

MDPB Minutes 1/13/15, MFBO, 249 Lakeside Ave., Marlborough, Ma

**In attendance:**

Mary Jordan - Chair  
Sam Shields—Vice Chair  
Darryl Williams – Treasurer  
Krisanne Koebke - Secretary  
Warren Shaw—Board Member  
Kathy Herrick—Board Member  
Dave Hanson – Board Member

Julia Grimaldi, MDPB Coordinator

**Not in attendance:**

Lynne Bohan—Board Member  
Sean Faherty – ANF

**Guests:**

Alex Gill, MDAR Procurement  
Jessica Burgess, MDAR Legal Counsel

Meeting called to order by Mary Jordan at 10:20 am

**General Business:**

**Secretary's Report:** Motion to accept the minutes from 1/6/15

Darryl moves to approved minutes  
Warren 2<sup>nd</sup> motion  
Affirmative Vote

**Treasurer's Report: numbers as of 1/6/15**

Total income 2014: \$197,122.93  
FY15 Expended: \$ \$84,579.91  
Uncommitted Balance: \$ \$132,232.04  
Encumbered: \$2,557.80

Dave made motion to approve  
Warren 2<sup>nd</sup>  
Affirmative Vote

**Old Business:**

**2014 Grant Updates Feedback:**

Barbara Hanley: MCG: \$14,000

Darryl—where are they going from here? Amount of money versus number of our producers impacted? All of us were in agreement on all of his points, & we can empathize with Barbara for the reactions she's getting from the actual producers. Basically, we support the brand, we'd like

to see more figures to support the positive impact of the funds we've given, and hope they will move forward with their own funds. Warren wants the message to Barbara to be that we'd like to have more measurable results in the final report.

Jill Monti: NEDPB: \$15,000

Darryl—wishing Jill was a little more dynamic & not sure about the fact that they had \$6000 still remaining without a lot of definite plans. We all agreed that the “influencer” portion doesn't seem to be cost effective. Something we'd like passed along to Jill, we'd like more of a plan going forward, we'd like to know going forward whether or not the fact that we didn't fund the whole amount asked for hamper their plans. \*Question to Alex & Jill about changing the way funds are spent during a contract, neither sees a problem as long as the promotional line is similar to the original scope of work, likewise with granting additional funds being asked for if available during a contract upon budgetary review. Julia will review the RFR to be sure that the language reflects that. We would only be able to advance funds to an existing grantee, not someone new. \*We may look into leaving ourselves a budgetary contingency reserve.\* As far as suggesting projects that work (i.e. Zip Trips), they could be listed generally in the RFR. Back to Jill, we want a more detailed report of expenditures; we want to be sure that the Board (Julia) gets notice of any events they are holding, and recognition.

Kelly Coleman: CISA: \$50,000

Bulk of the money going towards the development of the larger planning piece; Dr. Lass' adaptation of the economic info should be forthcoming soon. Perception is that working with the other buy locals is an ongoing challenge.

Debi Hogan, Christopher Szkutak, MAC: \$6,000

Concern about the changing of leadership, also pleased with the content of the dairy lessons, would like to have more measurable results about how many educators are making use of the materials. Everyone expressed concerns about the synergies & overlap in message & wants to encourage working together (between MAC, Farm 2 School, and NEDFC). More info may be in next two reviews below...

Lisa Damon & Simca Horwitz, MF2S: \$5,000

Warren looking for more imagination & creativity, group suggests maybe looking into the college & hospital markets more. History on F2S, was part of the DAR until budget cuts, Kelly Irwin stayed with the program post-government & obtained grant funds. She also partnered with Project Bread as the fiscal agent, when she left; Lisa & Simca (along with one other administrator) have taken over the program & are moving forward on all commodities.

Lisa Burnett, NEDFC: \$50,000

Always do an admirable job, concern that we aren't being involved (at all levels, Julia & farmers) in all events. Would like to see an expansion of the summer feeding program (coolers!), not an easy program to work with, how many schools asked? May need to hold Lisa's feet to the fire, i.e. was any school turned down for mini-grants? Remembering that to participate schools must meet eligibility for free/reduced lunches. Dave made the point that schools can have paying breakfast programs, and participates; it may make it more difficult to be involved. This is the favorite investment of much of the Board.

