Not satisfied, catching up; Solutions Center will speak to that in a new way; Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is also an important component
- Science in the public interest part of core mission of UC. Looking at links with the public and financing without affecting credibility and legitimacy is a big challenge.
- Update on California Nitrogen assessment
  - Currently mid-way through scientific review (following IPCC process; get science right)
  - Next stage – stakeholder review (is it credible, useful?)
  - Then – summaries created for different interests – policy makers, farmers, etc
    - Cliff notes version: 2 drivers of N in CA – fossil fuels/combustion + agriculture
      - Transportation has been addressed in policy, but not Ag
      - Q: How to create effective policy tools, what methodology has worked elsewhere?

ACTION ITEM: Begin stakeholder engagement now re: N project results–CDFA/policy interests

Debrief: Learnings from lunch conversations among board, staff, and affiliated faculty
- Importance of microscopic biota to agriculture
- Reintegration of plant and animal systems in ag/production
- Beijing genomics initiative (BGI) – Chinese/UC Davis partnership, beginning soon (14 new gene sequencers on coming to UC Davis campus)
- Colony collapse/pollinators in general; opportunities in urban/suburban area to enhance habitat for native pollinators
- Growing awareness among CA regulatory agency that N loss is a serious problem to air and water
- Leadership on campus really supports ASI

ACTION ITEM: Investigate closing of farmworker camp in Yolo County
SPECIAL PROJECT UPDATES

Student Farm Program Planning (Mark Van Horn)

Program Planning & Development

Background and Purpose
- Increasing numbers of students; many arriving with significant knowledge and skills
- Identify priorities for growth, development, funding

Process
- Gather input from students and faculty
- SF staff reflect and respond
- Develop an intentional ongoing dialogue with students

Faculty Input
- Remain rooted to: experiential learning; supporting student initiative; knowledge and commitment to sustainable agriculture
- Maintain focus on students
- Offer student learning opportunities in a continuum from introductory to advanced
  - Explore ongoing role of students in SF decision making
  - Expand SF role in recruiting students into sustainable agriculture major
  - A lot is happening already; don’t overextend

Student Input: The Student Organizing Team (SOT); with help from Francesca Wright; Two “Crews” on the SOT
- On-line survey - available to all UC Davis students: 1485 respondents
  - Think about sustainable agriculture: Daily: 16%; Often (about weekly): 35%
  - Have experience in agriculture or gardening: A lot: 9%; Some: 53%; None or little: 38%
  - Familiarity with Student Farm: Have heard of it: 59%; Know where it is: 36%; Have participated: 11%.
    - Of the participants, 85% “expectations were met or exceeded”
    - Of the non-participants, 2/3 expressed interest, but mostly in activities involving limited time commitments.

‘World Café’ events - for ‘Student Farmers’: 2 events, 45 total student participants

Resonant themes:
- SF is highly valued as an educational space; a place where it’s okay to make mistakes
- Community/camaraderie at SF is great, and is very important to people
- Students gain empowerment from being able to teach others things which they have recently learned themselves
- Staff have a lot to offer, are knowledgeable and approachable
- Most hear about SF through word-of-mouth
- Many come to SF looking for hands-on experience
• Desire more connectedness between various parts of the SF - both physical and communicative
• A perceived lack of connection between the SF and the rest of the student body
• Some parts of SF can feel chaotic, difficult getting to know people’s names and roles; can be hard to get information or direction
• Time constraints are the largest barriers to student participation

Considerations:
• Publicize SF more both off the farm and between programs
• Desire to learn more of the “why”
• Desire for more connection between SF programs
• Need a more structured communication system within some areas
• Desire for program scheduling to improve student access to all farm programs and resources

