

**Recipe for Success:
Recommendations of the Dane County
Local Food Policy Advisory Subcommittee**

**Jim Arts
Deirdre Birmingham
Patti Daubs
Mark Dohm
Judy Hageman
Tera Johnson
Jerry Kaufman
Jack Kloppenburg
Mark Olinger
Ken Ruegsegger
Dale Secher
Ruth Simpson
Jane Voichick
Loretta Wilson
Doug Wubben**

July 29, 2005

Table of Contents

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
Introduction: Building a Better Local Food System	3
Recommendation Area One: Buy Fresh/Buy Local	4
Recommendation Area Two: A Central Agricultural and Food Facility and Public Market	6
Recommendation Area Three: Farmland Preservation and Entrepreneurial Agriculture	8
Recommendation Area Four: Local Foods to Improve Health and Nutrition	11
Recommendation Area Five: Establish a Dane County Food Council	13
Conclusion	18
Appendices	
A. Annotated Bibliography of Dane County Food System Literature	19
B. Dane County Consolidated Food Service	27
C. Grant Opportunities and Other Resources and Organizations	30
D. Case Studies of Projects with Potential for Dane County	34
E. Food Policy Councils and Related Organizations In North America	40

The Dane County Local Food Policy Advisory Subcommittee wishes to thank Jill Rubin, Elisabeth Howard, Majid Allan and Martin Bailkey for their assistance in preparing this report.

Introduction: Building a Better Local Food System

Food is an essential part of our lives and our communities. Nowhere is this more evident than in Dane County. Through our highly productive farms, numerous farmers' markets and restaurants, and unique events like Breakfast on the Farm and Corn Fest, food is central to our history, culture, landscape, economy, as well as our individual and collective health.

Dane County has a dynamic and growing local food system that encompasses the many complex social, political, economic and environmental relationships between food producers, processors distributors, and consumers. It also faces a future filled with both opportunities and challenges. In June 2004, the Environment, Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee (EANR) of the Dane County Board established the Local Food Policy Advisory Subcommittee (LFPAS) to explore, develop, and recommend strategies to strengthen and improve the local food system. LFPAS members included producers, anti-hunger advocates, nutritionists, business people, academics, planners, and individuals with a passion for building a better local food system.

The LFPAS met regularly over one year (June 2004-July 2005), and convened a Local Food Summit Conference in February 2005 that brought together key stakeholders and the broader community to generate information and ideas to improve the local food system. Out of these efforts, the subcommittee developed a range of recommendations that address areas of need and also capitalize upon the county's comparative advantages, including efficient and innovative producers and consumers dedicated to supporting local foods.

These recommendations are presented in this report. They do not represent a complete list, but rather a summary of the subcommittee's recommendations based on its year-long study. The recommendations range from county support for coordinated local food system planning, as well as current supporting efforts to create and expand food processing infrastructure and marketing, and entrepreneurial opportunities for local foods; strategies to promote health and nutrition using local produce; and farmland preservation initiatives.

The Local Food Summit Conference held at the Alliant Energy Center on February 11, 2005 generated much of the information used by the LFPAS in making the recommendations in this report. Nearly 100 people attended, representing a broad cross-section of Dane County. They were divided into break-out groups for in-depth discussions of three critical aspects of the local food system - food production, food processing and distribution, and food access and consumption. The participants were then asked to share thoughts and generate new ideas for Dane County's food system, looking at four specific issues: (1) assets, (2) barriers to progress, (3) solutions to those barriers, and (4) specific roles that county government can play in the development and implementation of these solutions. *Setting the Table*, the summary report of the Food Summit, is available on the Dane County website.

Recommendation Area One

Buy Fresh, Buy Local For Healthier People, Land, and Communities

Background

Food production has long been a core component of Dane County's economy and culture. Dane produces more value of agricultural product than any other Wisconsin county. And, of course, we eat. Although residents of Dane County spend about \$1 billion each year in restaurants and grocery stores, little of that money goes directly to Dane County farmers. There is, however, a growing interest among consumers in purchasing fresh food locally. Not only are consumers seeking out local product in places like the Dane County Farmers' Market, restaurants and institutional food services are also offering their customers foods grown close to home. Dane County farmers now sell some \$3.6 million in direct marketed and organic foods each year, but that accounts for only about 5% of the county's fresh fruit and vegetable consumption. There is an enormous potential for growth in this economic sector.

There are several good reasons to buy local food:

- Buying local benefits our neighbors who are farmers. When farmers sell directly to consumers and local food retailers, fewer intermediaries cut into their profits.
- Buying local is good for Dane County's economy and quality of life. Purchasing from local producers stimulates our regional economy and helps keep our farmers in business. A robust market for a wide variety of farm products promotes biological and economic diversity and helps farmers avoid dependence on a narrow range of commodities with volatile prices.
- Buying local is good for the natural environment. When farmers can stay in business, farmland is preserved and provides open space for all to enjoy. Buying local drastically reduces the average 1,500 miles food travels to reach U.S. consumers and so saves energy and reduces the carbon dioxide emissions which are the prime contributor to global warming.
- Buying local is good for one's health and enjoyment. The fresher food is, the tastier and more nutritious it is. Few foods are as satisfying for the palate or as good for the body as are foods harvested at their peak of ripeness.
- Buying local is good for one's mind. Purchasing directly from farmers provides an opportunity to better understand both the people who produce our food and the nature of the production process itself. Seeing food produced makes us aware of the local social patterns and the natural cycles in which we are embedded.

Recommendations

Most of Dane County's residents now enjoy the opportunity to shop at a grocery store in their neighborhood, and the income to afford good food of their choice. Increasingly, good food is coming to mean "locally produced" food. However, not all Dane County residents have access to nutritious and affordable food. Food security for all is vital to our community's health and quality of life. The county can take a number of immediate steps to enhance access to fresh, locally produced food for all county residents:

- *Initiate Institutional purchasing.* The county should initiate local purchasing in its own food service facilities and set a goal that 10% of purchases should be made locally within three years. The county now spends about \$1.3 million annually on food through Consolidated Food Service, almost all of it shipped from considerable distances. (See Appendix B for information on Consolidated Food Service).

In addition, the county should support specific projects such as the Courthouse Catering project, which proposes to source 75% of food locally for a cafeteria in the new County Courthouse.

- *Establish a countywide network of farmers' markets:* Farmers' markets are a key component of a local food system, and Dane County now hosts an enviable number of markets. Because they represent the single most important vehicle for connecting consumers with fresh, local foods, Dane County should further expand this mechanism. In order to identify and address needs or problems common to our farmers' markets, Dane County should direct Extension staff to establish a network of farmers' markets by convening a meeting of market managers. Such a network could address the creation of new markets and the viability of emerging markets (e.g., Madison's Southside Market). It could also explore means of making markets more accessible to lower income populations, such as those using Quest funds (food stamps). The County's most vulnerable residents should not be barred from access to the high quality fresh local nutritious foods offered at our area farmers' markets.
- *Support farm-to-school programs.* The Wisconsin Homegrown Lunch project of the REAP (Research, Education, Action and Policy on) Food Group and the UW's "College Food Program" have illuminated the potential of schools as sites for food and nutrition education and their potential as markets for local farmers. The County should identify school boards or school district food service managers interested in purchasing foods from local farmers and support the development of a county-wide initiative. Farm-to-school projects are especially effective inasmuch as they both create markets for local foods and provide equitable access to those foods for vulnerable populations.
- *Identify areas of need:* The County should direct Extension staff to identify populations and areas in which there is insufficient access to food as a result of income, lack of transportation, location of grocery stores, or other factors. For example, using demographic maps of Madison prepared by UW-Extension, the Northside Planning

Council was able to effectively display the lack of food access that Madison's Northside neighborhood is currently experiencing.

There are many interesting local foods projects occurring in other places around the country. Four examples have been included in Appendix D, simply to illustrate ideas that may work in Dane County as well.

Recommendation Area Two

Support Development of a Central Agricultural and Food Facility and Public Market

Background

There is considerable demand for fresh, locally produced food across Dane County, and there are many local producers looking to expand production and link to new market opportunities. Often, however, these producers lack the processing, storage, and transportation infrastructure that would allow them to efficiently bring local, fresh produce to market. A Central Agriculture and Food Facility (CAFF) would address this critical need.

The concept behind a Dane County CAFF goes back several years. It was envisioned to be a central, convenient and efficient location for a variety of purposes related to processing and marketing of locally produced foods. It would include, for example, a processing facility, storage, marketing and office spaces for organizations and individuals involved in local food processing and marketing. A CAFF would also provide a winter venue for a year-round farmers' market.

Home Grown Wisconsin Cooperative, a local fruit and vegetable marketing cooperative, initiated the CAFF project and submitted the initial grants to fund a feasibility study. An initial, general study of the CAFF concept, completed in July 2003 by Carla Wright and Charlene Drumm, generated information through interviews with a variety of people and organizations involved in production, processing and purchasing of local foods. This overview was followed by two related preliminary feasibility studies by Yellow Wood Associates, completed for the UW Center for Cooperatives and Home Grown Wisconsin. One study addressed the idea of a fresh vegetable processing facility, and the second addressed the idea of a public market. The original CAFF concept envisioned these facilities in one location, but recent discussions have them as separate entities. One reason for the separation is that the processing facility may need to be located away from downtown Madison due to higher real estate costs, while the market needs to be in a more central location to generate the customer base needed for sufficient sales. The public market also provides a city amenity, probably most suited to a central location. However, the information on both the market and the processing facility is preliminary at this time, so development of a unified business should not be ruled out.

The Yellow Wood Associates study concluded that the processing facility and the public market could each be profitable in about three years, under certain assumptions. Both a processing facility and a public market can significantly help create an infrastructure that supports and promotes growth in local food, horticulture and agricultural marketing and production. However, the advantages each provides, and the limits and value of each facility are rather different.

