

CEWG Equity Questions for Work Groups

Date: 12.20.18

Purpose

Establishing a general internal understanding of our role in addressing work with an equity lens.

Some major themes arose from our conversation:

- Community Wants/Needs
- Sources & Resources
- Decision Makers & Structure of Decision Making
- Work Group Representation & Membership
- Community Voice & Community Advisory Groups

Questions

1. What sources of information drive your work plan/scope of work?
 - a. Quantitative
 - i. National or local data
 - b. Qualitative
 - i. Articles, plans
 - c. Community input

Pollinator Protection Task Force (PPTF) report scoped out a lot of the information using national research. Ordinance changes on noxious weeds and natural lawns had public inputs/hearings, went through several committee meetings, and residents attended. There are logistical challenges with what venues are used for meetings to gather community input. The WG does validate some of the educational efforts of Olbrich Gardens. Community interest in pollinators also informs WG members perspectives on what's important and what issues we take on.

2. Have you gathered community input on your work group's issues?
 - a. If so, how?

The PPTF report went through Council, ordinance changes had public hearings. The PPTF report was based on national research and the work done at the federal level, including survey data and national interest in monarch/other pollinator health.

3. How has community input informed your work group's progress to-date?

This work group originated from national interest and the investment of resources into exploring and researching the health of pollinators.

4. Who benefits from the projects of your work groups?
 - a. Who is impacted? Is it positive, negative, or neutral?
 - b. How do you know?

This has two components to some extent – resident benefits and environmental benefits

- Protecting pollinators protects our food supply and therefore benefits all people. Pollinator protection initiatives help educate residents on environmental considerations. The co-benefits of protecting pollinators leads to educational programs that benefit youth, etc on environmental education.
- There are some people who might be considered negatively affected because of changes in mowing policies and what plants are allowed to proliferate; potential health concerns for residents with allergenic sensitivities; competing interests between land and development/other uses

5. How is your work group's membership defined?

- a. What efforts have taken place to include non-MFPC members on the work group?

We have open membership to some extent. We have sought out community experts even if they are not MFPC members.

6. What voices are missing?

- a. What do you envision asking them?
- b. When do you ask for input?

Missing voices: Members of groups that work on these issue on-the-ground – org reps: Arboretum, CGW, MMSD, Goodman Youth Farm, REAP, other NGO groups. As we shift from recommendation to recommendation represented in the PPTF report, the voices that we need change. One shortcoming we face is diverse racial input/feedback/participation – connecting with groups that work with/serve and are staffed by PoC will be an important consideration for our work group.

7. How could we draw from university resources to help advance this work?

- UW Extension – Master Gardeners Program
- FH King
- Allen Centennial Gardens
- UW Departments
 - Soils/NIES/Horticulture/Agroecology/CALS
 - Looking at staff and students who are interested in pollinator protection
 - We need to think about what our questions and needs are so we can scope them out in a relevant way