OPENING NOTES:
JOHN: Reusables are the answer. We did not originally think that reusables were feasible. Compostables just aren’t working - they’re not getting traction within our subsidy program, and they are fraught with confusion and pitfalls for restaurants and suppliers. For whatever reason, restaurants are not doing the things we are asking them to do. In the meantime, reusable options are popping up every week. John saw the writing on the wall - Compostables are just not going to work.

1. PROPOSALS FOR CHANGES TO EXISTING SUBSIDY PROGRAM
   a. Eliminate all subsidies for single-use items, including certified compostable, effective June 30th (end of Q2).
   b. Honor commitments made to current/active subsidy recipients through 12/31/21. There are no MOUs with any of them.
   c. Offer a 100% subsidy, up to $5 per item, toward cost difference for each reusable item made of glass, wood, bamboo, stainless steel, or other non-petroleum-based material. (This formalizes existing policy.)
      i. Melissa: It could be helpful to formalize the process with a contract or written MOU with our partner restaurants.
      ii. John: I’m more than happy to write up a simple MOU with any restaurant or school that would feel more comfortable with something formal in place. That said, I think there’s value in not requiring a contract, as it keeps things simple.
      iii. Charles: An app with invoice submission a la mobile deposit could be good later.
      iv. John: With reusables, it’s just one invoice submission, but yeah, we could do that if there’s demand for it down the road.
      v. Rachael: What about added labor costs?
      vi. John: There are dozens of case studies from our non-profit partners showing restaurants and schools SAVING MONEY despite increased labor, electricity, and water costs. We don’t subsidize anything but the reusable items themselves.
      vii. Melissa: There are offset costs given garbage and procedures and all that.
      viii. Kate: Are those case studies from before or during Covid?
      ix. Melissa: Both.
   d. Offer a 50% subsidy, up to $1 per item, toward cost difference for each reusable item made of plastic. (Previously $2 per item)
   e. Offer an annual “restocking subsidy” for first two years after an initial subsidy, provided that the establishment provides a signed statement of compliance and a photo(s) of their tables/shelves. For restaurants, the restocking subsidy would be 10% (or 20% if they compost their food scraps). For schools, it would be 20% (or 30% if they compost their food scraps). (This is big for schools specifically)
   f. To qualify for a subsidy, restaurants must eliminate at least 25% of their single-use plastic items.
      i. John: I’m looking for feedback on this proposal item. Should the threshold instead be 33%? Or 50%?
      iii. Elaine: 25% is a good gateway number to encourage further getting rid of plastics in the future.
iv. Jody: Minimum threshold might be better than minimum requirement. What makes it worth if for you, us, and the movement? Primary value add here is education and knowledge sharing and recognition for places that are really, really trying.

v. Building in an incentive to increase the percentage of reusables could help
vi. Elaine: Is there a matching incentive possible? It would benefit us to have more on website without diluting the brand of PFR - it helps us get there more and show progress.

vii. Melissa: Do we need a percentage period? Could we go with a threshold?
   1. Is it worth the time for us to do it if it’s just 1 item versus 25%
   2. If the entry cost is too low, is it worthwhile for others to do it? Is anyone going to the list?

viii. Kenny: Might the long term strategy of the organization involve more of a messaging/communications/advocacy one? If we and others are successful at this, then more reusable-friendly manufacturers will become available and then we become more of a resource than a facilitator? In that way we are less concerned about moving forward worried about our involvement in the what has proven to be a time consuming process
ix. Jody will connect John with his Charter group to have some conversations around what’s doable.

x. JOHN: In the interest of moving the meeting along, let’s go with a 25% threshold for now, for purposes of voting on the entire subsidy change proposal. We can revisit this item at a future date if we feel that it needs adjusting.

g. There will be no minimum to eliminate for a school to qualify; if a school only wants to get rid of their single-use plastic forks, then we’ll subsidize their stainless steel forks.

h. We offer our subsidy to as many as three locations for a single parent company. (Previously, we had only allowed for a single location.)

i. For restaurants that are 100% plastic-free, we will subsidize the additional cost of plastic-free delivery services (e.g., Dispatch Goods) up to $500 per month.

j. Newly-opening restaurants (with no track record of past invoices) will also be eligible for our reusables subsidy, with the caveat that PFR will determine what their base cost for single-use items would be if they had gone that route.

VOTE TAKEN ON ENTIRE SLATE OF PROPOSALS ABOVE, AS WRITTEN IN BLACK TEXT. THIRTEEN “YEA” VOTES. ZERO “NAY” VOTES. Passed

2. BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES: John proposes that we bring back the initial $2,000 annual fundraising requirement for each board member, effective July 1st, and that we pro-rate it for the remainder of this year. In other words, each Board Member would be required to raise and/or contribute a minimum of $1K by the end of 2021, and then $2K every calendar year after that. VOTE TAKEN. Passed
   a. Melissa: PR campaign here around the changes? John: Yes. We will send a blast out to our entire email subscription list, update the FAQ/Resources/About pages of the web site, and make announcements via social media.

3. OUR LIST OF PLASTIC-FREE RESTAURANTS: We continue building our nationwide list of plastic-free restaurants (currently at ~100 locations), we continue to insist on them being 100% plastic-free front-of-house to qualify for the list, and we plan on launching/developing an app for consumers to find plastic-free food once the list tops 1,000 eateries. Jody: There are people who want the recognition even if there is no subsidy - we need to keep the marketing aspect up. John: Agreed.

NON-VOTING ITEMS
1. We need a schools committee.
   a. John nominates Sara to lead it. Maria also has a great depth of knowledge here, but she’s already offered to help launch a Grants committee.
b. Harry brought up school lunch services.
c. Make sure the committee knows about the CEH toolkit.
d. Sara agrees to lead the committee. Other interested board members are Melissa, Kate, and (via email prior to meeting) Maria.
e. Kate: Could we work with a direct-to-consumer production timeline for bigger orders? John: We can look into that down the line, but unfortunately vendors don’t yet exist that can handle all the products that schools need.

2. We need the Grant-writing committee to start getting serious.
   a. Maria, if you’re able, we’d love to see that spreadsheet/guide, as most of the rest of us don’t know much about what’s involved.
   b. At last check, the board members who expressed interest in joining this committee were Travis, Melanie, Melissa, Rachael, and JCM.

3. Everyone please note/remember that the end of the year is not the only time we should be talking about this non-profit and its mission. Our Q2 fundraising was considerably below our 2020Q4 fundraising.