A processing facility will help to address the need expressed by institutional purchasers and others to have a reliable source of pre-processed local food. Without this function, it would appear that some important potential purchasers of local food will not be interested. The public market can provide another venue for sale of local foods. It will also provide opportunities for non-food sales, and other functions such as a restaurant featuring local foods. There is an issue, however, regarding the ability of farmers to pay the cost of leasing a space, estimated in the Yellow Wood preliminary study to annually cost \$10, 000 per space. Methods to make this amount affordable to farmers will need to be explored. If farmers can't afford to be vendors, the purposes of promoting sales of local foods will not be achieved.

Recommendations

Groundwork should continue on both the public market and the processing facility to answer important questions.

For the processing facility, the following work remains to be completed:

Complete the needs assessment. Specifically, who are the buyers and sellers who want to use or invest in the facility? This will require better initial data than now exists about the pool of producers and potential buyers.

Organize the stakeholder community. Relationships among the potential stakeholders need to be developed, and tools and resources identified to facilitate collective action. (e.g., a role for the multi-partner Dairy Business Innovation Center).

Business plan. Once a stakeholder group forms, a business plan needs to be completed for the facility. This plan will build on the data and analysis of the Yellow Wood Associates study, and will go further to identify purchasers, facility location, financing, ownership and management, the potential role of the City of Madison, etc.

For the public market, a business plan is being developed that builds on the preliminary feasibility study. This plan would include location, ownership and management, vendor mix and characteristics, cost and financial feasibility, relationship with farmers markets, physical attributes, the target market and other information. In addition, a committee has been formed to review this plan and move the project ahead.

Dane County can assist in the further study and potential formation of the processing facility by taking the lead in completing the needs assessment and organizing the stakeholder community.

The county should also collaborate with the City of Madison in identifying sources of financial assistance for land acquisition and development. The county could also purchase food from the processing facility.

For the processing facility and for the public market (as well as some other local food related issues), the individuals and businesses involved should create a network or trade association to promote working together, consideration of business opportunities, and advancement of member needs. This would be especially helpful for people and organizations involved in business enterprises. Hundreds of these organizations exist statewide and nationally, and they are considered important for the business success of their members.

In addition, there is potential for a farmer cooperative to be organized to provide the local food supply for the processing facility; or, in the case of the public market, to help to address the cost leasing space by sharing costs or finding sub-lessees.

Recommendation Area Three

Promote Farmland Preservation & Entrepreneurial Agriculture

Background

The local food system affects, and is affected by, land use in numerous ways. With some of the most fertile and productive farmland in the world, agriculture continues to be part of the shared history and culture of Dane County, and its predominant use of land. Whether through the farms that produce food, the network of agricultural support services, the stores and markets that distribute food, or the landfills that receive food waste, from production and distribution to consumption and disposal, the local food system dramatically impacts the Dane County landscape.

Dane County faces the difficult challenge of balancing the rapid growth of its prosperous cities, towns and villages, while maintaining the continued viability of farming as a primary component of its economy and landscape. It will take the ingenuity and innovation of county residents to ensure a continued high standard of living in these healthy, diverse communities. Fortunately, Dane County is blessed with an abundance of innovative people, and a vibrant food system offering numerous opportunities to address the thorny issues facing our collective future.

Recommendations

The LFPAS has identified a number of recommendations in the area of land use, including the following:

Comprehensive Plan. The county's state-mandated comprehensive planning effort has, to date, identified a number of goals and objectives that the LFPAS supports. These include long

term farmland preservation strategies, marketing tools to promote Dane County-grown products, promotion of direct-marketing alternatives for agricultural products, and establishment of a county agricultural enterprise center. The LFPAS offers its recommendations to the Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources (ANCR) workgroup for inclusion in the county comprehensive plan.

Small Acreage Farming Zones. With numerous farmers markets, pick-your-own operations, and retail outlets increasingly supportive of locally produced foods, opportunities exist to expand the number of small acreage farms producing for local sale and consumption. These types of farming operations are also more compatible with a range of other land uses, including residential development. Small acreage farming should be supported in local zoning codes and land use plans. Such farms provide not only nutritious food for local markets, but can also provide valuable open space and community separation buffers between urbanizing areas and areas where large-scale production agriculture predominates.

Small-Acreage Farming Zones should meet the following goals:

- Shield predominately residential areas from the noise, odors, dust, etc. associated with production agriculture;
- Shield predominately agricultural areas from the automobile traffic, nuisance complaints, domestic pets, irregular lot lines, etc associated with residential areas;
- Provide a direct market opportunity for people in residential neighborhoods/subdivisions to purchase food directly from the farm.
- Provide an educational component-people living in residential neighborhoods can see food being grown, can see it as a benefit to them;
- Provide for limited, compatible, rural development, perhaps in a manner similar to current town density policies (i.e., 1 unit per 35 acres);
- Provide areas for Conservation Reserve Program sites, and prairie, woodland, wetland or habitat restorations.

Support entrepreneurial agriculture. Entrepreneurial agriculture represents an emerging market-based opportunity for the working farmlands in Dane County to remain economically viable. Research in traditional agricultural institutions around the country provides successful examples of farmers taking an economic development approach to improve their bottom line. Often, this means diversifying, adding value or identifying new markets and products, as well as employing savvy marketing strategies to command premium prices for products. This entrepreneurial approach to agriculture can yield net returns often twice that of conventional farms. In addition, entrepreneurial practices are less land-intensive, opening the possibility of maintaining existing farmland, or establishing new farms near urban areas and their lucrative markets. The growth of Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) enterprises in Dane County provides an example of how entrepreneurial agriculture is taking root and providing an alternative to maintain the viability of agriculture. Dane County should do more to encourage the type of innovation already taking place, including continuation of the Agricultural Enterprise Grant program.

Dane County has a number of advantages in making entrepreneurial agriculture a component of its economic development and land use strategy. These include:

- The largest producer-owned farmers' market in the US.
- A consuming public highly committed to local food purchasing.
- Large tracts of working lands in the county that are still economically viable.
- Marketing efforts, such as the REAP Food Group's *Farm Fresh Atlas* that aid the consuming public in identifying local producers.
- Anecdotal information on existing farms in Dane County that confirms the observations cited above on the economic viability of entrepreneurial farms.

Additional research designed to specifically measure the actual profitability and economic impact of entrepreneurial agriculture in Dane County would help target work in this area in the future.

Support Local Farmland Preservation Initiatives. While entrepreneurial agriculture represents an opportunity for Dane County, support for other efforts to preserve farmland remains critical. Efforts currently underway by other groups at the County and Town levels to help recognize economic gain from a sale of their development rights, whether through conservation easements or TDR programs, are also an important component of a strategy for preserving the rural landscapes and working lands of Dane County.

Dane County towns are recognized leaders in farmland preservation initiatives and the county should support these efforts. Most towns in Dane County have Exclusive Agriculture zoning in place, and utilize a 1 per 35 acre policy to limit nonfarm residential development. The Town of Dunn's Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) program has preserved hundreds of acres of productive farmland, and the Town of Cottage Grove was the first community in Wisconsin to experiment with a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Program. Many towns have land use provisions designed to limit conversion of farmland, from limitations on lot sizes and length of driveways to phasing requirements for permitted development. Other towns have established agreements with neighboring communities to jointly plan for long-term farmland preservation.

Dane County should expand its efforts to provide technical assistance to towns interested in implementing innovative farmland preservation strategies. This could include planning assistance, information sharing, and providing guidelines and frameworks for policy development.

Recommendation Area Four

Promote the Use of Local Foods to Improve Health and Nutrition

Background

Being overweight and obese is the result of consuming more calories than are used for basic metabolic functions and additional physical activity. Many environmental conditions contribute toward excessive consumption of calories. These include: supersizing of portions in most restaurants, the ready availability of many types of high fat and high sugar foods (including foods in schools); high expenditures for advertising snack foods and beverages particularly targeted to children; lack of availability of affordable more healthful foods in near-by grocery stores, oversupply of fast food restaurants and undersupply of supermarkets in lower income areas; and households without access to the skills and/or equipment needed to prepare meals containing nutritious fruits and vegetables, low fat meat and dairy products and whole grain breads and cereals. Other factors contribute toward low physical activity, including excessive TV watching, neighborhoods where it is unsafe to exercise outdoors, and less physical education in schools.

Overweight and obesity pose a major economic burden for the county and state. A January 2004 report estimated Wisconsin's annual medical expenditures attributable to obesity at just under 1.5 billion dollars. Obesity also raises the risk of cancer, type 2 diabetes and heart disease.

According to the Centers for Disease Control, the incidence of overweight and obese adults in the U.S. has rapidly increased in recent decades, from 48% in 1980 to 62% in 2000. The same pattern held true for children; 13% of children from 2-12 years old were overweight and 13% were obese in 2000, according to the National Health Examination Survey. The prevalence of obesity is significantly higher among adults with the least education and income. In poor minority areas, the figures are more alarming - 60% of the children in some low-income Chicago neighborhoods are either overweight or obese.

The percentage of adults 18-and-over in Dane County who were obese or overweight in 2000 (based on the body mass index) was 51%, slightly lower than the percentage in the state of Wisconsin (58%). Low-income children in Madison and Dane County who participate in the WIC program have similar alarmingly high rates of overweight, as do children in Wisconsin and other states.

Several of the work groups at the February 2005 Local Food Policy Summit identified nutrition and health as important goals of a county food policy. Work groups mentioned as county assets the large number of community supported agriculture farms and thriving farmers' markets that supply patrons with local fruits and vegetables. Particularly important for low-income consumers is the network of community gardens whose participants produce healthy food tailored to ethnic preferences, and that, through use of food preservation, provide highly nutritional diets over extended periods of the year. The Home Grown Lunch initiative in the

Madison Metropolitan School District has the goal of improving nutritional choices for school children. All of these activities and programs contribute to the availability of foods that are dense in nutrients and low in calories.

