



Board Meeting Minutes

6.21.2012

Attendance: Jayne K (facilitator), John R, Cezanne L, Josh S, Eric M, Rochelle G, Erin G, Joe W, Rob R, Fern M (notes)

Absent: Harry

Agenda

Announcements
Mission Statement
Member Comment
BPC Report
Local Farms + Products Committee: GMO
Co-op Conversation Final Report
Morningside Presentation
Crafting Co-operatives Conference
HABA Local Markup
Retreat Misc
Expansion
Committee Reports

Commitments Review

Jayne will send out a draft of the retreat agenda

Jayne will reply to the Global Exchange in regards to OFC's support of the Hershey Letter

Announcements

Harry is on vacation
Jayne will be on vacation next month
Joe graduated from SPSCC and will be relocating outside of the state this August.
Erin will not be attending the next meeting

Local Farms and Products: GMOS

SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT 1

Staff Member Erin presented and attended to get the Board's support on a petition for an initiative to require GMO labeling in Washington. Steve Halstrom from 'Let us Farm' contacted her a couple weeks ago about the proposed ballot initiative to label GMO foods, including GMO seeds. This issue will appear on the November ballot in California this year. One of the

differences is that the California initiative allows for up to 5% of contamination. In Washington the initiative will be less than 1%. All countries in European Union and Japan label GMO's.

MCAT has also been discussing the issue of GMO's and asks the Board's support in becoming a 'Supporting Retailer' for The Non GMO Project. The Non GMO Project will supply the Co-op with a list of all Non GMO verified products which will be labeled with shelf tags. We also will have access to trainings, information, and general support around this issue.

Proposal:

The Olympia Food Co-op will support the Washington initiative to require the labeling of GMO foods. The board will allow passive signatures to be gathered in the stores.

Consent

Proposal:

The Olympia Food Co-op will become a supporting retailer of The Non GMO project.

Consent

Commitments:

- *Erin will inquire if we have to draft a letter of support and where to send it*
- *Jayne will update the GMO page on the Website*

BPC Report

emailed report read aloud

Never a dull moment in keeping up on all things big and small in a ~\$15million, 80+ person Collective that relies on Consensus decision-making! Because you did not receive an official May report, this may be a bit longer than what you are used to. Well, that and Adam is the author of this report, and he is completely incapable of keeping anything short.

BPC has been focused on these areas:

- Cat Transformation. Phase one of three has us working with each Cat on getting up to date Job Descriptions and task lists for each group. Many of these groups have been working without written JD's for years. This is no small task.

- Setting up Department Evaluations. Supporting each Dept Coordinator by creating various Eval forms, communicating with Staff what is to be expected, coordinating the scheduling of all these Evals, and the follow up of what to do after these Evals.

- Consensus Trainings. We have been conducting and creating a meeting exercise around what we value about Consensus and Collectivism. We want to then look at how we are currently carrying out those values, and where there may be room for us to implement those values even more, or with better supported focus. Training one has happened, we plan at least two more. Working with the Cecosesola delegates has given us some great insight into this area. Stay tuned.

Co-op Conversation Report

Erin is excited to bring to the Board the Co-op Conversation Report that is a product of over a year of work. Great thanks to all involved, for making it a success! It has been an interesting journey that we have all learned a lot from. We have come out with a Comprehensive set of recommendations: Expansion, Decision making Community values, Reconciliation, Organizational Structure, and Education.

Education is a component to every recommendation. All three bodies of our organization (Staff, Membership and Board) need to be in alignment. The Conversation has generated a lot of data for the strategic planning retreat. We have captured a good sample of what our membership is looking for. We have felt very much supported by the Board despite the snags along the way.

Keziah reviewed the beginnings of the project over a year ago. In the committee's initial brainstorm for the 'Request for Proposal' phase of the process, three things that stood out in Bob's proposal were his experience in co-ops, collective consensus decision making and anti oppression.

Bob explained the three stages of the conversation. The first stage developed themes and questions. The second stage included the focus groups that delved deeply into the themes derived from the first group. The third stage was the general meetings. Then each theme was ranked by how many times it was mentioned. The constituent groups (GBLT, people of color, women) were all based on anti-oppression values. By beginning with these voices, the process ensured that they would be heard and resonate through the entire process.

The recommendations submitted by the committee need to be prioritized by the board. 'Don't lose sight of the quirky stuff' said one of the participants.

