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The Local Food System Project (LFSP) was a three-year project funded by two grants from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan. It was run by the Minnesota Food Association of St. Paul, Minnesota. It concluded June 30, 1997.

The Local Food Systems Project selected six policy development sites to receive technical assistance for developing food policy structures (policy councils, task forces, networks, etc.) to strengthen their local food systems. The six sites were: Los Angeles, CA; Berkshire County in western MA; a nine country planning region around Rochester, NY; Pittsburgh, PA.; Austin, TX; and Moyers, WV.

These sites were selected from among some twenty applicants on the basis of their probable success in implementing structural changes in their local food systems. Based on the work of Kenneth Dahlberg, the project's director, the-project team viewed local food systems as operating at the household, neighborhood, municipal, and regional levels. At each level there are a number of important issues associated with each portion of the food system: production, processing, distribution, access, food use (health, nutrition, food safety, processing and preservation), food recycling, and waste production. This approach includes, but goes beyond the other two main approaches to local food issues: sustainable agriculture and community food security. Sustainable agriculture approaches are only recently becoming aware of the importance of working with urban people, while community food security approaches tend to emphasize the issues associated with low income groups. We seek long-term sustainability, security, and equity for all groups in a given locality or region.

The six policy development sites worked to prioritize the food system issues in their areas and design structures to address these issues over time. The leading challenges the six sites have identified are land preservation, hunger and food security, sustainable agriculture and economic and community development, and human health.

The sites had access to the project team members who served as consultants. In addition, two technical assistance workshops for representatives of the six sites were held. The first was held near the Twin Cities on May 19-21, 1995. The second was held at St. Mary College, Leavenworth, KS, on June 27-30, 1996.

The project team included Kate Clancy, former Professor of Nutrition at Syracuse University, founding member of the Onondaga Food System Council, and Director for a five year policy project at the Wallace Center for Agricultural & Environmental Policy at Winrock International; Kenneth Dahlberg, project director, and Professor of Political Science and Environmental Studies at Western Michigan University; Jan O'Donnell, Executive Director of the Minnesota Food Association, which helped write the St. Paul, Minnesota Municipal Food Policy; and Robert Wilson, a chief architect of, and long-term consultant for the Knoxville, Tennessee Food Policy Council.

Some of the materials included here were circulated to the six sites to help them in their efforts. In the last year of the project it was decided to collect them and other relevant materials to make them available to a wider audience. The February 1997 version was a photocopy edition. A number of copies were distributed by the Minnesota Food Association at cost to interested groups.
In late 2001, Ken Dahlberg, responding to the increased level of activity and interest in local food groups, decided to make this resource guide more widely available. The materials included here are primarily those in the original edition, although there have been a few deletions and some updates and additions. Given time contraints, there was no effort to include new materials or discuss the many developments since the original edition.

Also, given the various errors that result from scanning photocopies, there are undoubtedly some which were not caught in the proofing process. Please let me know what they are (see addresses below).

One other important point to note is that the guide does not include any analysis of the results of the Local Food System Project itself. One very significant difference was noted by the team between the earlier food policy councils and those studied in the LFSP. Virtually all of the earlier examples of food policy councils which the team members had studied or worked with were official advisory bodies to a local government - city and/or county. The opportunites, contraints, and operations of these official advisory bodies were significantly different than the six groups studied in the LFSP - all of which had their main locus of leadership and membership in the non-profit sector, although some had links with various governmental agencies. This affected their strategies, opportunities, and contraints in ways often very different from official advisory bodies. This contrast is very important to keep in mind when reviewing the materials in Sections III and IV.

For more information about the project or this guide, contact:

Ken Dahlberg  
Dept. of Political Science  
Western Michigan University  
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Email: dahlberg@wmich.edu

Note: With an occasional exception (explicitly noted), there has been no attempt to update the contact information listed in the various documents in this resource guide, so if you want to contact any of the organizations or people listed, you may need to seek their current contact information.
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I. BRIEF HISTORY OF THE LOCAL FOOD SYSTEM PROJECT [F-1]

II. WHY LOCAL? [F-2]

There are a number of general reasons why greater localization of our food systems needed. Many of these are summarized in the following short articles.


Laura DeLind, "Local Foods: There's No Place Like Home", *Groundwork*, January 24, 1994, pp. 4 - 5.


Richard Bolan, "Global Economy and Sustainable Development." The Humphrey Institute, University of Minnesota, August 1996.

III. LOCAL FOOD POLICY GOALS AND ISSUES [F-3, F-4, & F-5]

This section contains a number of examples of goal statements and ordinances from various communities. Also, there is some discussion of the types of policy issues found at the local level.

A. Goal statements and resolutions from Knoxville, TN, St. Paul, MN and Onondaga County, NY. [F-3]

1. Knoxville, TN.
   b. "A Resolution of the Council of the City of Knoxville expressing its support of an effort to improve the quality, availability, and accessability of food delivery systems for all citizens, and designating the Community Action Committee's Food Supply Project as Coordinator of this effort." Resolution R-202-81. October 31, 1981.

2. St. Paul, MN.
   a. Ordinance of the City of St. Paul, MN, establishing a Food and Nutrition Commission and providing for its powers and staffing, July 8, 1992

3. Onondaga County, NY
   Onondaga Food System Council, Inc., "A Comprehensive Approach to Our Local
B. Different organization approaches used by food policy councils. [F-4]


C. Examples of policy statements from St. Paul, and Toronto. [F-5]


IV. LOCAL FOOD POLICY ORGANIZATIONS [F-6, F-7, F-8, & F-9]

In this section you will find a historical timeline of work that has been done on local food systems planning over the past several decades written by Kate Clancy. Also, there are some summaries as well as the complete reports prepared by Ken Dahlberg on the local food policy councils in Knoxville, TN, St. Paul, MN, Onondaga County, NY, and Philadelphia, PA

A. "A Timeline of Local Food Systems Planning." Kate Clancy, 1996. [F-6]

B. Studies of local food policy councils:

1. Knoxville. [F-6]


   a. "Minnesota Food System; Slow Start, Model Concept," Nutrition Week, Vol. 23, No. 27 (July 23, 1993), pp. 4-5. [An abstract done by the Community Nutrition Institute of the report immediately below].


3. Onondaga County, NY. [F-8]
V. GENERAL STRATEGIES FOR PLANNING AND ORGANIZING [F-10, F-11, & F-12]

This section begins with ways to assess the larger resource dimensions of your region and your local food system. This is followed by two short pieces that lay out basic planning and strategic sequences and elements. How to involve community groups in local food system visioning and discussion is outlined next. Finally, three detailed assessments of the Chicago foodshed are included.

A. The larger context [F-10]

1. Sustainability and urban impacts: "How Big is Our Ecological Footprint?" Mathis Wackernagel with The Task Force on Planning Healthy & Sustainable Communities, University of British Columbia, November 1993.


C. Preliminary Planning and Strategizing: [F-11]

1. “Developing and implementing your own local plans.” Ken Dahlberg and Tom Hemingway, 1995


D. Engaging other people and groups through visioning processes: [F-12]


E. Examples of detailed community food system assessments: The "Food Files" series. [F-12]


VI. LINKING FOOD SYSTEM POLICY ISSUES TO OTHER COMMUNITY ISSUES [F-13]

In this section you will find materials on how food systems related to economic development, community development, and to the development of "healthy cities."

A. Food-related economic development. [F-13]
   1. The importance of food in a local economy. One of the most systematic works here is one commissioned by the Philadelphia Food and Agriculture Taskforce. An abstract is included. The full reference is: Ross Koppel, *Agenda for Growth: The Impact of Food and Agriculture on the Economy of the Delaware Valley*, Philadelphia: Food and Agriculture Taskforce, 1988.
   
   2. Micro-enterprises. Little systematic work has been done here. Perhaps the most useful overview is that done in a report by the Toronto Food Policy Council. The full reference is: Toronto Food Policy Council, "Stories of Micro Food Enterprises and Implications for Economic Development." Discussion Paper #5, October 1995. The table of contents and the Executive Summary are included here.


C. The Healthy Cities and Communities Program. [F-13]

VII. FOOD SYSTEMS GRAPHICS [F-14 - F-18]

This section includes graphics that Ken Dahlberg developed for various audiences. These were combined in a poster session given at the International Healthy Cities Conference, 1993. Most of the graphics have a separate file because of the memory required for each. Also, see the graphic at the end of section V.C.1. [F-11]

A. The graphic, ‘What are Food Systems,’ along with the text of the poster session in which it was used, “Local and Regional Food Systems: A Key to Healthy Cities” given at the International Healthy Cities Conference, San Francisco, December 1993. [F-14]

B. Other graphics used in the poster session that depict different level food systems.
   
   1. Household Food Systems [F-15]
   
   2. Neighborhood Food Systems [F-16]
   
   3. Municipal Food Systems [F-17]
   
   4. Regional Food Systems [F-18]

VIII. MATERIALS CITED IN THIS GUIDE [F-19]
II. WHY LOCAL? [F-2]

There are a number of general reasons why greater localization of our food systems needed. Many of these are summarized in the following short articles.


Laura DeLind, "Local Foods: There's No Place Like Home", *Groundwork*, January 24, 1994, pp. 4 - 5. [F-2]


Richard Bolan, "Global Economy and Sustainable Development." The Humphrey Institute, University of Minnesota, August 1996. [F-2]
Alternative Visions
Localizing Food Systems
by Kenneth A. Dahlberg

UNTIL RECENTLY, WE HAVE BEEN BLIND to the importance of food in local and regional environments and economies, but the growing sustainability movement is starting to seek genuine, long-term, localized approaches to our food systems. With vision, we can do this in a way that will empower families and neighborhoods and make our communities healthier, more self-reliant and more equitable.

Current agriculture (nationally and internationally) needs restructuring. Not only does it impose extremely high health, social and environmental costs, but it is highly fossil-fuel dependent. In the U.S. it takes roughly 10 energy calories to deliver one food calorie on our plates. As fossil fuel prices rise, there will be a huge multiplier effect on food prices. We can either wait until things collapse or start building the necessary local and regional food systems now.

Most people are unaware of how dependent their cities are upon distant national and international systems for food or how vulnerable those systems are. Neither are they aware of the extent and complexity of their local food system, much less its potential—the annual value of produce from all U.S. gardens is roughly equal to that of the annual U.S. corn crop, about $18 billion a year. What's more, agricultural, horticultural and food-related activities constitute between 20 percent and 25 percent of a local economy.

Defining Local Systems
What then is a local food system? The local part starts at the household level and expands to neighborhood, municipal and regional levels. At each level there are different cycles, issues, problems and possibilities. The food part includes all the various social, symbolic, health, power, access and equity dimensions (imagine all the facets of personal and corporate efforts to provide the hungry and homeless with "real" Thanksgiving dinners). "Systems include not just the production aspects of food but also issues of processing, distribution, access, use food recycling and waste. Besides social, economic and environmental issues, each of these points also involves a number of ethical and value questions.

Why localize? Sustainable agriculturalists have called for localization to increase environmental sustainability. Developing local markets reduces dependence upon distant (and often erratic) supply. Localizing food systems and growing more food locally and regionally also opens new opportunities for dealing with problems of hunger, joblessness, urban decay and environmental degradation. Such a vision includes:

- Providing both long-term food security and better health for all local residents by making a variety of safe and nutritious food available to all.
- Creating a cushion of self-reliance against transport strikes, major storms and disasters and rising prices resulting from oligopolies and/or rising fossil fuel prices and their multiplier effects.
- Providing continuing employment for local farmers, horticulturalists and food workers.
- Making households and neighborhoods more self-reliant by making more land, work and employment available throughout the food system.
- Freeing up more local dollars for local development by increasing the energy and resource efficiency of local food systems, especially by reducing energy costs and putting organic wastes into productive use rather than expensive landfills.
- Creating a healthier, more diverse and more pleasant environment by cleaning up air, water and soil systems; creating more green spaces and more diverse rural landscapes; and reducing health costs and pollution clean up costs.
- Reducing dependence on emergency hunger and feeding programs by moving toward hunger prevention programs.

Food Policy councils
How do we do this? At a personal level we can grow, process and preserve more of our own food. We can buy local food from farmers markets and u-picks. We can join a community supported agriculture organization. As citizens, we can support innovative neighborhood and municipal programs and organizations. One example includes the growing popularity of food policy councils which form to address a given community’s food system. (see page 20).

The issues addressed by these citizen advisory boards are critical and need to be investigated by local governments, nonprofits and the general population. They include:

- Production: promoting household and community gardens; seeking to preserve local farmers and farmland; promoting community supported agriculture.
- Processing: encouraging local food processing plants, as well as household and community canning programs.
- Distribution and access: promoting co-ops, buying clubs and full use of available government programs; coordinating emergency feeding systems; ensuring availability of inner-city supermarkets; encouraging local farmers markets.
- Use: promoting food safety and handling, and nutritious diets.
- Food recycling: promoting gleaning, food banks, pantries and soup kitchens. Waste stream: using creative approaches to waste reduction, recycling and composting in each stage of the system.

KENNETH A. DAHLBERG is a professor of political science and environmental studies at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008.

"Alternative Visions" is a regular column giving readers an opportunity to lay out their vision for building strong communities. Send potential columns to TNW, 2125 W North Ave., Chicago, IL 60647.
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LOCAL FOOD: 'There's No Place Like Home'

by

Laura B. De Lind
Department of Anthropology
Michigan State University

It has been said that our food travels 1300 miles from its place of origin to its place of final consumption. This is a bizarre statistic, but not unlike many that are used to describe our life in contemporary society. Yet, what does it mean? What does it matter if the carrots sold and eaten in mid-Michigan come from California, the bananas from Honduras, the broccoli from Mexico, the potatoes from Idaho? In other words, what bearing does all this really have on our lives? The answer, quite simply, is "plenty." We pay dearly for our touring tomatoes, our well-traveled bell peppers, and our geographically-sophisticated salsas. Perhaps it's time for all of us who eat to look more closely at our extended, and frequently over-extended, food system.

We might begin by considering a few of the more obvious costs of an estranged food supply. It takes, for example, up to $4500 to transport a truckload of produce cross country, and it has been estimated that the cost of food transportation is well over $21 billion/year. The gasoline, the refrigeration, the road maintenance, the long distance trucking fees are all part of the price we pay for the food we eat. We also pay for its packaging - the styrofoam containers, glass jars, plastic wraps, foil seals, cardboard cartons that are designed to 'seal in' freshness and protect against breakage or damage in transit. These 'consumer amenities', not infrequently, are worth more than the foods they contain. Nevertheless, they are meant to be discarded once their function as 'food escort' has been fulfilled. We burn, bury, or selectively recycle them, expending additional energy and adding volumes to our landfills, to air and water pollution, and to the physical clutter of our immediate environment. Then, too, there is the cost of food industry promotion and advertising. Billions of dollars are spent each year targeting consumers and bonding them psychologically to commercially fashionable foods and food products. We are taught to value not what is available but what is imported or externally derived. This power to persuade can add 25-30% to the cost of the foods we eat.

What sort of food do we get in return for such extensive effort? On initial blush, it would appear that we are heir to a virtual cornucopia of food. We can have it raw or cooked, in single servings or institutional quantities, any day of the week, any week of the year. We can have foods only vaguely envisioned by nature, like brocoliflower, or foods never envisioned at all, like self-basting turkeys. Each year some 1200 new food products are introduced into the marketplace solely, we are told, for our benefit.

On closer scrutiny, however, there is much illusion to this vastness. It is of a very constrained and controlled nature. Where less than a hundred years ago there were dozens of apple varieties, with different tastes, ripening times, cooking and storage properties, we now typically have only four or five. We are familiar with only a few varieties of potatoes, of squash, of food and feed grains. In fact, the vast majority of the nation's diet is now comprised of only 8-10 distinct foods, despite the fact that they can be transformed into an almost endless, though superficial, array of commercial alternatives. Witness the potato chip.
In keeping with this 'minimized abundance', our food is further fitted to the requirements of field mechanization, transport and processing. The primary objective is to capture markets. Feeding people is quite secondary. Produce is routinely harvested 'green' to withstand shipping. It is gassed to induce ripening. It is colored to simulate freshness and waxed to retard spoilage. Foods intended for processing are engineered for uniform handling, ease of milling, juicing or extruding. Food products are filled with water, salts, starches, oils and additives to minimize production costs, enhance flavor, prevent settling and/or extend shelf life. At some level, we are all aware that taste, texture, and nutritional value (protein and vitamin content) have been sacrificed in the long march from field to table. Pesticide residues, whether domestic or imported, are yet another matter.

It is frequently argued that this is the price we pay for convenience. Women (and more recently men) no longer have to spend hours on food processing and meal preparation. We have been freed from such domestic drudgery and, in exchange for industrial food, have been given leisure time - time to spend on ourselves in more creative, more personal directions. Studies show that while we have reduced the time we spend in meal preparation each day, our television watching has increased accordingly. It seems that our leisure time, like our convenience foods, comes prepackaged, and that we are simultaneously and passively consuming our freedom and our capacity for individual action and expression.

Whether enamored by 'convenience' or enervated by the lack of alternatives, we as a population of consumers have grown dependent upon a system of food production and distribution that has become both irrational and brittle. From an energy standpoint, the long-distance nature of our food supply relies heavily on non-renewable, typically petrochemical, sources of energy. A minimum of ten calories is expended for each calorie consumed. On this basis alone, the system is seriously flawed. Yet, as many analysts have pointed out, it would be a relatively simple matter to sabotage our gas pipelines and energy generation plants, leaving vast portions of the country without light, or heat or food. The more centralized and concentrated the system, the greater the potential for major disruption. We need only look as far as Michigan's PBB crisis to suggest that such a system is not only unsustainable, but that it calls into question our own food security.

Our vulnerability, however, comes from other directions as well. In the process of conforming to the dictates of commerce, our food grows increasingly uniform in its genetic make-up as well as in its acceptable 'natural' appearance. Research energies, corporate and public dollars perfect and replicate 'the best' commercial specimens. Despite their wide distribution, these modern hybrids tend to be genetically narrow - a narrowness reinforced by the pharmaceutical and chemical industry's acquisition of seed companies. Many of our most successful hybrids are products of the same parental crosses and share the same gene pools. They are guaranteed to grow anywhere with the right chemical inputs.

While our focus is directed toward commercially profitable (and genetically limited) varieties, we are also at risk of losing the lesser varieties, the regional varieties, the indigenous varieties (and their wild and weedy relatives) through neglect and the demands of market competition. We discard as 'weeds' many plants that have high vitamin and mineral content. We ignore the food value of purslane, dandelion, lambs quarters, pig weed (amaranth), burdock and the like, poisoning them as best we can and then purchasing chemically 'enriched' foods or multiple vitamins to supplement our diets. Likewise, we fail to cultivate the raspberries or the blueberries or the fruit and nut trees that grow 'wild' and are thus well adapted to the specific demands of their microenvironments. We replace them with
ornamental varieties, dwarf varieties, high-yielding and short-lived varieties when we aren't eliminating them entirely to make way for uniformly green lawns and landscapes. Similarly, chickens and pigs that can scratch and root for themselves or can tolerate a wide range of temperatures and climates have been replaced by animals that have no life beyond an artificially controlled environment. We also overlook the potential of native plants and animals to provide alternative sources of fuel and fiber. The outcome of all these 'trade-offs' is the loss of a vast genetic repertoire and the flexibility it offers within an ever changing ecosystem.

The loss of diversity, whether committed by sins of omission or commission, is a recipe for disaster. We are setting up scenarios in which a single plant or animal virus can precipitate major, if not national and international, crop failure. Likewise, flooding, drought, salinization, climactic change (more possible now than ever), can be withstood by fewer existing species. The potential for famine and irreparable human and environmental tragedy improves daily. Our push, then, to dominate if not divorce ourselves entirely from natural systems - to simplify, to standardize, and now to internationally harmonize the processes and products of food production and distribution - has imposed a sameness upon our landscape. By undermining the diversity found in nature, we jeopardize the source of biological adaptability and survival on a global scale.

Yet, the loss of plant and animal diversity within our food system can not be reduced simply to issues of biology and technology. It is equally an issue of human behavior, for "(o)nly in use can diversity be appreciated enough to be saved. And only in use can it continue to evolve, thus retaining its value." Implicit in such a statement is the recognition that behavioral diversity - social and cultural diversity - protect and maintain biodiversity. Conversely, when the former is severely constrained, or suppressed or homogenized out of existence, the latter will also cease to exist. Equally implicit is the recognition that diversity resides at the margins, in small places, in micro-environments. It is here, at the local level, that people have the opportunity to continually interact with their unique ecosystems and with one another. It is at the local level that people acquire the wisdom, manage the knowledge, and practice the skills that contribute to our overall adaptability and long term survival. As Dorothy of Kansas finally recognized (and we have yet to), "There's no place like home."

Returning, then, to our current, long-distance, externally-control led food system, we have internalized the logic of an industry whose CEO's report annual salaries in the eight digits while the nation reports hunger on the same scale. We have traded the creative potential inherent in local resources (human and biological) for patent approaches to food production and consumption. We have traded food security for an easy and easily disastrous dependence. This being so, it is time, for our own long-term welfare and that of our environment, to take back our food system. It is time, in other words, for us to go home again and to EAT LOCALLY.

What this implies is a new way of thinking not only about what we eat, but how we eat, and the relationships that support our eating. As we move to decentralize, or localize, our food system, we will, of necessity, assume greater autonomy as well as responsibility for our mutual survival. Both eaters and food producers will need to interact more frequently and more directly. There will be a need to share the risks and rewards of resource use more equitably. People will know where their farmers are and just where they are coming from. They will also know how farm practices impact the health of the environment and the quality of the food it supports. Farmers, in turn, will know where there's local hunger and where it's coming from. They will also know how the lack of food equity impacts the health of the
environment and the quality of the lives it supports. As we shorten the distance between ourselves and our food supply, we simultaneously deepen our capacity for interpersonal trust, respect, and cooperation. Simply put, we begin to reconnect on a human scale with people and within ecosystems.

Local food, by its very nature, is fresher and more healthful than its long-distance counterpart (provided it is properly handled). It requires less energy, fewer pesticides, and other such life-support mechanisms. It has taste and can make eating an aromatic experience rather than an automatic one. Furthermore, food purchased locally through local markets enables additional local investment. It’s been said that a dollar spent on local foods circulates in the local economy generating $1.81 to $2.78 in other businesses. These could well be locally owned and operated grain mills, food lockers, bottling plants, slaughter houses, bakeries, restaurants that offer employment and diversify the economy. They could also be composting facilities, urban garden projects, land trusts and reserves that expand access to, and participation in, the local food system and ecosystem.

Investing inward in this manner is an investment in ourselves, in both our individual development and our common good. It is an investment that values and utilizes the diversity of human resources (social experience, cultural knowledge, personal skills) as well as biological and environmental resources. Herein lie the many grassroots solutions that connect people to place, place to purpose, and purpose to meaning. This is community building in its fullest sense. For community, as Wendell Berry writes, "exert(s) a sort of centripetal force, holding local soil and local memory in place." It offers us identity, continuity and tradition - the possibility of returning culture to agriculture.

Yet, it must be cautioned, eating locally does not mean that mid-Michigan forgoes bananas, that Lansing residents should starve rather than eat avocados, or that Michigan cherries will never find their way to Europe. It does not mean isolationism on a regional, state or national basis. What it does mean is that all people have the right to food self-reliance, and that this comes first. This is true for developing nations as well as industrialized nations. The best food should always be kept for local consumption. The surplus can be traded long-distance or given away as need arises. The best food is found closest to its source. It is food biologically and culturally suited to its microenvironment. It belongs and it confers this belonging to others, just as local honey imparts allergic immunity to local pollens. We need both this autonomy and diversity. The one makes the other possible and both ensure our long-term survival. We need to maintain communities of communities. If we fail to respect the integrity of such an ecologically complex and dynamic system, "no place like home" will all too soon become 'no home at all'.
Defining Sustainable Communities

Many Pieces Fit Together

Report from the Conference
June 2-4, 1994

A Project of the Tides Foundation
Published in Association with
Neighborhood Funders Group
Environmental Grantmakers Association
What Are the Fundamental Principles of Sustainable Communities?

Conference participants were asked to think about and write down one principle essential for sustainable communities, one value that must become part of conventional wisdom if we are to achieve sustainable communities. Responses to this admittedly difficult question were varied—spanning everything from decision making processes to our relationship with the earth. Included below are a few of the more than 150 thought-provoking and eloquent responses we received. The statements below are the words of *Defining Sustainable Communities* participants, unedited. The categories are the editors', however.

**Pluralism, inclusiveness and community-based decision-making**

- The foundation of sustainable communities has to be broad-based community participation and a proactive vision and strategy that includes all stakeholders in addressing community choices in an integrative way. Choices need to be considered in light of community partnership, enterprise, conservation and design, local economic diversity, and retention of wealth.

- Broadening our concept of what our community is and who is included in it is the foundation. If I view the entire planet as my community, then I will ensure others live as well and as fully as I do.

**Decentralize power, decision making and economic relationships**

- Smaller scale, decentralized production of energy and essential products. A focus on job creation through education, preventive health care delivery, bioregional food products and distribution.

- Find ways to keep local money from leaving my own community or region, e.g., encourage local businesses to purchase supplies produced locally, or local consumers to purchase local produce. Develop businesses which earn income based on value added by local assets.

- More connection between natural resources and their users/consumers on local/regional level (i.e., greater focus on regional agricultural production and use). Economy must come from ecosystem, rising out of the cooperative sharing of resources and needs of people in a place. Strong local economies with primary exchange within communities-less trade between more distant communities. Basic sustenance-food, clothing, shelter, etc., should be provided by the community itself, not corporate America or the world. Restore small business and local production based on renewable resources.

- Work toward increased localization of the economy so that more is produced at home by and for those who demand it. Re-evaluate that which is demanded-can it safely be produced? Is it necessary for a healthy life? cooperation, not competition, as the basis of economic, political and social relationships

- Cooperation rather than competition; less consumption; less materialistic mindset; reevaluate all subsidies to prioritize sustainability; change “scarcity” model to "recycling" of wealth within communities.

- Sufficiency and sharing as core values, rather than accumulation and independence.

- Seventh Generation principle rather than a personal ownership principle for use of resources.
• Wealth is not only individually based, but held in common as well. Foster cooperative arrangements instead of competitive arrangements. Increasing and improving quality is more important than simply increasing physical stocks (i.e., products, structures, etc.). Economic health is not measured by growth.

• What stands at the foundation of sustainable community is the value of our connection to one another and to the earth we live on. If we value this connection, we may begin to see that each human being is a resource and a steward to one another and to the earth.

• To value the social good as much or more than individual rights.

  **Redefine prosperity and the ways in which we measure it**

• Value redefined not as monetary gain, but through community improvement. Setting new set of indicators redefining "progress." Example: not through numbers (# of jobs, # of trees planted, etc), but through human measurements: Who acquired new skills, etc.?

• Everybody having enough to meet their basic needs (i.e. health care, food, housing) with dignity. Not seeing need as something negative.

• Central value placed on social relationships, being and doing together with nature. This means people would not need to fill their lives with things in order to fill the emotional and spiritual vacuum left when we are fragmented from each other. Rather than a value on making and accumulating $$/capital, value is interconnectedness and eliminating distractions created by $$.

• Compassion. Redefining what is meant by prosperity-away from accumulation of material wealth towards enrichment of a community through meaningful work, education which spurs curiosity, arts which entertain and push the limits of our understanding, an environment which sustains and is sustaining. Self-sufficiency. Cooperation. Reciprocity.

• Integrity Discounting efficiency with an exclusive focus on maximization of profits in the form of liquid, mobile capital with no tie to the community.

• Public control over capital. Consumption reduced to "renewable" level. Core concept: Capital is a resource to be shared with the community.

  **Redefine work**

• Secure income, meaningful work, environmental justice, job creation to meet social and environmental needs (with diverse skills base), public investment to accomplish this, and community and worker participation in meaningful decision-making.

• To produce goods and services that build community, i.e. that enhance the environment and build the culture of the community.

• To leave the environment and the culture richer for future generations. Build the capability and self-reliance of the community through import replacement.

• Create jobs to build a sustainable world (new jobs, nor just trading who stands in the unemployment line).

  **Equity and justice**

• Full employment and the re-distribution of wealth and the nationalization of key natural resources and services

• Redistribution of resources; recognition of long-term impacts of short term economic strategies and acknowledging "externalities." Incorporating long-term evaluation. Having an ethical "floor" to support everyone.

• Redistribution of wealth. Because this is difficult to do in our current capitalize greed, it has to begin to happen through new tax policy. Also, by more wage equity. Who in the world is worth $1 million? It might be about re-examining the labor market, about re-examining and improving jobs for growth, continued education. For corporations to take responsibility for themselves, the government must demand it.

• Sustainable communities are often looked at strictly in terms of resources-regeneration, preserving, scarcity, etc. But sustainable communities are not only achieved by this understanding. Sustainability is not about resources, but about distribution. It is not about efficiency but equity

• Power in the hands of those that make the wealth.
Recognize and live within ecological limits

- My mental block is the belief that 11 resources" are truly scarce. I agree that the quality of air and water depends on human decision and action. But some resources-trees, oil and gas, minerals-are scarce, so is time. What allocation method does this lead to?

- Living within the limits of our natural resources base (preserving it for the future).

- Assuring that access to resources is open.

- Understanding our dependence on natural resources and developing a system or policy for cleaning up and preserving for our children’s future. This thought process in itself would help create more equity and would put government in its proper role-setting goals.

- Natural supports remember connection with the ecology which supports us all. Live in such a way that these ecological systems are reinforced as we attend to the emotional and spiritual needs of diverse social groups. Find ways to work together to learn about and realize those processes leading to "happiness" and balance, emphasizing personal and local accountability.

Identify measure and pay "real costs"

- Social and environmental costs must be factored into the economic equation; systemic forces must be designed to value the sustainability of environmental resources and the livelihood of all people.

- An economic system based on true costing, i.e. capturing opportunities of

- Decentralize Political Power so that localities have more direct connection to their elected officials, and these officials have more power relative to the federal government.

- The fundamental institutional shift in tax structure-not how much to tax, but what to tax. Shift from income taxation to resource use taxation.

- Decisions should be based on long-term thinking and effects. Decisions should be based on the idea that we are interconnected and what affects us affects others. There are enough resources to go around and we can all have what we need. We must dispel the myths.
Conference participants were asked to identify one public policy or program that needs to be changed or enacted to help achieve sustainability. Clustered in informal discussion groups, participants wrote down their thoughts and then discussed their responses. The range of ideas and options, while not exhaustive, is a broad one and offers many ideas for action, research and alliance building. What follows is an attempt to group and organize these responses; they are ranked according to the number of times the response was given. Thus, tax reform, the first policy area listed, was the category mentioned most frequently.

**TAX REFORMS:** Use the tax system at the federal state and local levels to provide incentives for sustainable communities and activities and disincentives for polluting, resource depleting or wasteful practices. Use the tax system to help redistribute wealth and stabilize communities.

- Federal government should tax industries and activities that pollute or deplete finite resources. Eliminate tax breaks or subsidies (oil depletion allowance, Price-Anderson nuclear insurance, etc.) for polluting or resource depleting industries. Environmentally sound industries and businesses should be reinvested in developing new environmentally sound industries and businesses that create good jobs and in community-based businesses.

- Federal government should require extractive industries to invest in local economies and communities in which they operate.

- Make federal and state income tax even more progressive with fewer exemptions for the wealthy.

- Increase state and federal taxes on corporate profits.

- Tax subsidies that reward long term investments rather than rewarding short term profits and high turnover.

- Tax consumption (via sales and luxury taxes) not income; but exempt the basics from sales taxes.

- Tax net worth; tax "wealth" at higher rates than property used for sustenance.

- Reduce tax subsidies (mortgage deductions) for detached single Family homes; use tax savings to support transit and high density urban infill development.

- Tax credits for investment in human development, not investments in facilities.

- A carbon tax.

- (In California) Repeal Proposition 13, the property tax limitation.

- Higher inheritance taxes; put a cap on the amount of money that can be inherited in order to redistribute wealth inter-generationally.

**REDEFINE PROSPERITY OR GROWTH:** Current measures of growth, e.g., Gross Domestic Product, give skewed signals to the market by externalizing costs such as pollution, resource depletion, etc. The concepts of progress and prosperity should be decoupled from growth and profits.

- Require the private sector to internalize costs of doing business: clean up, pollution, depletion of finite resources.

- Create "full cost" accounting and pricing of products and services. This would encourage a transition to new, more environmentally sound methods of production, distribution and disposal; to new, more environmentally and socially benign products; to the elimination of many products and processes; to greater reuse and recycling.

- Create a new "official" measure of national prosperity to replace the GDP-one that internalizes full costs and places a value on human and community development as a measure of prosperity.

**REINVESTMENT AND ACCESS TO CAPITAL:**

Current policies (public and private sector) cause development to happen where it
shouldn't and not to occur where it should The former is the cause of sprawl air and water pollution and wasteful use of energy. The Latter is the cause of poverty, stagnating income, poor housing conditions, retail disinvestment crime and poor education in urban air;”

- Access to capital at preferential rates of interest for community economic development, environmentally sound business development and creation of good jobs for those now underemployed or unemployed.
- Federal, state and local incentives that will target public and private investments to low income communities in urban and rural areas underserved by current patterns. Reward businesses that hire locally and invest in communities in which they operate.
- Reward, via tax credits and other subsidies, research and development in energy conservation, pollution prevention, community based economic development and job creation.
- Duplicate Community Reinvestment Act for other industries-target inner cities and poor rural communities as beneficiaries.

REGULATION: Using a range of legal and regulatory schemes, prohibit or reduce unsustainable behaviors on the part of the private sector.
- Enforce and strengthen anti-trust laws to prevent increasing economic concentration and lower barriers to market entry by small companies.
- Strengthen laws that charter corporations; revoke charters of corporations that fail to protect die environment or workers.

JOBS: Full employment is a long term goal, Government at all levels, the private sector, philanthropy and non-profits should work in concert to create good, secure, healthy jobs that help to build communities.
- Halt lowest common denominator competition between communities and countries for economic development and jobs.
- Raise the minimum wage to a level that will allow full time workers to earn incomes above the poverty line.
- Put a ceiling on executive salaries; close the gap between CEO and average worker salaries.
- Make true (as close to 100% as possible) full employment a national goal.
- Create jobs that will help rebuild communities and infrastructure.
- Use tax and other incentives to develop "green jobs" and "community building," jobs in education, health care, child care, the arts.

TRANSPORTATION: Transportation is a primary tool for creating sustainable communities or causing their demise. Use transportation policy, programs and funding to conserve energy and resources, reduce sprawl and link jobs and family life.
- Shift federal, state and local transportation spending and priorities ,from highways to mass transit; encourage bikeways and pedestrian transit whenever possible.

TRADE: We need to understand the impact of trade (international and within the US) on communities, on jobs, on local economies. Trade policy should reflect the values of sustainability.
- We need a continuing society-wide debate on trade policy. Any trade agreements should include: highest common denominator labor, environmental and human rights

• Review and reform federal, state and local policies that permit or encourage sprawl; cause the flow of capital away from inner cities and established rural communities and small towns; separate people from their jobs; cause air and water pollution; destroy open space and ecosystems; segregate racial or ethnic groups.

• Revitalize land use planning and zoning as tools to create or enhance sustainability; encourage "general plans" for states and regions that identify fragile ecological areas, areas in need of investment, etc., that guide or determine development patterns.
protections; democratic participation; free movement of labor; ability to protect local and national industries.

- Put an end to policy that favors the North at the expense of the South, and begin by ending tax policies within the developed world that concentrate wealth. Sustainability requires economic justice within the world community first.

- Restrain or discourage via public policy mobility of capital across international borders. Allow capital mobility across borders only to achieve clearly and democratically defined social goals.

**HEALTH CARE:** Health is an essential element of sustainable communities. Good health results from access to affordable, high quality medical care and the creation of conditions that promote good health (clean air and water; elimination of exposure to toxics, good nutrition, etc.).

- Enact national health program whose primary goal is health status outcomes, not profits. Implement a federal, government-regulated baseline for all Americans.

**CAMPAIGN REFORM:** Widespread participation in electoral politics - as voters, candidates, and elected officials - is an essential element of sustainable communities because it fosters debate, responsibility and accountability.

- Enact campaign finance reform-at all levels of government-that reduces and ultimately eliminates the denomi-
American consumers have become more and more aware of the globalization of the economy in recent months. The debates were somewhat abstract leading up to the Congressional approval of NAFTA and GATT. However, issues surrounding the global economy have become more concretely highlighted in the recent celebrity embarrassments of Michael Jordan and Kathy Lee Gifford. Products they endorsed exposed them to damaging publicity when it was revealed the products were made in foreign sweatshops with abysmally low wages, heavy use of child labor, and near slavery conditions. The Walmart department store chain had earlier been similarly hurt when, despite their claims of selling only American made products, disclosures revealed that significant lines of their merchandise were manufactured under similar inhumane conditions in foreign countries. Thus, Americans have become newly aware of labor practices in China, India, Pakistan, Honduras, and Mexico that are being exploited by American transnational corporations.

In addition to labor practices, however, there are other dimensions of the global economy that need further examination. Prominent among these are issues concerning environmental protection and the use of natural resources. It is not uncommon today to have raw materials exploited in one country, then shipped halfway around the world to be processed into intermediate products that are then, in turn, shipped to some other distant country for assembly and further shipment to still another country for marketing and consumption. This can be seen in everything from textiles to automobiles. Where once transportation costs loomed large in economic location, today they have declined such that transnational corporations can regionally diversify operations based on the lowest labor costs and the lowest costs imposed by environmental regulation. In effect, in the short term, the costs of energy consumed in these far flung enterprises appear to be insufficient to outweigh the savings in labor and environmental costs arising from globe spanning operations.

Not only drawn to low cost labor, producers are ever alert to the international patterns of environmental laws and regulations. In my own experience, as Poland was casting aside communism and creating a new democratic state in 1990, US chemical companies were arranging for the sale of DDT and other American-banned chemicals to the Polish market. A strong and alert environmental NGO the Polish Ecological Club - got wind of the impending sale and managed to have it stopped. Closer to home are the American companies that have located across the Mexican border and have created horrendous environmental pollution in local Mexican communities. These examples represent the more notorious exploitation of weak environmental enforcement and minimal labor standards.

In short, while economists predict future abundance for all through globalization of the world economy, there are significant questions that require research and comprehensive policy analysis if full economic, social and environmental sustainability are truly to be achieved. In this thought piece, I will first try to outline the promise of globalization as seen in economic theory. Then I will examine assumptions that in my mind fail a reality test. From that I will suggest some of the consequences of holding to false assumptions and suggest a range of research questions that need attention in order to better understand what is needed to maintain a goal of sustainable development.
The Global Economy in an Ideal World

The arguments for a global economy are the same as those for a free market competitive capitalist system in the abstract. Essentially, a more prosperous economy will result for all -worldwide - if all political and nationalistic interventions to the free flow of capital and labor are eliminated. Thus, tariffs, subsidies, limitations on ownership, and other common governmental interventions are seen as barriers to the growth and development of a world wide economy. A competitive world economy means the availability of a diversity of choices among goods and services to all consumers throughout the world at competitive prices that will meet worldwide demand. Such an economy would make most efficient use of resources, capital and labor. Prices would be a true reflection of value and scarcity. Local regions would prosper through taking advantage of their unique resource endowments in an export oriented world economy. The key to prosperity is assumed to be open competition worldwide on a level playing field.

For producers, the free flow of goods and services throughout the world means that even small businesses can engage in world markets and substantially grow their operations as a result of being unrestricted in their search for new customers. They will also face more choice in suppliers as competitive markets in raw materials and intermediate products (tools, specialized parts, etc.) will mean better opportunities for lower production costs.

While acknowledging present day differentials in wage scales in the world, the argument is that eventually - in the long run - competition for labor will mean that labor costs will rise and become more uniform throughout the world (one example of this can be found in South Korea). Also "again in the long run" to the extent that environmental pollution is equated to inefficiency, pollution levels will fall without government regulation since pollution prevention, recycling, and reuse of materials will lower production costs.

In short, it is assumed that if the nation states of the world would stand back and adopt a laissez faire stance, a free global economy would mean worldwide economic growth that would result in more jobs for everyone everywhere at higher pay. This means the liberation of currencies from political control, the elimination of subsidies to provide the level playing field, the elimination of tariffs, complete mobility and freedom for investment, the elimination of government budgetary deficits, and the minimization of social safety nets and redistributitional policies.