Some barriers to increased nutritional health for all county citizens were also noted at the Summit. These included the inadequate nutrition information for consumers to make good decisions about food; the overabundance of calorie-dense foods; a wide choice of healthy low calorie foods that is not uniformly distributed across the county; a shortage of grocery stores providing a good supply of fruits and vegetables in some parts of Madison (particularly in low income areas), and in certain rural areas of Dane County.

Solutions mentioned included establishing closer working relations among city and county health departments and other county agencies to work on common goals of nutritional health; strengthening existing nutrition education efforts, in particular educating the public about using local foods of high nutritional value; starting a direct “market basket” program, modeled after Milwaukee's successful Growing Power program that provides local fruits and vegetables at low cost to low income people; supporting the development of more farmers’ markets throughout the county; and dedicating some county land for community gardens.

Recommendations

A number of Dane County agencies and non-governmental groups are currently working together to address nutrition problems. The recommendations of the LFPAS can contribute toward the goal of reducing obesity; but it will take a coordinated effort of many groups to reach this goal. Notable among the groups currently working on improving nutritional health are the Dane County WIC program, the Madison WIC program, the Dane County Hunger Prevention Council, the Family Nutrition Program administered by Dane County UW-Extension, and the REAP Program. Some specialized programs have been developed to combat the obesity problem. Notable among these is the DaneCan program initiated in the summer of 2004. The DaneCan program works with the Wisconsin Restaurant Association and area restaurants to develop and promote healthy dining choices on their menus. DaneCan has also implemented a County Youth Assessment of 7-12th graders studying body mass index, daily servings of fruits and vegetables, daily servings of soda/sport drinks and weight loss methods. Another important project is the development of a Madison School District Food Policy to address school lunch choices, competitive foods, food safety and allergens.

Specific LFPAS recommendations for combating obesity and overweight in Dane County emphasize increasing an individual's consumption of fruits and vegetables. In addition, a diet rich in fruits and vegetables has been shown to reduce risk for stroke, type 2 diabetes, certain cancers, coronary heart disease, and the development of kidney stones.

LFPAS recommendations include:

- Improve access to locally-produced healthy foods and more generally fruits and vegetables; e.g. extend the city of Madison's current initiative for the equitable distribution of grocery stores into the county.

- Collaborate with anti-hunger advocates and other community groups to establish a “Market Basket” program to distribute fresh local products in Dane County.
- Support and enhance the Dane County Extension Nutrition Education Program with additional emphasis on using locally-produced foods.
- Investigate the possibility of devoting county-owned land for more community gardens.
- Encourage direct marketing, CSA farms, farm stands and U-Pick operations that bring nutritious foods to more people.
- Network with existing Dane County Health and Nutrition projects (e.g. DaneCan, WIC, local school district health projects and others). This would include supporting options for increasing physical activity through bike paths, after school programs for youth, and adult recreation opportunities.

Recommendation Area Five

Establish a Dane County Food Council

Background

This report has shown how food issues significantly affect the public health, land use, economy, and quality of life of Dane County citizens. Although several county agencies are involved in particular aspects of food—e.g., the Division of Public Health, the Department of Planning and Development, the Land and Water Resources Department, Dane County Extension, the Department of Public Works, and the Department of Administration—no single unit looks at the myriad ways the food system impacts the county, from the production of food through the consumer food chain to the eventual disposal of food waste. At the local Food Summit in February 2005, participants expressed strong interest in creating a Dane County food policy council or food advisory council to examine local food issues and provide ideas and strategies for dealing with them. Since the first food council was established in Knoxville, Tennessee, interest has steadily risen, particularly in the past decade, to create such advisory councils. There are now nearly thirty food policy councils in North America, as shown in Appendix E. These operate at all levels of government, and are comprised of diverse stakeholders from various segments of the local food system. The time is ripe for Dane County to establish such a food council to address county food issues in a more focused, coordinated, and comprehensive way.

There are several reasons why a Dane County Food Council makes sense at this time:

- Dane County already has a tremendous foundation of organizational capital and infrastructure in support of greater reliance on local and regional food. A county food council would capitalize on these assets and coordinate efforts to build an even stronger local food system. Among these assets are farmers markets, community supported agriculture farms, food

coops, community gardens, and Dane County's recognition as the state's agricultural powerhouse. Groups such as REAP, the Friends of Troy Gardens, the Community Action Coalition, the Madison Area Community Supported Agriculture Coalition, the Hunger Prevention Council, the UW-Madison Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems, and the Friends of the Dane County Farmers' Market add to the organizational mix that exists in pursuit of a stronger local food system.

- Working cooperatively with county extension agents and university faculty and students, a county food council could play a valuable role in helping to inform and educate county residents about important food issues that affect the quality of their lives. Through public forums and periodic reports, such issues as reducing the growing obesity problem, composting more food waste, reducing water pollution from food production sources, and increasing urban dwellers' understanding of farmers' lives, as well as ways to add value to farmers' products, could be directly addressed through a food council.
- With the assistance of a food council, county board and staff members could gain a better understanding of how county government policies, programs and operations affect the full range of Dane County food system activities—from food production through food waste disposal.
- To assist county government in dealing with local food issues, a county food council could help identify timely and relevant information to be collected in developing appropriate food policies and programs at the county level.
- A county food council, working in concert with groups like the Hunger Prevention Council, Second Harvest, SHARE, and the Community Action Council, could give greater voice to the food concerns of elderly rural and urban residents, children, disadvantaged groups, and those most affected by food insecurity.
- A more sustainable food system that fosters organic agriculture, equitable food production, distribution, and consumption, healthy nutrition, and environmental health could be supported through efforts of a county food council.

Finally, establishing a Dane County Food Council would place Dane County among the leaders of a growing movement to provide a central place to coordinate and improve efforts to address local and regional food issues. At the core, a county food council can help put the need for local and healthy foods more clearly on the radar screens of government officials and citizens so that all households in the county have healthy food on their tables every day.

A Look at the Accomplishments of Other Food Councils. Given the steady rise of interest in food councils at all levels of government -city, county, and state - what have these organizations accomplished?

At the general level, food councils perform several important functions. They facilitate research on a variety of locally-generated food issues. They set up forums for people to learn more about food issues and ways of strengthening local food systems. They foster better communication

among the varied actors in the local food arena. And they provide timely advice to governments as a basis for making recommendations to deal with important food issues.

Following is a list of some specific accomplishments of food advisory councils. These activities and projects illustrate the breadth and diverse array of contributions these organizations are making. They have been grouped into five outcome categories: planning and infrastructure support; school and institutional food purchasing; food-based education, outreach and advocacy; community and economic development around food; and support for community gardens.

1) Planning and Infrastructure Support. Food councils in the United States and Canada have:

- Facilitated the creation of a coordinated food processing and distribution facility to better serve low-income residents (Vancouver, BC).
- Conducted a community food system assessment to evaluate the state of the local food system (Knoxville-Knox County, TN, Vancouver, BC).
- Advised the local planning agency on incorporating food policies into their plans (Knoxville-Knox County, TN, Toronto, ON, Berkeley, CA).
- Worked with local transportation agencies to create new bus lines bringing transit-dependent, low-income residents directly to affordable food stores (Austin-Travis County, TX, Knoxville-Knox County, TN, Hartford, CT).
- Assisted in planning for a county-wide network of permanent sites for farmers' markets (Portland-Multnomah County, OR, Vancouver, BC).

2) School and Institutional Food Purchasing. Food councils have:

- Worked with school districts to improve the quality of school lunches and develop kitchens where fresh food could be more easily prepared (Berkeley, CA, Hartford, CT).
- Convened a healthy schools summit focused on creating a healthy school nutrition environment in local school districts (Portland-Multnomah County, OR).
- Encouraged large institutional food purchasers - schools, hospitals and colleges - to switch from sole source food wholesaling to multiple wholesalers, allowing smaller local wholesalers to win more bids (Connecticut State).
- Incorporated sustainability criteria into food purchasing contracts issued by local governments to help build connections with local and regional food suppliers (Portland-Multnomah County, OR).
- Helped launch an institutional purchasing program of regionally produced foods (Portland-Multnomah County, OR).
- Significantly increased school food programs in partnership with the Student Nutrition Coalition (Toronto, ON).

3) Food-based Education, Outreach and Advocacy. Food councils have:

- Sponsored and conducted educational tours to increase awareness of the different parts of the local food system—food production, food processing, food wholesaling, food retailing, and emergency food programs (Onondago County, NY).
- Initiated “Buy Local” campaigns to increase local food production and consumption (Toronto, ON, Knoxville-Knox County, TN).

- Gave awards to groups successfully improving various aspects of local food systems - food security, marketing home-grown and labeled foods, nutrition education, and restaurants and food stores that actively support low-calorie food choices (Hartford, CN, St. Paul, MN, Knoxville-Knox County, TN).
- Prepared a road map with locations and brief descriptions of all farm stands, farmers' markets, and other venues for locally-grown food in the state (Connecticut State).

4) Community and Economic Development Around Food: Food councils have:

- Assisted a non-profit citizen group doing a study of the role of the food industry in the county's economy (Onondago County, NY).
- Helped coordinate a Youth Food Employment and Entrepreneurial program in collaboration with a local bank, the Private Industry Council, and the 4-H (Tahoma, WA).
- Researched commercial kitchen incubators in cooperation with the government's economic development division and a non-profit food organization, leading to the establishment of such a kitchen (Toronto, ON).