Since it has been so long that the membership has been engaged, there were a lot of complaints and ideas about current operations that are separate from strategic planning. The stated recommendations came from all three groups (staff, board, membership). The Committee hopes that the board moves forward with strategic planning with a similarly structured and balanced group.

During the Staff engagement phase of the conversation they followed a different process which was tailored to engage within the staff structure as the community phase of the conversation was not set up well for staff participation.

The committee presented the overarching themes, and asked staff 'what works?'. They then asked the staff to share their ideas of what the legacy of the co-op should be and what the barriers to reaching that legacy are. The Staff was then asked to create three solutions for every barrier and the facilitators questioned them about those solutions. There was a lot of creativity and ideas and everyone wanted to be involved in the future of the co-op.

It was clear to see the passion of the membership and how much they care about the co-op and the mission. The committee was moved by how much people were able to share and listen, especially during contentious topics. It seemed to be very healing. This community has the strength and vitality to continue to deal with conflict with great respect for each other.

Erin asked the board to pay special attention to implementation and careful consideration to all feedback. Bob recommended the Program of Work structure, which is an alignment tool, not a strategic plan structure.

This final report will be published for the membership online, and via hard copies within the stores. However, more work on the raw data is needed before public release.

Morningside

Chris Clark from Morningside presented to the Board. Morningside is a local non-profit which was started in the 60s by parents of adult children with disabilities. They are based in Olympia and serve multiple counties. Their sole focus is to help people with disabilities get jobs. 25% of people in Thurston County have a disability, which is higher than the national average and the numbers are growing. Work is a part of our identity, and without it many question their value. Data shows that with a few supports, people with disabilities excel in performance. Every grocery in town has Morningside client employees, doing jobs ranging from custodial services to an office assistant.

Morningside provides job support, which is an assigned Morningside employee to assist in the workplace. They also develop natural supports within the workplace with existing employees. Morningside prides themselves on finding a good job match for clients. 'Everybody works, everyone wins!'

Creating Co-ops Conference Report

Conference prep included: working with the four visitors from Cecosesola; traveling to Centralia, Portland, and more; creating posters and flyers; an article in Works in Progress; a city council proclamation; building a website (www.one-world.org); and announcements on KAOS

120 people attended over the two days. 80 people attended the Friday presentation. 70 attended the day-long conference. 60 people were in attendance at the close of the conference and 45 people attended the entire thing.

The 2012 committee will continue to meet. They will create an email list of people who attended. They will also consolidate and evaluate the information and generate a proposed action plan. On July 14th at the Olympia library, they will present the consolidated conclusions and lead further discussions.

Some of the ideas for consideration:

- The Co-op's position as a movement not just a store - a piece of a larger entity. Communicate vision that is holistic that is based on shared values and goals of the entire community.
- Think in terms of evolving organically, identify problems and solve those problems.
- Participate in generating co-operatives
- joining all local co-ops within a network of support and generation
- Provide more workshops and trainings, giving people an opportunity to volunteer and learn more about the co-op
- Create systems of mutual aid. Sharing resources (Small farmers ad health insurance)
- Identify community needs and opportunities for co-operative development.
- Become an organization that is co-ops, that supports co-ops, and develops co-ops.
- Integrating volunteers and producers.

Cezanne suggests that board members shadow staff as training!

Haba Local Markup

To: The Board
From: HABA Department

HABA Local Markup Proposal

When the markup sheets were updated years ago to show the 2% price increase for expansion, the HABA local markup disappeared. We have been operating without one and would like to reinstate it as soon as possible. Team HABA has been working hard to increase the selection of local and chemical free body care. A local markup would make these products more accessible to the community by lowering the price point and highlighting them on the shelf with the use of 'buy local' signage.

The Local Farms, Food and Products Committee charter includes definitions of local and regional. Local is defined as being within Thurston, Mason, Lewis, Pierce, and Gray's Harbor county that sells directly to the Co-op without the use of a third party wholesaler. Regional is defined as within Washington, Oregon or British Columbia that sells directly to the Co-op without the use of a third party wholesaler. Currently our produce department uses the local markup for local and regional products that are direct from the producer. The HABA department would like to do the same.

Proposal :

The Local Markup for the HABA department will be 1.5. Local Markup will be applied to local and regional products as defined.

Consent

Retreat Misc Brainstorm

Overview of agenda
Strategic plan (what it is what it isn't)
Feedback review
BPC will join for half day
One copy of appendices will be available
Everyone will read the Co-op Conversation report
Projector
Computers

Committee Reports

Finance – Our new auditor is amazing! They know our business and will prove to be a great asset for years to come. He also brought up the governance structure in which there could be great financial gain from changing our structure, for example patronage. We expect to have our audit back in a couple of weeks.