These ideas go back at least to the Bretton Woods agreements and have progressed through the Uruguay Round of the GATT agreements (General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade). The most recent agreements have been ratified by the legislative bodies of almost all of the signatories. Under the agreements a World Trade Organization (WTO) has been established to adjudicate any disagreements and any perceived actions by participating nations that could be construed as restraint of trade. The US Congress ratified the GATT agreements in 1994. Already other nations have brought the US before the WTO arguing that environmental regulations under the Clean Air Act constitute a restraint of trade. This Spring the NN70 found against the US in this case.

Assumptions that Fail the Reality Test

A number of assumptions are involved in the world view just described. Many unfortunately do not square with current realities.
a. The Growth Paradigm

This vision of the global economy, first and foremost, rests on the assumption of unlimited growth - the world as Cornucopia. Even assuming that it could work as promised, can producers find the energy, the wood, the minerals, the food and the water that would be necessary to fully move to the world envisioned by the proponents of global free trade? Thus, the first key question is whether the earth has the carrying capacity for growth and development that is truly sustainable given the current trends of economic globalization. One author has wryly suggested that the only thing worse than the failure of globalization would be its success.

b. Power: an Omitted Variable

Economic theory has traditionally omitted power from its purview. As Don Geesaman of the Humphrey Institute likes to say when talking about power, you can't see it, touch it, feel it or smell it but when it's in the room, you know its there. Its presence, of course, is not confined to mere rooms but is pervasive in all geopolitical and geoeconomic relations worldwide. The recent rise in status of the field of political economy is one response to the growing concern about geoeconomic power.

It is important to emphasize that the problem of power is not restricted to politics or even the interface of politics and economics. Even if all governments in the world were fully laissez faire and non-interventionist, one would still face differentials in economic power between producers and consumers, between different producers and between different consumers. Producers have historically sought power over consumers through advertising and by either exaggerating claims or withholding information (regarding effectiveness of products, safety, etc.- caveat emptor). Big business holds power relative to small business; rich consumers hold power relative to poor consumers. The historic legacy of colonialism suggests that developed countries have exercised not only military or political power over third world countries but, more common today, economic power as well. The power of transnational conglomerate corporations provides ample evidence of capacities to dominate so-called competitive markets. Thus, within this complex of geopolitical power differentials the issue of sustainability is very much a question that needs exploration.

c. The drive to oligopoly and monopoly

Deriving from these power differentials, very little has been explored concerning the so-called competitive dynamics of market economies. A truly competitive free market rarely exists in equilibrium nor does it remain as such for very long. The very purpose of competition is to win over your competitors and economic competition is like the elimination draw of a tennis tournament or the US college basketball tournament. One may start with 64 players or teams but in the end the competition is whittled down to only two. In the market place, this means that so-called competitive markets have a dynamic push toward oligopolies or monopolies in a Darwinian survival of the fittest game. In the US, this can be seen in the deregulation of airlines, banks and health care institutions. These policy steps were taken in the 1970's and 1980's in the name of restoring competitive markets but the results tend to be contrary. Airlines, banks and health companies alike have since been moving steadily toward oligopolies. In the world market, probably the best example is the oil oligopoly. Despite the highly diffuse and competitive character of local agriculture in smaller countries, a few agribusiness corporations (Nestle, Pepsico, Cargill, etc.) also show the potential to approach an international hegemony.
Based on current trends, the assumption that competition will ultimately lead to behavior that will preserve natural resources and protect the environment is very much in question. The historic record of the logging industry is an example that suggests that short term self-interest will rule over long-term self-interest in most cases. The use of high discount rates in valuing future earnings in most financial circles adds further credence to skepticism about ultimate, long range concern for the environment and sustainability.

d. The Underestimation of Opportunism and Rent Seeking

Contemporary economists acknowledge that in real markets there exists behavior that they term opportunistic or rent seeking. For the rest of us, this is bribery, corruption, and generally illegal behavior (including, of course, the activities of organized crime). Newspapers report on the discovery of such behavior almost daily— not only among government officials but also among those whose activities are strictly in the market place. Aside from individual rent seeking, there is of course the more systemic realm of black market operations. Such enterprise is not restricted to internal operations within countries but also includes world-wide black markets. One of the more threatening insofar as sustainable development is concerned is the global market in illegal arms sales (this includes not just pistols and rifles but also sophisticated, larger scale weapons, including nuclear technology). As the example of Poland cited above, black market activities also include banned pesticides and other environmentally dangerous products or wastes. Even in countries with tough environmental standards, border officials and others can be bribed so as to permit the illegal international transfer of toxic materials. Moreover, air pollution arising from violation of national or international standards cannot be stopped at the border.

Clearly, opportunistic or illegal behavior can be a major obstacle in the goal of sustainable development, just as it is likely a major contributor to polluting behavior throughout the world. While most transnational corporations prefer to avoid the public relations damage of this kind of behavior, many claim that local culture and practices in countries such as China or India or Honduras leave them no other choice but to go along.

e. The Highly Unequal Regulatory Environment

At the beginning I suggested that Americans are shocked and indignant when they hear about the labor standards in other countries - or the total lack of such standards. Less evident in the mass media is the similar situation with regard to environmental protection standards. Many nations that are players in the global economy are either totally lacking in environmental laws or totally lacking in capacity to enforce the laws they have. In effect, the global economy consists of many participating nations that serve as either labor or environmental sinks, or both. Transnational corporations are drawn to such nations as bees to honey. Not only are labor costs a fraction of those in developed countries but the absence of environmental regulation means the ability to avoid the cost of efforts to protect natural resources or to prevent or minimize pollution.

Environmental concerns were a part of the debate in the United States over the NAFTA agreement. Clinton, in his 1992 campaign, indicated his intention to insure that NAFTA contained strong side agreements concerning environmental and labor standards. These standards were written into the agreements but the evidence to date suggests that Mexico has done little to implement them.
The existence of these environmental and labor sinks and the freedom to have capital flow to such sinks with impunity constitutes a considerable obstacle to the idea of sustainable development. Obviously, such countries welcome the capital flow and the new job opportunities despite the short-term and long-term costs of excess exploitation of human and natural resources.

The Global Trade Bureaucracy

The beneficiaries of GATT are clearly the international corporate and financial institutions that have already built dominant positions in the world economy. The international development organizations (such as the World Bank and the IMF) have been strongly criticized this past year as they celebrated their 50th anniversary. One of the key and most telling criticisms has been their lack of attention to environmental and natural resource issues in their development aid. Equally important has been the charge that they have failed to build equity in the societies they were assisting. Large scale projects (such as hydroelectric dams) have largely benefited those already in power along with foreign investors but there has been little trickling down to persons of lower status and there has been little attention to natural resource conservation or environmental protection. The Yantze River project in southern China is a good example of such a project.

As noted above, the GATT agreement has spawned the World Trade Organization (WTO) as the institution responsible for overseeing the globalization of the economy. This organization has come into being through the ratification of the participating nations in the GATT agreement. It is a body that has both rule-making and judicial functions and its commissioners largely represent global financial institutions. Based on their first ruling against the United States noted above, the issue of the WTO's ability to overturn the environmental laws of a nation on the grounds of restraint of trade is already on the table (as predicted by many environmental NGOs while the ratification of GATT was being debated). There is little evidence that the NN70 is comprised of decision-makers possessing any serious orientation to sustainable development.

In a real sense, the WTO is a new international institutional regime that bears close attention and monitoring not only with respect to who they are and the interests they represent but also inquiry into the evolution of their decision-making practices and their powers and the impacts and effects of their decision-making on sustainable development objectives.

The global economy impacts us all - from the character of institutional and economic power influencing all nations to the character and quality of our cities and neighborhoods. In their award winning book, Separate Societies, Edward Blakely and William Goldsmith attempt to suggest the linkages whereby current trends in the global economy are linked back to central city ghettoes that maintain segregation by race and sustain the character of marginalized labor. This is, thus, another important area of research.

In many respects, the momentum of the globalization of the economy involves trends that will be very difficult to stop. The key issue is whether the emerging international institutional regimes can be designed to lead to sustainable development (not necessarily based on growth) and greater social equity among the world's populations. Current trends seem to mitigate against these interlinked goals.

Therefore, a research center devoted to the integration of economic, social, political and environmental sustainability must be concerned with what is happening in the global environment. There are many
research issues which will be important and this thought piece has suggested some of them. Recapitulating, they include:

1. As noted, we need considerably more research on the capacity of the earth's resources for growth and development that is truly sustainable given current trends of economic globalization. While this has a Malthusian ring to it, we have much more sophisticated knowledge and understanding of the earth's limits today and this research should continue both conceptually and empirically.

2. The issue of geopolitical power differentials and their impact on sustainability is an important area for exploration, starting from more realistic assumptions about the dynamics of corporatist capitalism rather than fictional, abstract conceptions of competitive markets that really don't exist.

3. Research is needed to undertake a more complete examination of the assumption that oligopolistic competition under corporatist capitalism and international finance can ultimately lead to behavior that will preserve natural resources and protect the environment. I am skeptical that this will come about but an international regime with appropriate incentives could begin some movement in this direction.

4. Clearly, opportunistic or illegal behavior can be a major obstacle in the goal of sustainable development. Continual study of international movements of toxic or dangerous material (legal or otherwise) and transboundary pollution is necessary to document and publicize their impacts and consequences for sustainability.

5. Research is needed on the existence of environmental and labor sinks and the extent to which capital flows to such sinks. Inquiry into the nature of incentives for such host countries to resist such flows and bring their environmental and labor policies up to world standards needs to be explored.

6. More research is needed on the relation of sustainability to human rights, poverty, racial discrimination and inhumane labor practices.

7. Inquiry is required into the complex relations between economic globalization and urban settlements and how these in turn impact sustainability.

8. Finally, additional basic theoretical research is badly needed. The Bretton Woods and the GATT agreements, the work of the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund are largely based on neoclassical economic theory which to date has not been sufficiently challenged. As Keynes long ago noted, we are still the captives of economists long dead. For my own part, I suspect the pursuit of general equilibrium models lies at the heart of the problem. Such models tend to abstract away history (time) and space and oversimplify human behavior. They come perilously close to the fallacy of misplaced concreteness.

There has been considerable recent work in the philosophy of the social sciences offering more detailed critiques of economics and the empiricist factions of other social sciences. The critical concern for our purposes, however, is that of finding common paradigmatic ground for economics, sociology, politics and the physical sciences that will help us understand what needs to be done in pursuit of sustainable development. There is a growing literature attempting to do this and our efforts could well profit by joining with those voices.
READINGS ON GLOBALIZATION


READINGS ON CRITIQUES OF CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL SCIENCE.

(The first three are my favorites; well written and highly readable)


III. LOCAL FOOD POLICY GOALS AND ISSUES [F-3]

This section contains a number of examples of goal statements and ordinances from various communities. Also, there is some discussion of the types of policy issues found at the local level.

A. Goal statements and resolutions from Knoxville, TN, St. Paul, MN and Onondaga County, NY. [F-3]

1. Knoxville, TN. [F-3]
   b. "A Resolution of the Council of the City of Knoxville expressing its support of an effort to improve the quality, availability, and accessibility of food delivery systems for all citizens, and designating the Community Action Committee's Food Supply Project as Coordinator of this effort." Resolution R-202-81. October 31, 1981.

2. St. Paul, MN. [F-3]
   a. Ordinance of the City of St. Paul, MN, establishing a Food and Nutrition Commission and providing for its powers and staffing, July 8, 1992

3. Onondaga County, NY [F-3]

B. Different organization approaches used by food policy councils. [F-4]


C. Examples of policy statements from St. Paul, and Toronto. [F-5]


FOOD POLICY COUNCIL of the City of Knoxville

MEMBERS OF THE FOOD POLICY COUNCIL

Thomas A. Short, Chairperson
Mary Nelle Traylor, Vice-Chairperson
Elizabeth J. Henry
D. Edward McMillan
Susan Rothchild
Sarah Scott
Ruth E. Staffney

MAYOR: Victor Ashe


FOOD POLICY COUNCIL GOALS FOR THE KNOXVILLE FOOD SYSTEM:
* Ensure that an adequate and nutritious food supply is available to all citizens.
* Strengthen the economic vitality of the private food industry.
* Improve the quality of food available to all citizens.
* Encourage citizens to accept and consume nutritious food.
* Minimize food-related activities which degrade the natural environment: limit wasteful use of scarce resources needed for future food production and distribution.

FOOD SYSTEM COMPONENTS
The Food Policy Council is interested in the entire network of activities by which food is supplied to the citizens of Knoxville primary focus is on activities located within the city. Most important, in terms of the quantity of food handled, is the food distribution industry itself -- wholesalers and retailers, food brokers, related transportation specialists, manufacturers and producers, etc. At the end of the distribution chain are businesses and non-profit institutions which prepare and serve food to individuals -- restaurants, hospital food service facilities, nursing homes, college food service operations, public school lunch and breakfast programs, etc. A number of social service and charitable institutions also serve food to relatively large numbers of citizens in non-commercial settings.

Associated with that complex are professionals with various interests: dietitians and nutritionists, food technologists, food business executives and other management specialists, nutrition educators, professors, etc. Consumers themselves, sometimes organized into advocacy groups, are of course important.

HISTORY
An October 13, 1981 resolution of the Knoxville City Council recognized food as a matter for governmental concern and encouraged formation of a group to "continually monitor Knoxville's food supply system and to recommend appropriate actions to improve the system as needed." Resolution R-202-81 declared that "local government has a proper role to play in ensuring that all citizens have access to an adequate and nutritious food supply." Supported by this statement, Mayor Tyree on July 1, 1982 appointed the Food Policy Council after a proposal had been prepared by an interagency staff committee from the Community Action Committee, the Metropolitan Planning Commission, and the Department of Community and Economic Development.
Much of the initiative for those actions came from food and nutrition programs of the Knoxville-Knox County Community Action Committee, representing poorer residents who have had problems getting food. The proposal also drew on an earlier study by graduate students under Robert L. Wilson, then Associate Professor at the University of Tennessee, which described Knoxville's food system as a subject for local public policy.

**FOOD POLICY COUNCIL'S ROLE**

The Food Policy Council is advisory to the City Council, the Mayor, and the community in general. It may prepare reports directed to the Mayor, and/or City Council, prepare publications for general distribution, or communicate through the media. The Food Policy Council is expected to present annually a report on the status of the food system with suggestions for strengthening system performance.

The Food Policy Council has no authority to operate food distribution facilities, to regulate or control any aspect of the food system or to intervene in the operations of private businesses, non-profit organizations, or others involved in the food system. Implementing the Council's proposals depends on voluntary cooperation by other public agencies, by non-profit organizations, and by firms in the food industry.

**ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

- Successfully encouraged expansion of school breakfast programs in Knoxville schools.
- Studied locational relationships between bus routes and major food stores.
- Stimulated bus line extension by Knoxville Transportation Authority to reach a cluster of new supermarkets.
- Developed food distribution policies which have been included in Metropolitan Planning Commission's General Development Policy, subsequently adopted by City Council and County Commission.
- Initiated the development of a "grocery bus." Now CAC vans are available for regular shopping expeditions of inner city residents.
- Conducted public hearings at which food-related experts and food program advocates identified problems and proposed solutions. The hearings influenced the FPC's new comprehensive food policy recommendations.
- Encouraged the Knoxville School Board to make nutrition training one of the prerequisites for the top administrative position in school food services.
- Sponsors yearly "Calorie Conscious Consumer" awards to recognize food businesses which help consumers make low-calorie, nutritious food choices in restaurants, stores and institutions.
- Conducted an informal evaluation of inner-city food stores, including site visits to several facilities, and price comparisons.
- Stimulated Metropolitan Planning Commission to survey and consider geographic distribution of food businesses in land use planning.

**CURRENT PROJECTS**

- Stimulate development of a pilot "Urban Store" suitable for inner city locations.
- Understand problems of independent inner-city grocery store operators; identify kinds of help and improvements needed to create more viable operations.
- Continue "Calorie Conscious Consumer" awards program.
- Publish comprehensive food policy recommendations.

**REASONS FOR HAVING THE COUNCIL**

The complex system which supplies our food is fragmented. The Food Policy Council provides a local forum where, people from the food industry, food-oriented public agencies, concerned consumers, food-based professionals and academics can discuss common problems and interests.

Many people without resources for basic needs of life including food, must have help from the community. Problems associated with food needs can be articulated by the Food Policy Council. National programs to help supply food to economically deprived people have been severely reduced in scope. There has been an expectation that local governments and other local resources will step in to fill the resulting gap. The locally oriented Food Policy Council can help stimulate and coordinate that response where food is concerned.
Citizens, as well as health officials, have become especially concerned about the role of nutrition and diet in maintaining health, preventing disease, and achieving a desirable quality of life. There also has been increased public interest in issues such as additives in food, toxicity, adequate labeling, and freshness of food.

Public costs of medical care, hospitalization, education, and other social services are believed to be adversely affected by poor diet. Poor diet reflects the community's level of nutrition education as well as the quality of its food supply; both are continuing concerns of the Food Policy Council.

About 18% of an average household's income goes for food. This rises to as much as 40% or more for low income households. Therefore the efficiency and productivity of the food system, which affects food costs, is of general public interest. The FPC can watch for ways in which municipal actions can influence efficiency and productivity.

The food industry is a major component of the Knoxville economy. About 21% of Knoxville's industrial, wholesale, and retail jobs are food-related. The FPC can focus community attention on the potential for economic development within the food industry.

COMPOSITION OF THE COUNCIL
Three broad criteria have guided the choice of members for the Food Policy Council: governmental ties, working knowledge of the food industry, and experience in advocating for neighborhood and consumer interests. Membership has included: City Council members, a nutrition professor, inner-city residents & neighborhood advocates, a Planning Commission member interested in agricultural issues, a vice-president of a grocery chain and president of a state retail grocer's association, a former president of a wholesale food company, owner-operators of catering, restaurant, and food manufacturing businesses.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES
The Food Policy Council creates advisory committees to assist in identifying and considering food issues and related policies. A nutrition and health committee was the first to begin functioning. Another, from the food industry, contributed to the development of transportation recommendations. An agriculture and land resource committee has recently been set up.

STAFF SUPPORT
Services are provided through an interagency task force from: The Knoxville-Knox County Community Action Committee, the Knoxville-Knox County Metropolitan Planning Commission, Knoxville's Community Development Corporation, and the Mayor's Office. The Community Action Committee is the lead agency. Persons most directly involved are:

DIXIE LEA PETREY, Nutrition Project Director, Community Action Committee
(Chairperson of FPC staff) (615-546-3500)

BETSY CHILD, Director of Policy Development, Office of the Mayor (615-521-2104)

EWING M. JOHNSON, Long Range Planning Supervisor, Metropolitan Planning Commission
(615-521-2500)

WILLIAM V. POWELL, JR., Human Resources Director,
Knoxville's Community Development Corporation (615-521-8726)

ROBERT L. WILSON, Urban Food Planning Services, Consultant to the Food Policy Council
(615-588-7168)
RESOLUTION

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF KNOXVILLE
EXPRESSING ITS SUPPORT OF
AN EFFORT TO IMPROVE THE
QUALITY, AVAILABILITY, AND
ACCESSIBILITY OF FOOD
DELIVERY SYSTEMS FOR ALL
CITIZENS, AND DESIGNATING
THE COMMUNITY ACTION
COMMITTEE'S FOOD SUPPLY PROJECT AS COORDINATOR
OF THIS EFFORT.

RESOLUTION NO: R-202-81
APPROVED ON 1ST READING:
10-13-81
MINUTE BOOK: 45 PAGE

WHEREAS, the availability of nutritious food for all citizens is essential to the health and well-being of the community, and
WHEREAS, local government has a proper role to play in ensuring that all citizens have access to an adequate and nutritious food supply, and
WHEREAS, rapidly increasing demands for emergency food offered through charitable organizations is now exceeding resources, as evidenced by the reports of fifteen (15) sources which distribute over $144,000.00 worth of emergency food, and
WHEREAS, the cost of necessary food items is generally higher in the inner-city than in outlying areas, and
WHEREAS, a large number of inner-city residents lack necessary transportation for regular access to a quality food supply.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF KNOXVILLE:

SECTION 1: That we recognize the availability of food for all citizens as a matter of public concern.
SECTION 2: That the Knoxville-Knox County Community Action Committee's Food Supply Project be directed to prepare a strategy for improving the inner-city food supply.
SECTION 3: That the Metropolitan Planning Commission, the Department of Community and Economic Development, the Knoxville Transportation Authority, and other appropriate government departments participate in the preparation of this strategy.
SECTION 4: That the private food industry, which constitutes 20% of our local economy and the general public, be encouraged to participate in developing this food supply strategy.
SECTION 5: That this strategy will be directed toward the following goals:
1) Ensuring that an adequate and nutritious food supply is equally available to all citizens.
2) Strengthening the economic vitality of the private food industry.
3) Improving the quality of food available to all citizens.
4) Encouraging citizens to accept and consume nutritional food.
SECTION 6: That we will lend support and encouragement to the formation of a community-wide Food Policy Council, with broad representation from private and public interests, to continually monitor Knoxville's food supply system, recommend appropriate actions to improve the system as needed.
SECTION 7: This Resolution shall take effect from and after its passage.
ORDINANCE #17934
CITY OF SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA

Administrative ordinance amending the Administrative Code of the City of Saint Paul by adding a new chapter thereto to establish a Saint Paul Food and Nutrition Commission for the City of Saint Paul and providing for its powers and staffing.

THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAINT PAUL DOES ORDAIN:

Section 1

That the Saint Paul Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding a new chapter to the Saint Paul Administrative Code to read as follows:

.01 Purpose and Future Intent. The Saint Paul City Council desires to establish a Saint Paul Food and Nutrition Commission (hereinafter referred as the Commission) to serve as an advisory body to the Mayor and City Council on food and nutrition matters relating to the planning for, promotion or, access to and education regarding safe, affordable nutritious food and the operation and evaluation of existing food delivery systems.

The Commission is responsible for creation of policy recommendations to governmental units.

The City Council, in recognition of the fact that local governmental efforts in the area of food and nutrition matters, are best addressed in our geographic area as coordinated project with Ramsey County, does hereby express its intent to make a further and expanded effort in these matters via a city-county food and nutrition commission formed via a joint powers agreement.

.02 Saint Paul Food and Nutrition Commission.

Subd. 1. Saint Paul Food and Nutrition Commission established. There is hereby established a Saint Paul Food and Nutrition Commission consisting of eleven at-large members appointed by the Mayor of Saint Paul and ratified by the City Council through the open appointments process.

Subd. 2. Terms. Of the members first appointed, three shall be appointed for a term of one year, three for a term of two years, and the remainder (5) for a term of three years. Thereafter, the term of each member shall be three years.

Subd. 3. Vacancies for removals. Vacancies on the commission for whatever cause shall be filled by the Mayor through the open appointment process for the unexpired term. If a member misses three consecutive regular meetings without having a sufficient excuse, that member may be removed from the Commission by the sole action of the Mayor, and the vacancy shall be filled by the Mayor through the open appointment process for the unexpired portion of the term.

Subd. 4. Qualifications. All members shall be residents of the City of Saint Paul or be interested in and knowledgeable of the Saint Paul food and nutrition concerns.

.03 Staff and budget.

Subd. 1. Staff The Commission shall be staffed by a representative from the Division of Public Health. The responsibilities of the Division of Public Health's representative include: 1) serving as staff person and recording secretary to the Commission, 2) informing the Commission of the progress and conditions in the area of nutrition and food access, 3) advising the Commission on matters pertaining to food and...
nutrition when requested, 4) cooperating with the Commission in such matters as may be requested, 5) administering the Commission's budget and 6) providing additional support services as needed.

In the development and review of the food and nutrition element of the City's comprehensive plan, the Commission shall also be provided staff support as necessary through the Division of Public Health.

Subd. 2. Budget-- For the operations of the Commission, an annual proposed budget shall be submitted to the appropriate officials for suggested inclusion *in the City's budget.

.04. Meetings. The Commission shall establish a regular time and place of meeting and shall meet at least quarterly. Special meetings of the Commission may be called at any time by the chairperson, or by any four or more members of the Commission. All meetings shall be conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order Revised and notice of all meetings shall be published in accordance with proper notice procedures. A majority of all qualified commissions shall constitute a quorum and all business may be transacted by a majority vote of such quorum. The Commission may adopt and from time to time amend rules of procedures. Unless otherwise provided, any action taken by the Commission shall be by the affirmative vote of a majority of its members. The Commission shall keep a public records of its meetings. Copies of all minutes, motions, resolutions, findings and reports shall be available to the public upon request.

.05. Powers and Duties. The Commission shall act in an advisory capacity to the Mayor and City Council in all policy matters pertaining to planning for, promotion of access to, and education regarding safe, affordable nutritious food and the operation and evaluation of existing food delivery systems through activities such as the following:

1. Review and recommend as provided in Section .06 the proposed food and nutrition element of the City's Comprehensive Plan, or amendments thereto, and the food and nutrition element of the City's 10 year program for capital improvements.

2. Review and comment on the pertinent portions of the proposed Annual operating and biannual capital budgets of the Division of Public Health, Department of Planning and Economic Development and others as appropriate.

3. Participate in the review and comment on any project or decision involving Saint Paul citizens' access to safe, affordable, and nutritious food.

4. Participate in the review and comment on any project affecting the region's capacity to supply safe, nutritious and affordable food.

5. Advise and comment on the coordination of programs between governmental agencies.

6. Hold joint meetings with other groups of similar interest.

7. Prepare and present an annual State of Food Access and Nutrition Statue Report to the Mayor and City Council.

8. Conduct all business in such a manner as to encourage and utilize maximum citizen participation.

9. Perform other duties relative to food and nutrition issues.

.06. Plan and Program Funding Review.
Subd. 1. Public Hearings. Prior to the Commission's recommendation concerning comprehensive plans or master plans to the Mayor and City Council, the commission shall hold a public hearing and seek recommendations from all concerned citizens. Prior to such hearing the Commission shall publish a newspaper, of general circulation, notice of said hearing at least 20 days prior to day or hearing.

Section 2.

This ordinance shall be effective and be in force 30 days from its passage, approval and publication.

Adopted by the Council: Date July 2, 1992

Approved by the Mayor: Date July 8, 1992
The Mission of the Saint Paul-Ramsey County Food and Nutrition Commission is to serve as an advisory body to the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners and to the Saint Paul Mayor and City Council on food and nutrition policy matters relating to education, planning, promotion, and access to safe, affordable nutritious food and the operation and evaluation of existing food delivery systems.

Among the purposes of the Saint Paul-Ramsey County Food and Nutrition Commission are:

* To encourage the Saint Paul City Council and Mayor and Ramsey County Board of Commissioners to work cooperatively with its citizens, voluntary associations, regional farmers, the private food business sector, county and regional governments and government units concerned with the local resource base to implement the Saint Paul-Ramsey County Food Policy.

* To encourage incentives for government, individuals, organizations and institutions to take actions that contribute to realizing the goals of the Saint Paul-Ramsey County Food Policy.

* To assure that the Saint Paul-Ramsey County Food Policy goals are periodically reviewed and updated as goals are achieved or as needs change.

************************************************

The Saint Paul-Ramsey County Food and Nutrition Commission urges the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners and the Saint Paul City Council to support and fund initiatives that relate to the following Food Policy:

**SAINT PAUL-RAMSEY COUNTY FOOD POLICY**

**ECONOMIC ACCESS AND FOOD AFFORDABILITY**

Goals:

* Create and support economic opportunities for low-income Ramsey County residents, enabling them to afford to pay for basic needs such as food, shelter and clothing, resulting in less dependence on emergency services and food shelves.

* Promote full utilization of available food programs such as Food Stamps, WIC, Meals on Wheels, Fare Share, etc.

* Encourage interagency cooperation to maximize existing resources and programs, resulting in less dependence on food shelves.

**GEOGRAPHIC ACCESS TO FOOD**

Goals:

* Pursue and support government initiatives that protect and enhance the capacity of its citizens to produce a portion of their own food supply, and of regional farmers to produce food for consumption throughout the County.
* Advocate access to direct or wholesale buying for low income and limited mobility citizens.

* Promote opportunities for lower income and disabled City and County citizens without access to private transportation to purchase groceries without leaving their homes.

* Increase the number of neighborhood-based, small businesses related to the production, processing and/or marketing of nutritious, safe, affordable food throughout the County.

* Increase the accessibility of competitively priced full service grocery stores to low income and disabled City and County citizens who do not have access to such stores close to home.

* Increase the number and variety of outlets for locally-grown food throughout the County and increase the number of regional and state farmers selling locally grown food within the County.

* Encourage dedication of county and city land for citizens to raise a portion of their own food supply.

* Increase the availability of appropriate equipment and knowledge regarding processing and storage of home-grown foods, as well as proper disposal of food waste.

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SYSTEM**

Goals

* Promote understanding of the food system through information and educational programs about the system of production, processing and marketing that supplies food to the City/County area, in order to influence food policy.

* Increase elementary/secondary students' exposure to information about the structure and process of the food and agriculture system through school curricula and work/study opportunities.

**NUTRITION AND HEALTH**

Goals:

* Assure that all Ramsey County citizens will have their basic nutritional needs met without persistent dependence on the emergency food system.

* Encourage knowledgeable use of food resources.

* Improve the nutritional status of Ramsey County citizens with the goal of reducing the incidence and prevalence of diseases which are related to diet.

**FOOD SAFETY**

Goals:

* Encourage appropriate government policies to reduce citizens' exposure to potentially hazardous substances employed in the production, processing and preservation of food.

* Increase consumer awareness of known and potentially harmful practices used in the production, processing, preservation and handling of foods sold throughout the County.
* Encourage government policies to protect and strengthen the region's capacity to supply a safe food supply.

* Encourage elimination of procedures that may produce surface and ground water pollution in the County and in the Metropolitan area.

* Encourage research and information available to Ramsey County farmers and food processors on sustainable production and processing techniques.

* Provide information to Ramsey County citizens on sustainable methods to maintain healthy yards and gardens.

* Encourage reduction of the use of non-recyclable food packaging materials in the County and increase the percent of recyclable food packaging that is actually recycled.

* Seek opportunities to expand the composting of yard waste and other materials generated in the County that would make appropriate farm inputs.
WHY HAVE A FOOD SYSTEM COUNCIL?
Over the last decade there has been a growing interest in food - its production, processing, delivery and availability. Concerns about hunger, farm closings, company mergers and the safety/quality/cost of food have emerged as major issues on the national and local levels. Although food is critical to the health of all citizens and local economies, most areas lack an agency or organization that looks at the various parts of the food system from production through consumption. In fact, the system that brings food from farm to table is composed of many distinct yet interdependent components:

- Natural Resources
- Agricultural Inputs
- Farmers
- Food Processing
- Technology and Distribution
- Restaurants
- Wholesale/Retail Marketing
- Commercial & Institutional Food Service
- Consumers
- Government (Policies, Programs, Regulations, etc.)
- Society/Culture.

In 1984, under the initiative of concerned local citizens and the Planning, Research and Development Committee of the Onondaga County Legislature, the Onondaga Food System Council was created. The Council was designed to serve as a forum in which representatives from various parts of the food system could communicate with one another and address shared issues and concerns.

WHAT IS THE ONONDAGA FOOD SYSTEM COUNCIL?
The Council is a not-for-profit organization comprised of representatives from the public and private sectors who have diverse backgrounds in areas associated with the County's food system. The Council consists of a Board of eleven voting Directors and a group of seven Special Advisors. The Directors represent local producers, processors, distributors, marketers, consumers, community organizations and institutions. The seven special advisors represent the County Department of Health, Planning, and Social Services, the County Legislature, the City of Syracuse and Cornell Cooperative Extension. The Council meets on a monthly basis through the auspices of Cornell Cooperative Extension's Education Center in Syracuse.

WHAT IS THE COUNCIL’S MISSION?
The Council's Mission is to aid the legislative and executive branches of local government, as well as leaders of public and private agencies and organizations, in local food system planning and policy formation, and to assist residents in gaining a useful understanding of the food system and food policy issues within Onondaga County and Central New York. To accomplish this mission the Council seeks to:
- foster better communication, understanding and cooperation among the various people and organizations involved with the food system of Onondaga County and Central New York;

- facilitate research on specific aspects of the local food system;

- promote better understanding of food system and food policy issues among Council members and local residents;

- serve as a repository of information on food system and food policy issues;

- prepare recommendations regarding key local food system issues and problems for the legislative and executive branches of government, other agencies and organizations, and the general public.

WHAT HAS THE COUNCIL DONE?
In its early years the Council undertook specific activities that were designed to educate its members and other interested groups about the local food system. Specifically, the Council:

* sponsored and conducted local tours that focused on four major areas of the food system: food production, food processing, food wholesaling/retailing/distribution and emergency food programs;

* produced a Directory of Informational Sources that provides information for community leaders about agencies, organizations and business involved with our local food system;

* provided a forum for the discussion of local food system topics such as the economic and environmental aspects of farming, agricultural districts, farmers markets, hunger issues, food policy during emergencies and food safety;

* developed and prepared a flow chart of the emergency feeding system and a graphic display of emergency food sites and retail outlets;

* assisted the Onondaga Citizens League In its 1988 study "Role of the Food Industry in the Economy of Onondaga County";

* began an inquiry (as part of a city task force) Into Inner city and rural retailing problems and options; planned and conducted a "Food System Dinner".

In 1992, the Council received a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation to hire a part time staff person and Initiate a project to preserve agriculture in Onondaga County and improve food accessibility for local consumers. At the same time, the Council continues to provide a forum for communication, discussion and debate among individuals involved with our local food system and helps keep our local government informed about local food system issues and concerns.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

The Council welcomes Involvement from community members who are interested In these issues. For Information about this or any facet of the Council's activities call (315) 424-9485.
III. LOCAL FOOD POLICY GOALS AND ISSUES [F-4]

This section contains a number of examples of goal statements and ordinances from various communities. Also, there is some discussion of the types of policy issues found at the local level.

A. Goal statements and resolutions from Knoxville, TN, St. Paul, MN and Onondaga County, NY. [F-3]

1. Knoxville, TN.
   b. "A Resolution of the Council of the City of Knoxville expressing its support of an effort to improve the quality, availability, and accessibility of food delivery systems for all citizens, and designating the Community Action Committee's Food Supply Project as Coordinator of this effort." Resolution R-202-81. October 31, 1981.

2. St. Paul, MN.
   a. Ordinance of the City of St. Paul, MN, establishing a Food and Nutrition Commission and providing for its powers and staffing, July 8, 1992

3. Onondaga County, NY [F-3]

B. Different organization approaches used by food policy councils. [F-4]


C. Examples of policy statements from St. Paul, and Toronto. [F-5]
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I. INTRODUCTION

In doing research on sustainable agriculture over the years, I have been struck by the contrast between the rhetorical stress placed on the need to develop local and regional food systems and the actual focus of most research on sustainable agriculture - which has been primarily concerned with agricultural, farm, and to some degree rural issues. This, of course, raises a basic question: Why has there been so little serious discussion and analysis of the general role of cities and towns in local and regional food systems, not to mention their potential for helping to increase the amount of locally grown food for local consumption?

There are several possible answers. One relates to the mental compartmentalization that results from our categories of "rural" and "urban." This compartmentalization affects not only our understandings, but the research on agriculture and food. Cities and towns are simply and unconsciously assumed by most to be only consumers of food. This perception is confirmed and reinforced by the fact that no U.S. city has a Department of Food. Food is not seen to be an issue or a problem for municipalities. Equally, few citizens or officials are aware of how dependent their town or city is upon distant national and international systems (public and private) for their food and how vulnerable those systems are. Nor are they aware of the extent and complexity of their local food systems, much less their potential. The extent of this potential just in the production sector is illustrated by the fact that the value of the produce from all U.S. gardens (urban and rural) is roughly equivalent to that of the corn crop (approx. $18 billion/year!).

This project has sought to remedy this general neglect by exploring the potential of cities to be more self-reliant and more efficient in operating their local food systems. In addition, it has sought to understand how these local food systems might fit into regional food systems. Much greater development of this potential is not only desirable in the shorter term, but will definitely be required in the longer term as fossil fuel prices increase and multiply prices throughout our energy-inefficient food system.

The concept of food systems used here is a very broad one, which extends through interacting levels from the household to the international and global scale. This paper focuses on how local food systems and cycles operate at the household, neighborhood, and municipal levels. At each level there are major issues associated with each portion or sector of the food system: from production issues (farmland preservation, farmers markets, household & community gardens), to processing issues (local vs. external), to distribution issues (transportation, warehousing) to access issues (inner city grocery stores, co-ops, school breakfasts & lunches, food stamps, the WIC program, etc.), to use issues (food safety and handling, restaurants, street vendors), to food recycling (gleaning, food banks, food pantries and soup kitchens) to waste stream issues (composting, garbage fed to pigs, etc.). Besides the social, economic, and environmental issues associated with the above, there are also a number of ethical and value issues involved.
The specific research involved focused on the activities of food policy councils in five cities and one county: Charleston, SC; Kansas City, MO; Knoxville, TN; Onondaga County, NY; Philadelphia, PA; and St. Paul, MN. The paper seeks to analyze the various factors that have influenced their successes or failures and to provide a brief overall comparison of their effectiveness. By so doing, it will hopefully give us a better understanding of the problems and potential of local food policy councils. The findings, while reasonably firm at this point, should not be read as final for two reasons. First, while the reports on the three most active councils have been completed (Knoxville, TN; St. Paul, MN; and Onondaga County, NY), additional details can be expected to emerge in the final reports on the remaining cities. Second, the whole area of local food systems is only now attracting the attention of a relatively small number of researchers. Those involved are in the process of sorting out the key issues and the best ways to try to conceptualize local food systems.

One other qualification is that in this kind of report there is a tension between the desire to be candid and honest about the role of key individuals, while at the same time respecting the confidences they and others provided me - all of which can touch upon strong personal and local sensitivities.

II. FACTORS INFLUENCING THE "SUCCESS" OR "FAILURE" OF FOOD POLICY COUNCILS.

A. Defining "success" and "failure." The basic question here is: Which evaluative criteria should be used to assess "success" and/or "failure." There are several possible answers. First, local food policy councils can and should be assessed in terms of their own goals - to the degree that they are spelled out and are specific enough to do so. Second, councils can be evaluated in terms of their local context, where one can look at policy results in terms of the nature and scope of proposals adopted and what was possible in that context. Third, one can estimate the degree to which the councils contribute to the education of political leaders, local government officials, and the public more generally on local food system issues. Finally, local food policy councils need to be evaluated in terms of larger and longer term set of goals relating to sustainability. That is, in terms of the degree to which such councils do or might contribute to ameliorating the larger urban crisis facing the U.S. and assist in creating what the World Health Organization calls "healthy cities." This imagery of "healthy cities" is important as it captures the underlying shift in basic evaluative criteria that is a central part of moving towards more sustainable/regenerative systems. This image, however, needs to be broadened beyond a public health conception - to include healthy natural, social, and technological systems.

B. Factors influencing "success" or "failure." The following factors are not presented in order of importance. Attempts at any ranking will have to wait for the completion of the remaining final city reports. It seems clear even at this point, however, that the relative importance of different factors varies from city to city.

In reviewing each factor, the cities/county will be discussed in alphabetical order. Tables will be used to summarize the main points for each of the cities and county. Where appropriate there is some discussion of the importance of each factor and/or a brief evaluation of how the different cities/county compare. A brief summary evaluation then follows.

1. Regional values. These do appear to vary considerably, although their importance in influencing behavior is hard to assess. Also, the number of people questioned was small and certainly not random. I asked people what they thought were important regional values relating to the land, agriculture, and food, as well as to community. I also asked for their assessment of the general political climate. The
comments differed within communities as well as between them. Table 1 summarizes the main views expressed.

2. City/county size and demographics. These are largely self-explanatory. It should be noted that the study does not include any smaller-sized communities. Among the mid- to large-sized cities included here it does appear that population size is a significant factor in what cities can or cannot do as well as in the organizational strategies that may work best for each. Table 2 summarizes the main size and demographic features of each city and/or county. Numbers are also included for each metropolitan area since one of the problems that food policy councils face is the fragmentation of the area "foodshed" into a number of different jurisdictions.

