

Public Review of the Draft
Local Food Strategy for Yukon

What We Heard

December 2015



“ We are thinking locally and globally as we take responsibility for our ecological footprint...our mission is to help farmers meet or expand the production of organic sustainable grown products in order to increase food security in our region. *Survey respondent* ”

For more information, please contact:

Agriculture Branch
Department of Energy, Mines and Resources
Government of Yukon
P.O. Box 2703
Whitehorse, Yukon
Y1A 2B5

Email: agriculture@gov.yk.ca
Telephone: (867) 667-5838 or Toll-free at 1-800-661-0408, ext. 5838
Fax: (867) 393-6222

For copies of this document, please visit: www.agriculture.gov.yk.ca

Published December 2015
© Government of Yukon

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources began researching and developing a draft local food strategy in fall 2014. Consultation on the draft strategy was conducted from August 5 to October 5, 2015, targeting First Nations, stakeholders and the public. The goal of the Yukon food strategy is to increase the production and use of locally grown vegetables, meat and other food products. In order to support the development of a sustainable, localized food system, this strategy focuses on four objectives:

- » Create initiatives that enhance competition, resiliency and responsiveness in the agri-food sector;
- » Develop a framework that offers local food producers opportunity and profit;
- » Promote local food so that it is conspicuous and widely available; and
- » Inform consumers about the value of supporting a local food system.

The draft strategy identifies five key areas of Yukon's food system: production, processing, distribution, access / availability and consumption. The consultation provided an opportunity to obtain feedback on proposed initiatives in support of these five key areas.

This is a summary of themes and ideas from more than 100 responses received from producers, processors and consumers. Quantitative data shows strong support for some initiatives, and less for others. Most respondents were positive about the draft strategy generally, although there were some concerns with its focus and scope. Many cited the need to support non-commercial production, several suggested a stronger tie to food security and sustainability and some spoke to the importance of conserving natural values and wild ecosystems. Several expressed concern that healthy local food be available for all Yukoners; for some, organic food is clearly the only choice. Several voices echoed the concern that this government effort not compete with or replace existing private-sector initiatives. There were numerous suggestions to improve initiatives and many ideas for partnerships and collaborations.



CONTENTS

- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... 3
- CONTENTS 4
- STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT AND CONSULTATION..... 6
- RESULTS–WHAT WE HEARD 6
 - GOALS AND OBJECTIVES..... 6
 - LOCAL FOOD PRODUCTION 8
 - Low Cost Land Lease 8
 - Promote Use of Non-producing Agriculture Lands 8
 - Increase Access to Grazing Lands 9
 - Regulation and Policy Assistance 9
 - Innovation..... 9
 - Food Waste to Compost..... 10
 - Increase Food Production for Individuals..... 10
 - Training / Mentoring..... 11
 - LOCAL FOOD PROCESSING CAPACITY..... 12
 - Community Kitchens..... 12
 - Food Processing Infrastructure 12
 - Regulatory Compliance, and Product Branding..... 13
 - Training / Mentoring..... 13
 - LOCAL FOOD DISTRIBUTION..... 14
 - Food Hub..... 14
 - ACCESS AND AVAILABILITY OF LOCAL FOOD..... 15
 - Online Market..... 15
 - Local Food Access Points..... 15
 - Coupon Program 16
 - Surplus Food Program..... 16
 - LOCAL FOOD CONSUMPTION..... 17
 - Increase Government Purchase and Use of Local Food 17
 - Building Awareness 17
- PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATIONS 18
- ONE MORE IDEA..... 18
- NEXT STEPS 18

- APPENDIX A: Draft Local Food Strategy Comment Submission Form 19

STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT AND CONSULTATION

Working with the Agriculture Industry Advisory Committee, the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources (EMR) began researching and developing a draft local food strategy for Yukon in fall 2014. Research was conducted with Yukon government departments (and contractors) that purchase food, food distributors, processors, and retailers, and agricultural product producers. This work¹ yielded valuable information on the impact that the proposed draft Strategy initiatives could have on the local food system.