Personnel – are still working on the drug and alcohol policy. They are in the rewording phase. Medicinal marijuana came up; they will be seeking legal advice.

Newsletter- are rebranding the newsletter and discussing and clarifying the newsletter purpose.

Outreach- are ordering brand merchandise and doing lots of tabling. They are also busy planning the Harvest Party for the Co-ops 35th Birthday! The party will be held at the Eastside Co-op. This year the Harvest Party will also be combined with Volunteer Appreciation. Outreach is in the early stages of creating a Volunteer Speaker's Bureau in which volunteers can table at events. We hired Ira Coyne for our signage. He will start at the Westside. We also hired a local interior designer to choose paint colors and a paint plan that will harmonize with the logo.

Expansion- Suzanne Schaffer has joined the committee as the member at large! We have been gathering all information and feedback about expansion and compiled it into a summary document.

Commitments

- *Erin will inquire if we have to draft a letter of support and where to send it*
- *Jayne will update the GMO page on the Website*

Attached Documents

1. Local Farms and Products: GMOS

AN ACT Relating to disclosure regarding foods containing genetically engineered material; adding a new chapter to Title 15 RCW; and prescribing penalties.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

NEW SECTION. Sec. 1. The people find that:

(1) Farmers from a wheat-growing region of the state have gathered more than two-thousand four-hundred signatures on a petition demanding mandatory disclosure for crops produced with genetic engineering. The farmers are concerned they will lose their wheat export markets if genetically engineered wheat is approved.

(2) Agriculture is Washington's number one employer and wheat is Washington's number two export crop, second only to goods and services produced by the Boeing Company, and ahead of Microsoft, which ranks third.

(3) Preserving the identity, quality, and reliability of Washington's agricultural products is of prime importance to our state's fiscal health.

(4) No international agreements prohibit the mandatory identification of foods produced through genetic engineering.

(5) Forty-nine countries, including Japan, South Korea, China, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Russia, the European Union member states, and other key United States trading partners, have laws mandating disclosure of genetically engineered foods on food labels. Some have restrictions or bans against foods produced with genetic engineering.

(6) Numerous foreign markets with restrictions against foods produced through genetic engineering have restricted imports of United States crops due to concerns about genetic engineering. Some foreign markets are choosing to purchase agricultural products from countries other than the United States because genetically engineered crops are not identified in the United States, making it impossible for buyers to distinguish what does or does not meet their national labeling laws or restrictions, rendering United States' products less desirable. Trade losses are estimated at billions of dollars. Mandatory identification of foods produced with genetic engineering can be a critical method for preserving the economic value of exports to markets with restrictions and prohibitions against genetic engineering.

(7) Consumers have the right to know whether the foods they purchase were produced with genetic engineering. The genetic engineering of plants and animals is an imprecise process and often causes unintended consequences. Mixing plant, animal, bacterial and viral genes in combinations that cannot occur in nature produces results that are not always predictable or controllable, and can lead to adverse health or environmental consequences.

(8) United States government scientists have stated that the artificial insertion of genetic material into plants, a technique unique to genetic engineering, can cause a variety of significant problems with plant foods. Such genetic engineering can increase the levels of known toxicants in foods and introduce new toxicants and health concerns.

(9) Mandatory identification of foods produced with genetic engineering can provide a critical method for tracking the potential health effects of consuming foods produced through genetic engineering.

(10) Industry data shows foods identified as produced without genetic engineering – including conventional foods identified this way – are the fastest-growing label claim. Consumers have a right to an informed choice at the point of sale.

(11) Currently, there is no federal or state law that requires food producers to identify whether foods were produced using genetic engineering. At the same time, the United States Food and Drug Administration does not require safety studies of such foods. Unless these foods contain a known allergen, the United States Food and Drug Administration does not require the developers of genetically engineered crops to consult with the agency. Consultations with the United States Food and Drug Administration are entirely voluntary and the developers themselves may decide what information they may wish to provide.

(12) Polls consistently show that the vast majority of the public, typically more than ninety percent, wants to know if their food was produced using genetic engineering. Without disclosure, consumers of genetically engineered food unknowingly may violate their own dietary and religious restrictions.