3. The historical and political context. The general history and political setting of a city or county makes a difference in how issues are handled. Obviously, it also affects the way in which advisory bodies, such as food policy councils, operate. There are important differences between strong mayor and council/manager forms of local government. Beyond the general setting, there are differences between individual mayors and the degree of support that they provide for recommendations coming from their advisory councils. As indicated earlier, each of the mayors involved in creating the five city food policy councils had to demonstrate a fairly high level of interest and commitment in order to participate in the US Conference of Mayors project. The range of groups and stakeholders represented (or not represented) in the original taskforces set up to draft recommendations was important because it tended to set the initial direction and membership of the councils. These, of course, can change over time, just as mayors and the level of support can change over time. Staff support is another important factor in providing continuity, access, and assistance in promoting and implementing recommendations.

Table 3 indicates the type of government, my assessment of the degree of support by the mayor and staff for the local food policy council, as well as the degree of representativeness of the original taskforces.

4. The mandated role and powers of the councils. There is significant variation between the councils in this regard as can be seen in Table 4. Only one of the councils (St. Paul) has its legal basis in ordinances. One (Knoxville) has its legal basis in a resolution. One (Onondaga County) was originally established by the Legislature and now - as a public non-profit organization - has its members appointed by the County Executive and Legislature. The other three have little or no formal status within their city governments. Philadelphia never had a formal city status, only public support from then Mayor Goode. The Charleston Commission was originally appointed by the Mayor, but has ceased to function. The council in Kansas City was appointed by the Mayor until they chose to separate from the city and become a private non-profit advocacy group that could address issues in the entire metropolitan area.

Three of the cities have developed formal food policy statements which either have been accepted by the Mayor (Philadelphia) or formally adopted by the city council (Knoxville and St. Paul).

Only St. Paul has anything more than advisory powers - where the Food and Nutrition Commission now reviews the food-related programs and activities of other city departments. Each year Knoxville gains attention and publicity through the annual report it presents to the Mayor and Council. Thus, the councils generally have a minimal power base in terms of their formal institutional position and powers.
5. The organizational position and degree of integration into city government. One of the key institutional questions (along with the type of city government) is just how much difference the location of a food policy council makes. There are several dimensions to this. One is how close or distant a food policy council is to the mayor's office. There are obvious trade-offs involved here. If a FPC is a part of the Mayor's office, then the degree of support it receives (whether budgetary or policy) can change significantly as mayors change. Also, the FPC is more likely to be politicized and to be pushed/pulled according to the priorities of the current mayor. On the other hand, if a FPC is distant from the mayor's office, then it is much freer to pursue its own agenda and priorities, but may not receive as much support for them from the mayor's office.

The particular department/agency where the FPC is located makes a real difference as does the type of support that a FPC is able to build with other departments or agencies through formal or informal linkages. One important type of formal linkage is to have people from various departments and agencies formally designated as staff support for the FPC. This formal designation of liaison people as staff support for the FPC seems to be much more effective than simply having them serve as regular members of the FPC. This latter approach was used in both Charleston and Kansas City (which had a particularly large Mayor's Committee), but does not seem to have been very effective in generating support. Perhaps it is the specific assignment as a liaison and staff support person that encourages greater efforts to perform those functions. Another consideration in this regard is that by making city staff members of a FPC, it is less clearly seen as a citizen advisory body.

In addition to formal linkages, there are many forms of informal linkage - the effectiveness of which depend primarily upon the political/bureaucratic skills of FPC leaders and staff.

Table 5 gives a summary of my evaluation of these factors. It will be noticed that the rankings in Table 5 are generally low. One reason for this is that food policy councils generally receive little substantive attention or support from mayors, councils, and city administrators. They (like many other advisory groups) are seen as useful bodies to keep the city informed of needs and issues and what non-profit groups are doing. Given their immediacy and visibility, hunger issues can easily come to dominate both food policy council agendas and city awareness. As a result, the many other important aspects of local food systems often receive little or no attention unless the food policy council or other groups push them vigorously. Another reason for the low rankings is that no American city has a department of food. What this means - as compared say to economic planning - is that the percentage of city budget and staff time that is spent on food-related issues is very low.

Any attempt to try to assess what would be an appropriate level of city support for food system issues really requires one to imagine what city governments would look like if they were reconceptualized and reorganized around the needs and requirements of sustainability. A "healthy cities" approach would suggest organizing cities around clusters of overlapping systems: food, shelter, health, education, neighborhoods, environment, resources, and sustainable development. The contrast with current administrative structures (based upon functional specialization) and current economic development priorities is very great.

6. The composition of food policy councils. Table 6 gives my impressions of the strengths and weaknesses of the composition and representativeness of the different food policy councils. Judgements are difficult here. First, the membership of the councils changes over time. Also, one person may speak for more than one group. Thus, the listing of "main groups represented" as contrasted
to "groups with no spokesperson." The idea is to indicate which groups not only have no direct representative, but no one to speak for that concern/issue. The question arose whether or not to include "consumers." Upon reflection, it was decided not to include them since there really is no broad-based consumer group concerned about food system issues (as distinct from groups concerned about labeling, food safety, nutrition, etc.). Also, each member of a FPC is also a "consumer" of food and is in a position to address any general consumer concerns.

Second, the listing of groups is based upon the elements of local food systems discussed earlier (see p. 1). Thus, waste stream issues are seen as an integral part, even though most FPCs do not include them. The same largely applies to schools, although several FPCs are concerned not only about school breakfast and lunch programs, but in trying to educate students about food issues. Yet, few, if any, K-12 teachers or curricular people are members. Farmers are also only occasionally represented, although several councils are concerned about loss of farmland. None of the councils has representatives from or liaison with environmental groups, although some members are concerned about environmental issues. The lack of formal representation or liaison with farmers and environmentalists means that most councils are not seeking to build bridges with groups that have a basic interest in a number of food-related issues and need to be made more aware of them.

In terms of the groups that are most commonly represented, one can see that they are hunger advocates and health and nutrition groups. This is consistent with the tendency of both the public and city governments to see hunger and related health issues as the main local food issue. While it is not obvious from this table, those councils which have been more successful are those that are not dominated by hunger issues and groups (see below). Finally, as mentioned above, if FPCs are to be understood by all as citizen advisory bodies, it is probably better not to appoint city staff as members, but rather have them serve in a liaison function as support staff to the FPC.

As in the previous table, the relatively low ranking of the various councils in terms of their links with other groups is based upon a criterion of effective linkages; that is, linkages that go beyond simple networking (of which there is plenty) to those that can provide concrete support for recommendations or programs.

7. Staff and budget support. The generally low priority of food and hunger issues in local government is clearly reflected in the low level of budget and staff support provided for the various councils. This is not surprising, nor unique to these issues. As with any "new" issue (such as environment, energy, recycling, etc.) that doesn't fit into existing bureaucratic rubrics, it is difficult either to generate new budget/staff or to reallocate from existing programs, many of which are underfunded. The federal cutbacks for urban programs in the 80s, combined with economic uncertainties and taxpayer revolts have made it very difficult for local governments to provide traditional basic services, much less be open to adding new ones. Thus, even the modest support received is important. As suggested above, most of this would appear to be focused on hunger issues.

Only Knoxville has had regular (but very modest) staff and budget support over the years. St. Paul and Ramsey County have passed ordinances which give the FNC new powers, plus a half-time staff person and a modest budget. Onondaga County has just completed a two year W. K. Kellogg Foundation grant which has provided a half-time staff person to the FSC through the Extension Service. They are now searching for ways to continue that support. All of the other councils have had shifting and/or minimal staff/budget support. Philadelphia had staff support during its early years, but not later. The same applied to Charleston until its council ceased to function. Kansas City's Mayor's Taskforce and
Municipal Food Policy Committee had city staff support until the new Heart of America Coalition, a private non-profit advocacy group, was created. Some staff support is now provided by the local food bank (Harvesters: The Community Food Network). See Table 7 for a summary.

As discussed in Section 5 above, the use of staff liaison people from relevant agencies to assist the primary staff person is an important way that a couple of the cities involved have strengthened both their staff support and their access and effectiveness. The presence of such liaison staff in FPC meetings encourages a two-way information sharing between the FPC and the respective agencies, plus offering possibilities for a more general coordination of programs and sometimes a leveraging of resources.

Another element here involves the background and training of the primary staff people. The kind of orientation people bring to the job influences their general approach to, and understanding of food system issues. The types of backgrounds found in this study included: social service people, professionals (nutritionists), and administrators. Other types found elsewhere include grassroots activists and academics who have moved into the public sector.

8. Consultants and advisers. It is interesting that the more successful FPCs all had formal or informal consultants (see Table 8). Knoxville has had regular and consistent help from planning consultant Robert L. Wilson, who originally thought of, and then helped to create the FPC there. His tasks have been the most regular. St. Paul has been able to draw upon the knowledge and expertise of the Minnesota Food Association and its Director Ken Taylor and staff, particularly Margo Stark. Onondaga County has had the regular presence of Professor Kate Clancy, as well as some of her students.

The availability of such experienced and knowledgeable consultants and advisers whether on a regular or occasional basis - is extremely important. Not only can they produce important reports and conduct retreats and focus meetings, but they offer an independent source of ideas, evaluation, and judgement. They typically have a broad public policy orientation so that they can explain the importance of not focusing exclusively upon hunger issues. Also, their typically longer-term perspective is particularly valuable in identifying emerging needs and opportunities.

9. Overall program leadership and management. The figures presented in Table 9 are based on my rough evaluation of how the overall leadership in creating and running programs has been distributed between the FPCs themselves, their major committees, staff, and consultants. These are particularly difficult estimates and evaluations to make. The figures are not meant to represent the amount of time or effort expended, but the relative amount of effective leadership and management by each group.

In the second column, it was thought useful to separate hunger from non-hunger projects and programs, since each council has spent considerable time and effort on hunger issues. Interestingly, those cities that have focused primarily upon hunger issues have been the ones that have been the least successful overall.

The two right hand columns distinguish between staff leadership and consultant leadership. The percentages for Knoxville and St. Paul represent the contributions of the paid consultants there, while for Philadelphia, they represent the unpaid consulting provided by Libby Goldstein.

Finally, it should be kept in mind that this table does not attempt to assess the success or failure of the programs and policies of each city or county. Rather, it seeks to point out where the leadership activity
is taking place and how it can shift with organizational changes, particularly increases or decreases of staff time.

III. A SUMMARY EVALUATION.

At this point in the project, no detailed evaluation of the "successes" or "failures" of the different councils will be attempted. Even so, it may be useful to give my current evaluation of the relative success of the different FPCs.

Among the six FPCs studied, Knoxville and St. Paul appear to be the most successful. Knoxville has nicely survived the transition from its founding to a new FPC Staff Coordinator and is continuing to pursue a broad agenda of issues. St. Paul has now become a joint city/county operation and has half time staff support (currently the most of any of the FPCs).

Onondaga County, after years of hard work, many accomplishments, and completion of a two year period of half time staff support (grant funded), is now at a crucial transition point - where the amount of local funding and staff support its council can generate will determine its form and future.

Philadelphia, Kansas City, and Charleston have been less successful. Philadelphia has many important food-related activities going on, but these are no longer coordinated through the Food and Agriculture Taskforce. In Kansas City, the change its council from a city advisory body to a non-profit body has meant a broadening of its geographic coverage to the entire metropolitan region, combined with a narrowing of its focus to hunger issues. The demise of the Charleston Food Policy Commission suggests the least success, although the role of Hurricane Hugo in this was significant. No other city or county suffered a comparable trauma - something that makes comparisons difficult.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The following reasonably firm conclusions regarding the various factors that influence the success or failure of FPCs can be made. Additional details will be added as the final reports for the remaining cities are completed.

The first three factors (regional values, size and demographics, and the historical and political context) constitute the larger-context setting elements or givens that councils must work with and within. Among the various aspects discussed, it would appear that the most important are city size and the presence of a strong mayor system. Generally, the larger the city, the more difficult it appears to be to organize an effective FPC. Part of this is the pure logistics of trying to bring the relevant groups together, plus the kinds of jurisdictional fragmentation that is ever-present in metropolitan areas. Generally, strong mayor systems offer the chance (given support from the mayor) for new groups/issues to make an impact. The lack of examples of council/manager systems in this study make it difficult to confirm that this general tendency applies to all food policy councils.

In terms of the mandated role and powers of the councils, the most important aspect appears to be the degree of formal institutionalization of the council. The more institutionalized the council, the more likely it is to have budget and staff support as well as perhaps some review and/or planning powers. How much such institutionalization reflects the success of the organizers and advocates of the council
in getting such recognition and how much it reflects the political priorities of the mayor or council is an interesting question - and one where the answers may vary from city to city.

Among the various aspects of organizational location, it appears that the presence of liaison staff and the organizational linkages and leverage which they can contribute are perhaps more important than the actual organizational location of the council in terms of closeness or distance to the mayor/council.

The last four factors (composition of the council, staff and budget support, consultants and advisers, and leadership) involve a mix of individuals, structures, and group decision making styles. While not discussed above, it is clear that individual personalities and capabilities have been extremely important in terms of what has happened at each site. Yet, the rules and structures at each site are also important. Perhaps the way to see it is that representative councils, good staff and budget support, and the presence of consultants/advisers are all necessary, but not sufficient conditions for a successful food policy council. Beyond these, dedicated, competent, compatible, and savvy individuals are needed to make the right things happen at the right time. A final factor here (discussed in the Knoxville and St. Paul reports) is that there is a major difference in approach and style between council members from the private sector (who often have an action orientation focused on results) and those from the non-profit or public sectors (who often have a process orientation focused on change and reform). Such differences in group decision-making styles (as well as interests) complicate one of the major challenges of a FPC - to make sure that it is pursuing an agenda which seeks to protect and enhance the long-term public interest, something, that as noted at the outset, needs to be (re)defined to include all the various issues of sustainability.

Among the last four factors, it does seem clear that staff and budget support are crucial to the success of FPCs. The presence of consultants and advisers is also very important.

Finally, it appears that a strong emphasis on hunger issues - whether in the composition of the council, the staff, or the leadership - negatively affects the longer-term success of a FPC. An important reason for this is that a predominant focus on hunger easily reinforces ideas and approaches which, in practice, tend to make people dependent rather than empowering them. Also, by focusing on relieving hunger rather than trying to reduce the sources of hunger (the lack of access to land and/or to jobs), such an approach reduces pressures to reform urban systems in ways which will make them more equitable and sustainable. Conversely, vigorous and diverse FPCs that address the full range of local food system issues can assist in the process of moving towards more sustainable and healthy cities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Key Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>A strong work ethic. An emphasis on reliability generally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A strong attachment to the land (with the focus on private property, not the common's). Some concern for preserving some island land and farming. (Good for the poor compared to middle/upper classes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Great Lakes/Midwest</td>
<td>A long tradition of farming and support for farmers. Largely a long tradition of farming, but also a strong attachment to the land (with the focus on private property).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>Upper Great Lakes/Midwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga County, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Great Lakes/East Coast</td>
<td>A strong tradition of volunteering. Distinct of government and taxes. Attachment to one's own property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>An emphasis on independence and self-reliance combined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid West/South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1: Regional Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Area (Sq. km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persons / Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentages (in sequence) are for whites; blacks; Asians & Pacific Islanders; and Hispanics. Totals may be more than 100% due to rounding and/or double identifications. The populations given in City, County, and Metro columns do not include residents of the city in other counties. The populations given in City and County columns do not include persons living in the city who are not residents. The population figures for Cities are based on the 1990 Census. The population figures for Counties are based on the 1990 Census and 1991 estimates. The population figures for Metros are based on the 1990 Census and 1991 estimates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Type of Government</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Mayor/Executive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>Strong mayor</td>
<td>1985-5</td>
<td>1992-5</td>
<td>Mayor Riley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>Strong mayor</td>
<td>1985-5</td>
<td>1992-5</td>
<td>Mayor Riley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>Strong mayor</td>
<td>1985-5</td>
<td>1992-5</td>
<td>Mayor Latimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>Strong mayor</td>
<td>1983-5</td>
<td>1992-5</td>
<td>County Executive Pirro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadephia, PA</td>
<td>Strong mayor</td>
<td>1983-5</td>
<td>1992-5</td>
<td>Mayor Berkley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga County, NY</td>
<td>Strong mayor</td>
<td>1984-5</td>
<td>1992-7</td>
<td>County Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1 = low; 10 = high)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Legal Status/Basis</th>
<th>Mandated Role and Powers</th>
<th>Official</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>Commission appointed by the Mayor</td>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(no longer functioning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>Council ordinance (1994); Council resolution (1983)</td>
<td>Advisory, plus review of city &amp; county plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1989-: Heart of America Coalition set up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appointed by the Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990-: Heart of America Coalition set up</td>
<td>Advisory, plus review of city &amp; county plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appointed by the Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>Council resolution.</td>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as a non-profit group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990-: Heart of America Coalition set up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appointed by the Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995-: Taskforce and Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(no longer functioning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commission appointed by the Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, SC</td>
<td>Council appointed by the Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>Informal private-public coalition with support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1985-90: Taskforce and Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appointed by the Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990-: Heart of America Coalition set up</td>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appointed by the Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994-: Community Health Coalition set up</td>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appointed by the Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994-: Community Health Coalition set up</td>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appointed by the Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995-: Taskforce and Committee</td>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(no longer functioning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commission appointed by the Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>Informal private-public coalition with support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1985-90: Taskforce and Committee</td>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appointed by the Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990-: Heart of America Coalition set up</td>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appointed by the Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994-: Community Health Coalition set up</td>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appointed by the Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995-: Taskforce and Committee</td>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(no longer functioning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commission appointed by the Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Legal Status and Mandated Role
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Distance/closeness</th>
<th>Liaison to other</th>
<th>Integration into Mayor/Council</th>
<th>Linkages to other agencies/units</th>
<th>Integration into City Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga County, NY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Agencies: CAC=Community Action Committee; CC=City Council; CCs=City Council Staff; CL=County Legislature; Oom=Office of the Mayor; OM=Office of the Manager; NCS=Neighborhood Services; MPC=Metropolitan Planning Commission; OoM=Office of the Mayor; NCS=Neighborhood Services; MPC=Metropolitan Planning Commission; OoM=Office of the Mayor.*

**Table 5: ORGANIZATIONAL POSITION AND DEGREE OF INTEGRATION**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Groups Represented</th>
<th>Main Groups Represented</th>
<th>Spokesperson Units</th>
<th>Links to Other Groups and Waste Stream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>Gd, Hg, HI, R</td>
<td>C, E, N, P, S, W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>E, Gd, Hg, Hl, N</td>
<td>C, F, P, R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>D, F, Hg, Hl, Gr</td>
<td>C, E, Cd, S, W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga County, NY</td>
<td>D, F, Hg, Hl, Gr</td>
<td>C, E, Cd, S, W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>D, Cd, Hg, Hl, N, P, R</td>
<td>C, E, Gr, S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>Hg, Hl, C, Gr, R</td>
<td>C, D, Cd, E, P, So, W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: FPC Composition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Staff (% of FPC)</th>
<th>Budget and Support</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>1985-89</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Mail, phone, x duplication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1985-90</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Social services; administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mail, phone, x duplication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>1982-90</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Social services, administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phone, x duplication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>1985-92</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Social services; farming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mail, phone, x duplication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1989-93</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Social services; administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>1985-92</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga County, NY</td>
<td>1982-92</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: STAFF AND BUDGET SUPPORT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Formal/Informal</th>
<th>Regular/Occasional</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga County, NY</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Prepare special reports;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>organize focus groups;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare Special Reports;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide General Advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide Special Reports;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare Special Reports;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide General Advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide General Advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare Annual Report;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular/occasional</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8: Consultants and Advisers**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Committees/Projects</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>1985-90</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>1982-93</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>1985-89</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga County, NY</td>
<td>1992-94</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>1989-93</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>1990-92</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Relative percentages per group and topic)*
This paper is based upon a project entitled “Local Food Systems: Policies and Values Influencing their Potential.” The research was supported by the Ethics and Values Studies Program of the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DIR-9022243. The government has certain rights in this material. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.


Of the six, all except Onondaga County participated in a 1984-85 project conducted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors to establish local food policy councils in those cities. Knoxville, TN, had developed its Food Policy Council prior to the US Conference of Mayors project and served as a model for it. The Onondaga Food Systems Council was also created prior to the U.S. Conference of Mayors project. While the cities chosen for the project varied in population, location, and poverty rates, a "principal element used in the selection of the cities, of course, was that hunger and malnutrition were major concerns of the mayor and the city government" and that they were willing to allocate staff time to organizing and running the taskforces and public hearings required. For details, see United States Conference of Mayors, Municipal Food Policies: How Five Cities Are Improving the Availability and Quality of Food for Those in Need, Washington, DC: October 1985.

For Onondaga County, there is no comparable figure to a mayor. The Chairman of the Board of Commissioners has some powers, but nothing comparable to a strong mayor. The County Executive has more overall power in terms of the kinds of policies which the county food policy council recommends.

The St. Paul Food and Nutrition Commission gained legal status through a city ordinance passed July 2, 1992. Recently, it became a joint city-county commission by the passage of a county ordinance which also helped to increase the base funding to include a half time staff person.
III. LOCAL FOOD POLICY GOALS AND ISSUES [F-5]

This section contains a number of examples of goal statements and ordinances from various communities. Also, there is some discussion of the types of policy issues found at the local level.

A. Goal statements and resolutions from Knoxville, TN, St. Paul, MN and Onondaga County, NY. [F-3]

1. Knoxville, TN.
   b. "A Resolution of the Council of the City of Knoxville expressing its support of an effort to improve the quality, availability, and accessibility of food delivery systems for all citizens, and designating the Community Action Committee's Food Supply Project as Coordinator of this effort." Resolution R-202-81. October 31, 1981.

2. St. Paul, MN.
   a. Ordinance of the City of St. Paul, MN, establishing a Food and Nutrition Commission and providing for its powers and staffing, July 8, 1992

3. Onondaga County, NY

B. Different organization approaches used by food policy councils. [F-4]


C. Examples of policy statements from St. Paul, and Toronto. [F-5]
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PREAMBLE

People, regardless of where they live, have certain basic needs - the need for shelter, for food, for health and for a sense of security. In the democratic community, these values are expressed as rights or entitlements accorded its citizens and deemed to be in the best interests of the total community.

Values are made real in the life of the community through the development of policies, the enactment of implementing laws and the adoption of practices which reflect those values. (Systems for fire and police protection are the most familiar of these arrangements.)

Most major cities have not taken responsibility for the development of policies addressing the basic need for food of their citizenry. The post World War II changes in the system which brings food to our table insulated the consciousness of urban leaders and citizens alike. The ongoing availability of safe, nutritious and affordable food was assumed.

This is no longer the case. The emergence of persistent hunger as an urban issue, expanding awareness of the connections between diet and disease, between agricultural production practices and the contamination of food products found on the grocer's shelves and the retreat of the Federal government from its role in the food policy-making process, are all factors contributing to a growing concern among urban dwellers for the security and the fairness of their food system.

The Saint Paul Municipal Food Policy is an attempt by government leaders and citizen interests to provide a framework within which the City can take action to address the range of food policy and program issues identified during the life of the Food and Nutrition Commission. This policy is, in the final analysis,

* a statement of values,

* a declaration of responsibility,

* a call for action.

The primary value statement is that food, as a basic need for survival of the human community, is a right and a responsibility of the citizens of this City; the City declares that it will assume the responsibility to provide the leadership and direction required to give life to this value, and it proposes to establish the cooperative framework within which the City, as a government entity and as a community of people can take action to achieve the policy objectives set forth in this document.
SAINT PAUL MUNICIPAL FOOD POLICY

GOALS

1) Assure that all Saint Paul citizens have access to safe, affordable and nutritious food.

2) Protect and strengthen the region's capacity to supply safe, nutritious and affordable food to Saint Paul citizens.

3) Assure that the Saint Paul Municipal Food Policy Is Implemented upon Its adoption by the City Council and that It Is periodically reviewed and updated as appropriate.

STATEMENTS OF POLICY

GOAL 1:

Assure that all Saint Paul citizens have access to safe, affordable and nutritious food.

I. ISSUE: GEOGRAPHIC ACCESS TO FOOD

It is the policy of the City of Saint Paul to assure that all of its citizens, regardless of where they live in the City, their income, physical disability, or ownership of private transportation, have access to food outlets offering competitively priced, nutritious foods.

II. ISSUE: ECONOMIC ACCESS & FOOD AFFORDABILITY

It is the policy of the City of Saint Paul to assure that all of its citizens have their basic nutritional needs met without persistent dependence on the emergency food system.

III. ISSUE: FOOD SAFETY

It is the policy of the City of Saint Paul to eliminate the exposure of its citizens to hazardous substances and to substantially reduce its citizens' exposure to potentially hazardous substances employed in the production, processing and preservation of food.

IV. ISSUE: NUTRITION & HEALTH

It is the policy of the City of Saint Paul to promote and support the dietary recommendations made in "Healthy By Choice, the Minnesota Plan for Nutrition and Health' to raise awareness, increase knowledge, and improve overall food choices made by its residents.

V. ISSUE: COOPERATION

It is the policy of the City of Saint Paul to work cooperatively with its citizens, voluntary associations, regional farmers, the private food business sector, county and regional governments and government units concerned with the local resource base to realize the objectives of the City's food policy.
GOAL 2:

Protect and strengthen the region's capacity to supply safe, nutritious and affordable food to St. Paul citizens.

I. ISSUE: RESOURCES FOR FOOD PRODUCTION

It is the policy of the City of St. Paul to pursue and support development policies that protect and enhance the capacity of St. Paul citizens to produce a portion of their own food supply, and of regional farmers to produce food for consumption in the City.

II. ISSUE: ENVIRONMENTAL & CITIZEN PROTECTION IN THE PRODUCTION OF LOCAL FOODS

It is the policy of the City of St. Paul to assure that the environment is not degraded, nor its citizens exposed to environmental hazards in the production or processing of local foods.

III. ISSUE: MARKETING OF LOCALLY GROWN FOODS

It is the policy of the City of St. Paul to pursue and support policies that maximize the percent of locally-grown foods in the City's food supply.

IV. ISSUE: EDUCATION ON THE FOOD SYSTEM

It is the policy of the City of St. Paul to assure that its citizens have access to information and educational programs about the system of production, processing and marketing that supplies food to the City.

V. ISSUE: NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT

It is the policy of the City of St. Paul to include small-scale, neighborhood-based food production, processing and marketing businesses in its development plans.

VI. ISSUE: COMPOSTING/RECYCLING

It is the policy of the City of St. Paul to cooperate with its citizens and with regional farmers to maximize re-use of yard and food waste generated in the City, and to minimize the generation of non-recyclable materials by the City's food system.

OBJECTIVES

GOAL I

ISSUE: GEOGRAPHIC ACCESS TO FOOD

OBJECTIVES
A. Increase the accessibility of competitively priced full service grocery stores to low income and disabled St. Paul citizens who do not have such stores in their neighborhoods.

B. Increase the opportunities for lower income and disabled St. Paul citizens without access to private transportation to purchase groceries without leaving their homes.

II. ISSUE: ECONOMIC ACCESS & FOOD AFFORDABILITY

OBJECTIVES

A. Create a competitive climate among food retailers regarding their pricing of 'basic' food items.

B. Increase low income and limited mobility St. Paul citizens' access to direct or wholesale buying.

C. Reduce the number of St. Paul citizens routinely requiring emergency food assistance.

D. Create and support economic opportunities for low income City residents, enabling them to afford to pay for basic needs such as food, shelter and clothing.

III. ISSUE: FOOD SAFETY

OBJECTIVES:

A. Increase the Information available to consumers at point of sale regarding known and potentially harmful practices used in the production, processing and preservation of foods sold in the City.

B. Reduce the availability of foods sold throughout the City that have been exposed to known or potentially hazardous substances and processes.

C. Increase the availability of foods sold throughout the City that have not been exposed to known or potentially hazardous substances or processes.

D. Increase consumer awareness of known and potentially harmful Practices used in the production, processing, preservation and handling of foods sold in the City.

IV. ISSUE: NUTRITION & HEALTH

OBJECTIVES:

A. Improve the nutritional status of St. Paul citizens. Indicators of poor nutritional status include anemia, low birth weight and short stature among infants and children. By 1995, the following goals should be met: Reduce anemia among pregnant WIC (Women, Infants and Children Program) mothers by 40 percent; decrease low birth weights; and reduce short stature among infants and children entering nutrition program services from 13.8 percent to five percent (the normal percent found in the population at large).

B. Reduce the incidence and prevalence of disease related to diet among St. Paul citizens.
V. ISSUE: COOPERATION

OBJECTIVE:

A. Provide Incentives for Individuals, organizations and institutions to take actions that contribute to realizing the goals of the City's food policy.

GOAL 2

I. ISSUE: RESOURCES FOR FOOD PRODUCTION

OBJECTIVES

A. Provide neighborhood residents access to open space, water and light for purposes of raising food.

B. Encourage City residents to raise a portion of their own food supply.

C. Eliminate unnecessary legal barriers to City residents' raising plants and animals for food.

D. To enhance Individuals' ability to provide their own food supply, increase the availability of appropriate equipment and knowledge regarding processing and storage of home-grown foods to citizens throughout the City.

E. Work with other appropriate public bodies to assure the continued availability of Metro area farmland for potential production of food consumed in the City.

II. ISSUE: ENVIRONMENTAL & CITIZEN PROTECTION IN THE PRODUCTION OF LOCAL FOODS

OBJECTIVES

A. Reduce soil loss from agricultural production methods to "T" (the rate at which soil is naturally replaced) in the Metropolitan Area by the year 2000.

B. Eliminate agricultural and lawn chemical pollution of surface and ground water in the City and in the Metropolitan Area.

C. Increase the research and information available to Metro Area farmers and food processors on production and processing techniques that minimize use of synthetic chemicals.

D. Increase the research and information available to St. Paul citizens on how to maintain healthy yards and gardens without use of synthetic chemicals.

E. Protect St. Paul citizens from exposure to synthetic lawn spray chemicals.
F. Eliminate the exposure of St. Paul citizens to toxic levels of lead in home and community gardening soil.

G. Protect St. Paul citizens from Dioxin and other toxic residues that can filter into the City's soils.

III. ISSUE: MARKETING OF LOCALLY GROWN FOODS

OBJECTIVES

A. Increase the number and variety of outlets for locally-grown food in the City.

B. Increase the number of regional and state farmers selling locally grown food within the City.

IV. ISSUE: EDUCATION ON THE FOOD SYSTEM

OBJECTIVES

A. Increase elementary/secondary students' exposure to information about the structure and process of the food and agriculture system through school curriculum and work/study opportunities.

B. Increase adults' understanding of the food system.

V. ISSUE: NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT

OBJECTIVES

A. Increase the number of neighborhood-based small businesses related to the production, processing and/or marketing of nutritious, safe, affordable food In the neighborhood and the City.

VI. ISSUE: COMPOSTING/RECYCLING

OBJECTIVES

A. Continue City support for, and seek opportunities to expand the composting of yard waste and other materials generated In the City that would make appropriate farm inputs.

B. Reduce the use of non-recyclable food packaging materials In the City and increase the percent of recyclable food packaging that is actually recycled.
WHEREAS, after a year of study the Food Policy Task Force, working as a pilot project of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, determined that municipal policy was appropriate and needed regarding the accessibility, distribution, and quality of food available to urban citizens; and

WHEREAS, a Food and Nutrition Commission was created by the City Council and its membership appointed by the Mayor to develop a food and nutrition policy proposal for the City of Saint Paul; and

WHEREAS, the process of policy development was assisted through the participation of neighborhood representatives, food retailers, health professionals, consumers, and agricultural providers; and

WHEREAS, the Food and Nutrition Commission has completed and submits for our consideration and adoption a food and nutrition policy proposal; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Saint Paul City Council does accept the report and policy recommendation of the Food and Nutrition Commission and does recognize the dedicated work and significant contribution of the Commission in presenting this document; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Saint Paul City Council does hereby adopt the policy as proposed by the Commission as the Food and Nutrition Policy of the City of Saint Paul.

Approved by Mayor: George Latimer Date: Nov. 23, 1987
Agricultural policy making must be changed if sustainability is to be achieved, says just released report

Government efforts to create sustainable agriculture in Canada will fail unless there are major changes to the ways agricultural policy is set, says the Toronto Food Policy Council (TFPC).

In a report released today, the Council called on the federal and provincial governments to make major changes to Departments of Agriculture. Said TFPC Co-chair Dr. Harriet Friedmann, "Agriculture has been enormously productive in recent decades. The main problem is that fragmentation of issues, knowledge and responsibilities has hidden the costs associated with this success. These are mainly environmental, social and health costs, which have been assigned to other ministries, with their own histories unconnected to agriculture. Now that agricultural policy has achieved its success, its costs are becoming apparent."

The report calls for the creation of departments of food and food security. Such departments would address the needs of all players in the food system, from the farmer to the consumer, and would focus on building food security, agricultural sustainability and opportunities for optimal nourishment for the population. The report also explores the implications of such changes by examining four case studies: the licensing of recombinant Bovine Growth Hormone (rBGH); the development of policy to protect Intellectual Property Rights; the provision of full information on food to consumers, and the existing Federal Fertilizers Act. Each case reveals significant flaws in both the process of decision making and the contents of the decisions. Were changes made to the process and content of policy development, very different policy would result: rBGH would not be licensed, Intellectual Property Rights would have a very different form, consumers would have much greater access to information so that they could make truly informed choices about food, and the Fertilizers Act would be replaced with legislation supporting sound agronomic practices. Given the magnitude of such changes, the last section of the report presents a 15-year timeline for the transition to a new system.

The Toronto Food Policy Council is a subcommittee of the City of Toronto's Board of Health. It offers new approaches to ending hunger and the need for a charitable food distribution system, and to creating a more environmentally and economically sustainable food system. Its members represent community organizations, food businesses, health professions, labour, education, and the farm sector.

For further information, contact Rod MacRae, Coordinator, Toronto Food Policy Council 416-392-1107. Fax: 416-392-1357.
IV. LOCAL FOOD POLICY ORGANIZATIONS [F-6, F-7, F-8, & F-9]

In this section you will find a historical timeline of work that has been done on local food systems planning over the past several decades written by Kate Clancy. Also, there are some summaries as well as the complete reports prepared by Ken Dahlberg on the local food policy councils in Knoxville, TN, St. Paul, MN, Onondaga County, NY, and Philadelphia, PA


B. Local Food Policy Councils:

1. Knoxville. [F-6]


3. Onondaga County, NY. [F-8]


5. Toronto, Canada. [F-9]
   Rod MacRae, "So Why is the City of Toronto Concerned about Food and Agricultural Policy? A Short History of the Toronto Food Policy Council." *Culture and Agriculture*, Winter 1994, pp. 15-18.
A Timeline of Local Food Systems Planning

Prepared by Kate Clancy - 1996

[This historical timeline of how local food system concepts and planning have developed includes only highlights of the many activities and writings that comprise this effort. The phrase local food systems planning (LFSP) is used to gather together under one concept a number of different activities and ideas. Many of the events in the timeline were not labeled as LFSP in the materials which describe them. The efforts listed here are in constant flux. Many projects and organizations no longer exist or have changed in various ways. New projects committed to understanding and improving local food systems start up every month].

1920s to 1960s

1929--Hedden writes *How Great Cities are Fed* (DC Heath and Co.), to educate people on the complexity of the food system at the time. First usage of the term "foodshed".

1941-45--Serious effort at planning for food supplies during WW II. Development of the Recommended Daily Allowances, grain enrichment policy, and rationing of some foods.

1962-Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* is published; begins the education of U.S. public on environmental issues and the relationship of many of them to food production.

1970s

1973--The oil embargo and Russian wheat deals alert general public to new issues like dependence on foreign energy sources, world grain trade (trading oil for food), and other similar complexities. The meat boycott is first major move of consumers onto the agriculture policy agenda. E.F. Schumacher publishes *Small is Beautiful*, a treatise on a new, more humane economics.

mid-1970s--Nutrition policy councils start in various places around the country; forerunners to food policy councils.

1975--*Food for People, Not for Profit* (Lerza and Jacobson) alerts the general public to many of the problems in the food system and how they are related to each other.

1977/78

- Bob Wilson and grad students in planning do study of food distribution system in Knoxville.

- Paige Chapel is hired as urban agriculture coordinator at the Center for Neighborhood Technology in Chicago.
-Mark Winne starts The Hartford Food System.

1980s

1980-82

-Rodale begins its Cornucopia Project to encourage groups around the country to describe and measure local food supplies.

-The Cornell Center for Local Food and Agriculture started by University's chaplain.

-Knoxville City Council resolution approves establishment of a Food Policy Council (1st in the country).

-Britz compiles and publishes *The Edible City Resource Manual* in Oregon; a philosophy and model for a "biologically healthy urban environment".

-London (England) Food Commission is established.

-Rod Leonard starts publication of *The Community-Nutritionist* to highlight community food activities.

-The Center for Neighborhood Technology publishes *Food Files*, a compilation of sophisticated analyses of the Chicago food system including an urban food system matrix, strategies for reform written by Paige Chapel, and a model plan for metro food production prepared by Roger Blobaum.

1983-85

-Onondaga County Legislature gives go ahead to develop a Food Systems Council based on arguments that it was needed to protect and plan for future food supply.

-Philadelphia Food Task Force begins.

-Ken Taylor founds the Minnesota Food Association. Threat to demolish farmer's market leads to development of the St. Paul Food Commission which MFA staffs.

-Bob Rodale proposes in op-ed ad in NY Times that the Mayor institute a New York City Department of Food.

-In response to hunger crisis of 1981-84, U.S. Conference of Mayors initiates a 5-city project to develop food policy councils.

-Brewster Kneen starts Nutrition Policy Institute in Canada. His *Ram's Horn* publication influences thinking about food systems throughout North America.

1988-90

-Healthy Toronto 2000, in furthering "healthy cities", "healthy public policy" model, recommends the development of a Toronto Food Policy Council (TFPC).
Kate Clancy outlines the eight elements critical to the success of food system councils.

TFPC is formed as a sub-committee of the Board of Health with substantial budget and extensive, sophisticated food systems agenda.

1990s

1991-92

Northeast Network Project, a collaboration of Penn State and Cornell University Extension begins public policy education on food and agriculture across the region.

Ken Dahlberg commences his study of food policy councils.

Arthur Getz publishes his thoughts on urban foodsheds (based in part on his work on Japanese “CSAs”) and inspires more food systems work.

Phil Lewis at U of Wisconsin proposes Circle City concept to preserve farmland and food supplies in the Midwest.

1993-present

An explosion of food system projects occurs across the country, including metro planning, community food security, regional food guides, and many others.
Nutrition Planning for a City
by Geoff Becker
Editor, CNI Weekly Report

Few citizens noticed last October when the Knoxville City Council unanimously adopted Resolution R-202-81. But the measure could have a far greater impact on their lives than the big World's Fair that will descend upon them in May.

That is, if the resolution's authors can make them understand its meaning. Knoxville may not know it, but it has embarked upon a unique and promising experiment.

The document is three pages long, but one line states its thrust: "Local government has a proper role to play in ensuring that all citizens have access to an adequate and nutritious food supply." The statement signifies one of the first times that a local community has recognized officially the food needs of its citizens.

It is more than a symbolic step. City Hall has called for a community-wide Food Policy Council to assemble all of the heretofore unconnected pieces that comprise the city's food system. With this act Knoxville joins only a tiny handful of other cities. (Hartford, Connecticut is another.)

Knoxville and surrounding Knox County is not a metropolitan area plunging so steeply into recession that authorities are casting about for drastic solutions. As home to the huge Tennessee Valley Authority, the University of Tennessee and several diverse private industries (the Oak Ridge nuclear facility is a neighbor), the area has escaped the most severe effects of the nation's economic downsizing. But neither is it a well-oiled urban utopia, where each of its citizens' needs is carefully attended to and problems are few. In fact, the Knoxville area (population: 320,000) falls somewhere in between; it's neither Cleveland nor Palm Springs.

And, like other city fathers, Knoxville's have generally overlooked an invisible, pervasive, diverse-but fragmented-urban support system: food supply.

Knoxville's blighted areas don't bring to mind the stark poverty of a Watts or Harlem. Nevertheless, the residents here are poor. City authorities have brought in many of the traditional cures to worn-out neighborhoods like Mountain View, treating physical signs of illness through block-razing, brick-raisin urban renewal. In fact, the area has undergone a pleasing facelift.