Subsequent to this research, EMR conducted public consultation on the draft local food strategy from August 5 to October 5, 2015. An illustrated hard copy of the discussion document and questionnaire (see Appendix A) was available, as well as an online digital version. A French translation of the document was also available.

More than 110 respondents used the questionnaire and 5 people wrote letters. Respondents identified as the following with respect to local food:

Consumers	97	Several respondents identified in more than one category. 12 respondents did not identify themselves. With one exception, everyone who identified as a food processor also identified as a producer.
Producers	64	
Producer/ processors	22	

RESULTS—WHAT WE HEARD

Goals and Objectives

The goal of the Yukon food strategy is to increase the production and use of locally grown vegetables meat and food products. In order to support the development of a sustainable, localized food system, this strategy focuses on the following objectives:

- » Create initiatives that enhance competition, resiliency and responsiveness in the agri-food sector;
- » Develop a framework which offers local food producers opportunity and profit;
- » Promote local food so that it is conspicuous and widely available; and
- » Inform consumers about the value of supporting a local food system.

Most respondents were positive about the Strategy in general, and thought the goal and objectives were appropriate.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Goal is Appropriate			
Yes	87.4	90.9	86.4
No	4.6	1.8	4.6
Don't know	8.1	7.3	9.1
Objectives are Appropriate			
Yes	86.1	85.5	77.3
No	8.1	7.3	13.6
Don't know	5.8	7.3	9.1

¹ (Contact Agriculture branch for copies of *Yukon Local Food Strategy Report on Survey Findings*).

There were some concerns with the focus and scope of the draft strategy.

Suggestions for change or additional focus included:

- » more emphasis on non-commercial production
- » concern with implementation (including cost, communication and accessibility of the strategy)
- » concern about food security and sustainability
- » importance of conserving natural values, preserving wild systems and food sources
- » importance of ensuring that farmers are able to sustain themselves and not have to work other jobs
- » importance of reducing our carbon footprint (i.e. reducing greenhouse gas emissions resulting from meat production, year round food production and food transportation)
- » more emphasis on organic production (no Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs), use manure instead of chemicals, consumers need to pay real costs, provide incentives for organic production)
- » broaden the scope to include fish products, game farms for elk, deer, moose, bison and game birds
- » concern that a government strategy should not sabotage or replace private sector efforts.

“The market will not support higher food prices necessary to make this profitable for producers.”

“Have a call for submissions within budget boundaries to address specific areas. Turn the tables and let people design solutions. Allow small budget allotments for design time, receivable with a completed submission.”

“You only need to look at the store shelves when the highway is shut down for more than a day to see what happens.”

“...the way to achieve food security in Yukon is through supporting and encouraging individuals to grow and preserve some of their own food.”

“Sustainability can be defined as meeting the needs of current generations without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” (Brundtland Report “our Common future”)

“Beef should be grass fed—no grains and no feed lots to pollute surface and ground water.”

“Some of our most productive agriculture (land) is reclaimed wetlands: we need a policy that addresses wetlands.”

LOCAL FOOD PRODUCTION

Low Cost Land Lease

This was a suggestion to reduce the initial land purchase cost, resulting in better access to planned agriculture areas and an increase in local food production.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	58.4	59.2	43.8
Somewhat Important	24.7	28.6	31.3
Not Important	2.6	2.0	0.0
Don't know	14.3	10.2	25.0

Several people expressed concern with the cost of land for agriculture and were in favour of solutions to remove this barrier to food production. One person expressed concern that resolving this would give new farmers an advantage over existing ones. Suggestions included:

- » create a government-owned farm for people who want to work but not wrestle with land price or the business
- » consider spot land applications again
- » consider more creative ways of subdividing land.

“Low lease must mean low..long term (10-30 years) at \$100/year would really allow young farmers in.”

Promote Use of Non-producing Agriculture Lands

This was a suggestion to promote reclamation of agriculture land, so it would be available for crop and livestock production, leading to more land in production and ultimately, increased food production.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	49.4	30.6	23.8
Somewhat Important	33.8	32.7	42.9
Not Important	6.5	14.3	14.3
Don't know	10.4	22.5	19.1

Suggestions and concerns included:

- » parcels could be smaller or large tracts could be shared
- » agriculture land has been turned into residential properties, rather than put to productive use
- » there should be tax incentives for farmers or penalties for those who were not using the land for production
- » land zoned as agriculture may or may not be suited to growing
- » public land (i.e. parks and small public spaces) should be used for food production.