(13) The cultivation of genetically engineered crops can cause serious impacts to the environment. For example, most genetically engineered crops are designed to withstand weed-killing herbicides. As a result, genetically engineered crops have caused hundreds of millions of pounds of additional herbicides to be applied to the nation's farmland. The massive increase in use of these herbicides has caused emergence of herbicide-resistant weeds, which have infested farm fields and roadsides, complicating weed control for farmers and encouraging use of increasingly toxic and more dangerous herbicides. These toxic herbicides damage the vitality of the soil, contaminate our drinking water, and pose health risks to consumers and farmworkers. The public should have the choice to avoid purchasing foods produced in ways that can lead to such harm.

(14) United States Department of Agriculture data shows Washington state ranks second in the nation for organic farm-gate sales at two hundred eighty-one million dollars per year. While total United States food sales are virtually stagnant, growing less than one percent overall, the organic food industry grew at 7.7 percent according to 2010 data. Sales of organic fruits and vegetables increased eleven and eight-tenths percent, accounting for approximately twelve percent of all United States' fruit and vegetable sales. Organic dairy, another key industry in Washington State, grew at nine percent and comprises nearly six percent of the total United States dairy market. Organic farmers are prohibited from using genetically engineered seeds.

(15) Trade industry data shows the organic industry is creating jobs at four times the national rate.

(16) Published data shows organic farming is more profitable and economically secure than conventional farming over the long term. This important element of Washington's economy must be protected.

(17) Conventional farmers have a right to choose what crops they grow and many conventional farmers want to grow traditional crops developed without genetic engineering. Identifying seeds and seed stock produced with genetic engineering would protect farmers' rights to know what they're purchasing and protect their right to choose what they grow.

(18) The labeling, advertising, and marketing of genetically engineered foods using terms such as "natural," "naturally made," "naturally grown," or "all natural" is misleading to Washington state consumers.

(19) The purpose of this chapter is to protect our state's export market and to ensure people are fully informed about whether the food they purchase and eat was produced through genetic engineering and not misbranded as "natural" so they may choose for themselves whether to purchase and eat such food.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 2. Definitions. The definitions in this section apply throughout this chapter unless the context clearly requires otherwise.

(1) "Department" means the Department of Agriculture.

(2) "Enzyme" means a protein that catalyzes chemical reactions of other substances without itself being destroyed or altered upon completion of the reactions.

(3) (a) "Genetically engineered" means any food that is produced from an organism or organisms in which the genetic material has been changed through the application of: (i) In vitro nucleic acid techniques including recombinant deoxyribonucleic acid techniques and the direct injection of nucleic acid into cells or organelles. In vitro nucleic acid techniques include but are not limited to recombinant deoxyribonucleic acid or ribonucleic acid techniques that use vector systems and techniques involving the direct introduction into the organisms of hereditary material prepared outside the organisms, such as micro-injection, macro-injection, chemoporation, electroporation, micro-encapsulation, and liposome fusion; or (ii) Fusion of cells, including protoplast fusion, or hybridization techniques that overcome natural physiological, reproductive, or recombination barriers, where the donor cells or protoplasts do not fall within the same taxonomic family, in a way that does not occur by natural multiplication or natural recombination.

(b) For the purposes of (a) of this subsection, "organism" means any biological entity capable of replication, reproduction, or transferring genetic material.

(4) "Ingredient" means any substance that is used in the manufacture, or contained in the final form, of a processed food.

(5) "Processed food" means any food other than a raw agricultural commodity and includes any food produced from a raw agricultural commodity that has been subject to processing such as canning, smoking, pressing, cooking, freezing, dehydration, fermentation, or milling.

(6) "Processing aid" means:

(a) A substance that is added to a food during the processing of the food but is removed in some manner from the food before it is packaged in its finished form;

(b) A substance that is added to a food during processing, is converted into constituents normally present in the food, and does not significantly increase the amount of the constituents naturally found in the food; or

(c) A substance that is added to a food for its technical or functional effects in the processing but is present in the finished food at insignificant levels and does not have any technical or functional effect in that finished food.

(7) "Raw agricultural commodity" is defined by 21 U.S.C. 321.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 3. Disclosure with Respect to Genetic Engineering of Food

(1) Beginning July 1, 2015, any food offered for retail sale in Washington is misbranded if it is, or may have been, entirely or partly produced with genetic engineering and that fact is not disclosed as follows:

(a) In the case of a raw agricultural commodity, on the package offered for retail sale, with the words "Genetically Engineered" stated clearly and conspicuously on the front of the package of such a commodity, or in the case of such a commodity that is not separately packaged or labeled, on a label appearing on the retail store shelf or bin in which such a commodity is displayed for sale; and

(b) In the case of any processed food, on the front of the package of such food produced by a manufacturer, with the words "Partially Produced with Genetic Engineering" or "May be Partially Produced with Genetic Engineering" stated clearly and conspicuously.