Staff Reflection and Response:
• Increase connectedness within SF community
• Strengthen communication methods
• Clarify student roles and opportunities
• Created Photo - Bulletin Boards
• Increased opportunities for interaction between students from different SF programs
• More, renewed ‘All-Farm’ social events, including meals
• New opportunities for ‘cross-training’ between SF programs
• Created, filled Community Events & Outreach Coordinator position
• Hired grad student as Student Mentor with grant funds
• Working on ‘SF Welcome Booklet’ and ‘Orientation Manuals’
• Scheduling ‘Introductory Farm Tours’ and events for prospective Student Farmers
• Started weekly ‘Planning Walks’ for students in leadership roles
• Codifying student roles, explicit requirements, expectations and paths for advancement

Next Steps:
  o Ongoing dialogue with students
  o Answering the ‘why’ questions
  o More students mentoring students
  o Need more paid mentors (student and staff)
  o Dig deeper into what competencies students need and roles of hands-on learning (including for those who will not be directly involved in production)
Russell Ranch science/research plan (Kate Scow)

“The Century Experiment”
- Cropping systems designed along a gradient of increasing irrigation and fertilization intensity...now in 18th year
- Corn/tomato experiment has “organic”, “conventional” and “hybrid” systems
- Wheat experiment has rainfed, irrigated, fertilized, unfertilized and cover-crop fertilized systems
- Many fallow plots each year; some plots unassigned

CHALLENGE: How to stay meaningful, both scientifically and societally, as we continue the Century Experiment?
- The challenges society faces regarding food systems and environmental sustainability have increased, sharpened, and deepened
- Interest in sustainable agriculture has expanded to include new disciplines, technologies and methodologies, orientations, values
- Benchmarks, indicators, and metrics must be relevant and universal to become part of global networks
- Important to keep local (CA) relevance as we interact on global scale

OVERARCHING QUESTION: Can we increase sustainability as we increase food production?

New Science Plan for Research at Russell Ranch: Sustaining and Renewing the Century Experiment.

Focus on three main resource constraints for agricultural production:
- **Land**: carbon inputs, residual nitrogen, above-ground and below-ground biodiversity and soil structure
- **Water**: water use, water quality, water periodicity
- **Energy**: fossil fuel inputs from tillage fuel, fertilizers and pesticides as well as solar energy flux to the system
- Also maintain some of the original farming systems

Selected research questions
- **Land**: What is best mix of intensification and extensification to deliver increased production, GHG reduction and increase ecosystem services?
- **Biodiversity**: What is relationship between productivity and biodiversity (and other ecosystem services) and how does this vary between systems and as function of scale?
- **Energy (fossil fuel and solar derived)**: What are the best options for agriculture increasing food production while simultaneously reducing contributions to GHG emissions and fossil fuel use?
Water (quantity and quality, periodicity): What approaches (operational, agronomic, genetic, supplemental irrigation, fertility management, winter rainfall storage) can be developed to increase water use efficiency?

Ecosystem Services: What processes can be harnessed/manipulated to maximize/conserve ecosystem services; (e.g. pollution biodegradation, water efficiency)?

Resistance and Resilience: How can the resistance and resilience of ag systems be improved with respect to gradual change, increased variability, extreme events (i.e. drought)?

Benchmarks and Indicators: How can we develop agreed upon metrics to monitor progress towards sustainability that are appropriate for, and acceptable to, different agroecological, social, economic, and political contexts?

NEXT STEPS

1. Scientific review: by national and international experts
2. Feedback from farmers and other stakeholders
3. Financial assessment: phased approach for implementation
4. Partnership with private and public sectors
5. Connecting with other long term research facilities and global sustainability networks
DISCUSSION

- Get stakeholder input early on (farmer)
- Issue: yield is often the only policy consideration for food security
  - Experiment – setting right goals, yield is not only consideration
- Long-term research incredibly important
- RR is unique – only large-scale experiment, replicated, over time, etc of this kind...
  - Missing: what’s really outside the box?
- Funding important for continuation of RR

CHALLENGE: also 7 experiment stations [ANR] with 75-100 years of data – data not being used/accessible yet
  - ANR newly agreed to put this data into electronic format
  - How will this information be disseminated?
  - For ANR/ASI – collaborate on data / analysis – modeling

ACTION ITEM: Need to figure out how to mine data effectively / collaborate [ASI, ANR, & others...]