“I grow what I can, very intensively, but there's no way I could expand that kind of intensity to my whole 160 acres. I also don't want to clear off the old-growth forest portion of my land that produces cranberries and provides habitat for wildlife.”

“I love walking along a bike path and seeing currants and raspberries instead of ornamentals.”

Increase Access to Grazing Lands

This was a suggestion to increase off-farm grazing options in order to free up farmland for crop production (needed for overwintering feed or for sale) or for food production.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	31.2	30.6	23.8
Somewhat Important	36.4	32.7	42.9
Not Important	11.7	14.3	14.3
Don't know	20.8	22.5	19.1

There was general support for using land for grazing, when animals are being raised for food and fiber. Some did have concerns including:

- » land dedicated to grazing was reducing wild habitat
- » grazing land was being titled and sold for profit
- » grazing land is used for horses, rather than food production.

“Rather than increasing access to wild and natural spaces for grazing, enhance the productivity of lands already deemed agricultural...”

Regulation and Policy Assistance

This was a suggestion to support producers through regulatory and permitting processes, allowing producers to dedicate more resources to growing food.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	37.7	40.8	18.8
Somewhat Important	48.1	44.9	62.5
Not Important	7.8	10.2	6.3
Don't know	6.5	4.1	12.5

Producers were most enthusiastic about this. Many were generally in support of reducing or easing regulatory hurdles.

Innovation

This was a suggestion to generally support innovation that would increase producer resiliency and productivity.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	61.0	65.3	61.9
Somewhat Important	29.9	30.6	28.6
Not Important	5.2	2.0	4.8
Don't know	3.9	2.0	4.8

This was a popular notion for all groups. Ideas included:

- » experimentation to expand fruit-growing in Yukon
- » innovation for housing animals in the winter

- » hydroponics
- » climate change may bring new opportunities in this area
- » dairy production (from sheep or cows) would contribute to food sovereignty.

“I would really like to see dairies set up in Dawson, Whitehorse and perhaps Watson Lake.”

Food Waste to Compost

This was a suggestion to allow compostable materials generated on farms (or greenhouses, community gardens, market gardens) to be exchanged for compost at facilities throughout the territory.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	58.4	65.3	65.0
Somewhat Important	33.8	28.6	20.0
Not Important	5.2	4.1	10.0
Don't know	2.6	2.0	5.0

There was much excitement about this idea. Feedback included:

- » an opportunity to create local employment in communities
- » livestock should be the first recipients of communal compost
- » local (Whitehorse) compost source be certified organic
- » use household collection containers and collect monthly fees
- » this is most important for the backyard gardeners
- » dis-incentivizing the use of the landfill through tipping fees, or provision of compost-credits.

“Food waste to compost program...so exciting!”

“Most farmers are avid composters, knowing the value of the materials they produce and how to build soil, and they have the bulk of material required. This program might be better directed at backyard gardeners who can't build big enough piles to get going—they're the ones in need of compost.”

Increase Food Production for Individuals

This was a suggestion to enable community, individuals and groups to produce local food through back yard production incentives and education partnerships with municipal and community programs.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	77.9	77.6	76.2
Somewhat Important	16.9	14.3	14.3
Not Important	0.0	2.0	4.8
Don't know	5.2	6.1	4.8

The notion of encouraging and supporting individual gardeners was pervasive throughout the survey responses. Many emphasized the idea that the strategy should increase food production for individuals and there should be equal emphasis on non-commercial production as there is on commercial. Several ideas came up more than once:

- » importance of greenhouses and compost facilities / sources for individuals (and communities)
- » the relationship of community gardens to building community
- » the tendency for small scale growers to steward (the soil) better than large operations
- » there is a need for seedbanks
- » our agriculture land grows (mostly) pet food (so we need backyard gardening)
- » Canada Infrastructure Fund can create funding opportunities to encourage individual back yard growers.