But, cruising up one street and down another, there's a gradual realization that something is missing: There are no food stores in this rejuvenated section. The nearest supermarkets barely skirt the edges of Mountairiview, well out of walking distance for most of the area's largely low-income population. Anti-hunger activists working with the Knoxville-Knox County Community Action Committee's Food Supply Project piqued the City Council's interest in Resolution R-202-81. The resolution underlines the city's "support of an effort to improve the quality, availability, and accessibility of food delivery systems for all citizens, and (designates) the Community Action Committee's Food Supply Project as part of this effort."

The Food Supply Project was funded by a two-year $25,000 grant from the now-defunct Community Services Administration that will be exhausted by September 30. Like so many advocates at the local level, CACs food staff had for years battled the food problems of low-income citizens with standard-issue weapons: food stamp and school meal advocacy, community gardens, food buying clubs, and so forth. Although useful, such activities often were unrelated, and treated symptoms rather than causes.

Then the group came across a 1977 study by Robert L. Wilson, a food planning consultant and professor at the University of Tennessee Graduate School of Planning. The study, "Food Distribution and Consumption in Knoxville," was conducted by his students in a ten-week graduate planning course. Wilson considers it one of the first comprehensive examinations of a community's food supply problems-and potential-in the nation.

At the CACs West Neighborhood Center, Rita Shoffner is troubled by the numbers she sees on her desk pad. In March, 1981, some 16,700 households in the county received food stamps. By December, the caseload had dropped to 14,968, the direct result of last year's federal cutbacks, not of any change in local economic or population conditions, she says. She sees even more cuts on the horizon this year.

Shoffner, an anti-hunger worker whose federally-supported salary is jeopardized also by budget cuts, reports another steep decline in participation in the women, infants and children (WIC) supplemental food program, from 5,700 last July to 3,600 in January. Ironically, much of the drop could have been avoided. "Knox County could have a caseload of 5,000-they have enough money for that. But the stories about WIC (huge cutback proposals, ultimately rejected by Congress) were so horrible that people just would not bother to apply for it," she observes sadly.
The U.T study documented many of the needs that CAC workers had been dealing with for years on a day-to-day basis. The study found that city residents spend about a fourth of their incomes on food, a rate that climbs as income drops to the poverty line. The U.T. students found a significant number of low-income and elderly residents in the city, which they defined as "high-risk" groups. Some 40 percent of all pupils qualified for free or reduced-price lunches. Other observations in the U.T. study, which CAC staff also had found but not formally documented:

*There was no broad coordinating agency for food in the city.

*The surrounding county was experiencing a disturbing loss of agricultural land. An aging and outmoded wholesale facility near the downtown area was handling most of the city's produce supplies.
* The coming World's Fair might put a heavy strain on the already fragile and fragmented food distribution system, as the city copes with large numbers of visitors.
* There was little or no monitoring of nutritional deficiencies among the city's high-risk populations, and no coordination of the public intervention programs aimed at these groups.

"Bob's study made a lot of sense to the agency in light of its experience," said Alan Town, who runs CACs Food Supply Project. As an anti-poverty organization, CAC's first responsibility has been to the poor. However, "looking at the community's entire food system, we realized that we're all affected by the same strengths and weaknesses in it," Town added.

Among those weaknesses is a flight of food retailers from the inner city, a phenomenon that Knoxville shares with many metropolitan areas. It affects all inner-city dwellers but is hardest on the poor and elderly, who lack the transportation or money to shop elsewhere. For example, researchers found that 20 percent of those in one low-income neighborhood took cabs to buy groceries.

"You can't comparison shop very well in a taxicab," Town commented. The few small stores that exist in the bowels of the city offer smaller selections, generally lower quality and higher prices, according to the Project's research. An inner-city shopper without transportation pays an average 12 percent more for food than suburban consumers, Town said.

"Even the stores here now, however inadequate, won't be here in the future, observed Wilson. "There's a complete absence of investment, and people still here aren't upgrading their stores. Even the Mom and Pops are changing hands rapidly, not a good economic indicator."

Like other city retailers, food merchants must deal with older buildings that are not energy-efficient, with urban congestion, poor loading facilities, outmoded equipment, lack of financing, and a host of other problems that ther suburban counterparts are generally immune to.

The most remarkable thing about the White Store in Knoxville's central business district is that it's there at all. Ed McMillan, White's vice President for public relations, says it's the only chain supermarket still operating in that part of the locally-owned string of 45 scores, moved this city. White, a local outlet into its present location from another downtown site about a year ago.

The inside of the White store looks like any of its suburban relatives, with wide, clean aisles lined by well-stocked shelves, gleaming meat and frozen food counters, and banks of cash registers waiting to ring up customers' purchases. Even that similarity is remarkable, considering the operating problems McMillan and store manager Gerald Waites relate.

The store opens at 7:30 a.m., quickly filling with office workers and nearby elderly and low-income residents. It stays busy all day until its 6 p.m. closing time. However, Waites says he sells fewer items per person than a typical supermarket, indicating that more people must pass through his checkout aisles to create a healthy volume of sales. This ratio makes cleanliness and neatness major headaches.

Many clients use food stamps, which sometimes slows the checkout lines. The store needs more employees to wait on the market's large number of older customers-and, though store officials are reluctant to admit it, to keep one eye out for shoplifters looking for an occasional five-finger discount. The White supermarket occupies an old department store, which took some creativity and good humor to adapt to. Maneuvering delivery trucks into the alley behind the store is a test of
nerves and driving skill. Those that double-park out front risk traffic tickets; customer parking is nonexistent and a source of complaints.

"It's not our most profitable store, by any stretch of the imagination," McMillan says, professing White's concern about meeting a community need. But he admits White is a business, plain and simple. "If we did not think the store would be profitable, we would not be here. The bottom line is: the store's got to make money."

Near the heart of Knoxville's food supply problems, Wilson believes, is a long-standing neglect of food and nutrition by government. Communities that ordinarily weave transportation, housing, recreation, and other basic needs into their comprehensive plans rarely mention food.

On the surface, the invisible hand of the marketplace seems to be taking care of things in the food system, and food has not been seen as a matter of public concern, Wilson observed. Then the Arab oil embargo shocked the nation out of its slumbering attitude about energy. As the source of food drifts further from those who consume it, the link becomes more fragile. Few cities are prepared to deal with a genuine food emergency-induced by a natural disaster, a labor strike, or even another oil crisis, he said.

Wilson likens a city's food supply to its water system. Few communities lack a well-filled reservoir, and authorities fret when droughts lower the water level. How many weeks-or days-could a community survive after it break in the food distribution chain?

There are the more immediate considerations in everyday community life that are just as important. Planners don't recognize that when a bus route is cancelled or altered, it affects whether or not it resident will be able to get to the store to buy food, Town put in.

Pointing to a pleasantly-designed subsidized housing project for the elderly, Wilson said, "it doesn't look bad up there on the hill" unless you're an elderly woman forced to carry a heavy bag of groceries all the way home up a long, long hill. "It's just another example of public decisions failing to take into account something that involves a daily need," he added.

Almeda Lemmings, an intake worker at CAC's East Neighborhood Center, recently learned that her job may be abolished, the result of federal budget cutbacks. It's not because there's too little to do. She meets daily with the people who trickle, and sometimes stream, into the center seeking help with jobhunting, paying for home heating bills, finding enough food for their families, fixing their homes, and other needs.

Lemmings said she has become keenly aware that food is not unrelated to other problems. She sees many clients with high heating bills, empty cupboards and too little cash to pay for both. For these families, life is literally a choice between heating and eating.

Food activists in Knoxville believe attention to food planning has become even more crucial since lawmakers last year began pulling the federal government out of the business of feeding poor people. "In the past, local officials could remain relatively unconcerned about food assistance. These days it's got to be a local responsibility because the federal presence is diminishing," said one.

"One problem with the present system is the lack of any overall coordinating agency which can perform a broad oversight function," the U.T study notes. Without such a body, acting on long-term solutions becomes difficult at best.

Clues on why food hasn't fit nearly into the agendas (if city officials can be found at the state level and beyond in Washington. While there are agencies that deal with pieces of food supply, none takes a comprehensive view. Food distribution seems to fit nowhere. Agriculture departments deal mainly with farmers. Health and human service agencies focus on poverty, diet-related problems and other individual needs. Housing agencies put people under roofs and alter the landscape around them, but rarely if ever think about how those people will eat. A few pioneering efforts in past years offered some promise at USDA in Washington, but that promise has faded in the current political climate. The U.T. recommendation led to local advocates' suggestion for a community-wide Food Policy Council, the implementing body for the city's resolution.

When planners do think of food, they're not very optimistic about the ability of surrounding farms to produce a reliable, inexpensive supply of fresh food for the community. "The time when East Tennessee was a food-producing region has passed," commented one, bemoaning the loss of farmland to the encroaching suburbs and the growing concentration of the food industry.

Jim Mansfield, local organizer for the Agricultural Marketing Project, offers a somewhat different perspective. There are enough farmers here to offer a steady supply of produce to many city and county residents. "From the farmers' point of view, marketing is the real problem," not producing. "They'd grow more if there were more places to sell it. " Smaller dealers once bought from local farmers and offered it to small grocers. But "vertical integration" of the food system and the growth of chain stores closed most of those doorways, explained Mansfield, who has helped to organize a farmers' cooperative and foster new marketing opportunities.

The CAC staffers and Wilson last August took their research and ideas to Mayor Randy Tyree, the energetic Democrat who crusaded to bring the World's Fair to his city. Tyree, who has set his sights on the governorship this year, listened sympathetically. He suggested that the group prepare a resolution for adoption by the City Council.
"The resolution was really the mayor's idea," said Dixie Petrey, CAC community food director. Tyree said later in an interview that it was a "reaction to what I perceived as a problem in the community. As mayor, you try to address the deficiencies in a community. It was a quality of life issue affecting people I had a responsibility toward."

(Ironically, it was Tyree and not an earlier mayor with a more direct stake in food that first gave the issue official status. Knoxville was run during the 1960s by Cas Walker, a colorful man who liked to present a hayseed demeanor to his public. Usually referred to by the press as "millionaire grocer," Walker made his fortune selling food to city residents, many of them Poor, through his is chain of supermarkets. Although on the wane, the stores, are still evident throughout the city, their faces decorated with homilies about drinking and driving.)

The resolution was put before the council in October, and it passed with surprisingly little debate. The resolution designates the CAC Food Supply Project to 11 and it passed with surprisingly little debate. The resolution designates the CAC Food Supply Project to 11

prepare a strategy for improving the inner-city food supply" with the assistance of several government agencies.

The resolution encourages the participation of the private food industry and the public. It calls for the formation of the Food Policy Council, with broad community representation, to "continually monitor Knoxville's food supply system (and) recommend appropriate actions as needed." The strategy will be steering toward four broad goals:

1) Insuring enough food for all citizens;
2) Strengthening the "economic vitality" of the private food sector;
3) Improving the quality of citizens' food;
4) Encouraging the consumption of nutritious food.

Residents of Knoxville's "MLB" area, consisting of the mainly low-income neighborhoods of Mechanicsville, Lonsdale and Beaumont, had been looking hopefully toward the groundbreaking for a new shopping center in their part of town. A private developer's plans called for a multi-million dollar financing package seeded by a $1 million federal Urban Development Action Grant, already approved. But the UDAG grant now is slipping away because the developer has been unable to attract a food store as "anchor" for his shopping center. Without it, other retailers probably won't locate there.

Harry Spencer, director of the West Neighborhood Center, and community organizer Mike Steele said the need for a large food store is real and documented. The only large store now in the area is an independently-run "Cas Walker Associate," which they describe as run-down and stocked with Often poorer quality but higher priced foods.

Steele conducted a community survey that indicated overwhelming support for a new market. But the developer has been unable to turn that enthusiasm into a commitment by a large grocer to locate in his center. The project has been weighed down by "poor planning and poor advice," Steele says. The developer "didn't build in community support early."

Since passage of the food supply resolution, Town and his colleagues have been working on the structure and objectives of the new food policy council. It's a slow moving process, partly because they still have a major teaching chore ahead of them. Speaking with even those familiar with Resolution R-202-81, one gets a strong feeling that not everyone has grasped the full implications.

Mayor Tyree suggests that the measure will "be of benefit to some truly needy people." He points to those who "were surviving but were not being adequately fed." He expresses confidence that American agricultural and technical know-how will keep the nation's horn of plenty well-stocked. He doesn't foresee such drastic measures in the near future as a city annexing surrounding farmlands as a reservoir for future food producing capabilities.

Part of the reason some may consider Knoxville's food issues mainly a poor people's problem is where the resolution was nurtured: at the CAC. The CAC is the agency in town that takes care of the poor. If you've got a poor people's problem, send it over to Luke Ross and Barbara Kelly at Knoxville CAC.

(If anything, that's a commendable axiom. "We were deeply involved in food programming long before there was funding to do it," asserted Kelly, the deputy director. "Any agency that's concerned about poor people has got to be concerned about food-it's one of the basics." Beside summer feeding and an array of community food and nutrition activities, the CAC sponsors elderly nutrition projects in 16 nearby counties.)

Even McMillan and Waites at the White store seem at somewhat of a loss to describe how the food supply initiative could help private industry. "We're sold on it," said McMillan, adding, "People in the food business are just a little bit shy." Waites said he thinks the City could help with the parking problem and through a more lenient attitude toward his delivery trucks that sometimes must block the street or alley.

"We see a public food policy council as trying to mediate this," Petrey ventured.

Elsewhere, the message is slowly getting through. "We've always been more concerned with the physical development of the community," conceded Frank Turner, the youngish director of the Metropolitan Planning Commission, whose staff fills an expansive office in the new city-county municipal building. He said he believes the food policy council will offer a "real opportunity" and "great forum for communicating food problems."

Dennis Upton, deputy director of the city's Department of Community and Economic Development, said the council will help in "getting the issue entrenched into the government cycle." Both men will, if prodded, recite the litany of problems that Wilson, Town and Petrey have been preaching about lately.
Del Long works during the cold winter months in a small garage warmed only by a portable kerosene heater. He is preparing packets of vegetable seeds that he and volunteers will distribute to disadvantaged Knoxville residents this spring. Although government-subsidized, the free seed program is run on a shoestring budget. Funding cuts have forced a reduction of Long's current workweek.

Yet this is perhaps the most popular food program in the city. People will use the seeds to grow food in their own gardens and in about 20 community plots throughout the city Long estimates that his seeds have produced about "three quarters of a million dollars worth of vegetables in the county—not bad for a garage."

What, then, will be Knoxville's solutions its specific steps for solving the problems defined by Wilson and the CAC staff and slowly being grasped by others in the community? "The approach is so new that you've almost got to make it up as you go along," admitted Town

The Council's organizers already have listed several immediate issues for the council to ponder:

1. Working toward a bus system that is responsive to citizens who use it as their primary access to food;
2. Building a food policy component into the planning council's general, sector, and small area Plans;
3. Vigorously supporting efforts to develop new food retailers within the inner-city;
4. Coordinating and promoting urban gardening programs;
5. Evaluating the impact on Knoxville of federal budget cuts, and the ability of existing local agencies to fill the gaps;
6. Educating itself on the ins and outs of the present Knoxville food system—or lack of it.

How seriously the community takes the council, and how far the council itself intends to carry its mission, are uncertain at this early date. One thing is clear: the almost certain (yet healthy) controversy in the coming months, as the various players discover the inherent conflicts that already exist between them, will be a marked contrast to the quiet passage of the resolution last October.

Wilson and the others have no illusions about the political realities. "We don't want to oversell what is here—a resolution is just a resolution, he said.

Community leaders may not want to aim directly at metropolitan food self-sufficiency, but they can take a few strides in that direction. "The city ought to get into a position to make judgments about its food supply problems—not necessarily actively producing and distributing food itself, but at least a self-protective stance regarding the availability of food in the future."

Said Town: "My hope is that when Alan Town and Bob Wilson are long gone from here, the city still thinks about food. That it becomes part of the fabric, the basic framework of government."

Community nutritionists will be watching the Knoxville experiment with a great deal of interest.

### The Hartford Experience

Hartford, Connecticut, one of the few other places to attempt a comprehensive approach to urban food problems, has teamed how crucial early planning and education can be. Organizers implemented a plan there in 1977 that is aimed mainly at the low and moderate income residents of this old, and ailing, industrial city. In “Food Marketing Alternatives for the Inner City: A Guide to Community-Based Solutions for Urban Food Problems, CNI's Pat Brown Kelly and Thomas B. Smith write:

"If you think of building a food system as putting together a puzzle, some of the pieces in Hartford were force-fit. Groups joined without knowing what they were joining; neighborhood commitments were made without agreement on a city-wide commitment.

"Says (Hartford Food System Director Mark) Winne: 'We have not resolved some basic questions like: What is the role of the food system in the lives of the organizations that comprise it? What are the organizations' roles to each other? What, in fact, is the function of an integrated, centralized food system?'

"Coalition members never asked these questions, he said. They took the grand plan presented to them and ran with it."

Winne likely would approve of Knoxville's careful, gradual approach to building its food system.
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INTRODUCTION

This report on the Knoxville food system and the Knoxville Food Policy Council is the first of six on cities and counties around the country. The reports are part of a larger research project entitled, "Local Food Systems: Policies and Values Influencing their Potential." The other study sites are: St. Paul, MN; Onondaga County, NY; Philadelphia, PA; Charleston, SC; and Kansas City, MO. All except Onondaga County participated in a 1984-85 project conducted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors to establish local food policy councils.

My interest in municipal food systems follows on from earlier work on sustainable agriculture - where the idea of localizing food systems is stressed, but where any role for cities themselves is neglected. This project thus seeks to explore the potential of cities to be more self-reliant and more efficient in operating their local food systems. Much greater development of this potential is not only desirable, but may be required if federal and state funds for food-related programs remain stagnant or decline. One of the major challenges at this point is that few citizens or officials are aware of the extent and complexity of their local food systems, much less their potential. This is reflected in the fact that no city has a department of food. Equally, few people are aware that the value of the produce from all U.S. gardens (urban and rural) is roughly equivalent to that of the corn crop (approx. $18 billion/year!).

I have sought to understand how local food systems operate at the household, neighborhood, and municipal levels. I have also sought to understand at each of these levels the full food system cycle and the associated issues: from production issues (farmland preservation, farmers markets, household & community gardens), to processing issues (local vs. outside), to distribution issues (transportation, warehousing) to access issues (inner city grocery stores, school breakfasts & lunches, food stamps, the WIC program, etc.), to use issues (food safety and handling, restaurants, street vendors), to food re-cycling (gleaning, food banks, food pantries and soup kitchens) to waste stream issues (composting, garbage fed to pigs, etc.). Besides the social and environmental issues associated with the above, there are also a number of ethical and value issues involved which I have also sought to understand and describe.

My visit to Knoxville (May 1991) and subsequent work has been greatly facilitated by the extensive and generous help of Dixie L. Petrey and Robert L. Wilson - two of the key long-term people involved in creating and developing the Knoxville Food Policy Council.

THE REGIONAL AND LOCAL SETTING

Knoxville, Tennessee, is the third largest city in the state and is located adjacent to the Great Smoky Mountains. Its population of 165,000 continues to be influenced by Appalachian culture and values. These include an emphasis on independence and self reliance combined with volunteerism. For many church goers, volunteerism is seen as a tithing of one's time. The city accounts for 49% of Knox County's population of 335,750. Blacks constitute 15.8% of the city's population and 8.8% of the county's. Asians, Hispanics, and American Indians constitute less than 2% of either the city or the
county's population. 1984 figures showed approximately 14% of county residents below the poverty line, with 71% of them living in the city.

The economic importance of Knoxville's food system is significant. 25% of all industrial, wholesale, and retail establishments are food related. 15% of all retail employees work in food stores and eating and drinking establishments. Food stores accounted for 18% of all retail sales and eating places for 13%. Wholesale groceries and related goods were 17% of total wholesale trade (1982). Since 1970, there has been a significant trend towards concentration in the number of wholesale grocers in Tennessee from approximately 50-60 in 1970 to only 6-10 in 1990. A similar trend is visible among retailers. There has been a comparable loss of inner city grocery stores.

As in all the cities studied, there have been dramatic increases in the need for food and shelter assistance, especially since 1980.

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE FOOD POLICY COUNCIL

Much of the groundwork for the creation of the Food Policy Council came from the food and nutrition programs of the Knoxville-Knox County Community Action Committee (CAC). The CAC was established in 1965 through an agreement between the City and the County. Its board includes the Mayor and the County Executive as members. A university study and a federal grant were important in giving CAC the perspective and the funds to expand its food programs. A 1977 study by University of Tennessee graduate students under Robert L. Wilson, then Associate Professor, examined Knoxville's food system and needs. Much of this information was used by CAC in its successful application for a Community Food and Nutrition grant from the Office of Community Services, Health and Human Services. The two year grant (1979-81) funded a staff person and a consultant to develop programs to improve the food supply in inner city neighborhoods. The programs developed included outreach to advise families of their eligibility for food assistance programs, mobile meals, a home garden program, a food buying club, and a community food and nutrition program.

These efforts, however, were not enough to offset the impacts of the 1981 and 1982 federal cuts in the food stamp program and in school breakfast and lunch programs. Local participation in WIC, Senior Nutrition, and the home garden program was also declining. New efforts were needed and the city responded.

An October 13, 1981 resolution of the Knoxville City Council recognized food as a matter for governmental concern and encouraged formation of a group to "continually monitor Knoxville's food supply system and to recommend appropriate actions to improve the system as needed." Resolution R-202-81 also declared that "local government has a proper role to play in ensuring that all citizens have access to an adequate and nutritious food supply." To determine how to proceed, the Mayor appointed an interagency staff committee with representatives from the Community Action Committee (designated the lead agency), the Metropolitan Planning Commission, and the Department of Community Economic Development. They developed a proposal which Mayor Tyree implemented on July 1, 1982, by establishing the Food Policy Council (FPC) and appointing its members.

The goals of the FPC for the Knoxville food system are to:

- ensure that an adequate and nutritious food supply is available to all citizens;
- strengthen the economic vitality of the private food industry;
- improve the quality of food available to all citizens;
- encourage citizens to accept and consume nutritious food;
- minimize the food-related activities which degrade the natural environment; and
- limit wasteful use of scarce resources needed for future food production and distribution.

**ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND DYNAMICS**

The Food Policy Council (FPC) is advisory to the City Council, the Mayor, and the community in general. It may prepare reports directed to the Mayor, and/or City Council, prepare publications for general distribution, or communicate through the media. The FPC prepares an annual report on the status of the food system, its needs, and FPC activities. The FPC has no authority to operate food distribution facilities, to regulate or control any aspect of the food system, public or private. Implementation of FPC proposals depends on voluntary cooperation by other public agencies, by non-profit corporations, and by firms in the food industry.

The Food Policy Council is coordinated through the Knoxville-Knox County Community Action Committee. Since councils often reflect the staffing agency's views, one might have expected the FPC to focus primarily on poverty and hunger related issues. The FPC, however, has addressed a much broader range of issues. This is because of: 1) the presence on the FPC of liaison staff from other agencies; 2) the use of advisory committees; 3) the use of an outside consultant; and 4) an understanding by CAC leadership that the entire food system affects the food available for low income people.

The size of the FPC has been seven since its inception. Rather than having a large council with representatives of various interests, it was decided to have a smaller group that would work individually and as a group to improve the Knoxville food system. Criteria include selecting a mix of people with leadership qualities and some knowledge of food issues who:

1) have a government tie and public status;
2) work in the food business; or
3) are involved with neighborhood and consumer interests.

In addition, the general criteria for the Council as a whole are that:

1) it include a diversity of food distribution interests and perspectives (e.g. advocacy, economic and business, physical logistics, social service, nutrition and health, agriculture and farming, consumers);
2) public interest be the dominant concern of the group;
3) there be at least one or two good moderators in the group; and
4) at least one or two persons have experience in the public arena.\(^8\)

To date there have been few people on the FPC representing either farming or environmental concerns.
At various points, there have been some problems with the lack of regular attendance by some members. Currently, the FPC is seeking to deal with this by having full meetings every other month with the Executive Committee meeting in between. If this does not work, then consideration might be given to making by-laws changes to address the problem. A better approach might be to seek to increase the visibility of the FPC so that nominees are aware of it and will want to serve on it. Also, the earlier practice of including one City Council member on the FPC has now been re-established after several years when no Council member served. This practice should be continued. If the work load of the FPC increases, consideration might be given either to increasing its size to nine or to broadening and strengthening the advisory committee structure.

Advisory committees have been a valuable part of FPC's activities. Some have been more effective than others. The Nutrition and Health Advisory Committee has been particularly active over the years, in part because of a pre-existing and active group of nutritionists - the Greater Knoxville Nutrition Council. However, the charge developed for this committee by the FPC helped to focus the efforts of these people and to bring in other health professionals. The Food Industry Advisory Committee has had its ups and downs -perhaps because it involves primarily private-sector people who are more interested in specific projects with fairly obvious results rather than longer-term institution- and program-building. In 1991, an amended charge was prepared for The Food Industry Advisory Committee in a effort to reactivate it. Efforts to develop an effective Agriculture and Land Resource Advisory Committee were not successful, both because of the lack of much public concern over these issues and the lack of any clear constituency groups.

Each advisory committee includes at least one member of the FPC as liaison. This is only one of the many tasks that FPC members carry out. There have been many very dedicated and capable members of the FPC who have served long terms. The degree of citizen commitment represented by their activities has been crucial to the accomplishments of the FPC.

The role of staff has also been very important to the success of the FPC. The coordinating agency, CAC, has worked at the highest levels of city government since its beginning (1965) and has gained the respect of local officials. This has had a positive impact on their responses to FPC requests and recommendations. Also, the presence of liaison staff from the Mayor's office, the Metropolitan Planning Commission, and the Knoxville Community Development Corporation has been very important. In the early years, they not only proposed the basic goals and structures of the FPC, but worked hard to get it going. Since then, they have provided an important source of continuity and expertise for the FPC and have been able to broaden its influence externally. Finally, these accomplishments also derived from the strong and careful administrative management of the FPC Staff Coordinator, Dixie L. Petrey. Her role in helping to create and then coordinate the FPC over the years was crucial.

The regular availability of an experienced and knowledgeable outside consultant, Robert L. Wilson, has also been extremely important. In addition to his role in helping to establish the FPC, he has drafted the charges for the advisory committees, prepared initial drafts of the annual report, helped to organize annual retreats, and helped to organize various hearings and workshops. It has been very important to have this independent source of ideas, evaluation, and judgement to help identify longer-term needs and opportunities for the FPC.

The result of all of these efforts is that the FPC has been able to involve and coordinate the efforts of many more individuals, volunteer groups, and public agencies than would otherwise have been the case. This means that much more has been accomplished in terms of providing/maintaining food-related social support systems than would otherwise be the case. This coordination and leveraging
of informal and formal resources is not easy to document nor portray. While the FPC has clearly been able to strengthen the social support systems in Knoxville, it has done less with environmental problems or environmental support systems.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. The FPC has helped to increase food availability and quality in the public schools. The FPC was an important part of the drive to require all schools to offer a school breakfast program. It has monitored school lunch programs to assure their availability and nutritional quality. It also pushed vigorously to have the schools hire a school nutrition educator. While the Knox County School Board authorized such a position in 1989, it still has not been funded.

B. The FPC has helped to improve access for inner city poor to reasonably priced and nutritious food. The FPC addressed this challenge by encouraging new studies and bringing together previous studies on the number and types of food outlets in the inner city - something that highlighted the decline in small grocery stores and the increase in convenience stores. Perhaps most importantly, the FPC was the main catalyst for bus route changes which provide better access for inner city poor to outlining supermarkets (and jobs). It has also encouraged experimental programs with K-TRANS and local supermarkets to make transport of groceries easier on buses through the use of bus racks and folding carts. Finally, beginning with the planning for the World's Fair, it has repeatedly urged the creation of a downtown farmers' market - with the latest call appearing in its most recent annual report.

C. The FPC helped to bring food into the planning process and reports of the Metropolitan Planning Commission (MPC). MPC reports now contain a section entitled "food, health and social services." These efforts were facilitated by the presence of a MPC staff liaison person on the FPC. The FPC has also sought to get other public and private agencies to include food issues in their planning process.

D. The FPC has monitored and encouraged efforts to strengthen the emergency food programs in Knoxville. The Emergency Food Helpers network has focused on food pantries and food assistance with the support of CAC's Nutrition Project. Community gardens have also been encouraged. As one observer noted regarding food availability, "Knoxville is better off now than 10 years ago. It is better off than East Tennessee, and much better off than the average U.S. city."

E. The FPC has drawn upon its advisory committees both for recommendations and programs. It requested that its Nutrition and Health Advisory Committee prepare a report on food-related health problems. The resulting report (1984) provided the basis for many projects and activities, both by the committee and the FPC. One of these, the Calorie Conscious Consumer, asked restaurants, grocery stores, and other institutional food suppliers and servers to encourage the consumption of low calorie, nutritious food. Awards were given in each category.

F. The FPC has testified at various public hearings dealing with food issues. Besides testifying on the need for the school breakfasts and nutrition education, it has publicly supported efforts to increase direct food support programs, to remove the sales tax from food, and to support better food labeling requirements. It has also organized its own hearings on local food issues.

G. In October of 1988, the FPC issued a major report setting out twenty-nine specific policy goals aimed at implementing the five broad goals of the FPC. This report and the other activities led and/or coordinated by the FPC have generally made food and nutrition issues more visible in Knoxville.
H. As a pioneer in dealing with local food system issues, the FPC has gained national and international attention among those interested in such issues. The FPC in many ways served as the model for the U.S. Conference of Mayors project which established food policy councils in four other cities. It also provided training to representatives of thirty cities involved in the 1986 Hands Across America project. Also, Dixie L. Petrey was asked to present a paper at a 1987 World Health Organization meeting on "Healthy Cities" held in Australia.

Summary: The FPC has been able to put food issues on the public agenda in a way that was not possible previously. This results from its different capabilities and roles: 1) its catalytic and coordinating role in getting public agencies and private volunteer groups to cooperate in pursuing food related policies; 2) its role in expanding the decisionmaking and planning horizons of the different agencies that it works with - for example, the local school board, the transit authority, the public housing board, and the Metropolitan Planning Commission; 3) its public educational role, where in developing the kind of programs described above, it has helped to educate the general public to the various food and nutrition needs of Knoxville; and 4) its role in legitimizing the work and efforts of others working on food issues.

THE SOURCES OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

There are a number of sources of the above accomplishments. First, there has been a high degree of continuity and support from the inter-agency staff. Particularly important were the dedication, enthusiasm, and administrative skills of Dixie L. Petrey, who recently retired. She had very limited staff time allocated to her for FPC activities. Fortunately, her successor apparently will have a larger portion of her time allocated to the FPC. Second, the ideas and proposals provided by the FPC consultant, Robert Wilson, have been crucial, not only in the creation of the FPC, but in encouraging a broad-gauge approach to the food system. Third, it is clear that most members of the FPC have taken their volunteer job very seriously and have devoted significant amounts of time and effort to promoting the FPC and its programs. The contributions of the FPC members has derived in part from their having been carefully identified (with staff and FPC input) and well briefed before their official nomination and appointment. This process was not used in 1989 with some negative results. Fourth, the annual retreat for the FPC members and staff has been very important in evaluating programs and developing priorities for the future. It also helps to keep a healthy balance between the FPC members and the staff. This retreat should be continued and every effort made to encourage all FPC members and inter-agency staff to attend, including the City's Director of Policy Development and Human Services herself as well as her Assistant. The written annual report is very important, both as a record and as a way of keeping the City Council informed of FPC activities and the larger food system needs of Knoxville. As suggested below, it might be useful to have a presentation and discussion of the annual report with the MPC.

ISSUES NEEDING CONTINUING OR ADDITIONAL WORK

A. Efforts to get the school nutrition coordinator position filled. In addition to continuing these efforts, there would seem to be quite a bit of potential to go beyond the purely nutritional aspects of this effort to include other complementary educational possibilities. Specifically, school garden and composting programs would get students more involved not only the sources, quality, health, and nutrition of their food, but would have science and social studies benefits as well. The Grow Lab and Life Lab programs (mainly K-6) have a long and well developed history in doing this. Also, it was reported that the Mount Olive school has a composting program. One possibility here might be to create a new "food and nutrition education advisory committee" that would be composed of teachers,
perhaps a university environmental studies professor or student, a couple of people from the gardening community (perhaps a Master Gardener), the nutrition coordinator, etc.

Another possibility would be to encourage the nutrition coordinator to improve the nutritional quality of the meals being served. When I met with a former Knoxvillian, Pat Snyder, in St. Paul, MN, she indicated that they have developed school lunch recipes which reduce the fat and salt content of school meals. A final problem noted by one person is that the school breakfast/lunchroom atmosphere is one of noise and chaos and that since the teachers no longer have monitoring duty, there is little nutrition guidance, much less guidance on reasonable behavior at meals. What to do about this is a difficult question.

B. Inner city food access. Now that bus routing has been improved, it would be useful to look down the road to see how access can be linked with inner city neighborhood redevelopment - particularly in the Five Points and Mechanicsville areas. Consideration might be given to trying to expand the non-profit mini-market concept that Knoxville Community Development Corp. (KCDC) has supported in one of its housing projects for the elderly. The basic parameters in access are: locational access, temporal access, and access to quality foods, particularly fresh produce and meats. The county should be encouraged to speed up its consideration of a satellite farmers market in the downtown area. Consideration might also be given to a "Tennessee Fresh" program (modeled on those of Massachusetts and Michigan whereby local produce is so labeled). A complementary program is one where recipients of food stamps and WIC coupons can use them at local farmers markets. This benefits both those receiving assistance and local producers.

C. Malnutrition and diet issues. As the Nutrition and Health Advisory Committee has recognized itself, there is still much work to be done here. After developing, promoting, and then spinning-off their Calorie Conscious Consumer program, they have been updating their 1984 report to identify new needs. One area where there might be a greater emphasis is on healthy-sized portions (with restaurants offering two sizes for major entrees, with the smaller costing less). A slogan for the "all you can eat" places might be: "A healthy-sized serving is one that doesn't go either to waist or waste."

D. Emergency food coordination. The role of the FPC in monitoring the emergency food system seems to be working well overall. It gets occasional reports both from the CAC Nutrition project and from the Emergency Food Helpers network. It can also serve as a forum for discussion of related issues. As a joint sponsor of just launched campaign to make Knoxville and Knox County a "Hunger-Free Zone," the FPC might seek to develop programs educating the public not only on the emergency food system, but on some of the linkages between hunger, poverty, poor nutrition and poor health, neighborhood and inner city decline, declining federal and state funding, etc.

E. Land issues. While trying to save farmland is very difficult and long-term, it may be useful to try to continue to give this a bit of publicity. In addition to the preserving farmland, it might be useful to add some discussion on how to make city/county land available for gardens on a long-term basis - either through leases or through the creation of a land trust.

F. The sales tax on food. While this has gotten tied up with more general tax and reform issues, it is an important and basic issue. Even though removal of the sales tax on food would mean tax losses to local jurisdictions, the basic need and equity dimensions still would seem to call for continued efforts to promote this reform - which would save the poor the equivalent of roughly one month's worth of food.
EMERGING AND FUTURE CHALLENGES

A. Current national trends are likely to further undermine the "safety nets" provided by the city's informal natural and social support systems. Declining federal and state support will increase the need for greater self-reliance for all local food systems (household, neighborhood, and metropolitan). The challenge is to try to maintain current support systems as much as possible, while building the foundations of greater self-reliance - all at a time when most people do not see any immediate or pressing need to do so. This means current perceptions of problems (hunger and poverty) and solutions (emergency feeding programs and welfare) will need to shift to the opportunities in local economic development, energy efficiency, and environmental improvement that would result from pursuing a self-reliant strategy based upon the World Health Organization's "healthy cities program."

B. In terms of the emergency feeding system, I got conflicting views. One person indicated that Knoxville has been able to hold its own over the past ten years and that while current funding levels need to be maintained, there is no need for expansion. Another indicated that the demand upon local food pantries has increased greatly the past couple of years. Another indicated that calls for assistance had gone up from 6000 in 1984 to 22,000 in 1990. Part of the reason the first person may not have seen an emerging problem stems from the increased efficiency of SHARE (the local food bank) over the past several years where deliveries have increased from 960,000 pounds delivered in 1988 to 2,400,000 in 1991 (est.) while the cost per pound to deliver this food has decreased from 19.5 cents per pound in 1988 to 11.5 cents per pound in 1991 (est.). Reductions in the cost/pound are clearly leveling off -which means that any future increase in demand for food will increase the cost to SHARE's various funding agencies roughly in proportion to the increase in demand.

C. In terms of building new foundations or frameworks for the future, these need to be cast in terms of energy and resource efficiency and environmental soundness for natural support systems and in terms of equity and greater community self-reliance for social support systems. Specific foci might include: work on how composting and other ways to handle food system wastes can be increasingly integrated into recycling and solid waste programs. Since Knoxville has already gained recognition from the World Health Organization's "healthy cities" program, updating and localizing their concepts might offer a good way to link and publicize various issues - and perhaps to build some new coalitions. Open hearings on how to make Knoxville a "healthy city" might be one way to do this.

In terms of social support systems, it would appear that providing increased access and quality of food for daycare children and for the elderly will require additional attention. Currently KCDC is trying to ensure that its daycare centers offer the equivalent of school lunches (and breakfasts). One challenge is how to extend this to private day care centers that don't have the staff to handle the federal reporting requirements.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS MADE ABOVE:

A. Attendance at FPC meetings: If the current meeting schedule changes do not work, consideration might be given to making by-laws changes to address the problem or to increasing the visibility of the FPC so that potential nominees are aware of it and will want to serve on it.

B. Membership on the FPC: The earlier practice of including one City Council member on the FPC has now been re-established and should be continued. Consideration should be given to including members concerned about farming and environmental issues.
C. Size of the FPC: If the work load of the FPC increases, consideration might be given either to increasing its size to nine or to broadening and strengthening the advisory committee structure.

D. New Advisory Committee: Create a new "food and nutrition education advisory committee" that would be composed of K-6 teachers, perhaps a university environmental studies professor or student, a couple of people from the gardening community (perhaps a Master Gardener), the nutrition coordinator, etc.

E. Food access: Consideration might be given to trying to expand the non-profit mini-market concept that Knoxville Community Development Corp. (KCDC) has supported in one of its housing projects for the elderly. Also, the county should be encouraged to speed up its consideration of a satellite farmers market in the downtown area.

F. Education and visibility: As a joint sponsor of just launched campaign to make Knoxville and Knox County a "Hunger-Free Zone," the FPC might seek to develop programs educating the public not only on the emergency food system, but on some of the linkages between hunger, poverty, poor nutrition and poor health, neighborhood and inner city decline, declining federal and state funding, etc.

G. Food wastes: The FPC needs to explore how composting and other ways to handle food system wastes can be increasingly integrated into local recycling and solid waste programs.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. Advisory Committees. Review the role and function of the FPC's advisory committees. The FPC has been well served by the reports and programs developed by its Health and Nutrition Advisory Committee. Its new Food and Nutrition Audio-Visual Advisory Committee appears to be off to a promising start. And the revised Statement of Purpose (August 20, 1991) for the Food Industry Advisory Committee suggests a revival there. While it is very important to have a committee such as this to express the views and needs of the food industry, the FPC should find a way to examine and discuss the implications of any and all advisory committee recommendations for the total food system, including food access, local jobs, food system sustainability, and local self-reliance.

These committees might broaden their activities as follows. The Health and Nutrition Advisory Committee might address the issues of food access for daycare centers and the elderly identified above.

As mentioned in Recommendation D above, an education-oriented advisory committee is needed to try to bring together teachers, environmentalists, gardeners, and nutritionists to create school garden and composting programs and healthier school meals. The new Food and Nutrition Audio-Visual Advisory Committee might well be gradually transformed into that broader Food and Nutrition Education Advisory Committee.

Finally, in the longer term, an advisory committee which would address issues of food and the environment should be considered. The FPC would benefit from greater links with the environmental community. Issues which this committee might address could include food waste recycling, composting and solid waste issues.

The above ideas and recommendations might well be considered at the next annual retreat of the Food Policy Council.
B. Public Visibility. Plan a major public event to gain greater visibility for the FPC. To be meaningful, this would need to be combined with a review of past programs, discussion of how to deal with emerging and future challenges, and an attempt to bring in new people through existing or new advisory committees. As part of this, the FPC might try to get a University of Tennessee student (or class) to do a detailed history of the FPC. In any case, it would be valuable for the FPC to update the excellent flyer prepared some years ago describing its history, role, and activities. Also, a set of orientation materials for new Council and advisory committee members would be helpful. These might include photos, news clippings, program summaries, annual reports, etc.

C. Garden Programs. Seek to broaden and strengthen current household and community garden programs. CAC's receipt of a special Community Development Fund grant will go a long way in providing the staff time to coordinate actions between CAC, KCDC, and public housing officials. Efforts are also needed to expand these programs beyond inner city and poverty groups. What the FPC might focus on is how to make city and/or county land available for gardens on a long-term basis - whether through leases or a land trust.

D. Relations with area governments. The FPC addresses its annual report to the Mayor, the City Council, and the people of the city. However, its activities really affect the entire county. In the longer term, the FPC should explore ways to build stronger links with county agencies, difficult as this may be. Not only are political jealousies involved, but important issues of race and class.

While one person suggested the idea of a "Metropolitan Food Commission," any such possibility seems unlikely in the next few years. Also, such a commission would not have the "leverage" which the MPC has in terms of its zoning and permit powers. Thus, it would appear useful to strengthen the already good ties with MPC. This might be done by scheduling an annual presentation (based around the annual report) before the MPC - something which would also give the FPC greater visibility.

E. Neighborhood Development. Encourage greater inclusion of food access and garden issues in community and neighborhood development or redevelopment efforts. This might be done in cooperation with both the KCDC and the MPC.

F. City Support. The City Council and the Mayor should consider modestly increasing the staff and budget resources it provides the FPC to help increase its scope, efficiency, and effectiveness. The current very modest support is being used very effectively, but as indicated above, there is a great need to build the foundations now for the greater self-reliance which will be required before many more years. Since the FPC deals with only one part of this, the City should be encouraged take the lead and to strengthen its own research capabilities as they relate to the broader issues of food, sustainability, and local self-reliance more generally. The city might also explore participating in the World Health Organization's Healthy City Program.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS:**

Through steady and persistent work, the Knoxville Food Policy Council has built up a wealth of knowledge and experience on the Knoxville food system. It has experimented with a number of approaches to better coordinate and encourage the activities of public and private agencies, schools, neighborhood groups, and citizens concerned about food and hunger issues. It has accomplished a great deal. Curiously, its local visibility and recognition is less than it has earned nationally and internationally. Perhaps most significantly, its accomplishments are a primarily a result of local efforts, with only occasional external support. Its work has been pioneering since there have been few other
examples for it to draw upon. Hopefully this report will help the FPC gain the greater local recognition it deserves.
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IV. LOCAL FOOD POLICY ORGANIZATIONS [F-6, F-7, F-8, & F-9]

In this section you will find a historical timeline of work that has been done on local food systems planning over the past several decades written by Kate Clancy. Also, there are some summaries as well as the complete reports prepared by Ken Dahlberg on the local food policy councils in Knoxville, TN, St. Paul, MN, Onondaga County, NY, and Philadelphia, PA.

A. "A Timeline of Local Food Systems Planning." Kate Clancy, 1996. [F-6]

B. Local Food Policy Councils:

1. Knoxville. [F-6]


3. Onondaga County, NY. [F-8]


5. Toronto, Canada. [F-9]

   Rod MacRae, "So Why is the City of Toronto Concerned about Food and Agricultural Policy? A Short History of the Toronto Food Policy Council." *Culture and Agriculture*, Winter 1994, pp. 15-18.
CNI
Minnesota Food System;
Slow Start, Model Concept

In the mid-1980s, the U.S. Conference of Mayors began a project to establish local food policy councils. Dr. Kenneth Dahlberg, of Western Michigan University, has studied these food councils and the impact they have had on their local food systems. Dahlberg's report on St. Paul's Food and Nutrition Commission is excerpted below.

Few citizens or officials are aware of how dependent their city is upon distant national and international systems (public and private) for their food and how vulnerable those systems are. Neither are they aware of the extent and complexity of their local food systems, much less, their potential and the need to develop that potential. No U.S. city has a department of food. Equally, few people are aware that the value of the produce from all U.S. gardens (urban and rural) is roughly equivalent to that of the corn crop -- some $18 billion a year.

History of the Commission
One of the sources of the creation of the Food and Nutrition Commission was a 1981 fight by concerned citizens trying to prevent demolition of old Farmer's Market, which for 80 years had been located [downtown]. The fight created a strong coalition of farmers and consumers which eventually became the Minnesota Food Association (MFA). Another source was the Home Grown Economy project initiated by Mayor George Latimer in 1982. This project emphasized utilizing local resources both to strengthen the local economy and to make it more self-reliant, especially in terms of energy, and to some degree, food. The mayor was open to participating in the U.S. Conference of Mayors project when he learned about it.

Latimer, with the backing of a Council resolution, created the "Mayor's Ad Hoc Taskforce on Municipal Food Policy," chaired by then City Councilman (and now Mayor) James H. Dahlberg.

St. Paul’s Demographics

Within St. Paul, different income groups spent widely varying percentages of their income on food. In 1986, those earning $5,000 or less (17 percent of households) spent 85 percent of income on food; those earning $5,000 to $10,000 (19 percent of households) spent 29 percent, those in the $10,000 to $15,000 range (22 percent of households) spent 22 percent; the overall average for all households was 15 percent. St. Paul’s excellent emergency and supplemental feeding system has largely been able to keep up with the increasing number of people requesting assistance, but is nearing its current capacity. In 1988, 20,000 households were served in Ramsey County as compared to slightly over 35,000 in 1992. The number of individuals served was 68,000 and 125,000 respectively.
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Scheibel. Following a series of public hearings, the Task Force submitted its report in June 1984 and made subsequent recommendations which led in June 1985 to a Council resolution which created a Food and Nutrition Commission. In 1987 the City Council adopted the Food and Nutrition Policy of the City of Saint Paul based on recommendations drawn up by the Commission in consultation with neighborhood representatives, food retailers, health professionals, consumers and farmers.

An important strategic decision was to present the City Council with a broad and general policy statement and to have a separate annex with a detailed set of implementing recommendations. This was in contrast to the approach used in Minneapolis, where a combined set of broad policy and detailed implementation recommendations were presented for approval and were defeated, largely on the basis of the nature and cost of some of the recommendations.

Mayor Uncertain
The birth of the FNC by resolution, rather than by ordinance, meant the FNC started as an advisory and largely voluntary group looking for a home and staff support. In addition to the slow process of commission members educating each other about the nature and operation of the local food system, a sorting out of priorities would be required. Latimer's unsureness as to how and where the FNC fit into the city led to a delay in identifying a home. The St. Paul/Ramsey County Nutrition Program was eventually chosen, but the staff felt a bit of apprehension and resentment at having this "adopted child" forced upon them with no additional resources provided.

A period of little activity and no meetings ensued until the FNC assimilated the priorities of the Nutrition Program, and by 1991, FNC had begun developing an annual work plan. The FNC was recognized by city ordinance in July 1992 as a full fledged commission with assigned duties, including review powers, staff and budget.

Organizational Dynamics
Changing from an advisory to an official body raises questions about FNC's role as well as its internal and external relations. Previously FNC could only recommend actions to the City Council. It occasionally endorsed proposals, such as requiring mandatory training for food handlers. It did not comment on others, such as the ordinance restricting the spraying of lawn pesticides or the ordinance requiring that virtually all grocery store plastics be recyclable. FNC also will be able now to initiate its own actions and review the food-related actions and budgets of other city agencies.

FNC's duties under the new ordinance include making policy recommendations, reviewing the relevant portions of the City's Comprehensive Plan and the proposed annual operating and biennial capital budgets of the Division of Public Health and the Department of Planning and Economic Development, as well as preparing an annual report.

An important consideration is to keep a healthy balance between the various sectors of the food system -- between production (conserving farmland, community gardens); processing and distribution (processors, wholesalers and grocers); food access (farmers markets, the emergency and supplemental feeding system, location of grocery stores, food
programs such as school meals, WIC, food stamps and elderly nutrition; recycling (food banks, composting), and disposal (landfills, packaging restrictions). Typically, there is a tendency for emergency and supplemental feeding system issues and concerns to dominate in local food councils, and St. Paul is typical.

The City of Knoxville [TNJ has found that an annual retreat is very effective. The agenda and issues to be discussed at the annual retreat are prepared by an outside consultant after coordinating with the Food Policy Council chair and staff. The outside consultant also prepares the annual report.

Accomplishments

Food policy councils deal in large part with the informal sector which is less visible than the formal sector, and often more difficult to assess because it involves coordinating the activities of individuals, volunteer groups and public agencies -- a vital function but difficult to document.

One of the major accomplishments, as Mayor Scheibel noted, is that the FNC has survived its initial ups and downs and has become part of the city -- something that will give it a much greater operational and outreach capacity.

More specifically, FNC has sponsored the SL Paul "Food and Nutrition Honor Roll". The Mayor on behalf of the City Council recognizes individuals or organizations for their contributions to nutrition education, nutritious meals, chemical-free produce, low-cost basic foods, hormone-free and organic meats and marketing Minnesota-grown and labeled foods.

Background reports on various aspects of the local food system have been prepared, and educational materials have been provided, including a flyer, "Nutrition Programs for Older Persons in Ramsey County." Focus groups have been organized to study important areas of the food system. One topic has been hunger, nutrition and food which involved staff from public agencies. One outcome of this was the publication of an interagency newsletter to link food service providers. Another group is studying a model K through 12 food curriculum which would include food, nutrition and gardening, although teachers are reluctant to participate.

While FNC has clearly strengthened some St. Paul social support programs, it has done much less with farmland, gardens, or environmental issues and problems.

Continuing Issues

In terms of regional food production, there is a need to continue to focus on conserving regional farmland. Farmers producing for the Farmer's Market who have been displaced by roads or real estate development have found it almost impossible to find comparable land within the required 50-mile radius.

Gardens should be encouraged both in public housing and the various neighborhoods. An inventory and evaluation of vacant lands with the city suitable for gardens is needed. City procedures for obtaining water for community gardens need to be clarified and improved.

FNC would benefit from more interaction with various grassroots organizations. These include co-ops, environmental, social justice and neighborhood groups. District Planning Councils were involved in some FNC dialogues some years ago, but there has been less contact recently.

Food safety is an emerging issue of importance. There has been much publicity about pesticides and other chemical residues, concern about irradiated foods, bovine growth hormones, etc. These concerns need to be placed in a larger framework which includes food handling in stores and restaurants and the safety of having assured local food supplies.

FNC is in a good position to stress the need to see food "wastes" as resources. Besides supporting efforts at gleaning and the recycling of usable foods, composting food and yard waste needs to be stressed. Prohibition in January 1993 of landfilling of yard wastes is an opportunity for encouraging household composting and more household gardens.

National and state trends are likely to undermine the "safety net" provided by the city's informal natural and social support systems, including the "environmental services." This increases the need for self-reliance by the city, and will involve a basic shift from defining food problems as hunger and poverty and solutions as emergency feeding and welfare to new and broader concepts of local economic development, energy efficiency and environmental improvement.

For copies of the report on the Saint Paul Food System or other information on community food studies, write to Dr. Kenneth A. Dahlberg, Department of Political Science, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008. (616) 378-5686

A Pioneering Effort

Keep in mind the initial years of a food council are particularly difficult. The effort is pioneering. It involves exploring new territory which few have thought about systematically. A significant amount of time is required for members to learn about the various sectors of the food system, how they operate, and which agencies and persons are active where. Efforts to devise a viable and locally functioning structure also require a lot of trial and error.
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INTRODUCTION

This report on the St. Paul food system and the St. Paul Food and Nutrition Commission (FNC) is the second of six on cities and counties around the country. The reports are part of a larger research project entitled, "Local Food Systems: Policies and Values Influencing their Potential." The other study sites are: Knoxville, TN; Onondaga County, NY; Philadelphia, PA; Charleston, SC; and Kansas City, MO. All except Onondaga County participated in a 1984-85 project conducted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors to establish local food policy councils.

My interest in municipal food systems follows on from earlier work on sustainable agriculture - where the idea of localizing food systems is stressed. Curiously, the role of cities and towns in increasing the amount of locally grown food for local consumption has been neglected. This project thus seeks to explore the potential of cities to be more self-reliant and more efficient in operating their local food systems. Much greater development of this potential is not only desirable, but may be required in the shorter term if federal and state funds for food-related programs remain stagnant or decline. Development of this potential will definitely be required in the longer term as fossil fuel prices increase and multiply prices throughout our energy-inefficient food system.

One of today's major challenges is that few citizens or officials are aware of how dependent their city is upon distant national and international systems (public and private) for their food and how vulnerable those systems are. Neither are they aware of the extent and complexity of their local food systems, much less their potential and the need to develop that potential. This is reflected in the fact that no U.S. city has a department of food. Equally, few people are aware that the value of the produce from all U.S. gardens (urban and rural) is roughly equivalent to that of the corn crop (approx. $18 billion/year!).

I have sought to understand how local food systems and cycles operate at the household, neighborhood, and municipal levels. At each level I have also sought to understand the issues associated with each portion of the food system: from production issues (farmland preservation, farmers markets, household & community gardens), to processing issues (local vs. external), to distribution issues (transportation, warehousing) to access issues (inner city grocery stores, school breakfasts & lunches, food stamps, the WIC program, etc.), to use issues (food safety and handling, restaurants, street vendors), to food recycling (gleaning, food banks, food pantries and soup kitchens) to waste stream issues (composting, garbage fed to pigs, etc.). Besides the social and environmental issues associated with the above, there are also a number of ethical and value issues involved which I have also sought to understand and describe.

My visit to St. Paul (June 1991) and subsequent work have been greatly facilitated by the extensive and generous help of Kate Dienhart and Joanne Anderson-Kendrick, respectively past and present Coordinators of the FNC; Richard Goebel, Chair of the FNC and Executive Director of Second Harvest: the Saint Paul Food Bank; and Ken Taylor, Executive Director of the Minnesota Food Association and oft-time consultant to the FNC.
THE REGIONAL AND LOCAL SETTING

Saint Paul, Minnesota, is the capital of the state and the second largest city, the largest being Minneapolis, its adjacent and "twin" city. The larger metropolitan area includes over one-third of the state's population. In 1990, the population of Minneapolis was 368,383. The 1990 population of St. Paul was 272,235, of which blacks accounted for 7.4%, Asians and Pacific Islanders 7%, Hispanics 4.2%, and American Indians 1.3%. St. Paul is also the seat of Ramsey County, which has a population of 485,765. While some additional minority group members live in the county, 83% of the county's minorities reside in the city. 11.4% of the county's residents have incomes below the poverty line. Most of them (79%) also live in the city.

The city has historically served as the distribution and transportation center for a vast Midwestern farm area. Extensive air, rail, and truck transport is complemented by significant amounts of barge traffic on the Mississippi. Minneapolis has historically been a major grain milling and exporting city and a major producer of farm equipment. Regional attitudes described to me included a strong work ethic, an emphasis on reliability, and a desire for self-reliance at the family level. At the social level, the presence of the "progressive" political tradition is still in evidence. Also, many urban people grew up on farms or have farm/rural links and thus have and interest in, and a sympathy for the farm family. Some indicated that not as much value is placed on open space and farmland preservation as in the East.

Agricultural trends in Minnesota are similar to those throughout the country during the 1980's, Minnesota lost more farmers than any other state with the farms declining from some 132,000 in 1967 to some 91,000 in 1989.4 The farmer's of the food dollar declined (from near 40% in the 1960s to 25% in 1988) and dependence upon foreign markets remained (with cash receipts attributable to international exports averaging 27% in the 1980s). Trends in the seven county Metropolitan Area are similar. The number of farms decreased from 5662 in 1982 to 5175 in 1987, while in the same period farmland in the area decreased 6% to a total of 52% of the region's land. The 1980 Minnesota Agricultural Preserves Act may have helped some in preventing even more farmland from being converted to urban uses. Most of the farms in the metro area are conventional, which means that their production practices generate significant risks and costs in terms of surface and groundwater contamination, soil erosion, and pesticide residues on food. Direct marketing of metro food products to individuals was $3.6 million in 1982, about 1% of total agricultural sales. In terms of food marketing more generally, the same trends towards consolidation in food wholesaling and retailing found nationally are found in Minnesota.

Within St. Paul, different income groups spent widely varying percentages of their income on food. In 1986, those earning $5,000 or less (14% of households) spent 85%; those earning $5,000 - $10,000 (19% of households) spent 29%; those in the $10,000 to $15,000 range (22% of households) spent 22%; the overall average for all households was 15%. St. Paul's excellent emergency and supplemental feeding system has largely been able to keep up with the increasing numbers of people requesting assistance, but is nearing its current capacity. 20,000 households were served in Ramsey County in 1988 as compared to slightly over 35,000 in 1992 (the respective number of individuals served was 68,000 and 125,000).5

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE FOOD AND NUTRITION COMMISSION

One of the sources of the creation of the Food and Nutrition Commission was a 1981 fight by concerned citizens trying to prevent demolition of old Farmer's Market, which for 80 years had been at
Besides raising public awareness regarding food system issues, the fight created a strong coalition of farmers and consumers which eventually became the Minnesota Food Association (MFA). Another source was the Home Grown Economy project initiated by Mayor George Latimer in 1982. This project emphasized utilizing local resources both to strengthen the local economy and to make it more self-reliant, especially in terms of energy, and to some degree food. This meant that the Mayor was open to participating in the U.S. Conference of Mayors project when he learned about it.

The Mayor, with the backing of a Council resolution, created the "Mayor's Ad Hoc Taskforce on Municipal Food Policy," chaired by then City Councilman (and now Mayor) James Scheibel. The Task Force, made up of a diverse mix of twenty citizens, held a series of public hearings in late 1984. In setting its agenda, it also drew upon the background report on food system trends prepared earlier by the MFA. The Task Force submitted its report in June of 1984. The Task Force then met periodically with the Mayor to work out specific recommendations. These were adopted in a Council resolution of June 20, 1985, which created a Food and Nutrition Commission of nine members and charged it with preparing a food policy statement for consideration by the City Council. The Commission, chaired by Jim Scheibel, worked with neighborhood representatives, food retailers, health professionals, consumers, and farmers to develop a set of recommendations. These were adopted on November 9, 1987, by the City Council, which designated them the Food and Nutrition Policy of the City of Saint Paul.

The early years of the FNC have been characterized by several phases involving various ups and downs. The gestation of the FNC through the Taskforce was a high energy effort involving many people. An important strategic decision was to present the City Council a broad and general policy statement and to have a separate annex with a detailed set of implementing recommendations. This was in contrast to the approach used in Minneapolis, where a combined set of broad policy and detailed implementation recommendations were presented for approval and were defeated, largely on the basis of the nature and cost of some of the implementing recommendations.

The birth of the FNC by resolution, rather than by ordinance, meant that the FNC started as an advisory and largely volunteer group looking for a home and staff support. The very broad mandate of the FNC - developed by the MFA - also meant that in addition to the slow process of commission members educating each other about the nature and operation of the local food system, a sorting out of priorities would be required. Mayor Latimer's unsureness as to how or where the FNC fit into the city led to a delay in identifying a home. The St. Paul/Ramsey County Nutrition Program was eventually chosen, but the staff there felt a bit of apprehension and resentment at having this "adopted child" forced upon them with no additional resources provided.

The combination of delay and uncertainty regarding staff, and then an initially unenthusiastic home meant that there was a period of little activity and no meetings. This changed with the appointment of a new Director of the Nutrition Program (Kate Dienhart). She worked with Jim Scheibel (then a City Councilman) to arrange an evening retreat. Several items the Nutrition Program was interested in were presented to the FNC for action - something that got things going again. Since then, there have been a series of dialogues and in 1990 a series of speakers was organized by MFA to review the operation of the St. Paul food system and the major issues facing it. In 1991, the FNC worked to identify and prioritize several objectives by developing an annual work plan.

Another major effort, beginning in 1991 and culminating in 1992 was to have the FNC recognized by a city ordinance as a full fledged commission with assigned duties including a review power, staff, and budget. This ordinance was adopted July The ordinance expanded the FNC from nine to eleven
members. The budget FNC will have to go through the regular city process. Support for a half-time what FNC leaders have pushed for. As yet, budget support has not been forthcoming even with informal backing from the Mayor and some Council members. The ordinance also refers to the possibility of Ramsey County adopting a parallel ordinance which would expand the coverage of the FNC to the county. Informal efforts are underway to encourage this. It is proposed that there be fifteen members in the joint city-county FNC and that the St. Paul/Ramsey County Nutrition Program continue as the staff base.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND DYNAMICS

The change in the status of the FNC from an advisory to an official body raises questions about its new role(s) as well as its internal and external relations. Previously, the FNC could only recommend actions to the City Council (such as the Food and Nutrition Honor Roll). It occasionally endorsed proposals, such as one requiring mandatory training for food handlers. It did not comment on others, however, such as the ordinance restricting the spraying of lawn pesticides or the ordinance requiring that virtually all grocery store plastics be recyclable. The FNC will continue to have the power to recommend new actions to the City Council, but will also be able to initiate its own actions and review the food-related actions and budgets of other agencies within the city bureaucracy.

If the FNC also becomes the subject of a county ordinance, this will give the FNC - like the St. Paul/Ramsey County Nutrition Program - a fairly unique location which will organizationally bridge the city and county on food system issues. It will also link food system issues with the health care system more generally. Such a geographic expansion should also encourage the FNC to address various production, farmland preservation, land use, waste stream, and welfare issues more than it has.

Assuming that the expected half-time staff support will be made available to the FNC, this will greatly facilitate it carrying out its duties under the new ordinance. These include making policy recommendations, reviewing the relevant portions of the City's Comprehensive Plan and the proposed annual operating and biannual capital budgets of the Division of Public Health and the Dept. of Planning and Economic Development, as well as preparing an annual report. It will also be able to organize joint meetings with other groups, etc. However, it also raises questions about maintaining a healthy balance between the commissioners and the staff. The City of Knoxville has found that an annual retreat is very effective in doing this. The agenda and issues to be discussed at the annual retreat are prepared by an outside consultant after coordinating with the Food Policy Council chair and staff. The outside consultant also prepares the annual report.

This points to another important question. Since the MFA has played such a crucial role in helping to create and in assisting the FNC through its down periods, what should be its role vis-a-vis the new and more institutionalized Commission? Given the importance of having outside and independent expertise to provide both perspective and new ideas, it would seem appropriate to have an ongoing and regular role for the MFA to play in assisting the FNC and its staff. This could range from doing the annual report to preparing an annual retreat to preparing a series of dialogues to doing in-depth studies on emerging issues. The main point is that the MFA is well equipped to continue to assist the FNC in important ways.

Another important consideration is to keep a healthy balance between the various sectors of the food system (i.e., between production [conserving farmland; community gardens], processing and distribution [processors, wholesalers & grocers], food access [farmers markets; the emergency and supplemental feeding system; location of grocery stores; school breakfasts, etc.], processing and use [restaurants; food handling; food safety], recycling [food banks; composting] and disposal [land fills,
etc.]. Typically, there is a tendency for emergency and supplemental feeding system issues and concerns to predominate in local food councils. Several people mentioned this as a potential concern in St. Paul as well.

This links in to the issue of the diversity of the commissioners and the constituencies they represent. Several observations and recommendations on this are listed below, along with some suggestions on having staff liaisons from several other departments or divisions. Also, given the tendency for some commissioners not to attend regularly, the provision for removal contained in the ordinance should be enforced.

**MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

While the accomplishments discussed below may not seem to be dramatic, it must be kept in mind that the initial years of a food council are particularly difficult. The effort is a pioneering one in several senses. It involves exploring new territory which few have thought about systematically. This means, that, as noted above, there is a significant amount of time required for members to learn about the various sectors of the food system, how they operate, and which agencies and persons are active where. Efforts to devise a viable and locally functional structure also require a lot of pioneering effort, including trial and error.

Even when fully functional, the fact that food policy councils deal in large part with the informal sector - which is less visible than the formal sector - means that it is often difficult to point to specific achievements. Also, one of the key capabilities of most food councils is their ability to coordinate the activities of various individuals, volunteer groups, and public agencies so that much more is accomplished in terms of providing/maintaining social support systems than would otherwise be the case. This coordination and leveraging of informal and formal resources is also difficult to document and portray.

These comments are definitely applicable to the emergency and supplemental feeding system, which had evolved and become vigorous prior to the creation of the FNC. The presence of a vigorous emergency and supplemental feeding system meant that the FNC has not had to become heavily involved with these issues, although it has been able to draw on the experience of its current Chair on these matters.

A. Given the above, one of the main accomplishments, as Mayor Scheibel, noted, is that the FNC has survived its initial ups and downs and has now become part of the city - something that will give it a much greater operational and outreach capacity. The creation of a city/county FNC would extend this even further.

B. Development and operation of the "Food and Nutrition Honor Roll" where the Mayor, on behalf of the City Council, recognizes individuals or organizations for their contributions to providing nutrition education, nutritious meals, chemical-free produce, low-cost basic foods, hormone-free and lean cut meats, and marketing Minnesota-grown and labeled foods. The FNC works with a panel of nutritionists, grocers, low income advocates, and restaurant reviewers to make award recommendations to the City Council. This activity has given the FNC some visibility in the community and has provided some legitimacy to the efforts of those honored. It has taken a fair amount of volunteer time on the part of the commissioners to conduct this program.

C. Development and distribution of a flyer, "Nutrition Programs for Older Persons in Ramsey County." This flyer outlines the various programs that are available and how to obtain more
information about them. To try to get the widest possible distribution, the plan was to include the flyer with utility bills, but this proved impossible because of budget constraints.

D. Beginning with the 1991 Work Plan the FNC has sought to explore other important areas of the food system through a series of focus group meetings. One topic has been hunger, nutrition, and food. This group, which includes many agency people, has met several times and has published an interagency newsletter to keep people informed. Another group has been exploring the development of a model K-12 food curriculum which would include food, nutrition, and gardening. There have been some difficulties in getting teachers to participate. Other topics include strengthening summer feeding programs and a cooperative harvest (gardening) program.

E. The FNC, with modest financial support from the Mayor's Office, has had the Minnesota Food Association prepare several background reports on various aspects of the local food system which have provided a valuable compilation of information.

Summary: While the FNC has clearly been able to strengthen some of St. Paul's social support programs (nutrition, emergency and supplemental feeding programs), it has done much less with farmland, gardens, or environmental issues and problems.

THE SOURCES OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

There are a number of sources underlying the above accomplishments. First, there has been a high degree of commitment and patience on the part of most commissioners. Most commissioners have taken this volunteer job very seriously and have devoted time and effort to keeping the FNC going.

Second, there has been good support from Mayor Scheibel. He not only served as Chair of the FNC prior to his election as Mayor, but has pushed for staff support. He has helped to make the funds available for the MFA studies and in 1991 assigned an intern to follow hunger issues. Councilwoman Janice Rettman also played an important role in developing and facilitating passage of the new ordinance.

Third, as noted above, the MFA has been crucial in helping to get the FNC established as well as providing ideas, expertise, and programs to educate and strengthen the operations of the FNC.

Fourth, the presence of a strong emergency and supplemental feeding system allows the FNC to address the many other important food system issues, while still coordinating with the emergency and supplemental feeding system through its current Chair.

Finally, the minimal amount of staff time available from the coordinators in the Nutrition Program has been used very effectively.

ISSUES NEEDING CONTINUING OR ADDITIONAL WORK

A. In terms of regional food production, there is a need to continue to focus on the importance of conserving regional farmland. A couple of farmers producing for the Farmer's Market who have been displaced by roads or real estate development have found it almost impossible to find comparable land within the required 50-mile radius. While the Metropolitan Planning Council has made some efforts at farmland preservation beyond those contained in the 1980 Agricultural Preserves Act, the seven county area it covers would have to be expanded to thirteen to be effective. Also, new techniques and more vigorous efforts will be required.
B. The FNC has spent relatively little time on household and community another source of production and community-building. Gardens should be encouragement both in public housing and in the various neighborhoods. In 1991 and 1992, Green (run by the Minnesota Horticultural Society) ran a demonstration program public housing site. With the help of some state funding, there will be an expansion gardening efforts in 1993, this time run by the Self-Reliance Center. Another approach is the one conducted by Merrick Community Service, where they have developing community gardens with the support and participation of private corporations.

There needs to be an inventory and evaluation of vacant land within the city to see which lots are suitable for gardens. Beyond this, city procedures for obtaining water for community gardens need to be clarified and improved. Although there wasn't time to explore the pros and cons, consideration could be given to having District Councils grant long-term permits for gardens on suitable lots. Another approach is to create a community land trust which would hold title to community garden lands - as has been done in Philadelphia. As community gardens are expanded, the issue of lead in garden soils will also need to be addressed more systematically.

C. An expansion of community gardens would be particularly helpful in addressing the need to integrate various Asian groups, and especially the Hmong, into all aspects of city life. Since some 80% of public housing is used by Asians and since many of them are interested in gardening, this is another reason to promote community gardens in public housing. This needs to be accompanied by many other measures, ranging from the translation of gardening and nutrition information (something the Extension Service is doing some of), to providing consumer and nutrition education, to improving food handling in restaurants, to encouraging the development of Hmong restaurants. One local restauranteur indicated a willingness to help with these issues.

D. The FNC would benefit by being able to interact more with, and draw upon the resources of various grassroots organizations. These might include co-op, environmental, social justice, and neighborhood groups. One strategy might be to involve them on advisory committees and/or to join with them on issues of joint interest. In regard to neighborhood groups, one approach might be to work more with the seventeen District Planning Councils. They were involved in some of the FNC dialogues some years ago, but there has been less contact recently. Perhaps the FNC could work with them and the Dept. of Planning and Economic Development to do a survey and ranking of potential garden sites. A system where the Councils would be asked to submit RFPs (requests for proposals) might be used if modest funding was available. This might be for developing community gardens -although systematic preparations would be needed to avoid the ironic situation with occurred with the community garden in the St. Anthony Park neighborhood. Their garden had won a national prize from the American Community Garden Association, but was closed down because of odor problems from its compost pile (something which resulted from lack of turning the pile regularly).

E. The FNC could help to encourage increased awareness of the emergency and supplemental feeding system as the demand for assistance increases. The United Way list of food shelves and other assistance could be publicized or published and circulated as. a directory as has been done in Syracuse, NY. Somewhat related to this is the problem of a decrease in food access in certain areas, especially near shelters. One major emergency shelter on the near East side has no food available within walking distance after 5:00 PM or on weekends. The downtown has only one grocery store. One community-oriented grocer indicated that for financial reasons he had to close one near downtown store (at University and Lexington), something that leaves only convenience stores in that area.
F. The FNC needs to encourage the use of WIC and food stamps at the Farmer's Market, especially now that food stamp reporting rules have been simplified and political support for WIC at the national level appears stronger. The pilot WIC project run there, where WIC participants got a voucher worth $10 towards produce, had to be cancelled because state matching funds were withdrawn. Even those seeking to get into the regular WIC program suffer from delays due to the lack of sufficient federal funding of this program.

G. Other food access issues include the need to make sure that mandated school breakfast programs are actually served with sufficient time for students to eat. There is a need to expand and simplify summer feeding programs. While difficult to do given the complex and burdensome USDA regulations and paperwork, some type of assistance might be provided. A related area is the need to explore how well the nutritional needs of day care children are being met and how to encourage the use of USDA supplemental feeding programs in day care centers.

H. While some valuable work has been done in the LUNCHPOWER Program to reduce the amount of fat and salt in school lunches, while keeping the meals nutritious and appealing, there is a broader need to expand both nutrition and food system education. One way of doing this which more fully engages students than purely academic approaches is to use the Grow Lab indoor garden and curriculum developed by the National Gardening Association and various science teachers groups. This can be built into the K-6 science curriculum and gets kids directly involved with growing food and other plants. Diet, nutrition, food safety (e.g. pesticide residues, etc.), and composting can take on new meaning from this kind of hands-on approach. This curriculum also involves a broader educational constituency than nutritionists alone.

I. Efforts to encourage greater use of locally-grown produce need to be The concerns that local users (such as county purchasing agents, the common school kitchen, grocers, and restaurants) have regarding the reliability of delivery of needed quantities of locally-produced food may require better networking, cooperation, organization among local producers. The FNC might explore ways to assist the

J. Food safety is recognized as an emerging issue of importance. There much publicity about pesticide and other chemical residues, concern about irradiated. foods, concern about the impacts of bovine growth hormones, etc. These concerns to be placed in a larger framework which includes food handling in stores and restaurants, and in the safety of having assured local sources of food. This means preserving farmland and farmers, encouraging farmers markets, promoting community gardens, as well as exploring new approaches such as "community supported agriculture (CSAs)" or "food maintenance organizations (FMOs)" whereby users share the farmer's risk by advance purchase of shares in the crop.

These food safety issues - broadly defined - can also be seen to fit in to the new approaches suggested by the World Health Organization's "Healthy Cities" Program. The FNC would be the logical organization to try to promote these broader concepts of food safety and how they fit into building better and healthier cities.

K. The FNC has spent little time on the food waste stream. The St. Paul Food Bank does an excellent job of re-cycling both useable foods as well as plastics and other wastes. The FNC is in a good position to stress the need to see food "Wastes" as resources. Besides supporting efforts at gleaning and the recycling of useable foods, the importance of composting food and yard wastes needs to be stressed. The prohibition of landfilling of yard wastes as of January 1993 provides an opportunity for encouraging household composting - and thus more household gardens. This will require a
somewhat different promotional approach than that for community gardens. Also, the FNC could endorse the efforts of MINNTAP (the Minnesota Technical Assistance Program) to encourage the feeding of commercial food wastes to pigs.

EMERGING AND FUTURE CHALLENGES

Many current national and state trends are likely to further undermine the "safety nets" provided by the city's informal natural and social support systems. These "safety nets" include the "environmental services" which natural systems provide communities in terms of clean air and water, plus the healthy soils needed for the city's vegetation and for gardens. Social support systems include all of the real, but informal services which households, neighborhoods, and a wide variety of volunteer and charitable groups provide to a city. While the long-term decline in federal and state support to cities may level-off somewhat with the new administration, it is doubtful that cities will regain former levels of funding. Thus, they will need to increase their self-reliance. This is especially the case for all local food systems, whether at the household, neighborhood, or metropolitan levels. The challenge is to try to maintain the viability of current support systems as much as possible, while building the foundations for greater self-reliance - all at a time when most people do not see any immediate or pressing need to do so. A crucial part of this will involve a basic shift from the way we currently define food problems (as problems of hunger and poverty) and solutions (as emergency feeding programs and welfare) to new and broader concepts emphasizing the opportunities for local economic development, energy efficiency, and environmental improvement that would result from pursuing a self-reliant strategy based upon a broadened version of the World Health Organization's "healthy cities program."

A. There is a need to start planning for an expanded or new Farmers Market which will provide more stalls and better parking. This will help meet the increased demand for membership, especially from the Hmong. As mentioned above, this should be tied to the need to conserve urban farmland.

B. Linked to this is the need to also emphasize the importance of green space within the city and of green belts around the Metro area. Wisconsin has a program which provides matching funds for cities to purchase green space and community gardens. Green belts not only help conserve farmland, but help to prevent urban sprawl and when combined with a "healthy city" approach, can encourage urban re-development.

C. The FNC needs to start developing a strategy for moving food systems issues from their current "low profile" status to a medium profile status. Particularly important in this regard is the education of the younger generation in the city - which does not have the rural or farm heritage that many adults have. This is where a wide variety of educational and hands-on experiences are needed -ranging from the Grow Labs mentioned earlier, to nutrition education, to education and experience with hunger and poverty issues at all levels. There are a variety of useful simulation games, including the new Foodgame which has recently been published.18

D. To do this, the FNC will need to try to educate various groups regarding the importance and operation of the larger food system and how their activities relate to it. In doing this, the FNC should also seek to build new constituencies and networks. It clearly could work more closely with a range of grass-roots organizations, such as household and community gardeners, neighborhood associations, food safety advocates, co-op people, environmentalists, recyclers, etc.

E. In terms of building these new foundations or frameworks for the future, the need for energy and resource efficiency and environmental soundness in natural support systems and the need for equity and social justice in social support systems should be highlighted throughout.
ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Once budget and staff are allocated to the FNC, the FNC should set up a committee to work with the city's (and also the county's) Personnel Departments to establish the job description and interview procedures for hiring the staff coordinator.

B. In addition to the half-time staff coordinator for FNC, efforts should be made to have four to five staff liaison persons from other city and county agencies assigned to the FNC. On the city side these should include someone from the Mayor's office (to reflect the "strong mayor" structure of the city), someone from the Dept. of Planning and Economic Development, and perhaps someone from Public Housing. Other possibilities would include the Parks and Recreation and Environmental Health Departments. On the county side someone from the Health Division should be included, and perhaps someone from Extension or the Metro Council. The choice of which liaison people should be included will depend upon the discussions of what new goals and priorities are appropriate to the expanded FNC. Having such liaison persons is valuable: 1) in helping to extend food systems concerns into these agencies, 2) in reviewing both FNC and the agency plans, and 3) in gaining support for the implementation of policy.

C. As mentioned earlier, it is important to ensure diversity and a good balance between the different food system sectors among the commissioners themselves. It is useful to have a City Councilperson serve. A county Commissioner should also serve once the county joins. Such people can help to promote or implement the policies recommended. The sectors that currently are not adequately represented include: household and community gardens; the commercial sector (grocers and restauranteurs); the waste stream/composting portion of the food system; the food safety sector (broadly defined); education (both schools and the general public); and the energy and environmental aspects of the food system. While there are not this many additional positions available, it is important in making recommendations for new members to the Mayor's office (and the County Commission Chair) to seek diversity and balance.

D. Another and complementary way of doing this is for the FNC to establish taskforces and/or advisory committees. This has worked very well in Knoxville in providing diversity and expertise in addressing a particular area or problem. Some of the focus groups which have were started the past year (those on nutrition, developing a model curriculum, and community gardens) might well serve as the foundation for such committees. The one on community and household gardens should include composting. Other possible taskforces or advisory committees could gradually be established in the following areas: 1) farmland preservation and local marketing; and 2) food safety (broadly defined), which would also include industry representatives.

E. At some point the larger planning implications of localizing the food system and making it more self-reliant also need to be addressed - perhaps by working with city, county, and Metro planning personnel. The concept of "sustainable development" which is gaining currency in Third World development circles as well as among agriculturalists needs to be extended to urban planning. An advisory committee or taskforce here might also include people from the food industry (processors, transporters, wholesalers, etc.) who have been largely absent from FNC deliberations.

F. Establish a procedure (and a budget) for obtaining regular outside consulting services. These would presumably be provided by the MFA - given its expertise and past contributions. As suggested above, this could include organizing an annual retreat or dialogues on specific issues, writing the
annual report, or doing specific studies. It is important to have an outside, independent source of ideas and evaluation.

G. If possible, the annual report of the FNC should be presented and discussed at a meeting of the City Council (and at a meeting of the County Commission, once it becomes a joint sponsor).

H. Given the number of requests that both the St. Paul Food Bank and the Nutrition Program receive for information on the FNC, two types of materials should be prepared: 1) an informational brochure that highlights the goals, structure, and activities of the FNC; and 2) background materials, such as copies of the original policy and objectives, the implementation strategies, and the new ordinance, should be printed up and made available to those seeking detailed information on the history, development, and structure of the FNC. Copies of each annual report are also useful references for a variety of purposes. In addition, a packet of orientation materials for new commissioners needs to be prepared. Finally, it would also be valuable to try to have one of the local colleges undertake a comprehensive history of the FNC. This should be accompanied by efforts to gather photos, slides, clippings, etc. of the FNC and its members. These could also be used in public briefings and/or in the brochure and orientation materials.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS:

The St. Paul Food and Nutrition Commission has done a great deal in developing a series of basic reports and recommendations and in educating its members on the nature, problems, and needs of the local food system. The food policy which it developed for the city, and especially the implementing recommendations, are comprehensive and innovative. The passage of the new ordinance which promises the necessary staff support to start implementing some of these recommendations offers an exciting range of possibilities to the FNC, particularly if it is able to expand its jurisdiction and coverage to include the county. These possibilities will require the creation of a process to set priorities, while at the same time making more groups aware of the FNC and its concerns. Hopefully this report will be of use in both those efforts.
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3. Their thoughtful comments and suggestions have greatly improved earlier drafts of this report and have helped me to avoid errors and misinterpretations. Any that remain are my responsibility. Also, I would like to thank all those that I interviewed and/or talked to on the phone. They gave me a much better sense of the dynamics and issues facing the Food and Nutrition Commission than would otherwise have been the case.