New SAREP grants funded (Sonja Brodt & Gail Feenstra)

Small Grants – Total awarded: $150,000

1. Planning Grants; $50,000 ($10K/ea)
   - Plumas County Food Policy Council (PRS)
   - Community Food Access Planning in East Salinas (ALBA)
   - Taco Trucks for Food Access for Farmworkers (CIRS)
   - Green Jobs for Campesinas (ARC)
   - Life Cycle Analysis of California’s Beef Production System (UCCE)

2. Education/Outreach Grants; $50,000 ($10K ea)
   - Food and Livelihoods Legal Project (SELC)
   - Expanding Regional Markets for SE Asian and Small Farmers in Sacramento (UCCE)
   - Grow and Eat Fresh in LA (UCCE)
   - LA Food Policy Council Website (LAFPC)
   - Ecosystem Services on California Rangelands (UCCE)

3. Graduate Student Research Grants; $15,000 ($5K ea)
   - Role of Middlemen in Farm to Hospital Initiatives (Klein – UCB)
   - Social Learning in Winery Value-Based Supply Chains (Hoffman – UCD)
   - Urban Ag in Public Parks in Oakland, CA (Watson – UCSC)

4. Research Grants on Farmworker Issues; $35,000
   - Assessment of Farmworker Communities and Residential Sites for Risk of Heat Stress (CIRS)

DISCUSSION

- Outreach mechanisms for information on grants—UC Delivers (http://ucanr.org/delivers/), policy briefs?

ACTION ITEM: Explore outreach for SAREP grants
Farmworker initiative (Gail Feenstra & Sonja Brodt)

Farmworker Initiative; $50,000

Initiative leaders:
- Gail Feenstra, Sonja Brodt – SAREP
- Ron Strochlic – Food Systems consultant, project coordinator
- David Runsten – CAFF, project consultant
- Thea Rittenhouse – Graduate Student Researcher (GSR)

Advisory Committee:
- Meagan Beaman, CRLA
- Maria Echaveste, UC Berkeley, School of Law
- Martha Guzman-Aceves, Legislative Affairs, Office of Governor
- Ed Kissam, Independent consultant
- Maricela Morales, Coastal Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy
- Don Villarejo, Independent consultant

UPDATE: Luawanna Halstrom, grower, has also agreed to serve

- Form advisory committee
- Identify key issues, research/outreach needs
  - Conduct interviews with ~ 50 stakeholders representing a broad range of constituents
  - ID most pressing issues affecting farmworkers, communities
  - ID research/outreach needed to advance program and policy agendas to improve farmworker conditions
- Synthesize findings and develop draft research and outreach agenda
- Ground-truth findings, refine agenda
- Identify key partnerships, collaborations
- Identify possible funding sources

Farmworker Initiative
Key Areas
- Diet, nutrition, food security
- Health (individual, community)
- Education (children)
- Growers (needs re: farm labor; win-win scenarios)
- Housing
- Indigenous farmworkers
- Market-based efforts (certification, domestic fair trade)
- Occupational health/safety (accidents, injuries, pesticides, heat stress)
- On-farm labor conditions (wages, benefits, job security, violations)
- Women
- Strategic changes in local law enforcement practices (as per advisors)

Key Informants
- Master list created
- Will include participation of large, corporate growers and farm labor contract businesses
- Will meet with CRLA’s farmworker leadership committees
- Developed draft key informant interview protocols
DISCUSSION

- Importance of terminology – influences perception

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Add grower to advisory committee *(UPDATE: Luawanna Halstrom will participate)*
2. Remove “corporate” term from target groups (keep large) *(UPDATE: Done)*