“I would love to have the ability to set up a veggie stand at the end of my driveway in Takhini.”

Training / Mentoring

This was a suggestion to support the development of educational and training programs that teach food production, animal husbandry skills and environmental stewardship.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	58.4	55.1	66.7
Somewhat Important	36.4	40.8	23.8
Not Important	1.3	0.0	4.8
Don't know	3.9	4.1	4.8

Almost every respondent felt that training and mentoring were very or somewhat important and had many ideas:

- » backyard gardeners’ coffee circle
- » idea bank for urban growers
- » learning for inmates
- » Master Gardener Course for all communities and especially for youth
- » school programs
- » community 4-H clubs
- » Yukon College should begin an agriculture program
- » Yukon student should be supported to go to Agriculture college outside the territory.

“I have 10 acres of land in one of the communities that I’d like to use to produce locally...but I have no idea where to start.”

LOCAL FOOD PROCESSING CAPACITY

Community Kitchens

This was a suggestion to provide funding to non-profit community organizations to develop community kitchens in existing community infrastructure to enable selling of value added products (i.e. at markets and retail outlets), increasing profitability and the duration that local food is available.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	39.0	44.9	52.4
Somewhat Important	44.2	40.8	23.8
Not Important	9.1	4.1	4.8
Don't know	7.8	10.2	19.1

Producer/processors were very much in favour of community kitchens. Most (but not all) others responded positively to the notion of community kitchens, as a way for small producers to access the market. One voice cautioned that such a kitchen would need funding for booking, cleaning and equipment. One person thought a community kitchen would be redundant as people can process at home and there are local businesses that do it as well.

Food Processing Infrastructure

This was a suggestion to fund and support harvesters, producers and processors to increase food processing capacity, primarily focusing on reducing the bottleneck in fall when farmers and hunters require food processing equipment and abattoirs at the same time.

LIVESTOCK PROCESSING INFRASTRUCTURE

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	58.4	65.3	52.4
Somewhat Important	27.3	20.4	23.8
Not Important	3.9	6.1	14.3
Don't know	10.4	8.2	9.5

VEGETABLE PROCESSING AND STORAGE INFRASTRUCTURE

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	75.3	73.5	76.2
Somewhat Important	19.5	20.4	14.3
Not Important	2.6	4.1	4.8
Don't know	2.6	2.0	4.8

Notably producer/processors were the least enthused about livestock processing infrastructure, but most excited about it for vegetables. Overall, there was a stronger endorsement for the vegetable processing and storage infrastructure. Many acknowledged the need to be able to process because of the short growing season and the need to have year round availability. Feedback included:

- » one abattoir is enough
- » we could use another abattoir

- » butchering expertise is needed
- » there is a lack (and need for) dairy/pasteurizing equipment
- » producers do leave the [Fireweed Community] Market and Potluck Food Coop with unsold produce.

Regulatory Compliance, and Product Branding

These were suggestions to provide funding for producers requiring specialized infrastructure necessary to meet regulatory compliance (e.g., egg grading facilities, meat grading, milking and pasteurization equipment) in order to access retail markets. A related idea was to develop a Yukon product brand that could be applied to meat or vegetable products that meet certain 'local' criteria for attributes valued by Yukon consumers.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	31.2	30.6	28.6
Somewhat Important	45.5	55.1	38.1
Not Important	11.7	6.1	14.3
Don't know	11.7	8.2	19.1

Helping producers comply with regulations was somewhat important to many respondents.

In response to the idea of branding, a couple of respondents suggested labels like “Grown in Yukon” or “Yukon food is healthy”.

“Infrastructure and regulatory structure to allow for retail sale of meat and dairy is very high on the priority list for producers, but as a small scale individual grower and consumer, I am not affected.”

Training / Mentoring

This was about supporting the development of educational and training programs that teach food processing and preservation skills.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	76.2	61.2	66.7
Somewhat Important	14.3	32.7	19.1
Not Important	4.8	0.0	4.8
Don't know	4.8	6.1	9.5

Response to this suggestion was largely positive. As with the suggestion to train or mentor people in growing food, several people suggested liaison with Yukon College, high schools and the existing Master Gardener course. A couple of people suggested emphasizing energy efficient processing methods.