5) Support for New and Existing Community Gardens. Food councils have:

- Helped increase the number of community gardens in the community (Austin-Travis County, TX, Toronto, ON, Tacoma, WA, Vancouver, BC).
- Formed a rooftop garden resource group to promote the use of rooftop gardens (Toronto, ON).

Issues and Recommendations

The LFPAS considered several issues were considered in discussing the framework for a Dane County Food Council: authorizing the council, its connection to county government, representation on the council, staffing and funding for the council, its geographic scope, and its program priorities.

How should a food council be authorized—by county board resolution or by county executive order? As an advisory body, the food council would furnish information and advice to both the legislative and executive branches of county government. The LFPAS recommends creation by county board resolution that requires approval of both the County Board and County Executive.

What should the food council's connection be to county government? A few food councils have been established within a particular unit of government. The Toronto Food Council, for example, operates as a subcommittee of the city's Board of Health. Portland-Multnomah County's Food Council is structured as a subcommittee of the city-county Sustainable Development Commission. Most food councils, however, operate quasi-independently as organizations with advisory, reporting, and at times staff support links to the governments they serve. To maintain access to the various branches of county government, the latter arrangement is preferable for the Dane County Food Council.

Who should be represented on the council? Membership on a food council is determined mostly by the government body or bodies that created the council—either the government’s legislature or its chief executive. The goal is for the council to have broad representation of issues and interests across the food system. Including a couple of representatives from government, council representatives should be drawn from the various food sectors: production (e.g., farmers, community gardeners); processing; distribution (e.g., wholesalers, farmers markets, food coops/retailers); access (e.g., anti-hunger groups, emergency food providers, representatives from ethnic and minority group consumers); consumption (e.g., nutritionists, schools, restaurants, consumers); waste management (e.g., composting, recycling, food rescue), and system-wide (e.g., food policy organizations, academics, food system analysts). Two food councils, Portland-Multnomah County and Vancouver BC, go a step further than others by asking people who want to serve on the council to submit an application highlighting their qualifications and experience for service. The LFPAS would endorse this approach.

Where should the council get funds and staff? One of the key challenges facing food councils is to acquire and maintain adequate funding and staff support. Mindful of the fiscal constraints that exist, the LFPAS recommends a multi-pronged approach in launching a Dane County Food Advisory Council. Taking into account the many hours of unpaid volunteer time that council members would undoubtedly be spending, a combination of staff support services should still be available to advance the council’s work program. This would include services of a part-time staff person, in-kind service contributions from a county agency staff member with some knowledge and interest in food issues, and employment of university and college interns. In addition, grants from foundations, the state and federal government, and the university should be actively sought by the council to carry out its work. (See Appendix C for possible grant opportunities, as well as other resources and organizations that may be helpful.

What should be the geographic scope of the council? Dane County would initially serve as the primary location for the food council’s efforts. Two other alternative structures, however, were discussed. Recognizing that food issues spill over geographic boundaries, the Dane County Food Council might consider investigating the merits of extending the boundaries of the council to include other counties in the region—i.e., a multi-county food advisory council. Another alternative discussed was a Madison-Dane County food council. This possibility has merit for several reasons: a number of food councils have been established as joint city-county organizations, many organizational and infrastructure assets in the local food system are located in Madison, and the Madison Mayor’s 2004 Healthy City Initiative report contained a recommendation for a Madison food policy council. Although the food council should be situated at the Dane County level, it is important that lines of communication on food system issues be open with Madison. Appointing an ex-officio representative of Madison’s city government to the county food advisory council would be one way of doing this.

What should be the council’s program priorities? The County Food Council’s continuing responsibilities would be to serve in an advisory capacity to County government to address food system issues, particularly aimed at strengthening the capacity of the local and regional food system. Among its ongoing responsibilities would be: assist in education, gather relevant data and information, help build networks and play a coordinating role among groups in the local food system, and develop policies to address food system issues. An early priority should be to

review and promote implementation of the recommendations in this LFPAS report - the CAFF project, a public market, a County food purchasing policy, ways of reducing the loss of farmland in the county, strategies to lessen the increasing obesity problem, and better serving the needs of lower-income and minority people for affordable, nutritious, healthy and culturally appropriate foods.

Conclusion

Through this report, the LFPAS has attempted to show that how and where food is grown, processed, packaged, transported and prepared makes a difference! Just as we in Dane County are shaped by what we eat, the land and our communities are also shaped by what we grow and what we eat. The food choices we make every day influence farmland preservation, water quality, the availability of jobs, and the health of our citizens.

The members of the LFPAS thank the Environment, Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee of the Dane County Board for forming the subcommittee, and appreciate the opportunity to offer our recommendations for a stronger food system across Dane County.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Annotated Bibliography of Dane County Local Food System Literature

(*Reference is annotated in Raja, 1999)

Adams, Anthony, Mary Ebeling, Genya Erling, Halley MacNaughton, John Mataya, Olivia Parry, Jamie Radel, Jill Rubin, Michelle Stahlhut, Laura Stauffer, Heather Stouder, Megan Thomas, and Corey Zetts. 2005. "Is the Time Ripe? Ideas for Strengthening Madison's Food System." Madison, WI: Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Wisconsin. February.

Report by Professor Marcia Caton Campbell's fall 2003 Planning for Community Food Systems class. The report identifies an array of public interest and organization involvement in Madison's food system but little collaboration, and recommends steps the city could take to investigate, create, expand and strengthen its food system.

Bruce, David M. 2003. "The State of the Foodshed: Agriculture, the Environment, and Sustainability in Dane County." Master's thesis. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.

Uses the concept of indicators, as applied to the environment of Dane County, to judge trends in the county's agricultural industry, concluding that these trends are unsustainable. Advises a change in emphasis towards "diversified, value-added and conservation farming." Expands beyond Falk's (2000) recommendations (county financial support of alternative markets, a buy local campaign, and a "Small Acreage Farming Area" zoning policy), adding a tax on synthetic fertilizers and pesticides, funds from which would go to help organic conversions, new agricultural start-ups, a buy local campaign, etc., a tax on runoff from farms and construction sites, less of a UW emphasis on biotech and more on technical assistance in the area of sustainable agriculture, and the production and regular update of a concise "State of the Foodshed" report for Dane County.

*Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems. 1997 – 2000. *The Wisconsin Foodshed*. Semi-annual newsletter on networking and information on Wisconsin's food systems. Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin – Madison. Vol. 1-4. Available: http://www.cias.wisc.edu/archives/2000/01/01/the_wisconsin_foodshed/index.php

Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems. 1995. "Regional Food Systems Research: Needs, Priorities, and Recommendations." Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin – Madison.

Based on a nine-month seminar organized and facilitated by CIAS to offer the opportunity to investigate food system issues and to foster connections between the many UW faculty and area professionals and practitioners with an interest in local food system issues. The process of monthly and intermediate meetings resulted in five major findings: concepts of regional food systems should be used to address problems of the current food system; the main assumptions and arguments involved in regional food systems require more refinement, documentation and evaluation; the defined size and boundaries of regional food systems

should remain flexible; hunger is a fundamentally a food security issue and should be studied as such; and finally, there are significant gaps in information on regional food systems which should be systematically addressed.

Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems. Research Briefs. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin. Available: <http://www.cias.wisc.edu>

#39: 1999. "New markets for producers: selling to colleges." February.

#40: 1999. "Managing a CSA farm 1: production, labor, and land." March.

#41: 1999. "Managing a CSA farm 2: community, economics, marketing and training." March.

#54: 2001. "Community kitchens: key elements of success." January.

Dane County Agricultural Advisory Council. 2000. "First Annual Report of the Dane County Agricultural Advisory Council." Dane County, Wisconsin. March 7.

Describes state of Dane County agriculture and its challenges based on research done by the Agricultural Advisory Council, particularly the pressures facing farmland preservation. Describes policy tools with potential to relieve this pressure, including zoning changes, purchase/transfer of development rights, farmland mitigation and economic development.

Dane County Local Food Policy Advisory Subcommittee. 2005. "Setting the Table: A Report on Dane County's Local Food Summit Conference Held February 11th, 2005." Madison, WI. May 2. Available:

http://www.co.dane.wi.us/committees/foodpolicy/pdf/2005/20050502_setting_the_table.pdf

Describes outcomes of the Local Food Summit participant discussions on Dane County's resources, opportunities and barriers to strengthening its local food system.

*Department of Urban and Regional Planning. 1997. "Fertile Ground: Planning for the Madison/Dane County Food System." Madison, WI: Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Wisconsin – Madison. 128 pp.

Design Dane. 1998. "Promoting Healthy, Working Rural Communities." In *Design Dane: Creating a Diverse Environment through Sensible, Intelligent Growth Now*. Report published by County Executive Officer, Dane County, Wisconsin. 60 pp.

Makes recommendations for county and state policy in several areas towards the goal of strengthening the economy and environment of rural and urban parts of Dane County. Areas include: "Promoting healthy, working rural communities; Building strong cities and villages; Conserving our land and water resources; Linking jobs, housing, transportation; Planning and governing together; Improving the way we do business."

Farm Fresh Atlas Steering Committee. 2005. "Farm Fresh Atlas 2005." REAP Food Group, Dane County Farmers' Market, Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems, and Friends of the Dane County Farmers' Market: Madison, WI. <http://www.reapfoodgroup.org/atlas/>

List of farm-to-consumer direct marketing outlets in southern Wisconsin.

Foltz, Jeremy, Carol Roth, and Christa Lachenmayr. 2005. "How Important is Value-Added Agriculture in Wisconsin?" Fact Sheet No. 22, Program on Agricultural Technology Studies. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin. January.

Based on data from survey of 1,500 value-added farmers around Wisconsin, this report gives an overall picture of these types of farming operations and their economic and land-use impact in the state. It shows them to be a "growing and diversified" segment of Wisconsin's agriculture, which, though typified by relatively small acreage and incomes, represents a beneficial and vital sector worthy of further investigation and analysis.