5. These figures were provided by Second Harvest: the St. Paul Food Bank.


7. The MFA was created in 1983 as the St. Paul Food Resources Project. It did a detailed study and report on national, state, and local food production and consumption issues - which became a background paper for the Mayor's Ad Hoc Task Force on Municipal Food Policy.


9. The fortuitous visit by a member of the Knoxville, TN, food bank, who mentioned the U.S. Conference of Mayors project to Dick Goebel, Executive Director of Second Harvest: St. Paul Food Bank, led him to encourage the Mayor to participate. The U.S. Conference of Mayors offered to include both St. Paul and Minneapolis in the project, but Minneapolis declined.

10. Much of the information in this paragraph is drawn from United States Conference of Mayors report, Municipal Food Policies. [See reference #2.]


12. The efforts in Minneapolis grew out of the work of the Self-Reliance Center, which since 1976 had helped area residents create community gardens. In part stimulated by the activities in St.
Paul, they approached the Minneapolis City Council in the fall of 1985 (with the help of Councilman Steve Cramer) requesting support for developing food policy recommendations. The Council passed a resolution of support and the Minneapolis Food Policy Task Force was created in April of 1986. With the financial support of the Minneapolis Foundation and several corporations, the Task Force organized itself into three committees and over the next year met with various technical experts, held a number of hearings (with the help of the Minnesota Food Association), and prepared its policy and implementing recommendations. These were contained in: *A Municipal Food Policy for Minneapolis: The Report of the Minneapolis Food Policy Task Force*, Minneapolis, MN: Self Reliance Center, May 1987. [For further information, contact: Self-Reliance Center, 1916 2nd Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55403; Phone (612) 870-4255.]

13. The present staff coordinator (like the previous one) is currently able to devote only some five to six hours per month to the FNC - something that makes the appropriation of funding for the half-time coordinator crucial.


15. In February 1993, the Food and Nutrition Council received a list of currently vacant lots it can work from to develop criteria for determining which are most suitable for gardening. The actual evaluations might be done by the Dept. of Planning and Economic Development and/or the District Planning Councils.

16. Minneapolis has streamlined its procedures for getting garden water it has also surveyed and ranked vacant lots in terms of their potential as gardens and has created short- and long-term lease arrangements and a permit system that is run through the Self-Reliance Center. In St. Paul, a new water policy will be pilot tested the summer of 1993.


19. The first group of recommendations are organizational, the next relate to policy, and the last to the future. These draw upon the important set of recommendations contained in: Saint Paul Food & Nutrition Commission, *Draft to the Mayor and Saint Paul City Council*, St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Food Association, January 1991, and in the FNC's 1991 Work Plan.
IV. LOCAL FOOD POLICY ORGANIZATIONS [F-6, F-7, F-8, & F-9]

In this section you will find a historical timeline of work that has been done on local food systems planning over the past several decades written by Kate Clancy. Also, there are some summaries as well as the complete reports prepared by Ken Dahlberg on the local food policy councils in Knoxville, TN, St. Paul, MN, Onondaga County, NY, and Philadelphia, PA.

A. "A Timeline of Local Food Systems Planning." Kate Clancy, 1996. [F-6]

B. Local Food Policy Councils:

1. Knoxville. [F-6]


3. Onondaga County, NY. [F-8]


5. Toronto, Canada. [F-9]
   Rod MacRae, "So Why is the City of Toronto Concerned about Food and Agricultural Policy? A Short History of the Toronto Food Policy Council." *Culture and Agriculture*, Winter 1994, pp. 15-18.
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INTRODUCTION

This report on the Onondaga County food system and the Onondaga County Food System Council (OFSC) is the third of six on cities and counties around the country. The reports are part of a larger research project entitled, "Local Food Systems: Policies and Values Influencing their Potential." The other study sites are: Knoxville, TN; St. Paul, MN; Philadelphia, PA; Charleston, SC; and Kansas City, MO. All except Onondaga County participated in a 1984-85 project conducted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors to establish local food policy councils.

My interest in municipal food systems follows on from earlier work on sustainable agriculture - where the idea of localizing food systems is stressed. Curiously, the role of cities and towns in increasing the amount of locally grown food for local consumption has been neglected. This project thus seeks to explore the potential of cities and counties to be more self-reliant and more efficient in operating their local food systems. Much greater development of this potential is not only desirable, but may be required in the shorter term if federal and state funds for food-related programs remain stagnant or decline. Improving local food systems in conjunction with innovative neighborhood development projects can also help cities deal with problems of urban decay, declining tax bases, and environmental degradation, plus help to meet the need for open and green spaces. Development of this potential will definitely be required in the longer-term as fossil fuel prices increase and multiply prices throughout our energy-inefficient food system. This will be a major factor forcing the localization of food systems.

One of today's major challenges is that few citizens or officials are aware of how dependent for food their city is upon distant national and international systems (public and private) and how vulnerable those systems are. Neither are they aware of the extent and complexity of their local food systems, much less their potential and the need to develop that potential. This is reflected in the fact that no U.S. city has a department of food. Equally, few people are aware that the value of the produce from all U.S. gardens (urban and rural) is roughly equivalent to that of the corn crop (approx. $18 billion/year!).

I have sought to understand how local food systems and cycles operate at the household, neighborhood, and municipal levels. At each level I have also sought to understand the issues associated with each portion of the food system: from production issues (farmland preservation, farmers markets, household & community gardens), to processing issues (local vs. external), to distribution issues (transportation, warehousing) to access issues (inner city grocery stores, school breakfasts & lunches, food stamps, the WIC program, etc.), to use issues (food safety and handling, restaurants, street vendors), to food recycling (gleaning, food banks, food pantries and soup kitchens) to waste stream issues (composting, garbage fed to pigs, etc.). Besides the social and environmental issues associated with the above, there are also a number of ethical and value issues involved which I have also sought to understand and describe.
My visit to Syracuse and Onondaga County (July 1991) and subsequent work have been greatly facilitated by the extensive and generous help of Kate Clancy, John Kramer (Director of Extension), and Steve J. Chandler (Extension Associate).³

THE REGIONAL AND LOCAL SETTING

Onondaga County is located in central New York. Its 1990 population was 468,973, while its main urban center, Syracuse, had a population of 163,860. In terms of minorities, the county had 8% blacks, 1% Asians, and 1.5% Hispanics, while the city had 20% blacks, 2% Asians, and 3% Hispanics. 10.3% of the persons in the county were below the poverty line, while 18.4% in the city were.

Descriptions of regional attitudes included a "progressive" political tradition in state government combined with a social conservatism regarding acceptance of new trends, including food trends. There appears to be a fairly high level of concern regarding the preservation of farmland and open space.⁴ There are real political contrasts between the county and the city - where the county is largely Republican and the city Democratic. This may relate in large part to the mix of traditional ethnic groups found in the city (Italians, Germans, Irish, and Blacks), plus new Hispanic, Asian, and Middle Eastern groups.

Historically the county was linked into the Erie Canal. Today the NY State Barge Canal System provides access to the Great Lakes and overseas through the deep water port of Oswego. Its central location makes it a major distribution center. The county was one of the early national suppliers of salt - an industry that was later expanded into a major chemical industry. Syracuse is the location of the Central New York Regional Market as well as the State Fair. It has extensive health care and educational facilities. The Chamber of Commerce reports the major industries to include defense, appliances, and automobile parts and the major service industries to include utilities and food marketing and distribution.⁵

A different perspective is found in an Onondaga Citizens League report which states that "the food industry is the largest industry in Onondaga County" generating close to 13,000 jobs in more than 1,500 firms in 1985.⁶ The report concludes that "despite its broad impact, the food industry has, until now, remained an unexamined and 'unsung' enterprise. Unfortunately it is often overlooked because it is not viewed in the same light as manufacturing industries or the increasingly-publicized service industries."⁷

The county has an area of 784 sq. miles (2,021 sq. km.), which as of 1987 included 158,276 acres of farmland. In 1978 there were 184,114 acres of farmland, so there has been a 15% decrease in just nine years. The county has twelve different agricultural districts which covered a total of 186,426 acres in 1991. These districts, mainly in the western and southern parts of the county, offer farmers lower tax assessments in return for keeping the land in agriculture. The districts go through a renewal process every eight years, at which point they can be modified. Given this short review period and the policy of the County's Agriculture and Farmland Protection Board to honor requests from landowners to withdraw from a district, it is not clear that to date the districts have done a great deal to preserve agricultural land from development, nor to protect the rural environment.⁸

Other aspects of the food system include a highly developed emergency and supplemental feeding system in Syracuse. Even so, demand has been steadily increasing to where over 215,000 emergency meals are served per month. There is a high infant mortality rate and only about one-third of the requests for WIC coupons can be met. There appears to be an increased consolidation in food
wholesaling and retailing that parallels the same trend elsewhere. Access to food for inner city residents is difficult.

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE ONONDAGA FOOD SYSTEM COUNCIL, INC. (OFSC)

After several years of meetings and prodding by a concerned local resident, David Yarrow, the Chairman of the Planning and Economic Development Committee of the Onondaga County Legislature requested in the fall of 1982 that Cooperative Extension explore the feasibility of establishing a Food and Agriculture Task Force. Extension established an advisory committee which met for a year to discuss the need for, purpose, composition, and relation to county government of an advisory body on food issues. The committee recommended that a broad-based advisory body - called The Food System Council of Onondaga County - be established with a sixteen member board of directors (eight appointed by the County Legislature and eight by the County Executive). In addition, seven ex-officio non-voting members from county agencies and the Legislature, called Special Advisors, were recommended as liaison people and technical advisors. The recommendations were accepted and the Council was officially authorized by the Legislature. The first members of the board of directors began their terms in March of 1984. The Council was housed at Extension, but the Legislature made clear that they would provide no additional funding for the Council. Thus, space, modest mailing expenses, and any supporting staff time had to come out of Extension's limited (and declining) resources.

The creation of the OFSC in 1984 made it the second food policy council created in the U.S. (the first being the Knoxville, TN). It remains as the only county food policy council in the U.S., although the St. Paul, MN Food and Nutrition Commission is in the process of becoming a joint city/county body.

There have been three phases in the evolution of the Onondaga Food System Council. During Phase 1 (1984-88), the Council undertook a number of projects to map out and educate its members and public officials on the basic dimensions of the county's food system. A flow chart of the emergency and supplemental feeding system was developed along with a graphic display of the sites where people could get assistance. A directory of information sources on the local food system was also compiled. Procedures for obtaining food during any major emergency were reviewed. Finally, a series of tours to local farms, processors, wholesalers, retailers, and distributors were organized, followed by visits to the Food Bank of Central New York and several emergency feeding sites.

As these activities progressed, the Council soon realized that the efficient, but very limited staff time provided by Extension was not sufficient for them to be able to address the many problems that the Council had identified. Therefore, they determined that they needed to seek non-profit status as a 501(c)(3) organization to be able to seek outside funding - primarily for staff support. This process, which was complicated and took time, was begun in 1987. One question which had to be resolved was whether the board members of such a non-profit could still be appointed by local government.

Phase II (1988-92) can be said to begin with the shift in legal status to a non-profit corporation - symbolized by the addition of "Inc." to the title. In its new by-laws, the Council reduced its board members to eleven (with five appointed by the County Executive and six appointed by the County Legislature). The seven ex-officio members remained with the representative from the County Disaster Preparedness Office being replaced by a representative from the City of Syracuse. The mission of the Council is:
to aid the legislature and executive branches of [the county's] government, as well as leaders of public and private agencies and organizations, in local food system planning and policy formation, and to assist residents in gaining a useful understanding of the food system and food policy issues within Onondaga County and Central New York.10

During this phase, the Council assisted the Onondaga Citizens League in preparing a report on the role of the food industry in the economy of Onondaga County above (see endnote 6). The report also recommended that the Council "act as an oversight body to encourage and follow up on the implementation of the many recommendations of the report." The Council organized a forum on food safety issues, reviewed the County's 2010 plan for the adequacy of its coverage of agricultural and food issues, and several Council members served on a City task force to study grocery retailing needs and opportunities in inner-city Syracuse. Most important, the Council prepared its own long-range plan of action. The first of its four priority objectives was that of securing funding for staff to implement the other program objectives.11 Funding was sought in a (successful) two year grant proposal to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The main goals of the grant are to: 1) preserve the county's agricultural base; and 2) to improve food accessability for local consumers, especially for lower income groups.12

With the receipt of the Kellogg grant in 1992, the Council began its current phase of operation. A half-time Extension Associate, Steven J. Chandler, was hired and an ad hoc committee of the Council was set up to supervise the overall operation of the grant. In addition, an Advisory Committee that includes a number of farmers as well as board members was set up to oversee the agricultural component of the grant. It is chaired by Dr. Kate Clancy, the Project Director. Activities conducted during the first year of the grant include: 1) conducting of three needs assessments among farmers, dairy farmers, and consumer leaders; 2) holding a luncheon meeting where issues of near-urban agriculture and sustainability were discussed by a nationally-known leader in the field, Roger Blobaum; 3) planning the educational activities for the second year of the grant; and 4) conducting a range of new Council activities made possible by staff support, such as creating information packets and a Council brochure, setting up a Funding/Finance Committee to seek additional future funds, and setting up a Marketing/Publicity Committee to increase Council visibility.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND DYNAMICS

The larger political setting within which the OFSC operates is one over which it has no control. It is also one where the political relationships between the city and the county can change either through elections, senior staff changes, or the emergence of contentious issues. The degree of OFSC involvement in city food issues has always been a sensitive matter, especially to the agriculture community.

As an organization, the first change in the status of the OFSC was from an unincorporated to an incorporated (non-profit) public advisory council to the County. The appointment of Board members by the County has remained unchanged. During Phases I and II, the Council depended upon the volunteer efforts of its board members and had only minimal staff and financial support from Extension (although this was crucial in obtaining its 501(c)3 status). While the OFSC was able to accomplish a number of things during this period (see below), it also was unable to respond fully to County requests for background information on the use of emergency and conventional food programs by low-income families in the county, for recommendations on food stamp use, and for more extensive input into the county's 20 year plan.
The Board now has eleven rather than the original sixteen members. Even so, the OFSC has consciously maintained a very healthy diversity of members. The presence of the seven Special Advisors serving as technical and liaison staff from area agencies also helps in this.13

This diversity has enabled the OFSC to avoid the problems of some food councils where representatives and the priorities of the emergency feeding system predominate, leading to neglect of many other important aspects of the local food system. Also, as a county body, the OFSC has had less direct involvement with the emergency and supplemental feeding system. The Syracuse-based emergency feeding system evolved and became vigorous in part prior to, and in part parallel to the OFSC. Thus, the OFSC has become involved with these issues only as they relate to the county.

The second major change occurred when the OFSC received a two year W. K. Kellogg Foundation grant, which has given it a half-time staff person to support OFSC activities and to pursue several new initiatives.

The addition of staff has helped to overcome some of the difficulties of the past, where there were ebbs and flows depending upon the time and energy that Board members had available. However, with the receipt of the Kellogg grant, various IRS rules governing 501(c)3 organizations were activated. First, such public organizations with a high percentage of funding from one private source cannot engage in direct advocacy or lobbying.14 Second, there is a requirement that at least one-third of such an organization's funds be locally generated. To meet this requirement, the Extension Director, John Kramer, was willing to make major organizational adjustments to have Extension house the staff person (Steven J. Chandler, who was hired as an Extension Associate) and to serve as the fiscal agent for the grant, even though the project direction in policy and programmatic terms comes from the OFSC (through its ad hoc supervisory committee) and the Project Director (Kate Clancy).15 Once the Kellogg grant expires, the relationship of staff to the Board and to Extension may need to be reexamined.

The expiration of the Kellogg grant in February 1994 presents the OFSC with its most important organizational challenge: how to find additional funding for staff support. It is unclear whether or not there is enough political support to have either the county and/or the city provide staff funding, particularly given the budget reductions they have been forced to make the past couple of years.16 It will also be difficult to identify any one large source of funds and if that were a private foundation, then the IRS limitations discussed above would remain. What remains is an approach of seeking to find enough small grants for specific projects to fund the staff person. This approach, of course, risks periodic shortfalls and does not solve the long-term problem of finding base funding for staff.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

While the accomplishments discussed below may not seem to be dramatic, it must be kept in mind that the initial years of a food council are particularly difficult. The effort is a pioneering one in several regards. It involves exploring new territory which few have thought about systematically. A significant amount of time is required for members to learn about the various sectors of the food system, how they operate, and which agencies and persons are active where. Efforts to devise a viable and locally functional structure also require a lot of pioneering effort, including trial and error.

Even when fully functional, the fact that food councils deal in large part with the informal sector - which is less visible than the formal sector - means that it is often difficult to point to specific achievements. Also, one of the key capabilities of most food councils is their ability to coordinate the activities of various individuals, volunteer groups, and public agencies so that much more is
accomplished in terms of providing/maintaining social support systems than would otherwise be the case. This coordination and leveraging of informal and formal resources is also difficult to document and portray.

While the five cities in this study have been able to learn of each other's experience through the U.S. Conference of Mayors report (see endnote 2), the OFSC is unique and has had to develop its own course. Given the above, the OFSC's main accomplishment is not only that is has survived as long as it has, but that it has been able to incorporate as a public non-profit organization (a long and complicated process) and to obtain a major grant to provide it half-time staff support for two years. Throughout, it has also been able to maintain its status as an official advisory body to Onondaga County. Other more specific accomplishments of the OFSC include (in roughly chronological order):

A. Conducting a series of food system tours for local leaders to farms, food processors, wholesalers, retailers, and distributors as well a tour to the Food Bank and several emergency feeding sites.

B. Preparing a flow chart of the emergency feeding system in the county along with a graphic display of emergency food sites and retail outlets. The OFSC has also served over the years as an informal networker for many aspects of the emergency food system and has helped in developing a clearer picture of current needs and demands. For example, a committee with members from the Food Bank, Social Services, and WIC is compiling data and working out ways to simplify reporting to the state and to avoid duplication of effort.

C. Preparing a "Directory of Information Sources" on the local food system (see endnote 9). More recently, information packets and a brochure on the OFSC have been prepared.

D. Reviewing procedures for obtaining food for the region during an emergency (such as the 1966 blizzard).

E. Having several members of the OFSC serve on the Citizen's League study on "The Role of the Food Industry in the Economy of Onondaga County." The report recommended that the OFSC be the body to follow up on the many report recommendations and that the county provide the necessary budget and staff support.

F. Undertaking with the city a study of grocery store availability, needs, and opportunities in inner-city Syracuse. Other research has included student research on the Hartford Food System.

G. Initiating action (after a review showed the need) to link the county's 2010 Plan (as well as other planning activities) to food and agricultural issues in the county.

H. Serving as an educational and discussion forum for food safety, preserving farmland, hunger issues, sustainable agriculture, and the regional economics of the food industry.

I. Preparing the long-range plan which led to the Kellogg grant application.

J. Expanding its activities under the Kellogg grant by conducting needs assessments among farmers, dairy farmers, and consumer leaders, holding an outreach luncheon to bring the OFSC to the attention of a wider audience, planning additional educational activities, and setting up three new committees - the Advisory Committee to supervise the agricultural component of the grant, a
Summary: The OFSC has carried out many useful activities related to food and agriculture in Onondaga County. It has done less with the environmental and social aspects of the food system. It has also laid the foundations for a broad range of future activities. Whether or not it will be able to achieve its great potential will depend upon finding additional funding for the necessary staff support.

THE SOURCES OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

There are a number of sources underlying the above accomplishments. First, there has been a high degree of commitment and patience on the part of most OFSC Board members. Most have taken this volunteer job very seriously and have devoted time and effort to keeping the OFSC going. Many are also on other boards and thus have a good general knowledge of community needs.

Second, Extension has provided very effective and knowledgeable support for the OFSC given the limited amount of staff time and budget it has available for this. It also made creative arrangements for hiring and housing the new half-time staff person made possible by the Kellogg grant.

As mentioned above, the OFSC has consciously sought to maintain a healthy balance on the Board of people from different sectors. Current Bylaws specify that two members are to be producers (farmers or people affiliated with a farm organization or government agency), four providers (food processors, distributors, marketers, agribusiness, a government agency, or food service people), three community members (people affiliated with consumer issues, non-profits, or educational and research institutions), and two at large members from the community. Typically, there is a tendency for emergency feeding system concerns and issues to predominate in local food councils, but this has not been the case with the OFSC.

Fourth, while there has been no budget support forthcoming from the County (not surprising given the budget cutbacks they have had to implement), there has been a willingness to continue it as an official advisory body in its new non-profit status. Also, the Legislature has appointed two of its elected members as Special Advisers to the OFSC - indicating a significant level of interest.

Last but not least, Kate Clancy has played a key role throughout the history of the OFSC in developing strategies, writing reports and grant proposals, and generally encouraging the growth of the OFSC.

ISSUES NEEDING CONTINUING OR ADDITIONAL WORK

As indicated above, the main and immediate priority of the OFSC is to find funds to continue staff support (hopefully upgraded to a full-time position) once the Kellogg grant expires in February 1994. This is the immediate part of its need to find a more permanent funding base. In the short term, whatever grant, project, and consulting opportunities exist will need to be vigorously pursued. In the longer-term, there is still a need to develop a strategy to provide more secure base funding for staff. It would be sad indeed if sufficient funding for staff ceased just at a time when the OFSC has begun a number of important projects which will require staff time to implement.

Intertwined with the funding issue is the need to continue to pursue the broad objectives set out in the Long-Range Plan and the Kellogg grant proposal. The activities identified for 1993-94 have been consolidated into three project areas.
A- Farmland preservation. In April 1993, farmers and local officials were invited to discuss the various issues and options identified in the needs assessments conducted earlier. A presentation by a representative of the American Farmland Trust on different approaches to farmland preservation, including tax policies, was included. Several different perspectives emerged from the lively discussions: those of the farmers, who are primarily concerned about the economic viability of farming and the need to retain the option to sell off their land when they retire; those of many local officials who are concerned about maintaining and/or expanding the tax base; and those of OFSC members who are concerned about the long-term food security requirements of the region and the need to develop a sustainable agricultural base.

B. Inclusion of agriculture in local and county planning. Since there had been several previous efforts to encourage the inclusion of agriculture and food issues in the county's 2010 Plan, the OFSC decided to focus more on planning in small cities and towns. A "dialogue" was organized in June 1993 for farmers, local planners and zoning officials, and members of the County's Agriculture and Farmland Protection Board (which makes recommendations to the county on the operation of the various agricultural districts). Given the interest in this, the Funding/Finance Committee has been working on a grant proposal for follow-on workshops.

C. Increasing consumer awareness on local food availability. Explorations regarding creation of a short video led to the conclusion that it would be too expensive, both in dollars and in staff time. Plans are now to organize a workshop or a dialogue on buying local food. This would complement the more general Chamber of Commerce program on buying local. Buyers for large institutional consumers -hospitals, schools, supermarkets, etc. - would be brought in to meet with local growers to discuss the barriers to increasing local purchases. Buying local would strengthen the local economy general and agricultural - in important ways. Part of the program would also include the issues of food access for lower income groups.

To efficiently carry out these and other activities, the OFSC needs to pay attention to several organizational issues.

D. Meeting times need to be found when more members of the Board can attend. Problems of getting a quorum have persisted over the years. The traditional luncheon meeting time of the Board does not fit well with the work schedules of farmers. Meeting times can be varied and/or meetings held in conjunction with other events (tours, retreats, speakers, etc.).

E. As the OFSC develops its procedures for choosing specific projects, it should consider using an annual retreat - as the Knoxville Food Policy Council has - to discuss these as well as other priorities for the coming year.

F. The OFSC should prepare an annual report and present it to the County Executive and to a meeting of the County Legislature. It might also report more regularly to relevant county committees.

G. In addition to the importance of maintaining diversity among the Board members, it will also be important to continue to choose projects that will engage the two broad types of people that seem to serve on such boards. First, there are those - largely from the private sector - who are task- and result-oriented. Second, there are those typically from the human resource agencies - who are more process and structurally oriented. Projects with a specific focus and clear objectives appeal to the first group, while longer-term, reform-oriented projects appeal to the latter.
H. The OFSC might consider having Kate Clancy serve as an outside consultant once her term of the Board expires at the end of 1994. Both Knoxville and St. Paul have had an outside consultant or organization that is able to provide new ideas and to offer independent evaluations and constructive criticisms. Staff are rarely able to do this both because of closeness to the projects as well as their employment status. In many ways, Kate Clancy has already performed this valuable role working within the OFSC framework and hopefully she will be able to continue it from the outside.

Beyond these organizational matters, there are a number of other local food system issues that are worthy of consideration in the longer-term.

I. At the regional level, the OFSC might consider working with the Central New York Regional Market Authority to develop a plan to maintain and upgrade the Farmers Market by integrating it into a more genuinely regionalized food system that is sustainable over the longer term - something that would involve sustainable production, processing, and distribution. Given the financial difficulties the Market has faced the past few years, this would be a difficult task. At the same time, the presence of a regional public authority would seem to offer many valuable possibilities and a joint grant, project and/or subcontract to OFSC from CNYRMA would help to meet some of the IRS requirements for public and local funding.

J. In terms of regional food production, the OFSC might expand on its current efforts and conduct a series of workshops to educate the public and help develop a white paper on the importance of conserving both regional farmland and farmers and the various ways to do this. While the county's agricultural districts are important, they might well be complemented with county and/or local agricultural zoning which would help to manage and channel suburban development and minimize the selling off of multiple parcels by farmers. In terms of conserving farmers, much of this depends upon national agricultural policy. However, local studies on the potential social and economic impacts of such things as bovine growth hormone on the number of dairy farmers can help to influence state policy.

K. Given its origins and sources of support, the OFSC understandably has been oriented towards county issues and problems, especially those relating to farmers and agriculture. However, it would appear that there is considerable potential to strengthen the links already established with the city so as to deal with food system problems that intertwine city and county.

L. Food access is such an area. Whether in the city or the county, programs are needed to provide access to various target groups such as infants, children, and the elderly. Examples include: school breakfast programs, summer feeding programs, expanding USDA supplemental food programs to daycare centers, and improving Meals on Wheels and bus shopping schedules for the elderly. Sometimes different approaches need to be taken between the city and the county, but cooperation and coordination would be beneficial.

Through the city Retail Task Force, there has already been OFSC involvement in analyzing how to try to get an inner-city supermarket in Syracuse going. By redefining this effort in terms of food access a wider range and mix of approaches could be pursued: multiple small stores; re-introducing hucksters; encouraging downtown tailgate farmers markets; trying to get convenient cross-town bus routes established to existing downtown or outlying supermarkets; etc.

Another important aspect of food access involves household and community gardens. While mainly a city matter, they offer both a source of self-reliance and community-building. Given the larger food systems perspective and approach of the OFSC, perhaps they can encourage the city and
volunteer groups to promote them more vigorously. This is especially needed in public housing and in
the various neighborhoods. The city program is operating well, but is not particularly visible, nor are
there efforts to expand it. There might be an inventory and evaluation of vacant land within the city to
see which lots are suitable for gardens. The Public Housing Authority could also be encouraged to
promote community gardens on their properties - as is done in a number of communities.

The Food Bank has established its own adjacent community garden which is run by volunteers
-a very nice idea. This might be extended to appropriately located food pantries, where "pantry
gardens" might be run by some of the pantry patrons (with some advice and assistance). This would
likely have a number of valuable spin-offs.

M. Food safety is another important area that involves both the county and the city. Given the
interest and expertise in this area, it might be useful to consider how current food safety issues fit into
building better and healthier cities along the lines of the World Health Organization's "Healthy Cities"
Program.

N. Another area of importance is composting. The halting of the landfilling of yard wastes in
April 1992 has provided both pressures and opportunities. A food systems approach would suggest
encouraging household, apartment, and public housing dwellers to develop compost systems and
gardens simultaneously. This would also reduce waste transport costs and should encourage people to
re-examine the risks of using pesticides on their lawns." There has already been cooperation between
Extension, the city, and the Resource Recovery Agency in training Master Composters. There is also a
Composting Committee that includes county legislators. Thus, the main potential role for OFSC might
be to help the various agencies and groups to see how the handling of food
wastes fits into the larger need to develop a more localized and sustainable food system.

EMERGING AND FUTURE CHALLENGES

Many current national and state trends are likely to further undermine the "safety nets" provided by the
county's informal natural and social support systems. These "safety nets" include the "environmental
services" which natural systems provide communities in terms of clean air and water, plus the healthy
soils needed for agriculture and people's gardens. Social support systems include all of the real, but
informal services which households, neighborhoods, and a wide variety of volunteer and charitable
groups provide to the larger community. While the long-term decline in federal and state support to
local governments may level-off somewhat with the new administration, it is doubtful that there will be
any overall increases. Thus, local governments will need to increase their self-reliance. Local food
systems, whether at the household, neighborhood, metropolitan, or county levels offer tremendous
potential in this regard.

The challenge is to try to maintain the viability of current local support systems, while building the
foundations for greater self-reliance - all at a time when most people do not see any immediate or
pressing need to do so. A crucial part of this will involve a basic shift from the way we currently define
food problems (as problems of hunger and poverty) and solutions (as emergency feeding programs and
welfare) to new and broader concepts emphasizing the opportunities for local economic development,
energy efficiency, and environmental improvement that would result from pursuing a self-reliant
strategy based upon a broadened version of the World Health Organization's "healthy cities program."

A. In order to pursue these challenges, the OFSC will need to gradually gain more visibility
while educating a variety of groups on the importance of greater local food self-reliance. The occasion
of its tenth anniversary (March 1994) might be used to organize a high visibility event.
Leadership education is crucial to this. Given the success of the previous food system tours, repeating them in an updated form with a wider/different audience should be considered. The workshops and dialogues conducted this past year should be continued. The new brochure on the OFSC should be widely distributed.

In terms of more public education, it is important to help the younger generation realize the importance of the local food system. While the Agriculture in the Classroom program is useful, it should be broadened to include other aspects of the food system. There are a wide variety of educational and hands-on materials which can be used - ranging from the Grow Lab elementary curriculum developed by the National Gardening Association, to nutrition education, to education and experience with hunger and poverty issues at all levels. There are also a variety of useful simulation games, including the new "Food Game" which the University of Minnesota has published.

B. While the OFSC is currently precluded from direct lobbying, it can still provide leadership on policy formation and dialogue. The OFSC might consider providing information to county or city officials and lobbyists on the importance of expanded funding for: the state matching portion of supplemental WIC coupons used in farmers markets; the direct purchase funds the state provides to food banks ($600,000 locally); strengthening recycling and composting programs, etc.

C. Another challenge will be to expand the work already done to show the relevance of food systems approaches to long-term and sustainable economic development. This could be done by showing the potential for local packaging of produce and local canning operations (which could be run by steam if the proposed incinerator is retrofitted to produce steam). Also, some sort of "vision document" on what a sustainable regional food system would look like might be useful.

D. The emergency feeding system appears to be reaching its current limits. Demand has increased from 140,000 to over 215,000 meals/month in the last four years. Perhaps it would be useful to encourage a joint OFSC/Citizens League study on this, both to generate more public awareness and to explore how future needs can be met.

E. Another challenge might be to try to help low income and food stamp users to get the most (in quantity and nutritional quality) from their resources. This might be done by helping to organize a "food shopping fair/clinic" at a local school. Fun and games could be included as well as other types of useful information. The local grocer who suggested this idea indicated that he thought there would be financial support for the idea from the industry.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS:

As it approaches its tenth anniversary, the Onondaga Food System Council remains unique as the only county food council in the U.S. The OFSC has accomplished things of which it can be proud. More than any of the other councils in this study, focused on the issues and problems of trying to preserve both farmland and far. However, rather than doing this in isolation, it has done this in terms of the larger system of the county (and the region). By including on its Board and in its pro activities a very diverse groups of leaders and citizens, it has helped to educate of people about the importance of a wide range of food issues. It has been able from a volunteer group to a non-profit status while retaining its advisory position county. It was able to obtain foundation funding for a half-time staff person for years. It is currently vigorously pursuing a fund-raising campaign to try to retain staff position. It would be tragic and ironic to lose this staff support at its tenth anniversary. All supporters of the OFSC need to rally between now and early 1994 to make sure that the strong foundations created over the
years and the new programs potential generated the past year and a half are carried forward. Hopefully this will help in those efforts.

ENDNOTES AND REFERENCES

1. This report is based upon work supported by the Ethics and Values Studies Program of the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DIR-9022243. The government has certain rights in this material. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.


3. Their thoughtful comments and suggestions have greatly improved earlier drafts of this report and have helped me to avoid errors and misinterpretations. Any that remain are my responsibility. Also, I would like to thank all those that I interviewed and/or talked to on the phone. They gave me a much better sense of the dynamics and issues facing the Food System Council than would otherwise have been the case.

4. It is often difficult politically to translate this sort of general public support into actual policies because those who would be most directly affected by proposals for better zoning and land-use planning (farmers, developers, town planning boards) may have strong reasons to oppose changes, while those supporting them typically have only a general interest in these issues.


11. "Long-Range Plan,” Onondaga Food System Council, Inc., 1990. The program objectives included: promoting better coordination and communication on food system issues through an annual conference/workshop; promoting research on an in-depth economic study of the regional food system; making recommendations on planning and policy formation; and educating target audiences on food system issues.

12. In pursuing these goals, the Council also seeks: 1) to promote civic education on food issues; 2) to improve communication on agriculture; and 3) to provide enhanced attention to the food system in planning and economic development.

13. Besides two county legislators, there are county staff persons from the Health Dept., the County Planning Agency, the Dept. of Social Services, Extension, and the city Dept. of Community Development.

14. Among the people that I interviewed, there were a small number who felt strongly that the OFSC should be engaged in policy advocacy and lobbying. The majority felt that developing background information and policy recommendations for a broad-based food systems agenda for the county as well as educating public officials and the general public on these were the main contributions that OFSC could make.

15. One consequence of this arrangement is that the OFSC Board and its Advisory Committee are not responsible for two important aspects of any organization's operations: personnel and fiscal management.

16. Even if the city were willing to provide funding (or become a partner with the county in funding the Council), this might well lead to loss of support for the OFSC by farmers, many of whom have a perception - going back to the involvement of several board members in some early projects on city food problems - that it is more concerned about city hunger problems than farm problems.

17. The Authority was set up in 1933 along with several others. Only the Authorities in Rochester and Syracuse remain. The Authority's goal is to promote agriculture and local produce in Central New York, which it does through some 300 retail stalls and 10 wholesale buildings. Thirteen appointed members from seven counties in Central New York make up the Board of the Authority. Almost all are growers, although legally up to seven could be non-producers. In 1988-89, the Authority got a planning grant. A three phase plan was developed which would have added new wholesale buildings and a cold storage facility ($1.5 million) and expanded the retail area from six to thirty-seven acres ($14 million). Two grants of $1.5 million were authorized for the wholesale phase. However, because the wholesalers strongly disagreed with the increase in rent that would be required (from $3.80 to approximately $6.00 per square foot), the grant was lost. This disagreement was the culmination of years of discontent on the part of the wholesalers who claim they have had little or no effective representation on the Board.
18. It should be noted that under a recent Supreme Court ruling, states and localities are not pre-empted by FIFRA from passing their own, more stringent pesticide rules and regulations.


20. This grocer also pointed out that many food stamp users are poor consumers (his downtown store has the least redemption of manufacturer's coupons of any in his 19 store purchasing co-op). He also pointed out that both he and low-income customers would benefit from increased purchases of private label products which are lower priced but also have a higher mark up for the grocer than do national labels.
IV. LOCAL FOOD POLICY ORGANIZATIONS [F-6, F-7, F-8, & F-9]

In this section you will find a historical timeline of work that has been done on local food systems planning over the past several decades written by Kate Clancy. Also, there are some summaries as well as the complete reports prepared by Ken Dahlberg on the local food policy councils in Knoxville, TN, St. Paul, MN, Onondaga County, NY, and Philadelphia, PA.

A. "A Timeline of Local Food Systems Planning." Kate Clancy, 1996. [F-6]

B. Local Food Policy Councils:

1. Knoxville. [F-6]


3. Onondaga County, NY. [F-8]


5. Toronto, Canada. [F-9]
   Rod MacRae, "So Why is the City of Toronto Concerned about Food and Agricultural Policy? A Short History of the Toronto Food Policy Council." *Culture and Agriculture*, Winter 1994, pp. 15-18.
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INTRODUCTION

This report on the Philadelphia food system and the Food and Agriculture Task Force (FATF) is the fourth of six on cities and counties around the country. The reports are part of a larger research project which was entitled, "Local Food Systems: Policies and Values Influencing their Potential."\(^1\) The other study sites are: Charleston, SC; Kansas City, MO; Knoxville, TN; Onondaga County, NY; and St. Paul, MN. All except Onondaga County participated in a 1984-85 project conducted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors to establish local food policy councils.\(^2\)

My interest in municipal food systems follows -on from earlier work on sustainable agriculture - where the idea of localizing food systems is stressed. Curiously, the role of cities and towns in increasing the amount of locally grown food for local consumption has been neglected. This project thus explored the potential of cities and counties to be more self-reliant and more efficient in operating their local food systems.

Much greater development of this potential is not only desirable, but may be required in the shorter term if federal and state funds for food-related programs remain stagnant or decline or, alternatively, the federal government consolidates and devolves food assistance and welfare programs to the states and localities. Developing and strengthening local food systems in conjunction with innovative neighborhood development projects offers cities new ways to deal with problems of urban decay, declining tax bases, and environmental degradation, while at the same time helping to meet the need for open and green spaces.

Development of this potential will definitely be required in the longer-term as fossil fuel prices increase and multiply prices throughout our energy-inefficient food system. This will be a major factor forcing the localization of food systems. In the meantime, the challenge will be to try to maintain current support systems as much as possible, while building the foundations of greater self-reliance - all at a time when most people do not see any immediate or pressing need to do so.

Few citizens or officials are aware of how dependent for food their city is upon distant national and international systems (public and private) and how vulnerable those systems are. Neither are they aware of the extent and complexity of their local food systems, much less their potential and the need to develop that potential. This is reflected in the fact that no U.S. city has a department of food. Equally, few people are aware that the value of the produce from all U.S. gardens (urban and rural) is roughly equivalent to that of the corn crop (approx. $18 billion/year!).

I have sought to understand how local food systems and cycles operate at the household, neighborhood, and municipal levels. At each level I have also sought to understand the issues associated with each portion of the food system: from production issues (farmland preservation, farmers markets, household & community gardens), to processing issues (local vs. external), to distribution issues (transportation, warehousing) to access issues (inner city grocery stores, school
breakfasts & lunches, food stamps, the WIC program, etc.), to use issues (health and nutrition, food safety and handling, restaurants, street vendors), to food re-cycling (gleaning, food banks, food pantries and soup kitchens) to waste stream issues (composting, garbage fed to pigs, etc.). Besides the social and environmental issues associated with the above, there are also a number of ethical and value issues involved which I have also sought to understand and describe.

My visit to Philadelphia (August 1991) and subsequent work have been greatly facilitated by the extensive and generous help of Libby J. Goldstein and Patrick Temple-West.

THE REGIONAL AND LOCAL SETTING

Philadelphia is located about half way between New York City and Washington D.C. in the Delaware Valley. Across the river to the East is Camden, NJ. Philadelphia has the largest population of the cities studied - 1,585,577 in 1990. The larger metro region had a population of 4,856,877 in 1990. In terms of minorities, the city had 40% blacks, 3% Asians, and 6% Hispanics, while the larger metro area had 18.5% blacks, 2% Asians, and 3.5% Hispanics. 20.6% of the persons in the city were below the poverty line, while 11.4% in the larger metro area were.

In 1952, the city gained home rule status from the state and has since been governed by a strong-mayor system. 1952 also represented a shift in control of city government from the Republican party to the Democratic party. As with most cities, there is considerable fragmentation among city departments and other agencies dealing with food-related issues. The ongoing city fiscal crisis has made new or innovative efforts difficult. Federal and state cut-backs forced increased local taxes which have resulted in 85% of the richest families leaving the city, leaving 80% of the region's poorest inside.

Descriptions of the regional setting included comments on the importance of the Delaware Basin and how jurisdictional fragmentation divides the natural "foodshed" of Philadelphia between various counties and two states. Politically, the rest of the state and especially the state government were seen as much less progressive politically than Philadelphia. Culturally, some saw Philadelphia as more "insular" than Pittsburgh Pennsylvania's other major city.