LOCAL FOOD DISTRIBUTION

Food Hub

We asked if there was support for the development of a food hub/distribution centre in Whitehorse and the communities. A food hub would aggregate produce from many farms to supply larger markets, and provide storage and packaging services for producers lacking the necessary infrastructure. Ultimately this initiative would simplify the storage, distribution and marketing demands placed on producers, as well as make it possible for small operators to enter larger markets.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	44.6	44.7	47.6
Somewhat Important	36.5	40.4	33.3
Not Important	6.8	4.3	9.5
Don't know	12.2	10.6	9.5

Consumers, producers and processors responded very similarly to this question. Most thought the food hub was either very or somewhat important as a distribution mechanism for farmers, to make greater production profitable. There was an acknowledgement of the need for convenience for consumers too. Other expressions included:

- » food hub could be integrated with a mechanism to get food for those in need
- » make the food hub a conduit for compost production.
- » collaborate or draw on existing expertise (i.e. Potluck Food Coop)
- » this would help make local meat available (otherwise hard to get)
- » cost of transport for farmers should be factored in
- » farmers need to be paid and treated well
- » this could be hard on existing distributors
- » hub solution is also needed in communities
- » storage and meeting regulatory standards are key to increased summer production and year round availability.

“This will allow a one-stop approach for local individual shoppers and provide farm to store direct sales with maximum profits to the farmer while minimizing business overhead costs for each facility.”

“A local coordinator, especially in small communities could liaise between government services and producers, producers and producers, and producers and consumers.”

ACCESS AND AVAILABILITY OF LOCAL FOOD

Throughout the survey, several people voiced concern that local foods be affordable and available to all Yukoners, including youth and low income consumers.

“To eat clean and healthy choices has (unfortunately) become somewhat elite.”

Online Market

This was a suggestion to support the creation of online marketplaces where Yukon food and food related products could be purchased.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	33.3	42.2	25.0
Somewhat Important	41.7	35.6	50.0
Not Important	15.3	11.1	15.0
Don't know	9.7	11.1	10.0

There was mixed response to this suggestion. Some felt that the existing online service of the Potluck Food Coop was adequate and/or has taught us the limitations of its utility. Some felt there was still some scope for expansion of the centralized online food source with respect to community needs, restaurants, seniors or other organized groups of individuals.

“The online market would be great in Whitehorse, but when I come to shop in Whitehorse, my day is so busy, I have no interest in trying to coordinate meeting someone to buy two blocks of cheese.”

Local Food Access Points

This was a suggestion to help local businesses, schools and public buildings purchase equipment to store, display, preserve and sell fresh local produce.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	73.6	68.9	85.0
Somewhat Important	19.4	22.2	5.0
Not Important	1.4	2.2	5.0
Don't know	5.6	6.7	5.0

Response to this was very positive.

“Consumers want hands-on and easy access—no gimmicks.”

Coupon Program

This was a suggestion to give low income consumers a weekly redeemable coupon (“grub bucks”) that could be exchanged with participating farmers (markets) or retailers for fresh fruit, vegetables, local eggs, meat and dairy.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	37.5	35.6	53.3
Somewhat Important	29.2	40.0	26.7
Not Important	18.1	11.1	6.7
Don't know	15.3	13.3	13.3

Some were not totally convinced that this was important, but many were supportive.

“We definitely hear that cost is one of the main reasons for not purchasing often or more, even among members who would not be considered low income.”

Surplus Food Program

This was a suggestion to create an incentive for producers with surplus product to donate that product to food banks or livestock producers.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	51.4	60.0	50.0
Somewhat Important	30.6	26.7	35.0
Not Important	0.0	0.0	5.0
Don't know	12.5	11.1	10.0

Generally there was support for this (especially amongst producers) and a few described situations whereby it is already happening, although there were some concerns:

- » producers should not be expected to donate
- » there really isn't a surplus, as evidenced by the difficulty in obtaining local eggs, milk and meat
- » a surplus food program is largely dependent on the availability of local food.