*Hendrickson, John. 1997. "Living in the Watershed, Eating in the Foodshed." *The Yahara Watershed Journal*, Vol.2, pp. 28-31.

*Hendrickson, John. 1996. "Providing Practice in the Arte of Commensality, Community and the Moral Economy: A Case Study of Zephyr Community Farm." Master's thesis. Madison, WI: Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Wisconsin – Madison. 97 pp.

*Hendrickson, John, Linda Hart, Michele Gale-Sinex, and Steve Stevenson. 1995. "Regional Food System Research: Needs, Priorities, and Recommendations: A Summary Report from the 1994-1995 Regional Food Systems Seminar." Madison, WI: Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, University of Wisconsin – Madison. 27 pp.

*Horvath, Linda. 1999. "Understanding the Madison/Dane County Food System: A Compendium of Data Sources." Madison Food System Project Working Paper Series MFSP-02. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin – Madison.

Howard, Elisabeth L. 2004. "Local Produce Marketing in Wisconsin: A Multiple-Case-Study Analysis." Master's thesis. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.

In depth interviews with 19 produce farmers in 6 south-central Wisconsin counties who sell locally provide a microscopic qualitative and quantitative view local produce marketing decisions. Farmers cite both personal preference and economic reasons for choosing each market outlet. Study uses price, quantity and marketing data for five products over five years to investigate the marketing portfolios used by these farmers, and estimates optimal market outlet portfolios using quadratic programming. Results support the idea that multiple market outlets are necessary to support a robust local food system.

Hunger Policy Council of Dane County, Inc. --. "Challenge to Community Response to Food Insecurity." HPC Position Paper.

Using data from Hunger Prevention Council surveys between 1997 and 2001 shows the growing trend of people using food pantries for long term instead of emergency use. The report explains the nutritional inadequacy of this practice, and its potential effects on health and education, and argues that the underlying cause has to do with barriers to or insufficiency of other government and community services that would ease food insecurity and help people out of poverty. It urges further support of such community assistance programs and increased person-to-person outreach efforts to enroll eligible individuals and families in assistance programs.

Hunger Policy Council of Dane County, Inc. 2003. "Report on the Survey of Users of Dane County's Food Pantries During October 2003." --.

Reports the results of an October 2003 survey, showing that, while the family make-up of respondents and their economic well being had not changed since 2001, visits to food pantries had increased by 23 percent. The survey also showed that a significant percentage of children experienced hunger, that only about a third of the eligible food stamp recipients actually received them, and that 21 percent of respondents depended on food pantries and free meal sites for most of their food.

Kovach, Vesna Vuynovich. 2001. "Homegrown Food for Thought." *Corporate Report Wisconsin* May: 42-47.

Illustrates the important relationships between Dane County businesses and local agriculture to show that businesses should have a direct and strong interest in supporting county land-use planning to preserve farmland.

Lappe, Frances Moore and Anna Lappe. 2002. "Taking Off the Cowboy Hat: Wisconsin, U.S. – Madison and Dane County." Chapter 10 in *Hope's Edge: The Next Diet for a Small Planet*. Tarcher/Putnam: New York.

Illustrates the "coral reef" of local food system initiatives in Dane County, WI, including the Food For Thought Festival, Dane County Farmers' Market, Vermont Valley Community Farm, Highland Hearth Farm, John Kinsman (founder of Family Farm Defenders), Cedar Grove cheese factory and its Living Machine®, L'Etoile Restaurant, Tami Lax (chef and leader of Midwest Slow Food Movement), Willy Street Cooperative, Organic Valley, the Midwest Food Alliance, Home Grown Wisconsin, Troy Gardens, and CSA Partner Shares.

Lawless, Greg, G.W. Stevenson, John Hendrickson, and Robert Cropp. 1999. "The Farmer-Food Buyer Dialogue Project." UW Center for Cooperatives Occasional Paper No. 13. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin. November.

Reports on an investigation of marketing opportunities for sustainably and locally produced foods, conducted through interviews, surveys and meetings with local farmers and food buyers. The report illustrates the various marketing options for locally produced food, identifies obstacles and opportunities as well as feasible actions to facilitate these marketing options. One outgrowth of this project was the development of Home Grown Wisconsin, a cooperative of organic farmers selling to high-end restaurants in the Midwest. Recommended actions are farmer, food-buyer and consumer education, further research on local food markets, and more general cooperation among organizations and stakeholders with an interest in local food markets for the purpose of pursuing joint research or funding opportunities.

Lemire, Steven. 2003. "2003 Dane County Farmers' Market Survey Report." --.

Survey of 500 customers of the Dane County Farmers' Market during the spring, summer and fall of 2003. The survey estimated an average attendance of 17,153 attendees per Saturday market. An average customer based on this survey is one who travels 16 miles to attend the market at least in part out of a desire to support WI agriculture, and who spends about an hour at the market doing one tour of the square, spending about \$16 at about five different vendors mainly on produce, and about \$22 at other downtown stores.

*Ness, Erik. 1996. "Co-opted." *The Isthmus, The Weekly Newspaper of Madison* 21 (15): 4.

*Oberholtzer, Lydia. 1997. "A Chicken in Every Pot: Tracing Our Food. How Much Do We Know About the Food We Eat?" *The Yahara Watershed Journal* Vol. 2.

Oncken, John. 2004. "David and Barb Perkins are prime examples of successful entrepreneurs." *Wisconsin State Farmer* November 12.

Highlights the history, motivation and business strategies of Vermont Valley Community Farm in Blue Mounds.

Parry, Olivia O. 2003. "Institutional Food Procurement: Current Trends and Obstacles for Locally Grown and Organic Products." Unpublished PowerPoint presentation. University of Wisconsin – Madison.

Presentation by Olivia Parry, UW URPL graduate student, on results of interviews with procurement directors from seven institutional food service operations (including Dane County, UW and private college operations) in Wisconsin to determine opportunities and barriers to incorporating local food into their facilities. Obstacles include lack of mechanism for customer feedback, contract limitations, lack of marketing mechanism and of forum for discussion of alternative transaction model, and fear, defensiveness or lack of awareness of issues on the part of directors. Suggests addressing these through creating customer feedback mechanisms, adapting bidding regulations and contracts, facilitating forum for discussion between producers and procurement staff, and encouraging customers to request local and organic food from institutions.

Powell, Maria and Greg Lawless. 2002. "The Dane County Farms and Neighborhoods Initiative: Saving the Country, Saving the City." Prepared for the North Central Initiative for Small Farm Profitability by the University of Wisconsin Center for Cooperatives.

Evaluated the progress made and challenges faced by Dane County Executive, Kathleen Falk's 2000 "Dane County Farms and Neighborhoods Initiative." The Initiative had successfully provided agricultural enterprise grants and Community Block Grants to support innovative and new agricultural business ventures, start-up funding for a new South Madison Farmers' Market, and had facilitated a feasibility study for a soybean processing plant in the county. A strong split between liberal and conservative County board members over the

*Raja, Samina. 1999. "The Dane County Food System: An Annotated Bibliography." Madison Food System Project Working Paper Series MFSP-WPS-03. Madison, Wisconsin: University of land-use rights of farmers had hampered further progress on the Initiative's goals. Wisconsin – Madison.

Stevens, Mark R. and Samina Raja. 2001. "What's Eating You About What You Eat? A Survey of Madison Residents' Likes and Concerns." Madison Food System Project Working Paper Series MFSP-WPS-05, for the Madison Food System Project, a Pilot Project of the Wisconsin Food System Partnership.

Survey of Madison residents investigating positive and negative aspects of food options in Madison. Found that, while most food comes from food stores, restaurants and farmers' markets, demographic factors determine the use of certain food sources. In fact, the poorest,

oldest, and least educated residents tend to be more likely to have unmet food needs. The study also showed that residents appreciate locally produced food. Report concludes that better intergovernmental and government-organization cooperation would help address residents' concerns, as would increased education about local food systems, improved food access, and promotion of local food production and consumption.

* Stone, Robert E. 1997. "Mapping the Social Structure of Food Retailing." Paper presented at the Agriculture, Food and Human Values Society Annual Meeting, University of Wisconsin – Madison, June 8-9. 15 pp.

Stouder, Heather. 2003. "Foodshed Planning in Dane County: Developing the infrastructure to feed a region within a global food system." Unpublished report. University of Wisconsin – Madison.

Takes stock of the current physical, economic and institutional environment in which food is produced, processed, distributed and sold in Dane County, including statistics on agriculture and food industries and buyers. The report identifies gaps in the flows of food whose remediation could strengthen the county's food system, and gives information on initiatives intended accomplish this goal, focusing in depth on the Wisconsin Homegrown Lunch Project. It concludes with recommendations for city and county policy that could facilitate these efforts.

Stouder, Heather. 2004a. "Farms, Schools, and Fresh Vegetables: Relinking Food Production and Consumption in South Central Wisconsin." Master's thesis. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.

Documents the research involved with the Wisconsin Homegrown Lunch Project in the Madison Metropolitan School District. Identifies the barriers to the school district purchasing locally produced vegetables as primarily a lack of time and funding for staff to do necessary food preparation, as well as seasonality, price and transaction costs. Describes the agricultural landscape of the Capitol region, where vegetable production is a small and declining sector and where no fresh cut processing facility exists. Estimates that, of 20 locally grown vegetables studied, five are produced in surplus of area consumption, and 15 are not produced enough to meet area demand, but could be if sufficient farms diversified into those vegetables. Presents five possible linkages to facilitate transactions between farms and school cafeterias, all of which require a "rebuilding or reorientation" of processing and distribution infrastructure in the region, a topic of ongoing study within this research project.