In terms of land use, there were high levels of support expressed for preserving open space in the city, but much less concern about preserving farmland on the urban fringe. In part, this may relate to the fact that the closest farmland is in New Jersey. One person interviewed commented on how there was much less of a "hands-on approach" to problems than in the Midwest. Also, that in the health field, as well as more generally, there was much less interest in dealing with rehabilitation (which implies accepting the ideas of failure and maintenance) than in curative/technological approaches.

The role of Philadelphia in the country's early political history is well known. Less well known is that "Philadelphia exerted a profound influence on the nation's eating habits, especially in the 19th century when eminent local chefs published a host of culinary works." Interestingly, Afro-Americans played a major role in transferring French culinary traditions to Philadelphia from the West Indies. Also, they, along with other immigrants, were predominant in street vending of food. Philadelphia was also a center of early food reforms. Religious groups such as the Bible Christian Church helped start a longstanding local tradition of vegetarianism, while the Rosicrucians rejected red meat. Philadelphia also had a strong temperance movement.

The contemporary role of food and agriculture in the greater Philadelphia economy is also not well known. Standard encyclopedias indicate that about 85% of the city's workers are employed in the
service industries (trade, finance, and health care), something that reflects the general decline of manufacturing since the 1950s. The major remaining manufacturing fields mentioned are clothing, chemicals, pesticides, metal products, and processed foods - especially bakery goods and beverages. Food and agriculture are thus presented as a minor part of the economy.

The picture of the importance of food, horticulture, and agriculture in Philadelphia and the Delaware Valley that emerges from a detailed analysis commissioned by the Food and Agriculture Task Force is very different. The study demonstrates that twenty to twenty-five percent of the regional workforce is employed in these three fields, generating nearly twenty-one billion dollars in direct local revenues and over five billion dollars in direct local payroll. The Delaware Valley still has more than 5,200 farms that generate almost half a billion dollars in annual sales. Philadelphia is at the center of a regional "food hub." Food and agriculture cargo amount to over twenty-five percent of non-fuel imports while food is the third largest category of venture capital expenditures in the Delaware Valley.

The economic value of emergency and supplemental feeding programs reflects the extensive hunger and poverty found in the region - estimated at nearly half a million people by the Greater Philadelphia Food Bank. Nearly $16.75 million of food was distributed to the homeless, poor, and hungry in 1987. This represented over 8,000,000 pounds of food. At the same time, close to 80,000 students participated in Philadelphia's school lunch program, while some 18,000 received school breakfasts. Some 307,000 participated in Philadelphia's food stamp program, representing a dollar value of $177,770,000 - almost a third of the state's total food stamp program.

While the poverty of inner city residents seriously reduces access to purchased food, the extensive gardening programs of Philadelphia Green have helped to provide fresh produce. There are over 500 community vegetable garden projects in Philadelphia. Other horticultural activities include the annual Flower Show of the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society, and a variety of programs carried out in the city's 10,000 acres of open space.

**BRIEF HISTORY OF THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE TASK FORCE**

Much of the initial conceptual impetus for the creation of the Food and Agriculture Task Force (FATF) grew out of the pioneering work in the early 1980's of the Cornucopia Project of Rodale Press and the Regenerative Agriculture Association on local, regional, and state food systems - work led by Medard Gable, now of the World Game. Important applications of these approaches were made through the Urban Gardening Program developed by Country Extension and its then director, Libby J. Goldstein. A number of other important food system activities have been developed and carried out by the Nutritional Development Services of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, still headed by Patrick Temple-West. Finally, there was the development of the Greater Philadelphia Food Bank and its related programs. The presence of an already developed and vigorous emergency feeding system meant that the Task Force did not have to become heavily involved with these issues. However, some important hunger-related issues and programs - those relating to nutrition, health, and child care - have remained fragmented. In part, this may relate to the general lack of interest in policy issues on the part of most nutritionists in the region.

The Task Force itself grew out of a conference on "Food and Agriculture: A Development Path for Philadelphia" held in January, 1984. The conference was organized by the Pennsylvania State University's Urban Gardening Program, the Philadelphia Green Program of the Pennsylvania Horticulture Society, and the Graduate School of Fine Arts at the University of Pennsylvania and was financially supported by the Mellon Bank (East). After a follow-on planning session, the Task Force
was created. At that point, it consisted of a fifteen member steering committee of "conveners," each of whom had a major role or interest in food and agriculture. They met regularly at breakfasts hosted by the Mellon Bank. In addition to the organizers of the conference, the conveners included city officials and staff, the manager of the Philadelphia Food Distribution Center, representatives of the state Dept. of Agriculture, officers and staff of non-profits like the Greater Philadelphia Food Bank, the Nutritional Development Services of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, The Neighborhood Gardens Association/A Philadelphia Land Trust, Extension agents, retail food people and academics.

Shortly after its creation and its election of Libby J. Goldstein as President, the Task Force became part of the U.S. Conference of Mayors project to develop municipal food and agriculture policies. The first major effort of the Task Force was to develop a comprehensive food policy statement. It did this by establishing four working groups - which after some slight changes in title became the working groups on food assistance and nutrition, land use and community gardens, economic development in existing systems, and economic development in emerging systems working groups. Once the working groups had completed the comprehensive food policy statement, it was submitted to Mayor W. Wilson Goode. He in turn sent it to the Philadelphia Neighborhoods Commission for their comments prior to adopting the policy in June 1985. At that point, each working group started developing specific recommendations for addressing its various goals.

The nature and legal status of FATF was firmed up at this time. The "conveners" became a Board, which peaked in membership at twenty-seven in 1990. FATF was recognized by the IRS as a tax-exempt, non-profit organization. At this point, it also merged with another non-profit organization, Food and Energy Systems, which had been set up by Patrick Temple-West and Libby J. Goldstein. As Director of County Extension, Goldstein devoted a great deal of her own and other staff time to developing and supporting the Task Force.

Early in its history, FATF decided not to seek any official status with the city, although a couple of city officials were represented on the Board. It was felt that this would give FATF much greater freedom and flexibility. As it turned out this also gave FATF some geographic flexibility as well, so that it could add members to taskforces from other counties and even from New Jersey.

At their peak, membership of the working groups included over one hundred individuals and organizations, including some from Southern New Jersey. The Task Force and its working groups were very active from 1985 until 1990, sponsoring a series of projects, reports, and conferences (see below).

As time went on, three things - all relating to staff and financial support - conspired to eventually bring the formal activities of the Task Force to a halt. When a new State Director of Extension with little interest in urban food and agriculture issues took over, Libby J. Goldstein left her position at County Extension. Second, a fire in the breakfast meeting area of the Task Force, plus a change in ownership and priorities at the Mellon Bank (East) led to a discontinuance of its modest financial support for the breakfasts, a newsletter, and general mailings. Third, while attempts to obtain city, corporate, and foundation seed money for a staff director had been successful, the individual hired mismanaged the funds as well as his administrative duties - leaving a bad taste both with local foundations and some of the Board - something making any additional fundraising very difficult. The last meetings of FATF were held in 1990.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

While the accomplishments discussed below may not seem overly dramatic, it must be kept in mind that the initial years of any food council are particularly difficult. The effort is a pioneering one in
several senses. Members have to explore new territory which few have thought about systematically. This means that there is a significant amount of time required for members to learn about the various sectors of the food system, how they operate, and which agencies and persons are active where. Efforts to devise a viable and locally functional structure also require a lot of pioneering effort, including trial and error.

Even when fully functional, the fact that food councils deal in large part with the informal sector - which is less visible than the formal sector - means that it is often difficult to point to the type of specific achievements which public officials and/or funders like. Also, one of the key capabilities of most food councils is their ability to network and coordinate the activities of various individuals, volunteer groups, and public agencies so that much more is accomplished in terms of providing/maintaining social support systems than would otherwise be the case. In this sense, they serve as a focal point of synergy where things that otherwise would not happen do happen. This coordination and leveraging of informal and formal resources is also difficult to document and portray.

The following list identifies those projects and activities which FATF organized or in which it played a leading role.

A. The Task Force developed a basic policy statement, "Food and Agriculture - A Policy Statement," which was accepted by Mayor Goode in June of 1985. This and its other activities listed below brought food and agricultural issues into public and political consciousness, often for the first time for many people.


C. The Task Force, along with Fairmont Park and Mellon Bank (East) sponsored a colloquium on open space issues in Sept. 1988 which brought together over 100 representatives of various groups. An independent coalition concerned with these issues grew out of this colloquium.

D. The Task Force sponsored a ground-breaking study, "Agenda for Action: The Impact of Food, Horticulture, and Agriculture on the Economy of the Delaware Valley" (Nov. 1988), which was supported by the Philadelphia Commerce Dept., Mellon Bank (East), the Down Home Diner, Fidelity Bank, PNB, and Bell of Pennsylvania. The report was done by Dr. Ross Koppel. [See endnote #8.]

E. The Task Force helped create a food safety working group which then sponsored a conference, "Critical Food Safety Issues for the 90's," at Drexel University, October 1989. The working group followed this up by working with the City Council on two proposed ordinances. One was entitled "Possible Dangers of Consuming Food Treated with Pesticides or Chemicals: Warning Sips." In its original version it would have required supermarkets to post warnings and make fact sheets available. They protested that this would be too cumbersome. At that point, the ALAR scare occurred and the ordinance was changed to require a labeling of organic and non-organic foods. The other proposed ordinance, "Food Establishment Personnel--Food Safety Certification," would have required a food handler certified in safe handling practices on each shift. Local community colleges were eager to run these certification courses, but the restauranteurs wanted to run their own courses and didn't want a certified person required for each shift. The street vendors association fought the proposal vigorously. The opposition of both groups was weakened by a series of TV specials showing the risks of food contamination. Unfortunately, these two proposed ordinances
(as well as many other progressive proposals) got lost during the city's fiscal crisis and resulting political changes in both the City Council and the Mayor.

Besides the above activities where FATF had a clear leadership role, a number of things have been accomplished by the organizations represented on the Task Force, either on their own or by working with other groups. It is hard to assess the role of the Task Force in these efforts, but it is clear that it offered a forum for coordination, networking, and synergism.

Accomplishments here include many different efforts related to community gardens, community greening, and composting. Also, various leaders in the Task Force were involved in the creation of the Neighborhood Gardening Association/A Philadelphia Land Trust and the Tailgate Farmers Market Coalition. These leaders also worked with the City in initiating an "Adopt-A-Lot" program to make additional land available for community gardening. They also encouraged educational efforts on World Food Day and Earth Day as well as implementation of a "nutrition/agriculture in the classroom" program at Fox Chase Farm - a joint facility of the Philadelphia School District and Fairmont Park.

Local hunger assessments and development of a "Federal-State Food Providers Coordinating Council" were also facilitated by the food assistance and nutrition working group. The results here were less than hoped for due to territoriality of the various agencies involved.

One of the major disappointments was the failure of the efforts led by Nutritional Development Services, PACE, the Food and Commercial Workers, and supported by many FATF members to create worker-owned supermarkets in the inner-city. One store was opened with help from an inter-faith revolving loan fund, but foundered between the contrasting visions of the different participants: those promoting an anti-hunger vision, those promoting cooperatives, and those promoting community development. None were focused on the details and practicalities of running a store.

In the area of food distribution, efforts were made to have surpluses from the Food Distribution Center (FDC) - a city-developed and capitalized fruit and vegetable facility that serves the entire region and is the fourth largest in the U.S. - given to the food bank. Problems with availability of transport and timing led to the eventual dropping of this program. Even so, some twenty other non-profits come to the FDC to obtain surplus produce. Recently, city assistance was provided to the Food Distribution Center to help it upgrade its facilities by adding refrigeration - something that helped it to maintain its regional leadership and weakened the position of promoters of a rival food distribution center in New Jersey. Perhaps the largest remaining threat to the FDC is the growth of several large regional supermarket warehouses.

In another area of food distribution, efforts to promote state and local produce have been mixed. As a state, Pennsylvania has been somewhat backward in promoting local marketing of its agricultural products. The "Pride in Pennsylvania" program came late and was not vigorous. In contrast, Philadelphia not only has a nationally known Flower Show (some of the proceeds of which help fund the community garden development programs of Philadelphia Green), but a "Harvest Show" and a "Taste the Harvest" fair to promote local foods, processing, and restaurants. In addition, there have been major efforts to revitalize the Reading Terminal Market and to add hunger and development programs for areas around the market.

Summary: The Task Force and its member organizations clearly were able to highlight the importance of the food system to Philadelphia through a series of conferences, to develop a number of innovative programs, and to encourage networking and cooperation among the various players.
THE SOURCES OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

There are a number of sources which underlay the above accomplishments. First, there was a high degree of commitment on the part of most Task Force members and particularly by its President, Libby J. Goldstein. Most groups saw the value of getting together at the FATF meetings and learning about each other's activities. Some members were also on other boards and thus had a good general knowledge of community needs.

Second, in the early years of the Task Force, the Extension Service provided very effective and knowledgeable staff support.

Third, in the early years Mellon Bank (East) provided a neutral and congenial meeting place as well as financial support for both specific projects and general overhead operations.

Another important factor was the generally healthy balance of Board members from the various sectors of the food system. It had representation from the following sectors: from production (few farmers or farmland preservationists, but many community gardeners), processing and distribution (mainly distributors, but few processors or grocers), food access (people concerned about farmers markets; the emergency feeding system; the location of grocery stores; school breakfasts, etc.), processing and use [restaurants; food handling; food safety], re-cycling [food pantries; composting] and disposal [land fills, etc.]. Typically, there is a tendency for emergency feeding system concerns and issues to predominate in local food councils, but this was not the case with the Task Force.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND DYNAMICS

As with the other sites studied, the larger political setting within which the Food and Agriculture Task Force operated was one over which it had no control. The main focus was on the city, although it did have the flexibility to include some of the issues relating to the larger "foodshed" of the city - the Delaware Basin - which encompasses several counties and two states.

The origins of the FATF reflected the personal and organizational interests of the main organizers. At that point the three main initiators were County Extension, Philadelphia Green, and the Mellon Bank (East). After the organizing conference, additional major groups were brought in, particularly representatives from the city's Dept. of Commerce (then later City Council's Technical Staff), the Nutritional Development Services of the Archdiocese, the Greater Philadelphia Food Bank, and the Food Distribution Center. The original fifteen "conveners" gradually expanded to a Board of twenty-five to twenty-seven members, very broadly representative of the entire food system.

Unlike the other sites studied, FATF had no official advisory role with the city. As noted, it did have general support from the Mayor and had city personnel represented on its Board. One city staffer interviewed felt that it was better that FATF was not an official body in that this enabled FATF to be more critical and creative.

Another notable aspect of FATF was that it clearly had the broadest representation of the various interests involved in local food systems of any of the sites studied. While the membership varied over the years, the following groups had at least one representative. City staff, county extension, public school teachers, universities, community garden groups, organic growers, food distributors, food retailers, food workers unions, the local land trust, neighborhood development groups, a senior center, restauranteurs, the Mellon bank, and a couple of food and nutrition consultants. While farmers were
represented to a degree by the representative of the organic growers, environmentalists were not formally represented, although clearly several members had environmental concerns.

While in many ways this broad representation was a strength, it also presented several challenges. One - as in all of the councils studied - was attendance. In a large city and with that many members, it was very difficult to schedule a time when most could attend a meeting. The breakfasts hosted by the Mellon Bank certainly helped greatly in this regard, but attendance fell off significantly after their meeting site was destroyed by fire. Another factor reflects the different orientation between groups noted in earlier reports between those in the private sector who are task oriented and those in the public sector who are more process oriented. One private sector person told me that when "nothing happened" after a couple of meetings, he quit attending. Over time meetings went from being monthly to bimonthly to quarterly.

Another organizational challenge involved trying to create and run a policy council in a city the size of Philadelphia. In contrast to some of the smaller sites where key players often are involved in multiple activities and know and trust each other, the operation of the council is necessarily more formal and more representational. While one can try to create a smaller and more flexible organization, it will generally have less visibility as well as less ability to carry out major projects. Alternatively, one can try to create a larger and broader-based organization, but it will likely be more cumbersome. FATF ended up doing some of each. It started out smaller and with a conscious effort to include only "movers and shakers." This did help get FATF established, but then in seeking to reach larger audiences, the Board was expanded. This meant that each member tended to serve as a representative, bringing various things to the table of the policy council and reporting back to her/his group on proposals or actions - something that made developing consensus more cumbersome.

Meetings for a large-city council operating on a representational basis need to be well organized and run smoothly. Several people commented that while the President of FATF was a great networker and strategist, she was not a detail person and that the meetings often rambled. For her part, the President felt that time was needed at meetings for discussion, both to help socialize the members and to give each group a chance to express its views.

Another major challenge associated with a large city/representational council situation is that in obtaining visibility and publicity for the larger council - FATF in this case - care is needed not to claim direct credit for activities or programs carried out by the members of the council. This evidently was a problem with FATF, where some of the groups felt that FATF was claiming credit for their projects.

One way of trying to avoid some of the representational issues at the Board level is to create working groups. This approach has been successfully used in Knoxville and was also reasonably effective in Philadelphia, although there were variations in the level of working group activity. Also, it appears that in Philadelphia fewer Board members were actively participated in working group activities.

A fundamental problem emerged, however, as FATF gained enough momentum to seek support for staff. With staff support, FATF, the umbrella group, became a potential competitor with its members for program support. Indeed, the person selected sought funding from the same sources as members without consulting them (or the Board) prior to his grant submissions.

The combination of competition between FATF and its member groups and the secrecy of the staff person hired left some members (as well as funders) resentful. Once the staff person left and the previous sources of staff support either dried up (with Mellon Bank's changing ownership and
priorities) or were lost due to staff changes (Extension), FATF was left with few resources to continue its activities.

Libby J. Goldstein explored various other "homes" or grant support for staff, but was unable to find any. Much of the networking initiated and facilitated by FATF continued after it stopped meeting (the last meeting being held in late 1990).

One of the basic issues that faced FATF throughout its existence was how to define its central organizational role. There are at least four possible roles for such a policy group - which cover a spectrum going from lesser to greater direct involvement in policy issues. First, it can serve as a forum for discussion and mutual education, and by holding conferences it can also educate the public. Second, it can serve as an umbrella body seeking to network and coordinate the activities of its members. Third, it can be an umbrella group where members work out joint policies on issues important to each. Last, it can not only develop joint policies, but develop programs or activities to seek to implement those policies.

During its history, FATF was engaged somewhat in each of these roles - yet without fully discussing which were most relevant or appropriate.

A remaining question is whether it would be useful to try either to revive FATF or to try to create a new umbrella group to carry on the various activities that FATF engaged in while it was active.

**OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE**

One option is to simply continue as at present where there is a very loose and ad hoc coordination and networking among those interested in food issues. Several people expressed their feeling that they missed getting together with the kind of diverse people who were members of FATF. Also, ad hoc coordination often risks one or more groups not learning about programs that they could help with or would benefit from.

The other broad option is to seek to revive the Task Force or create a new umbrella organization. The choice of reviving the Task Force or creating a new organization is one which local leaders need to make and one which ultimately hinges upon finding an organization which has enough interest to provide the necessary staff support, plus finding the right person to serve as the new leader/coordinator. It would also require finding a desirable meeting place (or rotating places) and a meeting time when most people can attend (several people mentioned that lunch meetings were hard to get to). As indicated above, there are four broad organizational roles which might be considered for a new organization or a revived FATF.

A. The first would be to serve as a forum for discussion and mutual education, including the sponsoring of public conferences. The purpose of such a forum would be to provide for networking, coordination of efforts, and discussion of shared or emerging issues and problems. Meetings sponsored by specific organizations could be held either bi-monthly or quarterly. The topics and sponsoring organizations could be determined several meetings in advance. The organization running a particular meeting might well choose the topic and chair the discussion. This would give the sponsoring organization a stake and responsibility for the success of the meeting and discussions.

This option could be done with minimal support personnel, but would require someone to keep the records, mailing lists, etc. and to be a central communications point. There might be a minimal
membership fee to help cover the basic costs (phone, stationary, etc.), while the mailing, publicity, and meeting expenses for particular meetings could be assumed by the sponsoring organization.

The forum structure would also be compatible with organizing half-day or longer workshops, conferences, etc. when the Task Force felt it important to discuss an issue more at length or to bring in additional people.

B. The second would be to serve as a center for networking and coordination of the activities of members groups. There are several directions this could go, but each would imply more staff and financial resources being available - both for background research and for meeting with the relevant people on a given issue. It would also suggest that the new organization would have to spend time - at least in the early stages - better defining its own identity and priorities, the degree (if any) to which it speaks for member organizations, etc.

In each of cities studied, the problem of finding funding for staff was extremely difficult. If one seeks staff time by being housed in a particular organization, then questions of bias and partiality come up.

To seek separate funding through grants is also very difficult - although the Onondaga Food Policy Council (Syracuse, NY) was able to get a two year "seed money" grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Sadly, it was unable to raise sufficient funds after that period to keep the half-time staff person and recently decided to disband.

One obvious way to address this problem would be to have staff support and leadership provided by one of the major local service providers (Nutritional Development Services, Philadelphia Green, the Reading Terminal Market Trust, and the Greater Philadelphia Food Bank). Another would be to rotate leadership by having each of these providers agree to offer staff (one-third to one-half time) for a period of one year each. This would reduce any perceptions of the organization's agenda being dominated by any one group, but would mean that it probably wouldn't address the issues of economic development and education as much as previously. This sort of arrangement would also provide a base from which to seek outside funding.

Any of these approaches also assume strong leadership, especially during the first year or so. This would involve a new leader and/or a small executive committee being willing to spend time and effort to help hammer out the new structures and priorities.

C. The third possible role would be for the new/revived organization to serve as a focal point for working out joint policies among member organizations. This would probably require a set of by-laws that would spell out the procedures which would be used to take policy positions and would have to be worked out according to which issues were considered "fair game" and which were considered "off limits" by the member organizations.

D. The fourth possible role would be to work as an action-oriented organization. Not only would the decision-making rules need to be clearly spelled out, but the issue of the umbrella organization potentially competing with member organizations would have to be resolved. This role would appear to be an unlikely beginning one; rather if it happened at all, it would most likely emerge out of the third option. It is generally easier for individual organizations to develop their own programs or to feed their action ideas directly into lobbying and/or political efforts than to work out common positions in an umbrella organization. Even so, it might be useful to discuss this option at any organizing meeting, both to get a clear sense of how much the various potential members are
action-oriented and whether there are overarching issues that only a broader and more comprehensive organization would be in a position to address.

Whatever option might be chosen, the importance of maintaining a rich diversity of members should be kept in mind.

PROGRAM AND POLICY NEEDS AND OPTIONS

A number of important program and policy needs and possibilities were identified while examining the work of the FATF. These remain even though the FATF is no longer operational. The types of needs and issues a new organization or a revived FATF might address include the following.

A. Leadership education. This not only helps to educate key leaders on the importance of their local food system and the need for increasing local self-reliance, but also provides important visibility. To promote this, the Onondaga County Food System Council in New York conducted tours to farms, community gardens, food distribution and processing plants, the food bank, etc.

B. Linking food systems approaches to long-term (or better, sustainable) economic development. One of the most promising areas here involves projects that connect food and jobs. There is significant room to update and expand Ross Koppel's report. In addition to further exploring the original thrust of the report, there could be a useful discussion of the need for (and the nature of) sustainable development. Sustainability as a concept has received a lot of discussion, both in agriculture and in Third World development circles. It is time to try to bring it into the debates about the future of urban America. Associated with this is a fundamental shift in evaluative criteria - from those of economic growth and productivity to those of healthy systems. The expanded report might also review the work that the World Health Organization has done on "Healthy Cities and Communities."

Along these lines, the new organization might consider ways to work more closely with the various planners in the City. They might seek to explore the planning requirements for designing a more sustainable, self-reliant food system and what it might look like.

C. Food safety issues. Current efforts on food safety can be added to by seeking to revive the proposed ordinance on food handler certification and helping to develop general training guidelines, plus perhaps exploring ways to involve community colleges in the process. Food safety and nutritional issues relating to food served in various institutions (schools, hospitals, universities, homes for the elderly, etc.) could also be explored.

D. Emergency feeding system issues. Given the debates in the new Congress regarding welfare reform and the devolution of welfare and food assistance programs to the states and localities, there is a greater than ever need for creative local thinking. This means a careful examination of existing programs both to see how they might be improved as well as how various programs might be integrated. In terms of the WIC program, there is a need to improve it both in terms of coverage and access. Unfortunately, WIC services in Philadelphia are now being pulled out of community centers, something that will make access much more difficult. Since there is little state or federal review of such actions, a new policy council/group might play a useful role here. Other emergency feeding system issues relate to school meals (making breakfasts generally available in public schools and exploring the reinstatement of lunches in public high schools), to a greater respect for ethnic food preferences in different community centers, and to an exploration of the Food Bank getting involved in local and national gleaning programs.
Extension of current emergency food programs is needed, both in time and space. Meals on Wheels programs and other elderly feeding programs need to be available on weekends, especially long weekends. Supplemental feeding programs need to be expanded to include daycare centers and to serve more during the summer months. Inner city access to supermarkets through better bus routes, etc. also needs to be improved.

E. Expansion of community gardens and composting. While there have been a number of very successful community garden programs, work is still needed to encourage more of them in public housing projects. Greater composting in community gardens should also be encouraged. Greater emphasis and publicity might be given those gardens encourage community gardens to seek to put their land in the Neighborhood Gardens Association/a Philadelphia Land Trust.

F. Farmers markets. As the suburbs expand, it becomes more difficult to organize city farmers markets or green markets. Besides emphasizing local and fresh produce, perhaps one or more permanent locations on the edge of the center city should be explored either with the City administration or with the Reading Terminal Trust.

G. Organic wastes. Much greater effort is needed to deal with the organic waste stream. While Extension did good work on household composting for some time, its composting agent was recently let go. As noted, more can be done in community gardens. Larger volume wastes from processors and distributors need attention. The state of Minnesota offers technical assistance to large-scale generators to dispose of these through land spreading or feeding to pigs. Heavy metals and pesticide residues in compost materials is also something that needs better monitoring. This is more important than ever because in 1991, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that states and localities are not pre-empted by FIFRA from passing their own, more stringent pesticide rules.

H. General education. There is a great potential in expanding the use of Grow Lab programs. Extension lends out a limited number of Grow Lab boxes to local schools. The innovative local nutrition curriculum developed by Sandy Sherman should be more widely used. School curricula should also be broadened to include other aspects of the food system. There are a number of useful simulation games which can help students understand hunger and poverty issues at all levels ranging from the "World Game" to the new "Food Game" developed by the University of Minnesota. It was also suggested that a grant be sought to commission a "Philadelphia Food System Game" which Medard Gabel of the World Game Institute might help design.

In terms of educational outreach, the super cupboard programs supported by the Food Bank offer a valuable model for expansion elsewhere. Another possibility along this line might be to organize "food shopping fairs or clinics" at local schools. These would be designed to help low income and food stamp users to get the most (in quantity and nutritional quality) from their resources. Fun and games could be included as well as other types of useful information. Finally, programs on World Food Day and Earth day could be expanded.

I. Farmland preservation. This has been largely neglected, although the Brandywine Conservancy does some work on this. Besides drawing on the expertise of American Farmland Trust, some of the surveys and techniques developed earlier by Rodale's Cornucopia Project, such as their Ag-Market Search and Farmer Search, might be revived and applied in the Delaware River Basin.

J. Organizational possibilities. If a new organization is created, it may want to consider some of the techniques which have been used elsewhere. The City of Knoxville has found that an annual retreat
is very useful in evaluating past efforts and sorting out future possibilities and priorities. This could be incorporated into efforts at revitalization. Another valuable practice found in both Knoxville and St. Paul is the use of an outside consultant who is able to provide new ideas and to offer constructive criticisms and evaluations. While a staff person may well be able to offer new ideas (if funding for such a person can found), it is unlikely that he/she will be able to offer independent criticisms and evaluations of the organization and its work, both because of closeness to the board and to the projects.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Food and Agriculture Task Force accomplished many things during its existence. It drafted a comprehensive food policy for the city, organized a number of conferences, and generally served as a central networking and coordinating point for a wide variety of groups and organizations. It is the only food policy council which from the beginning remained outside of city government - seeking thereby to retain greater flexibility. As all the other food policy councils, FATF had difficulty in obtaining staff support, although in its early days, it was able to draw upon significant support from Extension. The Board of FATF was the most diverse in membership of any of the sites studied, which while positive overall did create some problems in terms of consensus building. The size of the city requires an organizational approach using formal representation of the member groups more than was the case elsewhere. There were also the larger challenges of trying to deal with food system problems in what is one of the most depressed urban areas in country.

The Food and Agriculture Task Force not only raised the general level of awareness of food issues, but left a legacy of networking and working together that offers hope that a new organization might be created to take up the many remaining and difficult issues that Philadelphia faces. It is hoped that this report not only highlights the many things that are possible when some financial and staff support are available, but some of the strategies that might help in addressing the many food system needs that are so visible in Philadelphia.
1. This report is based upon work originally supported by the Ethics and Values Studies Program of the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DIR-9022243. The grant was completed May 31, 1994. The government has certain rights in this material. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.


3. Their thoughtful comments and suggestions have greatly improved earlier drafts of this report and have helped me to avoid errors and misinterpretations. Any that remain are my responsibility. Also, I would like to thank all those that I interviewed and/or talked to on the phone. They gave me a much better sense of the dynamics and issues facing the Food and Agriculture Task Force than would otherwise have been the case.


6. Ibid.

7. Ibid., p. 269.


9. Ibid.

10. Ibid., p. 54.

11. The low numbers for school lunches is a result of the public schools deciding some years ago to drop them in the high schools due to problems of maintaining order.

12. Ibid., p. 58.

13. The historical details in this section, unless otherwise noted, are based on: Libby J. Goldstein, "The Food and Agriculture Task Force: A History," Photocopy, October 17, 1990.


15. A food safety working group later emerged out of a conference sponsored by FATF.

16. Food and Energy Systems was set up to expand the programs which Extension's Urban Gardening Program could carry out by getting around some of the rigidities of State Extension rules. Such programs included fish farms, neighborhood food systems, and market gardens. It also provided an "insurance policy" against fiscal cutbacks in the Urban Gardening Program.
17. In Kansas City, the food council there came to feel that being an official city advisory group was very constraining in terms of geographic coverage. Part of the reason they became a non-profit group was to be able to cover the entire metro region.

18. Some discussion has been occurring in the framework of the President's Commission on Sustainable Development - which was formed in response to the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development in Rio. A sustainable city taskforce has been formed, but initially did not include any discussion of food issues!

So Why Is the City of Toronto Concerned About Food and Agriculture Policy?
A Short History of the Toronto Food Policy Council

by Rod MacRae
Coordinator, Toronto Food Policy Council

It's my favorite question, and I hear it most every week. The short answer is: We all eat and Toronto has 650,000 mouths to feed. The long answer is that the food and agriculture system in Canada (and most everywhere else) is not designed to provide opportunities for optimal nourishment and, consequently, is contributing to a host of health problems for Toronto residents.

Jurisdictionally, the Canadian food system is the responsibility of the federal and provincial governments. Nevertheless, it is the municipality (i.e., the most local level government in the Canadian system), which because of its public health mandate and proximity to the citizenry, has to deal first with food-based problems.

The Toronto Food Policy Council (TFPC) was created in the fall of 1990 by the Toronto City Council. Community groups and supportive civil servants convinced the City Council that the organization of the existing food and agriculture system was associated with health risks for Toronto residents. These health problems had emerged in the 1980s and were associated with three general phenomena: increased levels of hunger and poverty; concerns about declining food quality in a centralized and oligopolistic food economy; and environmental degradation.

Canada's traditional view of these problems centered on four premises: 1) that the food system provides, almost defacto, nourishing food and that all food system actors are interested primarily in nourishing the population; 2) that food is cheap for consumers; 3) that hunger is a problem largely of insufficient income, and that the structure of the food system is not itself part of the problem; and 4) that the food system is capable of addressing any problems of environmental degradation without significantly redesigning its structure or activities.

Proponents for the creation of the Food Policy Council felt strongly that these were false premises, and that existing institutional activities at the federal, provincial and municipal levels either ignored or were inadequate to address underlying realities. Proponents wanted the municipality to take a fundamentally different approach so that long-lasting solutions could be found.

Why and How

Early in TFPC's development a decision was made (after much difficult discussion) to assume the form of a roundtable - a structure deliberately comprised of people with differing political views from a variety of food system sectors. The group assigned to create the TFPC was itself very diverse, reflecting the values and opinions of many sectors (diversity of experience). Collectively, it also contained an awareness of ecological and community health promotion principles (experience of diversity). The TFPC would ultimately have representatives from: the farm/rural sector, anti-poverty activists, community organizations, food systems analysis, the conventional business sector, the organic business sector, education, labor, multicultural organizations, the Toronto Board of Health, and politicians sitting on Toronto City Council.

A roundtable was seen as desirable for several reasons. An essential task of the implementation group was to integrate the different perceptions of the food and agriculture system and its problems, and produce a comprehensive mandate.

The group recognized that, in contrast to the traditional view, food, agriculture, and health are all intimately connected. This understanding is reflected in TFPC's mission statement, its goals and objectives (see Table 1). The group also felt that it was essential for a food policy council to confront its diversity, especially where it contributed to historically separate intellectual and institutional domains. A structure and process had to be put in place to allow linkages both between isolated issues and the people working on those issues.

The multisectoral representation inherent in the roundtable has permitted sectors that typically do not communicate on any formal basis to work together to develop innovative projects. For example, farmers and anti-poverty activists, two groups whose paths rarely cross, provided the initial design for a non-profit food distribution project. It is a project that takes into account the needs of both Ontario farmers and their lack of local markets and the urban poor and their lack of access to distribution systems that were truly affordable. The details of the Field to Table project took many months of difficult discussion to hammer out, and ultimately produced a study to examine how high quality foods could be sold at below wholesale prices to low-income people in Toronto.

Through the roundtable structure, TFPC has obtained essential insights into the agendas of various sectors...
which permit potential problems to be anticipated as proposals are developed. The TFPC discussions allow different sectoral representatives to hear and understand each other's views. At the same time, decisions are not made to reflect a "lowest-common-denominator" position. This has provided us with some credibility in places where none would normally be forthcoming. Likewise, it has linked us to resources we would not have hoped to leverage given our modest budget of $200,000.

Since most of TFPC's members volunteer their time to TFPC activities or are volunteered by their employers, this small public investment yields large returns in "free" expertise. Even complete failure would not cost the municipality greatly, so structure and financing contribute to risk reduction.

**Political and Community Linkages**

It was decided that the TFPC should be administered as a subcommittee of the city's Board of Health, a standing committee of City Council. This relationship provides immediate access to both the political machinery and preventive health care knowledge and apparatus of the city.

TFPC's three staff, persons are attached to the Department of Public Health, and their salaries and other TFPC expenses are paid by City Council. This arrangement provides a stable funding base and facilitates the development of a lateral network of bureaucratic allies and access to the bureaucracy's information gathering systems. It also gives TFPC staff credibility within the civil service which, in turn, enhances the TFPC's ability to gather information and effect change within the municipal government.

---

**Table 1. The Mission of the Toronto Food Policy Council**

The Toronto Food Policy Council will work to develop a just and environmentally sustainable food system for all Torontonians.

**Guiding Principles**

The Toronto Food Policy Council will recognize the cultural and economic diversity of the city; enable communities to be actively involved in developing policies; and facilitate collaboration among all sectors of the food system.

**Operational Goals:**

I. **To end hunger and the need for a food distribution system based on charity**

   The Toronto Food Policy Council will:

   1. recognize the causal relationships between poverty, hunger and ill-health, and advocate for improved wages, income support programs and affordable housing;

   2. work with the Boards of Education and all levels of government to establish sound nutrition programs in all Toronto area schools. This would include measures addressing both immediate and long-term food and nutrition needs of children in Toronto; and

   3. in conjunction with concerned community groups, the corporate sector and municipal agencies, work to improve physical access to affordable and nutritious food.

II. **To promote food production and distribution systems which are equitable, nutritionally excellent, and environmentally sound**

   The Toronto Food Policy Council will:

   1. heighten public awareness of the nature of the current food system including: ecological sustainability, economic interdependency, and health implications;

   2. advocate for improved food labelling and advertising to assist the consumer in making food choices; and

   3. work with all concerned sectors of the food system to promote healthy food production by encouraging local production of the most nutritional food possible and the elimination of excessive food packaging.
The sectoral structure of the TFPC has also helped create linkages with community groups. The TFPC plays a bridging role between community agencies and the political and bureaucratic machinery of the city. This role is primarily catalytic and facilitative. Members and staff help community groups organize and coalesce, and provide strategic advice on how to solicit support from the municipal government.

Once coalitions are secure, the TFPC slowly decreases the support it provides, and transfers ownership of the project to a non-profit community organization. TFPC then focuses on a new community grouping or issue. The close relationship with community agencies gives the TFPC a much better sense of what is happening "on the ground" than is true for most government bureaucracies.

What and When

The TFPC has consciously engaged in multiple projects, believing that solutions will emerge from a diverse number of activities in contrast to pursuing a single large initiative. Because the TFPC operates in an arena where many players (e.g., politicians, civil servants, community people) can decline to participate or can halt a project, this strategy further reduces risk by moving many initiatives forward simultaneously and by using a diversity of players.

The TFPC has also focused on short, medium, and long-term initiatives. For example, we are working with other city departments to fashion the city government into a promoter of healthy and local food choices. This has required discussions with private sector food service companies who have historically supplied city cafeterias, parks concessions, and street food vendors. As discussed above, we helped to establish a non-profit food distribution company that buys fresh fruits and vegetables at below wholesale prices and sells to organized low-income people in public spaces: schools, housing complexes, and neighborhood buying groups.

We're trying to demonstrate, in a concrete way, that community food security can be enhanced by shifting food distribution, at least in part, from private sector control to those places that communities view as public or 11 commons." In the short-term, this seems moderately acceptable to the private sector, as we locate in places poorly served by quality food retail outlets. In the medium term, however, such efforts have the potential to subvert the dominant system because clients are withdrawn from it. This, we believe, is justifiable given the fact that the dominant system is not really interested in servicing low-income people, and rarely designs distribution systems that ensure their access to affordable, nourishing food.

Our long-term projects include: redesigning an industrial food district slated for conversion to high-volume retail outlets and condominiums; developing an advocacy campaign to change the role of the health care system in addressing poverty and hunger; and changing the consumer food information system from one that currently sows confusion to one that promotes public policy efforts that support healthy food choices and agricultural sustainability. We're also challenging the free trade agreements and GATT, and providing an alternative perspective on trade and food security that has received little attention in the Western world.

These projects represent significant challenges to the status quo, and are being opposed, or at least ignored, by businesses and regulatory people. Our closeness to the city's Board of Health, and its concerns, however, affords us some protection and influence. Just how these projects will evolve is unclear. The very fact that we have initiated them is impressive and a significant poke in the ribs to the agricultural establishment.

New Challenges

The TFPC has been in operation for over three years. A major difficulty now is bringing closure to some of our projects and finding ways to pass them on to others who can take over leadership. We are unable to take on new challenges until this happens. But we are seeing increased enthusiasm for local food initiatives, much of it not linked directly to us, but somehow encouraged by our presence. For example, the eastern part of Toronto is about to launch a Green Communities Initiative that will develop programming for consumers and local businesses interested in supporting the transition to sustainability (e.g., buy local programs, community food projects, gardening, organic food purchasing). Also, many community agencies have a new-found interest in community kitchens and associated projects such as baby-food preparation circles. This affirms for us that food is a powerful force for community mobilization and that the expertise to run programs has been lying dormant, awaiting the enabling conditions.

Evaluating what strategies work best is also challenging, especially given our need to target our limited resources for maximum effect. Because much of our work is indirect, facilitative, and collaborative, it's difficult to isolate the impacts of our specific efforts. We do know, however, from focus group work, that many of the 10,000 customers of Field to Table are now eating a more nourishing diet. Qualitative research inquiries into Toronto school food programs indicate better attendance, less tardiness, and better socialization in many classrooms. We know from informal communications that our political advocacy efforts have favorably affected provincial and federal government decisions. We continue to seek partnerships with researchers in the hope that better evaluative tools can be developed.