Suggestions for implementation included:

- » take produce to a central location (the food hub) for sorting, processing and sale or donation
- » store and sell surplus food through Potluck Food Coop at a reduced rate
- » donations to food kitchens might be good so food is partly prepared for those without access to kitchens.

LOCAL FOOD CONSUMPTION

Increase Government Purchase and Use of Local Food

This was a suggestion to secure a market for producers with public sector institutions (i.e. through procurement policies), thus allowing them to incrementally increase production based on predictable sales. There was a lot of support for this idea, amongst all respondent groups.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	62.5	62.2	60.0
Somewhat Important	26.4	31.1	30.0
Not Important	8.3	4.4	5.0
Don't know	2.8	2.2	5.0

Generally survey results show positive response to this idea and several people offered thoughtful comments. Producers seemed receptive and remarked that a steady local market paying a fair price was the right mechanism to ensure farmers could make a living, but there were caveats:

- » institutions need to adapt to what is locally available (i.e. not just 3" potatoes)
- » this should not result in increased public (i.e. tax dollar) spending.

“Nutrition and food procurement policies for all public facilities can help ensure both a healthy, local food system and the health and well-being of the residents of Yukon.”

Building Awareness

This was a suggestion to develop (and support existing) educational and communication material (i.e. curriculum) about the types of food grown in Yukon, ways to access and utilize those foods, the nutritional, social and economic benefits to supporting local producers, and food preparation and preservation.

%	Consumers	Producers	Producer / Processors
Very Important	76.4	80.0	85.0
Somewhat Important	19.4	15.6	5.0
Not Important	2.8	2.2	5.0
Don't know	1.4	2.2	5.0

Response to this notion was very positive and many respondents provided thoughtful feedback. Someone suggested that a Yukon student be supported to attend Agriculture College and there were ideas about where training could be offered locally (i.e. schools, Farmer Robert’s, Yukon College, Government, Kids on the Farm).

“Communicate the connection between a local food system and the health and chronic disease prevention impacts associated with access to healthy food.”

PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATIONS

Many respondents spoke to the need to collaborate generally, and that government should support and collaborate with existing programs initiatives and businesses. Several people spoke to the need to collaborate and many mentioned the cooperative model. Several noted the importance of partnering with First Nations and one respondent pointed out that the Dawson area could serve or partner with citizens further north (Fort MacPherson and Inuvik).

There were many suggestions for partnerships and collaborations.

Organizations contacted as part of the consultation included:

Carmacks General Store	Klondike Conservation Society
City of Dawson	Potluck Food Coop
City of Whitehorse	Whitehorse Anti-Poverty Coalition
Dawson City Farmers Market	YG Departments (Health and Social Services, Environment, Economic Development)
Dawson City General Store	Yukon Agricultural Association
Farmer Robert's	Yukon College
Fireweed Community Market Society	Yukon First Nations
Growers of Organic Food Yukon	Yukon Young Farmers
Independent Grocery Store	

ONE MORE IDEA

A few respondents had thoughts about improving animal health and veterinarian services, citing the Yukon challenges of vitamin deficiencies, poor natural grazing/browsing, long dark cold winters and need to rely on online resources for animal-specific mineral mixes, supplements and vitamins. There was also a request for annual veterinarian visits, and support for livestock health.

“Should be support for those with male livestock for breeding. We rely on friends and we have no idea how healthy the males are or how much this should cost and we end up asking a lot of favors. There is a lot of inbreeding here.”

NEXT STEPS

The contents of this document will inform the final iteration of the Local Food Strategy for Yukon: Yukon government officials are ‘ground-truthing’ and budgeting for the various initiatives endorsed through this engagement. A final version of the strategy will be proposed for approval by the Yukon government once this work is done.

APPENDIX A: COMMENT SUBMISSION FORM

The information is being collected by Yukon government. Your individual responses will be for internal use only. Individual respondents will not be identified in any reports, and your responses will be combined with others for reporting purposes. Here are some questions with space for you to provide your responses. Attach additional pages if you need them. If you prefer, you can fill this form out online at www.agriculture.gov.yk.ca. Please submit your comments by **Monday, Oct 5**.

1. Your role: Are you producing, processing or consuming local food? (Check all that apply)

Producing Processing Consuming

2. The Strategy overall: Do you think our goal is appropriate? Yes No Don't Know

Do you think our objectives are appropriate? (Page 4) Yes No Don't Know

Do you have any thoughts about the context, goals or objectives of this Strategy?

.....

.....

.....

.....

3. In your opinion how important are the actions being considered to enhance local food production?

1 = Very important 2 = Somewhat important 3 = Not important 4 = Don't know

Low Cost Land Lease 1 2 3 4

Increase Access to Grazing Lands 1 2 3 4

Promote Use of Non-Productive Agriculture Lands 1 2 3 4

Regulation and Policy Assistance 1 2 3 4

Innovation 1 2 3 4

Food Waste to Compost Program 1 2 3 4

Increase Food Production for Individuals 1 2 3 4

Training / Mentoring 1 2 3 4

Please use the space below to share your ideas or concerns with any of these actions.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

4. In your opinion how important are the actions being considered to enhance local food processing capacity?

1 = Very important 2 = Somewhat important 3 = Not important 4 = Don't know

Community Kitchens	<input type="radio"/>	1	<input type="radio"/>	2	<input type="radio"/>	3	<input type="radio"/>	4
Livestock Processing Infrastructure	<input type="radio"/>	1	<input type="radio"/>	2	<input type="radio"/>	3	<input type="radio"/>	4
Regulatory Compliance, and Product Branding	<input type="radio"/>	1	<input type="radio"/>	2	<input type="radio"/>	3	<input type="radio"/>	4
Vegetable Processing and Storage Infrastructure	<input type="radio"/>	1	<input type="radio"/>	2	<input type="radio"/>	3	<input type="radio"/>	4
Training / Mentoring	<input type="radio"/>	1	<input type="radio"/>	2	<input type="radio"/>	3	<input type="radio"/>	4

Please use the space below to share your ideas or concerns with these actions.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

5. In your opinion how important is the Food Hub as an action to enhance food distribution?

Very important Somewhat important Not important Don't know

Please use the space below to share your ideas or concerns with the Food Hub or other ways to enhance food distribution.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

6. In your opinion how important are the actions being considered to improving access and availability of local food?

1 = Very important 2 = Somewhat important 3 = Not important 4 = Don't know

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|---|
| Online Market | <input type="radio"/> | 1 | <input type="radio"/> | 2 | <input type="radio"/> | 3 | <input type="radio"/> | 4 |
| Local Food Access Points | <input type="radio"/> | 1 | <input type="radio"/> | 2 | <input type="radio"/> | 3 | <input type="radio"/> | 4 |
| Coupon Program | <input type="radio"/> | 1 | <input type="radio"/> | 2 | <input type="radio"/> | 3 | <input type="radio"/> | 4 |
| Surplus Food Program | <input type="radio"/> | 1 | <input type="radio"/> | 2 | <input type="radio"/> | 3 | <input type="radio"/> | 4 |

Please use the space below to share your ideas or concerns with these actions.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

7. How important are the actions being considered to promote and increase local food consumption?

1 = Very important 2 = Somewhat important 3 = Not important 4 = Don't know

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|---|
| Increase government purchase and use of local food | <input type="radio"/> | 1 | <input type="radio"/> | 2 | <input type="radio"/> | 3 | <input type="radio"/> | 4 |
| Building Awareness | <input type="radio"/> | 1 | <input type="radio"/> | 2 | <input type="radio"/> | 3 | <input type="radio"/> | 4 |

Please use the space below to share your ideas or concerns with these actions.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

8. Can you suggest partnerships or collaborations that would make this Strategy stronger?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

9. How could this Strategy be improved in order to enhance your contribution to local food production, processing or consumption?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

10. Do you have any other thoughts on the draft Local Food Strategy or any aspect of local food production and consumption?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

If you would like your name included as a participant in the development of this strategy, please include it here.

Name

If you would like a copy of the summary document from this process, please share the contact info you want us to use.

Mailing address or Email