Stouder, Heather. 2004b. "Grocery Stores in City Neighborhoods: Supporting access to food choices, livable neighborhoods, and entrepreneurial opportunities in Madison, Wisconsin." Office of the Mayor, David J. Cieslewicz: Madison, WI. May.

Report by the Madison Neighborhood Grocery Store Advisory Group, convened by the Mayor in 2003, gives recommendations on how the city can "preserve and encourage grocery stores as important components of healthy neighborhoods across the city." Details trends in consumption, food retail industry and distribution, as well as other cities' attempts to attract grocery stores. Illustrates the current Madison context for grocery stores, including the diversity in size and type, the city's history of intervention in food retail

development projects, and recently closed grocery stores. Recommends pursuing the goals of promoting diversity of and access to retail outlets, encourage the development of small and medium grocery outlets in new and redeveloping areas, promoting entrepreneurial and employment opportunities in the pursuit of these goals and locally-owned grocery stores when feasible.

Stouder, Heather, Jack R. Kloppenburg, Jr. and Sara Tedeschi. 2003. "The Potential of Public Schools a Markets for Local Fresh Fruits and Vegetables: Assessing the barriers and opportunities for farm to school connections in Madison, WI." Prepared for the North Central Initiative for Small Farm Profitability. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.

Reports on the first year of the Wisconsin Homegrown Lunch project. Describes the current food procurement, distribution and delivery system in the Madison Metropolitan School District, and identifies seasonality, price, transaction costs, preparation labor, length of lunch period and child preferences as barriers to more integrated farm-to-school program. In its pilot project, WHL used educational components and menu development to introduce local foods into school meals. The report suggests focusing on small school districts, incorporating experiential education, and offers ways to address the unavoidable need for fresh-cut processing.

University of Wisconsin – Extension. 2004. "Dane County Agriculture: Value and economic impact." Brochure, Dane County – UW Extension.

Brochure that provides economic data from 2000 on the impact of Dane County agriculture on the county's economy in terms of economic activity, employment and taxes, and breaks down farming operations by ownership the top product sales, highlighting the dairy and horticultural industries.

Wright, Carla and Charlene Drumm. 2003. "Central Agriculture and Food Facility, Madison, Wisconsin." Prepared for Home Grown Wisconsin: Madison, WI.

Based on proposed Central Agricultural and Food Facility which would include an indoor retail operation, incubator commercial kitchen, cooler/freezer/storage/loading dock space and office space, this report evaluates the need for such a facility using a survey of and focus groups with producers as well as personal interviews with potential buyers (restaurants, grocery, distributors, food broker). Reveals some interest from buyers but little from producers in a processing component, and most interest from both buyers and producers in a distribution function.

Yellow Wood Associates, Inc. and David Boyd MSA Associates. 2004. "Preliminary Feasibility Study of a Fresh-Cut Produce Processing Facility for Madison, Wisconsin." Prepared for University of Wisconsin Center for Cooperatives and Home Grown Wisconsin. July 14.

Presents initial investigation of the potential for a processing facility in Madison for fresh produce. Evaluates current trends in fresh-cut produce processing, both supply and demand, in Wisconsin, particularly institutional markets (schools, colleges, health care, nursing homes and retirement facilities, and corporate cafeterias). Assesses equipment, facility, and labor needs, regulatory requirements, and operating costs. Estimates four revenue/cost scenarios based on: limited supply, meeting total institutional demand, break-even, and

production at capacity. Also presents profit/loss estimates at a range of production levels, and evaluates several facility locations..

Yellow Wood Associates, Inc. and David Boyd MSA Associates. 2004. "Preliminary Feasibility Study Public Market for Madison, Wisconsin." Prepared for University of Wisconsin Center for Cooperatives and Home Grown Wisconsin. July 14.

Presents initial investigation of the potential for a public market in Madison. Describes similar markets and important considerations learned from their experiences, including areas such as farmer role and involvement, customers, types of vendors, how to use space, ownership and management model, staff, and rules. The report then proposes a public market structure for Madison that would promote Wisconsin agriculture and products as well as community and economic development. Estimates revenue needs, development costs, possible locations, and funding sources.

Appendix B

Dane County Consolidated Food Service

The Dane County Consolidated Food Service provides meals or cafeteria service to the following facilities:

- Badger Prairie Health Care Center (BPHCC)
- Dane County Jail
- Public Safety Building
- William Ferris Center (Huber Center)
- Neighborhood Intervention Program
- Juvenile Detention
- Juvenile Shelter (occasionally)
- Verona Senior Citizens Center

Greg Brockmeyer has managed county facilities and food services for the past two years, and has significantly opened up county purchasing beyond the former primary-vendor-dominated system. Previously the primary vendor (Sysco) supplied almost all products for food service, but Brockmeyer says that his goal when he started this job was to focus on getting better prices as well as better quality products, which, he felt, was difficult when relying solely on Sysco. The County still uses Sysco as a primary vendor but has branched out to a variety of vendors for smaller quantities or specific products, and has a separate bidding system and contracts for meat, bread and milk (this has been true for milk for some time). Brockmeyer says the County also buys a fair amount of products without a contract if the vendor offers either a better price or a higher quality product. He admits that the County Purchasing Department prefers to use a contract if the County purchases more than \$5,000 from a vendor, but sometimes this is not possible.

According to Brockmeyer, there have been attempts at using more locally produced food at County facilities. Initiated by the Dane County Senior Centers in 2003 and expanded to the Badger Prairie Health Care Center (BPHCC) and the Verona Senior Citizens Center, Brockmeyer says that, working with Homegrown Wisconsin Cooperative, he has helped to coordinate one-day events where all meals are locally produced. Clients, he said, have received this well, and he would like to expand this kind of event. Brockmeyer also says that he has been involved in and supportive of the effort by Nancy Christy, former owner of the Wilson Street Grill, to pilot a 75 percent locally produced menu at the cafeteria in the new county courthouse.

While Brockmeyer is very supportive of such expanded efforts, because of CFS's "higher than industry norm labor rates," the need for product preparation is the biggest obstacle to incorporating locally produced food into its system. According to Brockmeyer, other barriers to buying locally might include a lack of coordination of ordering and delivery, seasonal and regional limitation of product diversity, and higher prices. However, were there a local-food-processing facility in the area, "I would be the first one pounding on the door in the morning," Brockmeyer says. Given a solution to processing, ordering and delivery issues, he says the only barriers might be seasonal availability and price. "If the price was significantly higher, I would need some directive from the County Executive to purchase a certain percent of our food from locally produced vendors," he says. "The County's purchasing practices look at price first and then quality." However, he is optimistic that this type of directive is in line with other County purchasing policies, such as its goal of having purchases from minority-owned businesses make up ten percent of its total expenditures.

When faced with the question of directing CFS's current vendors to source local foods, Brockmeyer is cautiously positive, pointing out the issue of leverage. While it might be hard to influence the purchasing choices of a giant company like Sysco, smaller vendors for which a majority of sales are to the County may be more willing to accommodate such requests.

Source

Brockmeyer, Greg. 2005. Facilities and Food Services Manager, Dane County Department of Administration. Personal interviews May 23 and June 10 (Elisabeth Howard).

Appendix C

Grant Opportunities and Other Resources and Organizations to Support Additional Dane County Local Food Work

1. Grant Opportunities¹

State of Wisconsin Grant Programs

Agricultural Development and Diversification (ADD) Grant Program

- DATCP
- \$400,000 per year
- Goal: to “further develop the Wisconsin agriculture industry”
- “Demonstration projects, feasibility studies, market research, market development, and new product development projects are typical recipients of the grants.”

Community-Based Economic Development Program (CBED)

- Dept. of Commerce
- Goal: “to enhance business retention and expansion as well as entrepreneurship efforts in distressed areas by increasing the capacity of communities or community based organizations to perform economic development.”

Minority Business Development Fund (MBDF) Development Projects Program

- Dept. of Commerce
- Goal: “to help businesses expand, thereby creating new jobs and benefiting economically distressed communities in Wisconsin”
- “Working capital, machinery and equipment, land and building acquisition, existing business acquisition and related expenses.”

Rural Economic Development (RED) Early Planning Grant Program

- Dept. of Commerce
- Goal: “to stimulate the start up and expansion of small businesses in communities throughout Wisconsin.”
- “Financial assistance to rural entrepreneurs and small businesses so that they may obtain the professional services necessary to determine the feasibility of a proposed start-up or expansion.”

¹ Grant information from “Farm Options” website of UW-Extension, available:

<http://www.uwex.edu/ces/agmarkets/grants.html>

Value-Added Agricultural Product Market Development Grants (VADG)

- Grant programs for:
 - Independent producers
 - Goal: “to encourage producers of agricultural commodities and products of agricultural commodities to further refine these products increasing their value to end users.”
 - Information resource centers

US Federal Grant Programs

Community Food Projects Competitive Grants Program

- Goal: “to help eligible private non-profit entities that need a one-time infusion of Federal assistance to establish and carry out multi-purpose community food projects.
- “projects designed to increase food security in communities by bringing the whole food system together to assess strengths, establish linkages, and create systems that improve the self-reliance of community members over their food needs.”

The USDA's Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE) Programs (For the North Central Region)

The USDA's Rural Business Enterprise Grants Program

- Goal: “ financing and developing small and emerging private businesses with less than \$1 million in revenues, and which will have fewer than 50 new employees.”
- “technical assistance, revolving loan program, incubatory/industrial buildings, and industrial park improvements.”

2. Dane County Programs

UW/Dane County Extension (<http://www.uwex.edu/ces/cty/dane/>)

Dept. of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP)

- *Savor Wisconsin*: Online directory of direct-marketing farmers in Wisconsin (<http://www.savorwisconsin.com/>)
- *Something Special from Wisconsin* marketing program

Dane County Environment, Agriculture & Natural Resources Committee
(<http://www.co.dane.wi.us/committees/standing.asp?commnum=137>)

3. University of Wisconsin Programs

College Food Project: Funded by SARE and carried out by the Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems (CIAS) at the University of Wisconsin – Madison, this project assessed the potential for Wisconsin colleges and universities to source cafeteria food locally. CIAS

then worked with schools, local farmers and students to create such farm-to-college purchasing initiatives. <http://www.cias.wisc.edu/collegefood.php>

UW Center for Cooperatives: Helped to study the feasibility of and to organize Homegrown Wisconsin, a cooperative of organic produce growers in south-central Wisconsin marketing to restaurants in the Midwest. <http://www.wisc.edu/uwcc/>

Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems (CIAS), UW-Madison: The work of this research institute has reflected a commitment to local food systems since its inception 1989. Its efforts include “partnerships with grassroots groups promoting urban agriculture and sustainable eating” as well as “research aimed at halting the decline of mid-size farms and food enterprises and developing local/regional food systems.” <http://www.cias.wisc.edu/foodsys.php>

F. H. King: A UW Madison student organization devoted to “learning about agricultural issues as well as practicing sustainable agriculture.” <http://fhking.rso.wisc.edu/>

4. Non-Profit Organizations

Community Action Coalition: With a mission “to develop economic and social capacities of individuals, families and communities to reduce poverty in Dane, Jefferson and Waukesha Counties,” this organization has developed a network of food pantries in Dane, Jefferson and Waukesha Counties, and runs the *Wisconsin Harvest* food recovery program, efficiently redistributing or composting 668,862 lbs excess food from businesses annually. <http://www.cacscw.org/>

Dane County Hunger Prevention Council: This non-profit’s goal is “to serve as a community forum to address the full range of food security issues in Dane County,” primarily focusing on networking, research, education and advocacy, and occasionally direct assistance. <http://www.madison.com/communities/hpcdc/>

Family Farm Defenders: FFD works “to create a farmer-controlled and consumer-oriented food and fiber system, based upon democratically controlled institutions that empower farmers to speak for and respect themselves in their quest for social and economic justice.” Efforts have included initiating farmer-cooperative endeavors, the formation of a mutual marketing agency, and strengthening farmer-consumer alliances. <http://www.familyfarmdefenders.org/>

Friends of Dane County Farmers’ Market: This non-profit seeks to “support the educational and charitable activities of the Dane County Farmers’ Market,” and does so through food tastings, supporting publication of the Farm Fresh Atlas, cooking demonstrations, children’s activities, food donations and a program providing free transportation for seniors to the market. <http://www.madfarmmkt.org/friends.asp>

Friends of Troy Gardens: Troy Gardens is a 31-acre site on Madison’s north side, acquired, developed and maintained through a grassroots community process now being facilitated by the Friends of Troy Gardens. Under current development are a community garden, youth gardens, a community supported agriculture (CSA) farm, woodland and prairie restorations, nature trails, an edible landscape, and 30 units of affordable cohousing to be built by the

Madison Area Community Land Trust, the owner of the entire Troy Gardens property.
<http://www.troygardens.org>

MACSAC (Madison Area Community Supported Agriculture Coalition): This non-profit is a coalition of CSA farms serving the Madison area. The organization provides information to consumers about area CSAs, coordinates the Partner Shares program, which subsidizes the cost of CSA shares for low-income households. Publishes the recipe and food book, *From Asparagus to Zucchini: A Guide to Cooking Farm-Fresh Seasonal Produce*.
<http://www.macsac.org/>

REAP (Research, Education, Action, and Policy on) Food Group: Started in 1997, REAP “provides a forum for the residents of Madison and Dane County to explore how the way in which our community eats is linked to social, political, environmental, and health issues.” Three major projects have been the annual Food For Thought Festival that “brings together farmers, direct marketers, cooperatives, advocacy organizations, and cultural and educational groups,” annual production of the Farm Fresh Atlas, listing farms in southern Wisconsin who produce sustainably and sell locally, and a Farm to School Project, that brings local farm produce into Madison public schools, and farmers in the classrooms.
<http://www.reapfoodgroup.org/>

Second Harvest Foodbank of Southern Wisconsin: This foodbank and distribution agency serves 16 counties in Wisconsin, distributing an average of 4,194,890 lbs of food annually.
http://www.secondharvest.org/zip_code.asp?z=53715

SHARE: This non-profit “builds and strengthens the community through volunteer service and helping people save money on food.” Through bulk ordering of food and extensive system of drop-off sites throughout Wisconsin, the Upper Peninsula and northern Illinois, participants buy food at reduced cost. <http://www.sharewi.org/>

Sustain Dane: Through topical events and “discussion courses on sustainability” within the Northwest Earth Institute, Sustain Dane explores ways that individuals and communities can better integrate their lives within various levels of ecosystems. <http://www.sustaindane.org/>

Appendix D

Case Studies of Projects with Potential for Dane County

A. Tuscorora Organic Growers Cooperative, Pennsylvania

The Tuscorora Organic Growers (TOG) Cooperative, in operation since 1988, is made up of 18 organic produce farm-members in south central Pennsylvania ranging from two to over 60 acres. The co-op emerged out of a desire among six organic fruit and vegetable farmers of the region to “complement one another rather than compete” by working as a group to cut costs and offer more diverse products and better service to customers (TOG 2004). TOG’s cooperative structure allows these farms to collaborate in order to market, package and transport their local, organic produce to retail grocery stores and restaurants in and around Washington D.C. (TOG 2004). After the initial six farms had established the business and proven that it could be successful, other farms invested equity and the cooperative has since grown (Ingerson 2002), with sales projected to reach 50,000 cases of produce worth \$1 million in 2005 (TOG 2004).

Along with this growth in membership and sales, TOG’s operation has also inevitably grown more complex. The co-op hired two full-time and seven part-time staff to coordinate marketing, orders and product availability, industrial standard packaging, and delivery (TOG 2004). Also, in order to continue sales all year long, the co-op buys some produce from other regions of the east coast and Florida during Pennsylvania’s off-season (TOG 2004). The co-op has also had to deal with competition from both global and local companies (Ingerson 2002).

In the experience of TOG, reputation and trust are very important to success. The co-op relies entirely on word-of-mouth to attract new customers, and depends to a large degree on maintaining the same customer base every year (Ingerson 2002). To establish a successful reputation, the co-op emphasizes the quality of their products and service to customers, and follows the principles of careful seasonal planning, enforced quality standards, rigorous and reliable accounting, efficient work systems, premiere customer service and attention to detail (Ingerson 2002).

Sources

Ingerson, Ann. 2002. “Agriculture and Forestry in the Sideling Hill Creek Watershed Case Studies.” Western Pennsylvania Conservancy. May. Available: <http://www.wilderness.org/Library/Documents/upload/Sideling-Hill-Case-Studies-Tuscarora.pdf>

Tuscorora Organic Growers Cooperative. 2004. Website. Available: <http://www.tog.coop/index.html>

B. Farmer's Diner, Barre, Vermont

The unique business model of Farmer's Diner is rooted in supporting rural economic vitality through the area's local farms. Despite facing a lack of small-scale local food processing and distribution at its outset, founder and CEO Tod Murphy's three-year-old operation has succeeded in sourcing more than 70 percent of its ingredient purchases from farms within 60 miles (Reiber 2004). To overcome the lack of local infrastructure, the restaurant simply created its own, in the form of two USDA-certified processing facilities: one for meat and one for canning, drying and baking. In fact, as Murphy has explained, "The restaurant is a nice front, but the real core of the business is creating that infrastructure, with the distribution and processing capacity" (Reiber 2004).

The Farmer's Diner offers 'typical' diner fare but with a clear message about the local sources of ingredients. Currently, the restaurant buys meat, dairy products and produce from 15 local farms, and, though far more affordable by design than the prices of the many upscale restaurants that seek out local, seasonal farm produce, customers have thus far been willing to pay small premiums when necessary (Shorto 2004). Typical or not, the restaurant has become a popular destination both for Barre residents and for others traveling from farther away, for seekers of both convenience and quality. Its success has allowed the diner to spurn its skeptics, who claimed the model was too risky, by reaching a financial break-even point within its first year of operation (Reiber 2004).

Murphy hopes to spread this business model by creating 'hybrid franchises' in other areas around the U.S. He envisions each franchise as a "pod" of four or five diners within a particular area, all served by one central processing facility to save on costs. However, it is clear from his experience that more than physical infrastructure is essential to the model of Farmer's Diner. Murphy himself puts significant time and effort into creating relationships with farmers and coordinating a patchwork of distribution plans and transactions (Shorto 2004). Replicating the model will require someone willing to create relationships and find innovative ways around the myriad of unique local distribution obstacles in any given area.

Sources

Reiber, Derek. 2004. "A Truly Local Diner: A Vermont eatery that adheres to a strong local food ethic has big plans in store for a broad-based resurgence of rural economic vitality." Ecotrust. Available: <http://www.ecotrust.org/foodfarms/farmerchef2004.html>

Shorto, Russell. 2004. "A Short-Order Revolutionary." *New York Times* January 11.

C. Farm-to-Hospital Initiatives

The potential for health care facilities to purchase more food from local farmers is enhanced by their primary dedication to health and their relative institutional flexibility. Hospitals in the U.S. are remarkably independent with respect to food purchasing; 70 to 80 percent of their food services are self-operated (Kulick 2005). Examples of current local purchasing health care facilities in Iowa and Vermont illustrate this concept's potential. In addition, Health Care Without Harm and the Green Guide for Health Care™ represent two initiatives aimed at promoting such local purchases by health care facilities.