Donna Wolman, Big E: \$10,000

Members were surprised by some of the exit poll numbers reported. The whole thing is hard to measure! Thoughts on the methane exhibit, it didn't seem inviting to us, but seems to have been well-received. The brochure was definitely geared more to an older audience. Mary wonders if this exhibit is listed/featured in the educational pamphlet that goes to schools pre-visit. Warren wants to be sure that we are always featuring MA milk/products whenever we can at the fair.

### **New Business:**

RFR review

- Under “Grant Program Description”: Maybe paragraph rearrangement in this section. Alex explained the difference between a grant and a contracted service, and why a grant program is our best option (efficiency & cost-wise). New order will be 1, 3, and 2.
- Under “Contract Duration”: “a no cost performance period” will be changed to reflect the discussion above from the NEDBP discussion
- Under “Anticipated Expenditures”: the max amount listed will be \$150,000, discussion focused on keeping or removing the listed max per project amount, none of this precludes partial funding. Group agrees to remove per project statement & next encouraging lesser amounts. After discussion and calculations, we have decided to go with \$200,000 total granted.
- Under “Performance & Specs”: bulleted points will be rearranged according to November meeting discussion, Jessica suggested a catch-all statement that would cover any thing we may not be thinking, & both suggested changing “eligible” to “suggested” project areas, the first sentence in A. should read “A suggested project will: and “increase the consumption of MA dairy products” will be added as a bullet. (Measurable will be added under “Evaluation”)
- The: “Examples of” section will be removed.
- Under “Evaluation”: Flexibility is key, this is how we will decide how proposals will be judged. This is where we state that projects that will increase the sales of MA dairy products will be weighted more than others (increased sales, increased consumer awareness, increased awareness of farmer role in food supply, health & nutritional benefits, school based wellness programs for example). We need to add measurable (quantifiable) results, and authorizing JG to work with staff to be sure that both legal & financial requirements (submission requirements) are met.
- “Presentations”—It has been recommended that we scrap this portion of the RFR, the Board has reflected for a week, Jessica reminded us that there is no new info that can be presented (procurement violations could easily happen), much discussion... in the end, all in agreement to not include presentations, any questions pre-decision will be sent to Julia, she will vet through Alex, if allowed she will forward to bidder & answers will be shared with Board at decision making meeting, if it's necessary to include this in the RFR Alex & Jess will decide. Section C will need to be removed.
- “Reporting”—simply adding a sentence “In addition to these reports, additional reports/presentations may be required of grantees.”
- “Invoicing”—this section is new and was discussed earlier in these minutes. Alex will build in an exception clause, on a case by case basis with the Board's approval.

- Scheduling—to release by 2/2, responses due 2/23, mailed to Board with review sheets that week, can be reviewed, notes made, no values need to be assigned if discussion may influence, any questions would be emailed to Julia for her action, all questions in by the 9<sup>th</sup> to Julia to facilitate getting answers back, Board will meet on 3/17 to make grant decision, with the 24<sup>th</sup> as a backup if needed for further discussion. Bidders could be in attendance because it's a public meeting, but Chair is advised not to allow public comment until after awards have been made. Julia should alert bidders to the fact that we've made changes in the RFR, especially the no presentation part. If the new RFR is ready before 2/2, Julia will get them out sooner.
- Post-decision grantees will be alerted to their award amount or lack thereof, and contract negotiations begin (main work done by Julia, Jessica, & Alex).

Above changes to the RFR 2016 were moved by Darryl, seconded by Warren, and approved by all.

**Updates:**

Mary: KLF (Must Be the Milk) \$ Because of tax issues, the group was reorganized, each state was going to receive \$\$, MA Commissioner Greg Watson decided to put it towards MADF because their mission. VT Association sent \$5000 directly to Dave Shepard on behalf of MADF.

Julia:

Procurement team doc signed by all present.

Board terms renewed for Warren, Dave, Kathy, Lynne, Krisanne, & Dave for 3 yrs 2014-2017  
Darryl & Sam terms expire 11/15

**Next Meeting: March 17, 2015 @ 9:30 am**

**Public comment:** No public in attendance.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:25

Darryl made the motion

Sam second the motion

All in favor.

Respectfully submitted

Krisanne Koebke, Secretary