

Harvard Agricultural Advisory Commission (HAAC)

Town of Harvard, MA

Minutes of Meeting August 6, 2020
Approved October 28, 2020

Green called the meeting to order via Zoom at 7:07pm

Members in attendance by roll call: Chair - Kerri Green - here, Christiane Turnheim - here, Rob Duzan - here, Rob Traver - here, Franklyn Carlson - here

Guest Speakers: *Kim Lundgren & Associates:* Annie Suttle, Kortni Worten, Kari Hewitt

Review of Logo & Branding with KLA

- **Logo**
 - Turnheim - feels logo is more representative of the Commission rather than that of the community. Feels that a horse should be the center focus of livestock of the upper part of the logo. Additionally Turnheim wishes we could “test” this logo to the larger community/uninvolved individuals for feedback.
 - Green advised that the design of the logo is not 100% set in stone, and that we can still make minor changes to get it where we want. Unfortunately this process didn’t allot for time to “test” the logo.
 - Turnheim advocates for an informal test to non-agriculture individuals and is concerned that we are missing a big part of a traditional branding process to test the logo on the audience we are trying to connect to. Suttle said that we are welcome to do such a thing over the next week and then provide feedback/request changes based on such, as long as they are fine tuning changes on what has been presented rather than a whole new design.
 - Green responded that at the end of this process, the Commission can decide if this logo is the one we want to be married to. And if not we can determine how to move forward with building off this one, or starting over.
 - Traiver feels like it is a little generic.
 - Carlson feels there are definitely more horses than cows in town, but also pointed out that logos are not made to last a lifetime. We could go to print with it for now and revisit it again. It’s a solid start.
- **Brochure, Map & Product/Service Icons**
 - Suttle showed the first draft of the brochure, map and icons for different farm offerings.
 - Turnheim expressed concern that we might be missing certain icons that are representative of Harvard’s product/service offerings. One being beekeeping & honey production.

- Traiver is concerned that we could be potentially accused of not including a farm and that we need to be careful, and have a plan for outreach to cover our bases.
- Green reassured that the farms/icons on the draft was based on a contact list that she had and provided KLA as a starting point and that no farms had been reached out to officially yet. But there is a submission form that will be provided to collect information from those that want to be included either on the brochure map, on a general farm list on the website, or both.
- Duzan advocated that we need to make sure that the brochure map is used to drive visitors to the farms that are open to the public and welcome visitors. Duzan also asked if we had the whole town on the map? He said you obviously don't want it to look like spaghetti, but having some more roads added to the map so the farms listed aren't just "floating" in place. Turnheim agreed. Traiver said Harvard Conservation Trust has a great map. Green offered to locate and link some map options to KLA and to see which is best to incorporate.

Stakeholder Meeting #2 and Survey for Stakeholders

Kari Hewitt acknowledged the fact that the timing of this process isn't ideal for farmers. The attendance at the first Stakeholder meeting wasn't ideal. For the 2nd Stakeholder Meeting they are going the route of a survey to collect the prioritized goals and actions to implement. The final report will assign a matrix system as the steps that need to be taken, who the key players are, cost to implement, and what potential effect they could produce for the town. (positive, negative, neutral) KLA has already created the survey, and sent it out to be completed. Turnheim pointed out that there was no review of a draft version of the 2nd Ag. Stakeholder Survey prior to asking Ag. Stakeholders to complete. Hewitt responded that this second stakeholder survey was to replace a Stakeholder meeting that would have gathered the information needed to create the prioritized actions. Green responded that the issue isn't about the process of how they are collecting, it has more to do with the fact that there wasn't input/involvement of the Commission in the creation of the 2nd stakeholder survey prior to KLA distributing for responses.

Traver pointed out that one needs to be aware at how they structured the survey. On one hand he was impressed at the way the consultants captured and articulated all the major facets of agriculture and agriculture education in Harvard - it's very explicit. But his issue falls in the fact that respondents need to rank and that he fears that he ranking system you end up choosing the better and worse of for each individual respondent and that isn't going to work for the "mosaic" of diverse farms in Harvard. (economic viability, resource efficiency/greenhouse gas reduction, nature based resilient & regenerative practices, social cohesion & agricultural character) Ultimately his issue with the survey is that it creates a system where a small majority is going to over rule a very large minority. Turnheim agreed that the way it is structured you will statistically end up with biased/skewed results due to the diversity of farms alone. Hewitt

agreed, and understood, but explained that unfortunately it's not going to be a scientifically perfect process. She assured just because respondents are going to rank their top priorities as doesn't mean that the other priorities go away. Unranked priorities will still be included in the report, but the top ranked ones will be the ones where more detailed actions will be explored. Hewitt wants to clarify that "It's a prioritization process not an elimination process." Green advocated that it would be best to explain that in more detail in the opening paragraph of the survey. Hewitt said she can do that.

Turnheim also asked if there was a way to include an identification section so that respondents can group the priorities for different farms. Possibly 4-5 different groups - large farms, small farms, livestock farms, orchards to name a few.

Once edits are made, the Commission can push it to Stakeholders.

Stakeholder Meeting #2 is where the results from the survey will be discussed more openly. Hewitt gave a final deadline for survey responses on August 13, 2020, with the Stakeholder meeting being Tuesday, August 18, 2020 at 7pm.

Traver advocated for members to reach out and connect with a minimum of 1 to 2 Stakeholders to complete the survey.

Harvard Grown Submission Survey & Logo/Brochure Edit Requests

Commission reviewed the Harvard Grown Submission Survey. Commission would like to have KLA add: beekeeping & honey, fruit, flowers & herbs, eggs, maple syrup, change farm tours to educational tours & demonstrations.

Traver suggested a couple edits for spelling and grammar errors.

- **Map Icons to Add**

- beekeeping/honey
- fruit (not PYO)
- flowers & herbs
- eggs
- maple syrup
- make the farm tour icon be "educational tours & demonstrations"
- 4H (could potentially fall under "educational" or "non-profit")

- **Brochure**

- icons are too big and don't really compliment the logo.
- fiber as in wool not grain
- farm tours should be less Alpaca Specific. Maybe call them "educational tours & demonstrations"
- Farm Store could be the shape of a store with items inside. (ie: milk, eggs, produce, bread) Instead of a door/display stand.

- **Map**

- [HCT Map](#)
- Historical Harvard Map

**Traver motioned to adjourn the meeting. Turnheim Seconded. All in favor - adjourn
9:22pm**

Minutes Submitted: Kerri Green