In practice, several health care facilities are demonstrating how an institutional commitment to procuring local food can be successful. For example, Bartels Lutheran Home in Waverly, Iowa is a 200-bed retirement, nursing, assisted living, skilled, and Alzheimer's care facility (Kulick 2005). Its dietary manager and sole food purchaser has been sourcing local fruits, vegetables, milk, honey, pork, turkey and beef since 2000, reaching more than 15 percent of food purchases in 2004 (Kulick 2005). Several states away, the private nonprofit Fletcher Allen Health Care system, which operates several health care facilities in Vermont, has a 10 to 15 year history of purchasing local foods for its food service (Kulick 2005). Local produce and cheese are sourced through its primary vendor, U.S. Foodservice, and, within limits, through other local suppliers and distributors (Kulick 2005). New in 2005 is the debut of a patient menu of 30 entrees that incorporate and promote fresh, local foods, prepared in a recently renovated kitchen (Kulick 2005).

On a larger scale, Health Care Without Harm² (HCWC) is a non-profit coalition of health care organizations from 52 countries with the goal of transforming the health care industry through education, facilitation of networks and organized advocacy. The organization's food procurement efforts involve providing tools to advocates of change within health care facilities through online listservs and regular conference calls for information sharing and strategizing, and through the strategic use of relationships and networking at different levels to influence changes. The Green Guide for Health Care™ (GGHC), which HCWH helped to create, is an environmental certification standard for health care facilities based on a 150 point rating system, a concept similar to the LEED Green Building System® for construction. Its ratings cover design, construction, and operation of health care facilities, and are currently being piloted at several hospitals around the world. Related to food procurement, the operational standards include "food credits" for facilities that "support sustainable food production and improved environmental health through purchase of organic, drug free and locally produced food products" (GGHC Steering Committee 2004).

² Unless otherwise noted, all information about HCWH and GGHC from Harvey (2005).

Sources

Harvie, Jamie. 2005. Food Procurement Work Group Leader, Health Care Without Harm. Personal interview, May 3 (Elisabeth Howard).

Health Care Without Harm. 2005. Website. Available: <http://www.noharm.org/food/issue>

Kulick, Marie. 2005. "Healthy Food, Healthy Hospitals, Healthy Communities." Minneapolis, MN: Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy. May.

D. Iowa ‘Buy Fresh, Buy Local’ Campaign

Evidence suggests that consumers respond positively when presented with food labeled as locally grown (Lattanzi and Berenkamp 2002; The Headwaters Group 2004). In the hopes of increasing the economic stability of direct-marketing farmers, educating consumers about the markets for locally produced food, and stimulating Iowa’s local economies, in 2003 the Practical Farmers of Iowa initiated a marketing campaign to capitalize on this consumer preference for local (PFI 2004). The campaign uses a “Buy Fresh, Buy Local” logo on marketing materials offered to participating grocery stores, restaurants and other points of purchase to display with locally grown food (FoodRoutes 2003). Also part of the campaign is a directory for consumers called “Get Yourself a Farmer,” which lists businesses selling local foods, such as farmers markets, meat lockers, roadside stands, and u-pick operations (FoodRoutes 2003). First focusing only in a seven county area around Cedar Falls and Waterloo, the “Buy Fresh, Buy Local” campaign, with the help of partnerships with the University of Northern Iowa and the Drake University Agricultural Law Center, is now expanding to target the entire state (PFI 2004).

The Iowa program is one of twelve campaigns across the country participating in the “Buy Fresh, Buy Local” campaign of FoodRoutes Network (FRN). FRN is a national nonprofit organization that assists local and community-based food organizations with technical, communication, networking and informational needs (FoodRoutes 2003). Evaluations of two previous buy-local campaigns supported by FRN reveal a high rate of recall and purchasing influence among targeted consumers, a greater proportion of local products sold in retail outlets and a significant increase in farmer sales (FoodRoutes 2003; The Headwaters Group 2004). Organizations can apply to the “Buy Fresh, Buy Local” campaign, and FRN uses marketing techniques honed during previous campaigns to help organizations develop effective messages to accomplish their marketing goals (FoodRoutes 2003). They receive a Toolbox, or set of marketing materials (such as logos, labels, price cards, and templates for fliers, brochures, newspaper ads and posters) adapted for use in their own buy-local campaign (FoodRoutes 2003).

Research, Education, Action and Policy on Food Group (REAP) hopes to initiate a “Buy Fresh, Buy Local” campaign in the Madison area using FRNs assistance and templates. In addition to publicity, REAP’s initiative includes investigating models of brokering between producers and food buyers at restaurants and institutional food services using the experience of other organizations in the FRN campaign. Further, two restaurants, a hospital and a university food service have agreed to participate in pilot projects to test potential brokering mechanisms for purchasing locally produced food. REAP is currently pursuing funding options for this project.

Sources

Food Routes. 2003. Website. Available: <http://www.foodroutes.org>

Grunes, Miriam. 2005. “Agricultural Development & Diversification (ADD) Grant Proposal: Buy Fresh, Buy Local: Building Marketing Opportunities for Local Foods in Restaurants and Institutional Food Services (Phase 1).” REAP Food Group: Madison, WI.

Lattanzi, Mark. and JoAnne. Berkenkamp. 2002. "Harvesting Support for Locally Grown Food: Lessons Learned from the Be a Local Hero, Buy Locally Grown Campaign." CISA and FoodRoutes Network.

Practical Farmers of Iowa. 2004. Website. Available:
<http://www.practicalfarmers.org/buyfresh.asp>

The Headwaters Group. 2004. "Changing the Way America Feeds Itself: Creating Economically Successful Community-Based Food Enterprises." Outcome 5 Cluster Report. Prepared for W.K. Kellogg Foundation. October.

Walsh, Joani. 2005. FoodRoutes Network. Personal contact June 24 (Elisabeth Howard).

Appendix E

Food Policy Councils and Related Organizations in North America

Updated June 2005

City-wide

Berkeley Food Policy Council, California, <http://www.berkeleyfood.org>

Grand Rapids Food Systems Council, Michigan,
<http://www.wmeac.org/programs/foodsycoun/default.asp>

City of Hartford Advisory Commission on Food Policy, Connecticut,
<http://www.hartford.gov/government/FoodCommission/>

Holyoke Food Policy Council, Massachusetts

Sacramento Hunger Commission, California, <http://www.targethunger.com/>

Salina Food Policy Council. Kansas, <http://www.wannabhealthy.com/SFPC/index.htm>

San Francisco Food Systems, California, <http://www.sffoodsystems.org/>

Currently Forming

Atlanta Food Policy Council, Georgia

Chicago Food Policy Council, Illinois, <http://www.growingpower.org/>

Twin Cities Food Council, Minnesota, <http://www.mnfoodassociation.org/>

County-wide

Marin County Food Systems Project, California, http://www.eecom.net/projects_school.htm

Placer County Food Policy Council, California,
http://ceplacer.ucdavis.edu/Nutrition_Family_and_Consumer_Sciences/

West Contra Costa County Food Security Council, California,
http://www.cchealth.org/groups/west_co_food_security/

Currently Forming

King County Food Policy Council, Washington

Lane County Food Coalition, Oregon, <http://www.lanefood.org/>

Prima County Food Policy Council, Arizona,
<http://www.communityfoodbank.org/dynamic2/home.aspx>

Yolo County Food Policy Council, California

City/ County Hybrid

Knoxville/ Knox County Food Policy Council, Tennessee,
<http://www.cityofknoxville.org/boards/food.asp>

Portland/ Multnomah Food Policy Council, Oregon,
http://www.sustainableportland.org/default.asp?sec=stp&pg=food_policy

Regional

Tahoma Food System, Washington, <http://tahomafoodsystem.net/index.html>

State-wide

Connecticut Food Policy Council, <http://www.foodpc.state.ct.us/>

Iowa Food Policy Council, <http://www.iowafoodpolicy.org/index.htm>

Michigan Food Policy Council, <http://www.mda.state.mi.us/mfpc/>

New Mexico Food and Agriculture Policy Council, http://www.statefoodpolicy.org/nm_fpc.htm

North Carolina Food Policy Council, <http://www.ncagr.com/paffairs/release/2001/8-01council.htm>

Oklahoma Food Policy Council, <http://www.kerrcenter.com/ofpc/>

Utah Food Council, http://www.statefoodpolicy.org/utah_fpc.htm

Currently Forming:

Arizona Food Policy Council, <http://www.foodconnect.org/>

Illinois Sustainable Food Policy Council, <http://www.illinoisstewardshipalliance.org/>

Kansas Food Policy Council

Washington Food Policy Council,
<http://agr.wa.gov/Marketing/SmallFarm/foodpolicycouncil.htm>

First Nations

Integrated Food Systems Project of the Oneida Nation in Wisconsin

Tohono O'odham Community Food System in Arizona,
<http://www.tocaonline.org/homepage.html>

Canadian

Kamloops Food Policy Council

Peterborough Food Policy Coalition

Toronto Food Policy Council, http://www.city.toronto.on.ca/health/tfpc_index.htm

Ottawa Food Security Council, <http://www.spcottawa.on.ca/ofsc/>

Vancouver Food Policy Council,

<http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/commsvcs/socialplanning/initiatives/foodpolicy/council.htm>

Sources

Borron, Sarah Marie. 2003. "Food Policy Councils: Practice and Possibility." Hunger-Free Community Report. Eugene, OR: Congressional Hunger Center. Available:

<http://www.lanefood.org/content/foodpolicycouncils.htm#reports>

Drake University. 2005. "State and Local Food Policy Councils." Website, available:

<http://www.statefoodpolicy.org/>

Vancouver Food Policy Council. Website. Available:

<http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/commsvcs/socialplanning/initiatives/foodpolicy/council.htm>

Web search "food policy councils"