(c) In the case of any seed or seed stock, on the seed or seed stock container, sale receipt or any other reference to identification, ownership or possession, with the words

"Genetically Engineered" or "Produced with Genetic Engineering" stated clearly and conspicuously.

(2) Subsections (1) and (4) of this section shall not require either the listing or identification of any ingredient or ingredients that were genetically engineered, nor that the term "genetically engineered" be placed immediately preceding any common name or primary product descriptor of a food.

(3) Misbranding of genetically engineered food as "natural." In addition to any disclosure required by subsection (1) of this section, if a food meets any of the definitions in Section 2 (3) (a) or (b) and is not otherwise exempted from labeling under subsection (4) of this section, the food may not, on its label, in accompanying signage in a retail establishment, or in any advertising or promotional materials, state or imply that the food is "natural," "naturally made," "naturally grown," "all natural," or any words of similar import that would have any tendency to mislead a consumer.

(4) Subsection (1) of this section does not apply to any of the following:

(a) Food consisting entirely of, or derived entirely from, an animal that has not itself been genetically engineered, regardless of whether the animal has been fed or injected with any food produced with genetic engineering or any drug that has been produced through means of genetic engineering;

(b) A raw agricultural commodity or food that has been grown, raised, produced, or derived without the knowing and intentional use of genetically engineered seed or food. To be included within the exclusion under this subsection, the person supplying a raw agricultural commodity or food must provide a sworn statement that the raw agricultural commodity or food: (i) Has not been knowingly or intentionally produced through genetic engineering; and (ii) has been segregated from, and has not been knowingly or intentionally commingled with, foods that may have been genetically engineered at any time. In providing such a sworn statement, a person may rely on a sworn statement from his or her own supplier that contains such an affirmation;

(c) Any processed food that would be subject to this section solely because one or more processing aids or enzymes were produced or derived with genetic engineering;

(d) Any alcoholic beverage that is subject to regulation under Title 66 RCW;

(e) Until July 1, 2019, any processed food that would be subject to this section solely because it includes one or more materials produced by genetic engineering, provided that the engineered materials in the aggregate do not account for more than nine-tenths of one percent of the total weight of the processed food;

(f) Food that an independent organization has determined has not been knowingly and intentionally produced from or commingled with genetically engineered seed or genetically engineered food, provided that such a determination has been made pursuant to a sampling and testing procedure approved for this purpose in rules adopted by the department. These rules may not approve a sampling and testing procedure unless it is consistent with sampling and testing principles recommended by internationally recognized standards organizations, such as the international standards association and the grain and feed trade association. No testing procedure may be approved by the department unless:

- (i) It does not rely on testing processed foods in which no deoxyribonucleic acid is detectable; and
- (ii) it is consistent with the most recent "Guidelines on Performance Criteria and Validation of Methods for Detection, Identification and Quantification of Specific DNA Sequences and Specific Proteins in Foods" (CAC/GL 74, 2010) published by the Codex Alimentarius Commission;

(g) Food that has been lawfully certified to be labeled, marketed, and offered for sale as "organic" pursuant to the federal Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 and the regulations promulgated pursuant thereto by the United States Department of Agriculture;

(h) Food that is not packaged for retail sale and that either: (i) Is a processed food prepared and intended for immediate human consumption; or (ii) Is served, sold, or otherwise provided in any restaurant or other food service

establishment that is primarily engaged in the sale of food prepared and intended for immediate human consumption; or

(i) Medical food.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 4. The department may adopt rules necessary to implement this chapter, provided that the department is not authorized to create any exemptions beyond those provided in section 3(4) of this act.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 5. (1) The department, acting through the attorney general, may bring an action in a court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin any person violating this chapter.

(2) The department may assess a civil penalty against any person violating this chapter in an amount not to exceed one thousand dollars per day. Each day of violation is considered a separate violation.

(3) An action to enjoin a violation of this chapter may be brought in any court of competent jurisdiction by any person in the public interest if the action is commenced more than sixty days after the person has given notice of the alleged violation to the department, the attorney general, and to the alleged violator.

(4) The court may award to a prevailing plaintiff reasonable costs and attorneys' fees incurred in investigating and prosecuting an action to enforce this chapter.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 6. Sections 1 through 5 of this act constitute a new chapter in Title 15 RCW.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 7. If any provision of this act or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected.