

Seaweed Community Action Fund



A community-funded effort for seaweed education, public demand, and shared policy change.

A community-shaped pilot for seaweed education, public outreach, and policy development, coordinated by Jules Marsh through Brackish & Co.

The proposed first phase

A \$10,000 net work budget before fees. A four-week initial fundraising window, followed by a 12-week paid-work pilot. One \$50 hourly rate for all paid project labor.

This proposal is a starting point for discussion with the people doing, studying, buying, and depending on seaweed work. Its priorities, methods, and governance should change with their voices and needs.

An effort people can shape

The Seaweed Community Action Fund would pay for the listening, research, public education, and shared drafting needed to turn seaweed community priorities into practical proposals for lawmakers and agencies. Its starting topics are seaweed-specific food safety; clearer permitting and access; education and demand; cooperative infrastructure and small-farm financing; biodiversity and restoration; and coastal resilience.

What the pilot would deliver

Proposed minimum outputs: one corrected listening summary and priority register; two reviewed public explainers; two short priority briefs; one checked coastal-relief and crop-insurance pathway tracker; one briefing packet and documented outreach requests; and public progress and financial reports. These are proposed work commitments, not completed results. Shared review selects the two issues that fit the available hours.

Who can take part

Growers, harvesters, workers, tribal governments, coastal businesses, researchers, educators, students, buyers, cooks, and community members are invited to help identify what is useful and what is missing. No participant, partner, or representative authority is assumed. Participation and reviewed public materials do not depend on giving money.

The proposed operating model

I coordinate the pilot through Brackish & Co., my Washington-registered organization and the project's legal operator. A small paid collaborator pool supports agreed scopes. Campaign income and spending are tracked separately from ordinary studio work. Contributions support labor and shared public outputs, not equity, profit, or control.

The decision requested

Name one barrier or change that would help; offer relevant experience, evidence, or a missing perspective; review a short draft; or introduce someone whose voice belongs in the discussion. Funding supports the work, not influence. Choose a bounded first scope and an independent financial reviewer before paid work begins.

Start now. Keep the scope real.

Why this work cannot wait for a finished grand plan

Jules's Open Letter Two calls for public demand, seaweed-specific rules, community-scale economic models, and coastal resilience preparation before spring. This pilot responds by organizing questions, checking current pathways, and preparing useful public and policy materials while there is still time to act on what can be changed. It does not rely on an unverified El Niño forecast or assume a future disaster.

What can change within the pilot

People can have clearer public information, a documented account of barriers, a checked list of existing funding and insurance pathways, and concise requests directed to the offices responsible. The project can complete and share those materials, invite corrections, and request conversations. It cannot control agency schedules, legislation, grant awards, permits, demand, or environmental outcomes.

Public demand is part of the policy work

Prepare source-checked education for schools, shoppers, kitchens, and community groups. Ask willing reviewers what remains confusing and what would help them choose seaweed. Record actual questions and responses. Views, signatures, and interest are not purchases, representative demand, or proof of policy impact. No school program or partnership is already committed.

A spring-readiness track starts early

Begin relief and crop-insurance pathway checks in the first pilot phase, not after the final policy packet. Publish what exists, what is unknown, who may qualify, and what action can be taken. Recheck time-sensitive entries before sharing. If the pilot starts too late for a relevant deadline, report that clearly; the four-week fundraising window plus 12 weeks of work is not an immediate launch.

Urgency does not override shared review

Invite alternatives and disagreement, prioritize the work that available funds can cover, and publish how input changes the plan. Move forward with a useful bounded scope rather than promising to resolve every topic at once.

Listen before deciding

A proposed listening process

Begin with a public invitation asking for one barrier, one useful change, or one missing perspective. Use the free website support form only after it is publicly available and tested. Until then, invite non-sensitive comments on the campaign or social post; never ask people to post private business details. Follow-up conversations require permission. Ask what existing work this effort should support rather than repeat.

Keep a useful issues register

Separate personal experience, checked facts, proposed changes, and unanswered questions. Record which perspectives remain missing. Return a non-identifying summary to participants for correction before using it to set priorities. Participation does not require a contribution, a newsletter subscription, or agreement with every proposal.

A bounded record of support

Support applies to the exact statement people sign, not every later demand. Submissions require review, and an email address is not independently verified identity or residency. Distinguish submitted from reviewed records. Do not describe the record as verified constituents, an industry vote, or a representative survey.

Consent stays specific

Keep names, email addresses, and sensitive business information private. A signature does not authorize a public story, identification to officials, or a new policy position. If a more specific community accord is developed, publish its wording and version and obtain fresh agreement rather than transferring earlier signatures.

Participation beyond donations

People can suggest a priority, review materials, share relevant experience, identify overlooked groups, or help circulate a reviewed invitation. The free support page must be publicly available and tested before the campaign invites online signatures.

Specific topics. Bounded work.

Seaweed-specific food safety and workable access

Check current food-safety research and guidance for seaweed. Map the permitting steps, responsible offices, and questions affecting small growers, including tribal participation from the start. Compare clarification, coordination, shared-area, and proportionate-review options without presenting a legal interpretation as settled.

Education, demand, and community-scale economics

Develop public education that helps people understand and choose seaweed. Investigate cooperative processing, shared marketing and business services, and financing options for small and tribal farms. The pilot produces option notes and questions; it does not construct a processing hub, capitalize a loan fund, or promise buyers.

Biodiversity, restoration, and coastal resilience

Keep species diversity, wild genetics, restoration, and adaptation questions visible in reviewed policy materials. Research possible coastal-relief pathways and crop insurance appropriate to seaweed. Record official sources, geography, eligibility, deadlines, restrictions, and checked dates. This is preparation and research, not a promise of aid, insurance coverage, or a scientific outcome.

Select two issues for the first briefs

By the end of pilot week 2, propose two tractable issues using participant input, readiness of evidence, relevance to a concrete decision, and fit within funded hours. Explain the choice and retain the other topics in a future-work register. If qualified review or evidence is unavailable, publish the question as unresolved instead of a recommendation.

A practical request, not a broad manifesto

Each brief states the problem, current guidance or process, checked sources, affected perspectives, options and tradeoffs, unresolved questions, and one requested next step. A permitting clarification brief could inform later CAPRA work, but this pilot does not promise a full bill, legal review, or hired lobbying. Qualified advice is required before regulated advocacy activity.

An honest handoff

Return drafts to affected participants before sharing with officials. Request appropriate agency or legislative conversations and record actual replies. Do not claim a requested meeting happened, a meeting signals endorsement, or the project represents a tribal nation or an entire industry.

Cooperative in practice

The proposed model combines a clearly accountable operator with shared input and paid collaboration. It is not a claim that a legal cooperative has been formed, and financial contributions do not create ownership or voting rights.

Coordinator and collaborators

I coordinate listening, research, outreach, drafting, and reporting through Brackish & Co. The collaborator allowance is a combined pool of 60 hours, not a confirmed team size or named appointment. Each paid scope should specify its work, hours, output, approval, and payment terms. All paid labor uses \$50 per hour.

Shared review

Before paid work begins, invite participants to review priorities, missing perspectives, proposed outputs, and the first funded scope. During the pilot, use open review points to test usefulness and revise future tasks. Publish the basis for decisions and unresolved concerns instead of presenting silence as consensus.

Financial responsibility

Brackish remains responsible for financial commitments and administration. Separate project tracking and reconciliation must be in place before contributions open. Appoint an independent reviewer for Jules's invoices before paying them. Reviewer appointment, scope, and conflicts policy remain decisions to finalize, not completed arrangements.

Conflicts and safeguards

Disclose relevant commercial interests and funding restrictions. Anyone with a personal financial interest should not approve their own expense. Sponsors may receive agreed acknowledgment, but cannot purchase a policy position, exclusive access to public work, or control of community input. Protect confidential records and publish only appropriate summaries.

Learning before formalizing

Use the pilot to assess whether a more formal shared structure is wanted and workable. Any future legal cooperative, membership system, or voting model would need a separate decision and qualified review. The initial proposal does not preempt that conversation.

Fund the work openly

The proposed pilot requires \$10,000 available for labor and direct work costs. Payment processing, applicable platform charges, and any chosen subscription are additional. The gross fundraising target cannot be finalized until actual fees are confirmed.

Budget item	Hours / rate	Amount
Jules: coordination and delivery	120 × \$50	\$6,000
Paid collaborator pool	60 × \$50	\$3,000
Direct project costs	Proposed allowance	\$600
Contingency	Proposed allowance	\$400
Net work budget	Before fees	\$10,000

Proposed coordinator allocation

Listening and coordination: 30 hours. Evidence and policy research: 30 hours. Public education and demand-building: 25 hours. Community-reviewed drafting and policy handoff: 15 hours. Relief and crop-insurance pathway research: 10 hours. Reporting and administration: 10 hours. Total: 120 hours, averaging 10 hours per week. The separate collaborator pool adds 60 hours, for 180 paid hours total. This is a part-time pilot, not a full team working full time.

Spending discipline

Collaborator hours are assigned through written scopes after shared review. Direct costs and contingency are planning allowances, not already incurred expenses. Do not commit unfunded hours, charge the same work twice, or spend restricted awards outside their written terms. Review reallocations before new commitments.

Separate records and public reporting

Reconcile the project ledger against the actual financial records. Record external transactions as well as platform contributions. Publish monthly income, fees, approved spending, funded hours, progress, and remaining balance, while keeping payment details and sensitive supporting records private.

Terms to finalize before fundraising

Agree the minimum funded starting scope, fee allowance, independent reviewer, reduced-scope process, and unused-fund and refund terms. Do not promise automatic refunds or a specific start threshold before those terms are approved and posted.

Many ways to support it

Community contributions

Offer one-time contribution options starting at \$5, with proposed \$25, \$100, \$250, and \$500 tiers and a custom amount option for larger support. Each supports the same shared work. Tier descriptions should not imply paid influence, ownership, guaranteed results, or a requirement to donate to participate.

Organizations and sponsors

Invite businesses, foundations, community organizations, and public agencies to discuss support. Sponsorship acknowledgment can be agreed in writing without implying endorsement or ownership of public materials. No organization is named as a committed partner or funder in this proposal.

Grants and agency partnerships

Investigate eligible grants, contracts, and partnerships using official program information. Confirm whether the Brackish legal entity and proposed work qualify before applying or promising tax treatment. A nonprofit-only award may require a separate eligible partner and agreement; such a partnership is not assumed.

Restricted support

Keep restricted awards separately coded and reported. Match each funded expense and hour to its approved purpose, reconcile overlapping funding sources, and never bill the same cost twice. Publish material restrictions without exposing confidential agreements or personal information.

A contribution is not an investment

This project does not offer charitable tax-deductible contributions, equity, repayment, profit share, or guaranteed financial or policy outcomes. Any other tax treatment depends on the contributor's circumstances and qualified advice. Do not describe the campaign as an investment offering.

Fundraising window and readiness

The proposed initial window is four weeks after receiving payments is tested and the budget and launch safeguards are approved. It is separate from the 12-week paid pilot. A visible project page is not proof of active receiving or payouts. Publish a smaller funded scope before committing work if the full budget is not available.

Useful work in 12 weeks

Phase	Proposed deliverable and next action
Before fundraising	Approve scope, fees, reviewer, consent, and closure terms; test payment receiving and public links. No payment activation assumed.
Fundraising: four weeks	Invite community input and eligible support. Confirm funded hours before commissioning paid work. If underfunded, publish a smaller scope and revised schedule.
Pilot weeks 1 to 2	Open the listening register; propose two priority issues; start relief and insurance checks; publish scope and missing perspectives.
Pilot weeks 3 to 4	Return one listening summary for correction. Publish an initial pathway tracker with verified entries or explicit gaps. Prepare two public explainers for review.
Pilot weeks 5 to 8	Release the two reviewed explainers. Draft two priority briefs with current sources, options, and a specific next-step request. Gather and document corrections.
Pilot weeks 9 to 10	Finalize one briefing packet. Send documented requests to appropriate offices and invited collaborators. Recheck time-sensitive funding entries.
Pilot weeks 11 to 12	Report actual replies, open questions, spending, and remaining funds. Publish next steps with an owner and dependency for each; do not assume an extension.

Proposed deliverables are not promised outcomes

The minimum scope is one listening summary and register, two public explainers, two short briefs, one pathway tracker, and one briefing packet. Monthly financial and progress reports document paid hours and spending. Final issue choices remain collaborative. If evidence, review, or funds are missing, show the gap and revise the scope rather than publish unsupported conclusions.

Measure what happened

Record completed reviews, sources checked, invitations and actual responses, corrections, bounded support records, requests and confirmed replies, funded hours, and remaining balance. Do not invent participant quotas, signature targets, conversion rates, or policy victories.

Continue only with a new decision

At week 12, share unfinished work, the next feasible action, and what it requires. Further outreach, legal work, grant applications, infrastructure planning, or lobbying needs its own approved scope and funding. Apply published unused-fund terms rather than automatically extending the pilot.

Help make the plan useful

Help choose useful work, not just endorse a fund. Name one barrier, offer evidence or experience, review an explainer or brief, or introduce a person whose perspective is missing. Giving money is optional. Community input helps choose the two initial issues and correct the materials before they reach officials.

Questions for shared review

Which barriers should come first? Whose perspective is missing? What public material would be useful? What existing work should this effort support? Which policy options deserve investigation? What would make decision-making and financial reporting trustworthy? What should change about the proposed scope?

Campaign page

<https://opencollective.com/brackish-and-co/projects/seaweed-action-fund>

The public project page provides a place for the proposal and campaign updates. Financial contributions will be invited once receiving payments and the published terms are confirmed.

Website

<https://brackishco.org/links>

Short public introduction

The Seaweed Community Action Fund would fund listening, research, education, and shared policy work on seaweed-specific food safety, clearer permitting, public demand, community-scale economics, biodiversity, and coastal resilience. The proposed 12-week pilot would produce reviewed explainers, short priority briefs, a relief and crop-insurance pathway tracker, and a practical briefing packet. I coordinate it through Brackish & Co. The proposed net work budget is \$10,000 before fees, with the same \$50 hourly rate for all paid labor. Priorities are open to community review; grants, permits, policy changes, and disaster aid are not promised.

The next shared decision

Before committing the pilot, review the priorities, participant roles, financial safeguards, and work that available funds can support. Record agreed changes and unresolved questions. The next version should reflect that review, not treat this initial proposal as the final word.