SAREP Solution Centers *(Tom Tomich & Sonja Brodt)*

Background

**SAREP's Goals**

- To assist California farmers and ranchers in developing and implementing *sustainable production and marketing systems*
- To support California’s rural and urban communities in *understanding the concept and value of sustainable agriculture* and participating in sustainable food and agricultural systems

**SAREP’s Mandates**

- Administer *competitive grants* for research on sustainable agricultural practices and systems
- Develop and distribute *information* through publications and on-farm demonstrations
- Support long-term research in sustainable farming systems on UC farmlands

**SAREP Solution Centers**

**Concept & Aspirations**

- Virtual centers providing decision support to farmers, ranchers, and communities across California, and a variety of outreach partners, including UC advisors and specialists
- Driven by users’ needs
- Web-based *information portals* supplying practical, science-based information in user-friendly formats
- Working prototypes across California
- GIS-based *information to guide users* to prototypes
- Networks of qualified technical interpreters
- Innovative funding models

**Possible criteria**

- Pressing need in California
- Strong interest from UC Cooperative Extension Specialists and Advisors
- Prototypes will exist
- Funding prospects of about $150-200 K per year for five years

**Possible examples**

- Converting farm waste to valuable resources (energy, nutrients, water)
- Best practices for fertilizer use efficiency and agricultural water stewardship
- Sustainable energy alternatives for farms and ranches
- Garden-based learning
- Food system assessment
- Urban agriculture
- Benchmarking agricultural sustainability
- Farm and ranch internships and apprenticeships
- Additional topics from discussion
  - Conservation tillage
  - Food safety issues

**FISHBOWL DISCUSSION: What would a solution center look like?**

*Where to start? SAREP is not looking to be expert on all aspects of an issue – but to be a hub linking to experts on specific aspects.*

- How we pick topics as/more important as what topics
- ASI role as aggregator
  - Model not about building stand-alone expertise (ie: ASI doesn’t need expert staff), need to broker/leverage existing resources and expertise among our colleagues
    - IPM website good example
- Build out solutions centers on areas where ASI has core competencies (ie: N)
  - Try out 2 different paths – biodigesters, nitrogen; different models for different topics
- Build off core competencies – of ASI and/or the UC system more largely
- **Overall goal of solution center?** Clearing house of information vs. response to user needs/solving specific problems that crop up?
  - To be explored: Role of ASI: physical feasibility, also policy assessments
  - Supply and demand of information – driven by user needs
    - Where is USER voice in this conversation?

*Example: Anaerobic digesters/converting waste to resources*

- Anaerobic digesters – Solution Center use for linking potential users together? Incentives for working together, synergies (ie: dairy waste – energy for processors, etc). Promote/support energy independence in specific regions?
Where are the boundaries? Ie: energy could grow to become its own institution... could become larger than the parent institution?

- UC provides opportunity to show/open awareness of broader ecosystem services associated with digesters; access to technical information – water reclamation, nutrient management
  - Secondary benefits for digesters, aside from power generation? (ie: steam heat)

- Producer: structural impediments to digesters use; access – potential value/tipping fee for waste not going to landfills;
  - Missing in UC things – engineering group? Tech to manage exhaust fumes (NOx); ie: catalytic convertor?
    - SAREP role – bringing ag engineering piece into picture
  - Back to who is the target audience – answer: Farmer

- Funding: commodity leadership? Tremendous potential for funding from these collaborations (multi-commodity group approach) + potential government buy-in
  - Investors: renewable energy opportunities, biomass & waste energy – q: what is incentive, it’s not power generations, broader ecosystem

- Make use of org structures for outreach
  - Link to extension/NGO org that has been advocating for use of digesters;
  - Networking – NRCS for nutrient managing plan, state regulatory...
  - Make website itself interactive – sharing of knowledge, potential partners meeting up; social media use in extension; does open door to content management requirements

- Biodigesters – solution center should bring people together in competition (ie: x prize) – ie international call for innovation, share information; must involve industry; link the conversation to leverage information
  - Create competition: universities as examples for green power, generating own power?
  - Opportunity for INFAS coordination? Offer different potential solutions, to meet different needs? (esp re: bio digesters)

- Appropriate technology is key

---

**Fundraising for allASI work (Melissa Haworth)**

- RE: Solution Centers: Estimate $150K/yr for 5 yrs for a specific solution center
  - Are there ideas with obvious funding sources?

- Overview: UC Davis corporate affiliate structure – way for private sector to engage in pre-competitive research...

- Foundations are generally looking for action
  - Philanthropic interest in funding projects with measurable impacts is growing

- Potential room for ASI to lead movement for specific action (ie: move to drip irrigation)

- Example - Seed Central: (global seed companies all in general Davis area, being organized), funded by Mars
  - Shows can convene people of similar interests for some joint activity, without completely joint agendas...

  Suggestion: WATER
o Show ag how will be part of the discussion, bring in early, will be more willing to help fund an effort (likely won’t contribute if on peripheral)
  ▪ IE: level of ambiguity is not necessarily a bad thing...PROCESS is VERY IMPORTANT
• Need to include growers, foundations, and also end users/industry
• Sustainability Certification for growers?
• Industry – support is important, but ASI research is a public good, and need to actively interact with public and make forward thinking arguments for public funding for ag research
• Public/private partnerships – look to solve shared program (gotta have the “pitch”)
  o IE: Start with N as model - Packard and add crop/commodity groups
  o Nutrient problem: Dairy Associations/ DMI would be good partners
• Long term solution – make ASI a public investment/seek public support
  o Also – endowment funding critical
  ▪ More on endowments: Just established SAFS Endowment – long term support for ASI (will replace Rosenberg funding, which will expire in five years.)
• Recognize that people are excited about FOOD – connect ag to food
  o “Kick start” model for food...
• PROPOSE: ASI hone solution center topics (ie N/Water/Nutrients) and engage w/ board on potential funding contacts
• SUGGEST: also run w/ public funding/web model – multi-purpose: money raising, discussion,
• CHAIRMAN’S REQUEST: Board actively engage in helping fundraise to support these efforts
Monitoring and Evaluation (Bev Ransom)

**Monitoring and Evaluation is critical because:**

a) It shows if having an impact, and  
b) It shows if we are living up to our operational principles  
c) It is the basis for organizational learning and adaptation

Currently ASI is undergoing a broad effort (w/ Francesca Wright) to institutionalize monitoring and evaluation.

Broadly, ASI:

- Builds knowledge  
- Distributes knowledge  
- Incubates leaders  
- Collaborates with strategic partners  
- Leverages resources  
- Learns from experience  
- Adapts

**DISCUSSION**

- Want to understand synergies between efforts  
- Would be valuable to try and extract stories, various players, contributions to change in the food system  
  - **Research question: root of social change**  
  - **Output:** paper needed for philanthropic community, EGA (environmental grantmakers)  
    - **Opportunity for joint ASI/ROC work on this?**
  - **Caution:** need to actively partner w/ farmers and ranchers regarding change – make sure not to make them out to be villains  
- **M&E is expensive and hard**  
  - Impacts are valuable, activities are not...  
  - Metrics that actually measure the outcomes are key;  
- Real impact is largely a result of collection action  
- Social networking could be useful in quantify impact / connectivity to make powerful statement for evaluation  
- **Aside from academic impact – storytelling is very powerful**  
- Leopold award, others, putting positive light on farmers who are way ahead of the curve is very important  
  - **ASI role in making these advances visible? IE: CA farmers way ahead of rest of country...**  
    - This is the idea behind benchmarking sustainability – show regional comparisons and also progress over time
Bringing it all together (Howard Shapiro & Tom Tomich)

Meeting evaluation

- **Goal 1**: Introduce new board members – **good to fair, need more time**
- **Goal 2**: Update of ASI accomplishments to enable advocacy – **good, can be a lot do digest when all info is new**
- **Goal 3**: Share advice, perspectives – **very good**
- **Goal 4**: Explore solution center – **explore and know where we’re going, fair, but work to do (good for small amount of time involved)**
- **Goal 5**: Opportunities and fundraising – **fair; need individual engagement strategies/conversations, multiple roles group can play**

Closing

*Tom highlights*

- Speed dating: philosophy, ethics, values component of SA&FS curriculum
- Next year EAB topic – communications
- Next year EAB topic – CA Nitrogen Assessment report (Update before EAB)
- Relationship w/ ANR improved dramatically – need to pool efforts in data presentation
- Communication – nuance very important; ie: using right language, remain true and systematic in inclusive approach to problem solving (particular example: farmworker initiative)
- Farmworker housing in Yolo county
- Solutions Centers – not bad idea, need more work to tell if good idea
  - Might be time to refresh priorities for framing solution centers (online tool + potent. other involvement means)
- Fundraising: critical stage, need to broaden team effort (need to increase frequency of interactions with board members)

*Howard highlights*

5 years: ASI almost 5 years old. **5 years is not long to start from scratch and make the progress ASI has.** Why is ASI important to California? The United States? The planet? ...all conversations today link across all scales. Key highlights:

- N project
- Land management issues
- Wild ducks vs Tame ducks – you can make a wild duck tame, but you can never make a tame duck wild again. All members in room are “wild ducks” – all have unique perspectives to contribute.
- Meeting twice per year seems reasonable.
- **We gotta knock this fundraising thing out**. Hard to do, but essential to fit everyone into the conversation at some level.
- **How do we get everyone comfortable to talk about ASI?** How does it fit into your conversation as building capacity ... of course California will influence the world. 80-90% of fruit/veg production in US comes from California? It has the most to lose, but also most to gain...
Overview of Action Items:

- **Begin stakeholder engagement/ now re: N project results**
  - (P. 5; Follow up: Tom, Sonja)
- **Investigate closing of farmworker camp in Yolo County**
  - (P. 5; Follow up: Kate)
- **Need to figure out how to mine data effectively / collaborate [ASI, ANR, & others...]**
  - (P. 10; Follow up: Kate, Tom)
- **Explore outreach for SAREP grants**
  - (P. 10; Follow up: Gail, Sonja, Eve)
- **Add grower to farmworker initiative advisory committee**
  - **UPDATE:** Luawanna Halstrom, grower, has now agreed to serve
- **Remove “corporate” term from target groups in farmworker initiative**
  - **UPDATE:** Done
- **PROPOSE:** ASI hone solution center topics (ie: N/Water/Nutrients) and engage w/ board on potential funding contacts
  - (P. 15; Follow up: Tom, Kate, Sonja, Gail)
- **SUGGEST:** also run w/ public funding/web model – multi-purpose: money raising, discussion
  - (P. 15; Follow up: Tom, Eve, Melissa)
- **CHAIRMAN’S REQUEST:** Board actively engage in helping fundraise to support these efforts
  - (P. 15; Follow up: Tom, Melissa)
WHAT'S NEXT

- Deliver more info on N-assessment
- ASI improved relationships with others = pool data
- Farm worker housing question for RR folks
- Need to talk more
- Wild ducks + tame ducks
- Conversations have deepened
- Support from UCD
- See Russell Ranch

5 years!!!

- Accomplishments
- Why ASI is important to CA, USA, globe
- Links
- Fundraising - critical stage
- Board interaction frequency
- Focus
- Solutions center
- Prioritize setting
- Online option
- Each one of our comfort level
- We need to knock this one out
- More work Z do
- Encouraged
- Forms
- Communication as next MTZ
- Focus
- Nuance
- Inclusive (no stereotypes)
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