Our roundtable structure also raises interesting questions at this juncture in our development. The very features that proved important for successful startup may become challenges for TFPC’s ongoing operation and project implementation. As projects become more detailed and complex, it is difficult for volunteers who only spend a few hours per week on TFPC work to find satisfying ways of participation in discussions and actions. At the same time, those around the table who represent the dominant system are finding
increasingly that their interests are challenged by our activities. Yet, they are unable to articulate a valid reason for stopping the projects. The dilemma is understandable given the fact that TFPC’s mission is ultimately at odds with the interests of most agribusiness firms and the values of the dominant institutions (e.g. departments of agriculture, research institutes) that support them. Clearly, the issues TFPC is addressing will not be resolved quickly. Nevertheless, a food policy council does provide a workable institutional mechanism for food system reform. As long as we all need to eat, there’s work to be done.

Toronto Food Policy Council Discussion Paper Series

Reducing Urban Hunger in Ontario:
Policy Responses to Support the Transition from Food Charity to Local Food Security

In the past 10 years, our perceptions of food banks have changed dramatically. First seen by policy makers and the general public as an emergency, short-term, and caring response to what was supposed to be a time-limited hunger problem, they are now viewed, at least implicitly and often reluctantly, as one of the cornerstones of society's anti-hunger and anti-poverty strategy. Although there is much talk about eliminating the need for them, concrete strategies to effect such an outcome remain elusive.

This discussion paper presents an evolutionary series of policy initiatives designed to reduce the need for food banks. These initiatives recognize both the government's fiscal dilemmas and the responsibility of many sectors of society for both the current problem and the potential solutions. 35 pages.

Health, Wealth and the Environment:
The Impacts of the CUSTA, GATT and NAFTA on Canadian Food Security

Little attention has been given to the effect of trade arrangements (CUSTA, NAFTA, GATT) on Canadian food security issues, particularly for large urban areas such as Metro Toronto. Food security exists when all citizens have access to an appropriate, affordable, and nourishing diet.

The pillars that underlie food security are equitable wealth generation, environmentally sustainable food production and community health promotion. Each of these pillars is rooted in specific principles and conditions. These principles and conditions are being undermined by the trade arrangements. In concrete terms, this means that we are likely to see increasing levels of hunger and food insecurity, increasing degradation of the natural resources on which food production is based, and decreased individual and community health.

It will require significant efforts on the part of advocates for change and their institutional allies to create a food system and trading regime that promote food security. It is the TFPC’s view that current trade agreements so compromise food security that they must be abrogated and eliminated. Then new systems must be put in place that respect the foundation principles of food security: equitable wealth generation, environmental sustainability and the health of communities. 27 pages.

If the Health Care System Believed You Are What You Eat. Strategies to Integrate Our Food and Health Systems

Our health care system does not recognize the extent to which hunger and poor food choices create problems and increase acute health care expenditures. We propose strategies to integrate our food and health systems so that health care costs are reduced in the long-term and population health improves. Available Early 1995.

Setting a New Direction: Changing the Agricultural Policy Making Process

Many current problems in agriculture are a result of a flawed public policy system. This paper provides some examples of those flaws and proposes changes to the agricultural policy making system. Available Early 1995.
V. GENERAL STRATEGIES FOR PLANNING AND ORGANIZING [F-10, F-11, & F-12]

This section begins with ways to assess the larger resource dimensions of your region and your local food system. This is followed by two short pieces that lay out basic planning and strategic sequences and elements. How to involve community groups in local food system visioning and discussion is outlined next. Finally, three detailed assessments of the Chicago foodshed are included.

A. The larger context [F-10]

1. Sustainability and urban impacts: "How Big is Our Ecological Footprint?" Mathis Wackernagel with The Task Force on Planning Healthy & Sustainable Communities, University of British Columbia, November 1993.


C. Preliminary Planning and Strategizing: [F-11]

1. “Developing and implementing your own local plans.” Ken Dahlberg and Tom Hemingway, 1995


D. Engaging other people and groups through visioning processes: [F-12]


E. Examples of detailed community food system assessments: The "Food Files" series. [F-12]


People depend on nature, which provides a steady supply of the basic requirements for life. Energy is needed for heat and mobility, wood for housing and paper products, and we need quality food and clean water for healthy living. Through a process called "photosynthesis" green plants convert sunlight, carbon dioxide, nutrients and water into plant matter, and all the food chains which support animal life - including our own - are based on this plant matter. Nature also absorbs our waste products, and provides life-support services such as climate stability and protection from ultra-violet radiation. Further, nature is a source of joy and inspiration. Figure I shows how very tightly human life is interwoven with nature, a connection we often forget or ignore. Since most of us spend our lives in cities and consume goods from all over the world, we tend to view nature as a collection of commodities or a place for recreation, rather than the very source of our existence.
The Ecological Footprint is the land that would be required on this planet to support our current lifestyle forever.

Figure 2: The Ecological Footprint

If we're to continue to have good living conditions, we must ensure that nature's productivity isn't used more quickly than it can be renewed, and that waste isn't discharged more quickly than nature can absorb it. We know from the increasing loss of forests, soil erosion and contamination, fishery depletion, loss of species and the accumulation of greenhouse gases that our current overuse of nature is compromising our future wellbeing.

To find out whether nature provides enough "resources" to secure good living conditions for, everyone in a community, the Task Force on Planning Healthy and Sustainable Communities at the University of British Columbia has developed an ecological accounting tool that uses land area as its measurement unit. Various categories of human consumption are translated into the areas of productive land required to provide those items. From that, the area of land required by a given group of people (household, city or country) to provide its resources and assimilate its waste products can be calculated. This land area is known as the Appropriated Carrying Capacity or, more simply and graphically, the group's ecological footprint (figure 2). It's the land that would be required on this planet to support our current lifestyle forever.

Our current economy has given rise to increasing demands which compete for dwindling supplies of life's basic necessities such as food, clean water, etc. A group's ecological footprint can be used to measure its current consumption against projected requirements and point out likely shortfalls. In this way society as a whole can compare the choices we need to make in the near future about our demands on nature - or else nature will make our choices for us. We'll have to look at issues like long term ecological sustainability as they relate to future economic health.

Table I shows the ecological footprint of an average Canadian, i.e. the amount of land required from nature to support each individual's present consumption. This adds up to over 4.8 hectares, or an area 220 metres long by 220 metres wide roughly comparable to three city blocks. The column on the left shows various consumption categories, and the
headings across the top show land use categories.

*This adds up to 4.8 hectares... roughly comparable to three city blocks.*

"Energy" as used in the talk means how much land would be necessary for the long term provision of a biological substitute for fossil fuels (coal, oil and natural gas). "Built Environment" means land that's no longer available for nature's production because it's been paved over or used for building. Examples of what's included in "Resources in Services" are the fuel needed to heat a hospital, or the paper and electricity used to produce a bank statement.

To use the table to find out how much agricultural land is required to produce the average Canadian's food for instance, you'd read across the "Food" row to the "Agricultural Land" column, and find that 0.9 hectares of land is needed.

### Table 1: The ecological footprint of the average Canadian, in hectares per capita.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Energy</th>
<th>Built Environment</th>
<th>Agricultural Land</th>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Goods</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources in Services</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In figure 3 there’s a comparison of the **ecological footprints** of various Canadian households.

A. **SINGLE PARENT WITH CHILD – ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE $16,000**

B. **STUDENT LIVING ALONE – ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE $10,000**

C. **AVERAGE CANADIAN FAMILY, 2.72 PEOPLE – ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE $37,000**

D. **PROFESSIONAL COUPLE, NO CHILDREN – ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE $79,000**

The ecologically productive land available to each person on Earth has decreased over the last century (figure 4). At the moment there is, on average, 1.6 hectares (about one City block), or one-third of the area which each Canadian is currently using according to Table 1. In contrast, the land appropriated by richer countries has increased. This means that if everyone on Earth lived like the average Canadian, we'd need at least three Earths to provide all the material and energy essentials we currently use (figure 5).
If the world's population continues to grow as anticipated, by the year 2030 there will be 10 billion people, each of whom will have an average of only 0.9 hectares of productive land available, assuming there's no further soil degradation. This shows the pressure of population size on nature's productivity.

The numbers become really interesting when you look at the land area that people in North America actually use. Figure 6 shows the ecological footprint for the Lower Fraser Valley, the area east of Vancouver, which contains 1.7 million people or 4.25 people per hectare. The area is far smaller than that needed to supply the resources for its population. If the average Canadian needs 4.8 hectares as shown in table 1, then the Lower Fraser Valley needs an area 20 times larger than what's actually available for food, forestry products and energy.

Holland has a population of 15 million people, or 4.40 people per hectare, and although Dutch people consume less than Canadians on average, they still require more than 15 times the available land for food, forest products and energy. In other words, human settlements don't affect only the area where they're built.
Increasing density in cities can lead to lower land use requirements, not only because of a reduction in the built environment, but also because of lifestyles which are less energy-intensive. For example, a recent study of the San Francisco area found that when residential density was doubled, private transportation was reduced use by 20 to 30 percent. It's also been shown that residential heating requirements can be reduced significantly if housing is grouped rather than free-standing.

Our challenge is to find a way to balance human consumption and nature's limited productivity in order to ensure that our communities are sustainable locally, regionally and globally. We don't have a choice about whether to do this, but we can choose how we do it. In fact, many people concerned with these issues believe that if we choose wisely now, there's still time for us to make our communities more sustainable, and at the same time improve our quality of life "Buy items made orgrown locally rather than far away."

There are three key requirements for developing a sustainable community
(a) Ecological health. Use nature's productivity without damaging it.
(b) Community health. Foster social wellbeing through the promotion of fairness, equity and cooperation.
(c) Individual health. Secure food, shelter, health care, education etc. for everyone.

This means working to integrate environmental, economic and social policies so that economic success, ecological integrity and social health become compatible.

In order to make our communities more livable and sustainable we can work towards change at the personal, urban and commercial levels.

**AT HOME WE CAN.**
1. start composting
2. use more energy-efficient light bulbs, shower heads etc
3. switch to forms of recreation and tourism which have a low impact on the environment
4. grow some of our own food
5. live closer to work (or the other way around)
6. use bicycles and public transport rather than cars
7. buy items made or grown locally rather than far away

**Households** can start by reducing their resource consumption. At the urban level we must develop an **infrastructure** that leaves options open, rather than one which dictates resource-intensive lifestyles for our own and future generations. Along with these lifestyle changes, there must be changes in our **economies.**

This approach differs from today's global economy which favors Urban Industrial centres, and requires the support and involvement of people in each sector of society.

We can all make a difference.

Influential groups are:

**Politicians** (MPs, MLAs, City Councillors, etc), who can initiate OF support sustainability Programs and projects, particularly at the infrastructure level. They can set up screening processes which will take ecological impact into account when assessing a budget or project, and they can encourage the use of the concept of sustainability by the government. They can persuade their parties to develop sustainability strategies, Involve the public, and discuss the dilemmas being faced. They can support community groups working towards sustainable societies.

**Administrators and planners,** who can help politicians write appropriate legislation and ensure that existing policies are followed. They too can involve the public, present them with the dilemmas and invite input. They can encourage people to participate in shaping the future of their community, and support and assist community groups making positive contributions to society.

**CITIES AND TOWNS CAN:**
1. plan attractive increased population density areas such as town centres and urban
villages instead of accommodating further sprawl
2. offer living, working and shopping spaces in integrated neighbourhoods
3. reallocate urban space to encourage decreased use of cars (e.g. reduce road and parking space) and increased use of public transport, bicycles mid walking (e.g. build bicycle 'speedways and attractive pedestrian areas)
4. encourage the planting of trees and greenspaces
5. establish urban land-trusts to give the community more control over land use
6. promote various kinds of affordable high-density housing such as secondary suites and cooperatives
7. introduce housing construction guidelines which minimize the consumption of resources
8. develop comprehensive waste reduction systems which include municipal resource reuse and reduction schemes

**The general public**, which is all of us -possibly the most important group! We can look at our lifestyles, think about what's important to us, and start family and friends thinking too. Let's get involved and participate in community and municipal groups. Write and talk to politicians at a local, regional or national level, and let them know we want to work with them to develop our communities sustainably.

**IN DOING BUSINESS WE CAN:**

1. rely on using locally available resources rather than imported ones
2. regain local control over production and distribution of those resources
3. secure local needs so that the long term livelihood of a region can be protected without compromising the livelihoods of other people in other regions
4. charge the true costs for private transportation, pollution and resource use
5. support community-based non-cash, volunteer and mutual aid networks
6. encourage ecologically sound businesses lifestyles, and tax and regulate unsustainable behaviour,
7. offer tax breaks and other incentives for encouraging sustainable

All of us - including politicians and planners - are consumers of nature's productivity. We must work together to achieve a more sustainable way of living now in order to ensure that resources continue to be available not only for ourselves, but also for future generations.

"**We must work together to ensure that resources continue to be available for future generations.**"
If you're interested in finding out more about the issues raised in this pamphlet, we suggest the following reading material.

**General**

"For the Common Good Redirecting the Economy towards Community, the Environment and a Sustainable Future" by, Herman E Daly and John B Cobb., 1989. Beacon Press, Boston.


**Ecological Footprint:**


**For further information, please contact:**

Janette McIntosh, Coordinator  
The Task Force on Planning Healthy and Sustainable Communities  
The University of British Columbia  
Department of Family Practice  
5804 Fairview Avenue  
Vancouver, BC Canada V6T 1Z3  
phone: (604) 822-4366, fax: (604) 822-6950

This pamphlet may be reproduced. If excerpts are quoted, the source should be credited.
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V. GENERAL STRATEGIES FOR PLANNING AND ORGANIZING [F-10, F-11, & F-12]

This section begins with ways to assess the larger resource impact of your region and your local food system. This is followed by two short pieces that lay out basic planning and strategic sequences and elements. How to involve community groups in local food system visioning and discussion is outlined next. Finally, three detailed examples of community food system assessments are included.

A. The larger context [F-10]

1. Sustainability and urban impacts: "How Big is Our Ecological Footprint?" Mathis Wackernagel with The Task Force on Planning Healthy & Sustainable Communities, University of British Columbia, November 1993.


C. Preliminary Planning and Strategizing: [F-11]

1. “Developing and implementing your own local plans.” Ken Dahlberg and Tom Hemingway, 1995


C. Engaging other people and groups through visioning processes: [F-12]


D. Examples of detailed community food system assessments: The "Food Files" series. [F-12]


ASSESSING YOUR LOCAL FOOD SYSTEM
by Tom Hemingway

Introduction

This section is designed to help structure an exploration of your local food system. The section is organized according to various domains, such as ecology, food production, economics, and so on. Each domain includes a set of questions to get you thinking. Your food system will probably look very different from other local food systems around the country, so a "one size fits all" essay won't stimulate your thinking as well as some open-ended questions. You may choose only one or two of these questions to pursue as you look at your local system, or you may come up with your own questions.

Each section begins with a brief discussion of the topic area, followed by questions. The first questions deal with basic information about the topic area that can help you determine whether your community faces a particular problem in that area. The final set of questions deals with a few of the specific policy issues you may choose to address in your local action group.

The questions are intended to "prime the pump", that is, get you thinking in new ways about the relationships between different activities and institutions. It isn't necessary to answer any of the questions at this point. Look at them instead to guide discussions at preliminary planning meetings and visioning events, or just to gauge how much you know now about your food system and the resources that are available to you.
General Socioeconomic Structures and Trends

The food system is much broader than one or two industries or communities. The following questions are designed to expand your thinking about food in relation to your community's social organization and economics. Use these questions to get the big picture: what are the local resources, and what are the local needs? What are the major social problems in the area? How do these problems relate to food system problems?

Population & Demographics

1. What is the population of the area, population density, variations in density.
2. What categories were used in census? (Socioeconomic status, ethnicity, etc.). How are these groups distributed?
3. Draw an age pyramid for the community (this may have already been done by the Census Bureau).
4. How many residents own their home? How many rent?

Economics

5. What are the major economic activities of the area? Who are the major employers? In what sectors? (e.g. raw material extraction, agriculture, processing, manufacturing, service sector, other sectors, such as government employees)
6. What is the distribution of incomes?
7. What is the unemployment rate? Does unemployment have seasonal variations? How much has unemployment changed over the last few years?
8. How many people are on public assistance? WIC? Food stamps?

Government

9. How much is the local (city, county) budget for this year? Where does the money come from?
10. How much of the budget is for social services? How much for other uses?

Social action

11. Do any businesses contribute to food banks, or otherwise respond to local social needs?
12. What volunteer organizations assist poor (e.g. churches)? Are they organized into coalitions?
13. What other charitable organizations operate in the area? Where do they get their money?

Policy issues

14. What is the political climate for promoting social issues? Is there much precedent for local public funding of innovative programs?
15. What are the key policy issues identified by city and county government? by local newspapers? by others?
16. What type of development projects are sponsored?

Some suggested resources...
* Start at the local Chamber of Commerce.
* Census data is available at your local library.
* Interview public administrators, directors of social service programs, charities, churches, United Way. Check with the state Department of Human Services or Department of Economic Security.
Ecological Factors

The first set of questions is to get you thinking about the local ecosystem and to help you identify some of the natural resources of your area and how they interrelate. The next set of questions is to help you understand the impact of human settlements on the environment including those of native Americans prior to the arrival of Europeans. The last set of questions brings us back to the issue of food systems: how does the environment affect what you eat, and how does what you eat affect the environment?

The Local Ecosystem.

1. Describe the local watershed. How much area does it cover? What are the water sources? What are the patterns for surface water and underground water, annual and seasonal precipitation.
2. Describe local soil types, the depth of the topsoil, porosity, rock formations.
3. Describe the local climate, temperature. Don't forget seasonal variations.
4. Describe the local flora. Forests, ground cover. Geographic distribution. Changes over time in vegetation (more or less forest, desertification, etc.).
5. Describe the local fauna. Distribution of habitats. Changes over time in populations of local species.
6. Describe the bioregion that you are in.

Interaction between humans and ecosystem.

7. Who were original inhabitants of the area? What were their settlement patterns? What plant and animal species did they consume? What was their impact on the environment? (e.g. agriculture, herding, clearings, earth works, trails, stream diversions, dams, introduction of new species, or depletion of species, etc.)
8. What were subsequent settlement patterns over time? How has human occupation affected the environment? e.g.:
   - level of water table, dams, wells, irrigation, or other water diversion
   - soil degradation, overfarming, addition of chemicals
   - air and water pollution
   - introduction of new plant and animal species. Domestic species, new pests.
   - depletion of indigenous plant and animal species

Ecology and the food system.

9. What can you infer about the sustainability of current land use from an historical perspective on the environment?
10. How has the environment influenced what people in your area eat? To start with, compare local cuisine with that of other parts of the state or country, and ask how much the ecology has to do with those differences.
11. How does what you eat impact the environment? Is local food production hurting or sustaining the ecosystem? What about the "externalities" (unintended impacts) of agriculture, food processing & packaging, population growth, urbanization, etc.?

Some suggested resources...

* Interview older rural residents, meteorologists, local historians, archaeologists, anthropologists. Visit local museums. Look at old plat books, census data, since European occupation, if your library has them.
Agriculture

Urban residents, and even rural residents who work in the city, are often completely unaware of the agricultural activities in their area. Stereotypes from the 1940s and 1950s still determine much of the non-farmer's perception of farming. But since World War II, the percentage of Americans engaged in farming has dropped from 10% or 15% to less than half of one percent. Family farms are now being farmed by what may be the last generation of family farmers. Farms are more specialized and mechanized, and produce far less for home or local consumption than even one generation ago. Farming decisions now are driven by federal funding policies, world market prices, the availability of capital, and other forces that originate in Washington, Wall Street, or beyond.

1. How many farmers do you know? How many urban residents that you know have ever met a farmer, or visited a farm? How many farms in your area?
2. What is the average age of farm owners in the area? How did they enter farming? What agricultural education did they receive (e.g. high school ag, FFA, university programs, etc.)?
3. What agricultural products are produced in the area?
   - fruit & vegetable crops
   - commodities (soybeans, corn, oil seeds)
   - livestock & dairy
   - hybrid seeds or nursery plants sold to other farmers
   - specialty crops (e.g. herbs, medicinals, "luxury" food items?)
   - non-food agriculture (agricultural inputs, fibers, lumber, ornamental plants, sod, tobacco)
4. Where do these products go for processing? After processing, where are they distributed?
5. How much produce is already produced locally for local consumption? Has this changed over the years? Why?
6. Do small farms produce different types of crops from large farms? How do they differ?
7. How is farm labor utilized? When are the labor peaks and troughs? What are the sources for farm labor? Do the farmers themselves hold other jobs, or do they work year-round on the farm? Which crops are the most labor intensive?
9. What growers' associations are in the area? Besides the Farm Bureau, there are often associations for each type of product, e.g. apple growers' association. What activities do they engage in? What is their role in setting prices?
10. Do area high schools have a chapter of the Future Farmers of America? 4-H? Ecology Club? What are their primary activities? Can linkages be created between these youth organizations and some local food issue?
11. Is any farm land available to rent to gardeners? Are U-pick operations common? Or gleaning?
12. Is there a local homesteading movement? Or a movement of urban residents occupying old farms? Or a land trust movement? How well do these movements relate to established farmers?
13. What is the history of farming in the area? How has agricultural production changed over time, viz technology, crops, geographic distribution of farms? Have there been changes in the last few decades in land ownership, or land use? How much farm land been converted to residential, industrial, or other commercial use?

Policy Issues

14. What are the major economic and legal issues that concern farmers?
15. How is local farming affected by subsidies, export policies, or trade agreements?
16. What do politicians do to "get the farm vote"?

17. What are the goals and objectives of local agricultural extension programs? Who determines those goals?

18. What efforts to preserve local farm land are in place? How knowledgeable are the local citizens about farm land preservation? What types of zoning laws control development?

19. Are there Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) farms in the area? How many people subscribe?

Some suggested resources:

- Talk with farmers personally at farmers' markets and at roadside stands.
- Visit with people at the Farm Bureau, and the feed stores and hardware stores in rural communities.
- Meet the local agriculture extension agent, and representatives of local growers' associations.
- Get a tour of a few local processing and packing plants, and find out who their suppliers are, and where their products go.
- Get plat maps of the county from the County Courthouse, to look for patterns of land ownership. Compare them with plat maps of twenty and thirty years ago to see how things are changing.
- Visit the local employment office to learn about the changes in the demand for labor, the sources of that labor, and what exactly that work is.
Gardening

John Jeavons says that, using environmentally sound, low-input techniques, a family of four can grow enough produce for a year in a garden of only 800 square feet. Gardening provides plenty of cheap food, exercise, and release from stress. There are many easy-to-learn techniques that control pests, fertilize the soil, and save water without using chemicals or high-tech machinery, allowing gardening to be a very efficient and environmentally friendly way to produce food. Since even growing just a little food is part of the solution, community gardens are a popular and visible response to food needs (and social needs) in urban areas.

1. How many households have gardens? How many household gardens produce food crops? Are there any patterns in who gardens, e.g. certain neighborhoods, social classes, ethnic groups that seem to have more gardens than others? Can you find out why some groups are more likely to garden than others?

2. Are there community gardens? How many? How are they organized? If they are no longer in use, why not?

3. Does anyone have rooftop gardens, such as on top of high-rises? Even if there aren't any gardens of this type, are there good locations for rooftop gardening? How about other innovative gardening techniques, such as intensive or raised bed gardening, or container gardening?

4. What happens to garden surplus (e.g. if someone grows too many zucchini)? Garden waste (weeds, discarded plant parts)?

5. Are there local garden clubs? Do they have a special section for food plants and for ornamental plants? Are there seed saver clubs for heirloom and landrace varieties?

6. Are there public organizations that encourage people to grow food (or discourage them?) These might be schools, social services, agricultural extension services, etc.

7. Is there a network of gardeners who practice xeriscaping, low input gardening, or integrated pest management?

8. Is local farmland or fallow land available for rental to garden groups? Is it close enough to be practical? Is there technical help available for novices?

Policy Issues

9. Is city land available for community gardens that is not being used? Who administers the use of this land?

10. What policies affect the creation or maintenance of community gardens and open spaces?

Suggested resources

* Visit local nurseries, garden supply stores, and nature centers to find out about gardening clubs.
* A community food co-op may have information about community supported agriculture, or community gardens.

Food Processing

The price of the food is determined not so much by the grower, but by those who process, repackage, distribute, and retail the final product. The more stages of processing, the higher the price at the store. Those who sell food try to gauge the varying budgets and tastes of their customers, and may or may not be on target. Diets have changed greatly in the United States since World War II, as we became more interested in ethnically diverse cuisines. Also, as both husband and wife entered the job market, we have demanded foods that are packaged more conveniently, and that are easier to prepare. Concern about nutrition has grown, so now foodsellers compete to sell food that is packaged in individual servings for the microwave, that are fat free, and still look "international" But there are other unintended impacts: more energy consumption, more consumption of paper and plastic, more fuel for transportation, and more pollution. Low-tech and small scale processing can include canning (in tins or jars), freezing, milling, curing, or drying separate products (tomatoes, pickles, meat, flour), or mixed products (sauces, seasonings).

1. Where do local agricultural products go for processing? Are unprocessed goods shipped out of the area for processing? Are there any value adding activities that could be done locally?
2. Are products brought from elsewhere for processing? Distribution centers?
3. Do local products make a "round trip" from local producers, to a regional processing, repackaging, or distribution point, and then back to your community grocery store? How much of the price reflects this?
4. Do food co-ops engage in small scale food processing?
5. Are there community canning centers, or other facility for people to do their own food processing? e.g. church kitchens, gardening clubs?
6. Where can people learn small scale processing?
7. Do specialty grocery stores sell the products of small-scale, low-tech, or cottage industry processors? Where do these products come from?
8. Do local fruit and vegetable processors (if there are any) allow the public to salvage discarded produce? For example, crooked carrots, cracked cabbages, blemished tomatoes?

Policy issues

9. What are the obstacles than hinder the development of local value-adding activities? Do local development agencies encourage activity in the food sector?

10. What are the commerce and food safety laws that may discourage small scale food processing enterprises?

11. Are there health regulations concerning the salvage or recycling of irregular food products?

Some suggested resources...

- Food co-ops.
- Farmers' markets.
- Gardening associations.
- Local processing plants.
- Small business associations.
Local Food Markets

Once foods are ready for consumption, they may be sold and consumed locally or shipped across the world. Or they may be sold to regional distributors, who return them to the original community via local grocery store chains. Our local grocery store in Kalamazoo carries snow peas that were grown in Central America, then shipped to a town on the Canadian border for redistribution in the Midwest! In addition to mapping the travels of food, market issues include decisions about what will be sold where, when, and for what price.

1. Are local farmers organized into growers' associations? What are the goals of these associations? How are product prices established? How much of the retail price goes to the farmer? What are the rights and obligations of members?
2. Do local farmers participate in farmers' markets, co-ops, or other alternative markets?
3. Locate on a map the different types of grocery stores. Perhaps identify them for size, or specialty (e.g. co-ops, delis, Middle Eastern shops, cheese & wine shops, etc.) or local versus nonlocal ownership.
4. How many stores are located on bus routes? Are the bus schedules adequate for shoppers without cars?
5. How much do stores buy locally? Do the stores vary in their buying patterns?
6. How much do prices vary for the same items from store to store? What are the reasons for this variation?
7. Sometimes local growers are dissatisfied with their dealings with local grocers. Is that the case in your area? Ask local growers associations about their local buyers.
8. What are the food sources for institutions such as hospitals and schools? Where do local restaurants get their food? Are there linkages between these institutions and local producers? Fast food restaurant chains may be particularly prone to the "round trip food" syndrome if they buy from a central source.

Policy issues

9. Is there competition between local producers and food imports? What are laws or trade practices that address that competition?

10. How do merchants decide what to put on their shelves? Are there trade practices that favor large corporations over smaller, local companies? Ask both grocers and local producers to get both sides of this issue.

Suggested sources of information

- Talk to a local agricultural extension agent about where unprocessed foods come and go.
- Find out about local growers associations, and meet their representatives.
- Meet grocery store managers and find out who their suppliers are.
- Choose a few popular products, and try to trace them all the way back to their source.
Health, Nutrition, & Food Safety

People know that if they don't eat enough, they will become malnourished. Now people are more aware that just being filled isn't enough; we have to eat the right kinds of foods in the right proportions to stay healthy. The connection between food and health is obvious.... or is it? Even people who know what they should eat and how much they should exercise, don't behave according to that knowledge. Diets lean toward bacon cheeseburgers and stuffed crust pizzas, and away from fruits and vegetables. Eating is affected by one's lifestyle as well as one's budget. Eating well depends on how you use your time, and even whether you know how to cook! Since a homemade salad is more work than microwave popcorn, people too often opt for the easier, but less nutritious choice.

1. Have there been local problems related to food safety? E.g. illness due to contaminated fish or other wild game, or due to the poor preparation or storage of food?
2. Is food inspected for pesticide residues or illegal veterinary drugs?
3. Who inspects unprepared food sold in the area? Who inspects grocery stores & restaurants?
4. Are there particular nutrition problems in the area? What groups do they affect? (which ethnic groups, age groups, income levels).
5. Is there a Meals-on-Wheels program in the area? What do they observe about the nutrition status of people with limited mobility?
6. How do people learn about nutrition? Is this effective? Are there other ways to motivate people to better nutrition?
7. Do WIC or food stamp recipients receive adequate instruction about nutrition?
8. Are there special programs to address eating disorders?

Policy issues

11. What are local issues regarding welfare and food stamp recipients? Is there evidence of hunger in the community?

11. What are local regulations concerning the safe preparation and storage of food (e.g. restaurants, local processing plants, delicatessens, salad bars)?

Some suggested resources ...

• Sources of information about nutrition, and the frequency of malnutrition include the local WIC and Food Stamps offices, community health centers, food banks, and the local health department. These organizations frequently have dietitians and nutritionists on staff who are in constant contact with special populations. Ask them about the problems they see in the community, and what they'd do about them.

• The public health department can also tell you about the inspection process for farms, grocery stores and restaurants. Health inspectors are often very aware of the deficiencies of government policies, and could give you a few ideas.
Waste & Recycling

Waste occurs at all stages in the food cycle: production, processing, packaging, distribution, preparation, and consumption. This waste impacts the efficiency of production, the price you pay, and the ability of the environment to sustain the food system. Families with kitchen gardens have long used kitchen waste for composting to invest in next year's garden, but this type of recycling is not so common in large scale production. There is growing demand for recyclable packaging, but there is also a demand for more elaborate presentations that increase the amount of packaging per ounce of food: individual servings, heat-and-serve soups, frozen dinners, all-in-one-package pizza kits & pre-packed school lunches. Even when we do try to be more waste conscious, we still can't decide between "paper or plastic". The questions below are to stimulate your thinking about the disposal of waste and how it relates to other food security issues.

1. How are food and agricultural waste managed? Where does it come from? Where does it go? How is food waste handled differently from other solid waste? Are there special regulations intended to control disease?
2. What are the most common types of household waste?
3. Is there community-wide recycling? How is it organized? What items are recycled? What is the recycled output? Is the output also recyclable?
4. Do any stores give discounts if you bring your own container, basket, bags, etc.? What kinds of products can you buy at wholesale price with your own container? e.g. honey, produce, grains, etc.
5. Does the community have neighborhood or municipal composting? How well is it managed?
6. Does the local government have particular problems related to waste management or specifically to food waste? What public health ordinances are related to these issues?
8. Do local farmers permit gleaning? Is gleaning practiced in the community? By whom? How much of the crop surplus is recovered?
9. Are some growers and grocers more interested in waste and recycling issues than others? Do grocery stores live up to their publicized positions on recycling

Policy issues

10. How are decisions made concerning what materials will be collected for recycling, and to whom those materials are sold?

11. Are there laws in your state that discourage litter and waste? How does it work? Has the program been evaluated? If so, how was the evaluation used?

12. How do grocery stores make decisions about discarding waste and recycling? Are the decisions made locally (store by store) or centrally (at company headquarters)?

Sources for more information....

- Talk to the people who collect garbage for the city (they know some things that city hall doesn't!).
- Look at the municipal or state ordinances and other policy on sanitation and recycling.
- Identify some of the leading industries in the area and find out how they manage waste. Visit local waste collection sites, landfills, recycling centers.
This section was developed by Ken Dahlberg, with the help of Thomas Hemingway, a graduate student at Western Michigan University at the time. The attached detailed outline and figure give an overview of how to develop an overall planning process. Obviously, it needs to be adapted to your local conditions, something that the above materials on doing a preliminary assessment of your local food system should help you with. Clearly, this is only one of a number of different ways to develop your own local plans and is meant to help you make sure that you have included most of the relevant factors and developed a planning strategy.

A. Phase 1: The Creation Phase. This is where a small group develops the background and strategy needed to create a new organization or to transform and broaden an existing organization.

1. Develop an initial vision and set of goals based on a broad concept of local food systems [see graphic below as well as F-15 through F-19]
   a. Identify and bring together a small core group to help identify resources, challenges, and opportunities.
   b. Discuss your long-term goals and objectives.
   c. Consider doing a vision exercise [See F-12]

2. Do a preliminary assessment of your food system. This involves the identification of resources, challenges, and opportunities by doing an initial inventory of resources related to your local food system. Briefly consider the following to identify the main issues, actors, challenges, and opportunities. For more detailed questions and suggestions, see section V.B. above.

   a. Identify key stakeholders--existing and potential; which are politically and economically important now?; which are needed in the longer term to build a healthier system?
   b. Arrange a meeting of these key stakeholders to see if they are willing to participate in an effort to create a food policy organization.

B. Phase II: Implementing Your Organizing Strategy. This is where your larger group goes through the same process as above, but in greater depth and with more specific focus on policy needs and opportunities.

1. For this larger group, develop an initial vision and set of goals based on a broad concept of local food systems.
   a. Discuss Long-term goals and objectives.
   b. Consider doing a vision exercise. [See F-12]
2. Develop a deeper understanding of the resources, challenges, and opportunities of your particular food system by going beyond your preliminary inventory to a more in-depth assessment. Again, consider the main issues, actors, challenges, and opportunities relating to the items in section V.B. above. In addition, have each participating group prepare a brief history of food policy issues of importance to them and then jointly discuss the longer-term policy needs of your community.

3. Determine what type of organization or network you are going to be.
   
   a. Discuss your organizational strategy: what will work best for you? A network a forum, a coalition, a clearing-house type organization, or an action organization or network?

4. Build your organization/network. This includes getting your organization formally established (by-laws; tax-exempt status; officers, etc.) and launching it - hopefully with lots of attendant publicity. During this process also start organizing for the longer-term as well, by planning how to:
   
   a. Obtain funding and staff support
   b. Structure your committees and/or taskforces
   c. Structure an annual cycle--meetings, workloads; retreats, etc.
   d. Develop procedures for running meetings which include both mechanics (place, minutes, etc.) and group dynamics
   e. Develop a resource base - data, research, reports, a history of your efforts, etc.
   f. Create and distribute publicity

5. Develop policy goals, policy targets, and specific policy campaigns. This includes:
   
   a. Examining the interactions between long- medium- and short-term policy goals and objectives to come up with realistic policy targets by (1) Assessing bureaucratic feasibility (2) Assessing political feasibility
   b. Developing specific policy campaigns

6. Establish an ongoing set of procedures for operation and evaluation. The above cycles of goal-setting, research and analysis, and policy action can be repeated as the organization as well as conditions change. It is important to build into your annual cycle a formal time to assess successes and failures in order to guide planning for the future. An annual report and retreat is useful here. Also, some sort of outside evaluation can be very helpful.
A STRATEGY FOR CREATING AND OPERATING A LFPO

VISION & GOALS
Discuss/Review at Regular Intervals

INITIAL VISION & GOALS

THE CREATION PHASE [I]

UNDERSTANDING YOUR FOOD SYSTEM
Initial Inventory

ORGANIZE AND TAKE ACTION
Bring Key Stakeholders Together

THE OPERATING PHASE [II]

UNDERSTANDING YOUR FOOD SYSTEM
Assessments of Resources Challenges Opportunities

ORGANIZE AND TAKE ACTION
Create LFPO Specific Policy Goals Policy Campaigns
Eight Elements Critical to the Success of Food System Councils

Prepared by Kate Clancy, June 1988*

(1) Official sanction- necessary legitimation, but not sufficient without ongoing support from local political entities.

(2) Staff- paid for a significant amount of time per week. Accomplishments of all-volunteer councils likely to be minimal.

(3) Funding- for staffing and projects. Councils trying to function with only in-kind support have trouble.

(4) External legitimacy- as measured by (a) representativeness of the council; (b) council's identity (how perceived); and (c) council's function in the community (catalyst? program initiator? convener? other?).

(5) Knowledge base- how much information exists about the local food system, and what members know about sectors of the system other than their own. Requires much time for education.

(6) Power-sharing- constant need to recognize the "creative tension" that exists as attempts are made to allow powersharing and planning in areas in which they have never occurred.

(7) Vision- what system might look like in future is obscure and alien to most people. In the most successful councils, several participants share and express the vision.

(8) Leadership- has been most important element to this point. Leaders must have vision, personalities that encourage sharing and community building, major management skills, significant time commitment, and incredible patience.

* Part of a speech titled "Local Food Councils: A New Tool for Community Health". Presented at Cornell Nutrition Update

copyright 1996 Kate Clancy
V. GENERAL STRATEGIES FOR PLANNING AND ORGANIZING [F-10, F-11, & F-12]

This section begins with ways to assess the larger resource dimensions of your region and your local food system. This is followed by two short pieces that lay out basic planning and strategic sequences and elements. How to involve community groups in local food system visioning and discussion is outlined next. Finally, three detailed assessments of the Chicago foodshed are included.

A. The larger context [F-10]

1. Sustainability and urban impacts: "How Big is Our Ecological Footprint?" Mathis Wackernagel with The Task Force on Planning Healthy & Sustainable Communities, University of British Columbia, November 1993.


C. Preliminary Planning and Strategizing: [F-11]

1. "Developing and implementing your own local plans." Ken Dahlberg and Tom Hemingway, 1995


C. Engaging other people and groups through visioning processes: [F-12]


D. Examples of detailed community food system assessments: The "Food Files" series. [F-12]


How to facilitate a vision workshop

Next time you have a 15-minute break, try this exercise:
Find a quiet place, take a moment to relax, close your eyes, and take a journey into the future:
It is the year 2013 and you are hovering in a balloon above your own community. During the past 20 years, it has transformed itself into an ideally healthy community.
Imagine yourself floating down to the center of this place, where you climb out of the balloon and move around the community. Take your time as you go into and out of stores ... workplaces ... streets ... parks ... neighborhoods ... houses ... healthcare and educational settings.
In what way are the places you visit and the people you see healthy? What makes them healthy?
Notice the colors and shapes and textures around you. What sounds do you hear? What smells do you notice?
Pay attention to how people move from place to place.
Observe the settings where ill people receive care and the places where people learn
Take the time to experience this community at different times of day and night. At different seasons.
Try to imagine yourself as an elderly person living in this environment ... as a child ... as a woman/man ... as a disabled person.
Now spend a few minutes revisiting places you have seen that struck you most forcibly or that you liked the best, then re-enter the balloon, ascend back into the sky, and return to the present.

This is the core exercise in the vision workshops I have conducted in Canada, the US, and Europe. Organizing such a workshop provides one of the most powerful ways to answer the question, "What is a healthy community?"
The idea is to demonstrate to participants that they already know what a healthy community is—not to give them your ideas and have them feed those ideas back to you.

Ask participants to reflect back on the past few months and recall something they have personally experienced that strikes them as an example of a healthy community.
Don't allow people to give you examples they've heard from someone else or examples of what makes an unhealthy community. Insist on personal and positive experiences. In large groups, ask for volunteers and take 15 or 20 examples. In small groups, use this exercise as an "ice breaker" by asking people to introduce themselves and give their example.

Write the answers on a flipchart.
Unless you have a high proportion of healthcare professionals in the group (which you shouldn't), you will find that people seldom talk about or give examples of the healthcare system. Rather, they will talk about parks and green spaces, street fairs, neighbors helping neighbors, bicycle paths, recycling campaigns, school and community events, good transit, and anti-Litter initiatives.

After filling a couple of flipcharts with experiences, point out, first, that the participants already know what a healthy community is and, second, that they know that it is not primarily the result of the activities of the healthcare system. (This second point may surprise them once they realize what they've said.)

Facilitate a guided imagery exercise like the one above.
Have people take a "trip" through their own community at some point in the future, say 15 or 20 years hence, when it is an ideally healthy place. It may be useful to explain that guided imagery is not some strange "way out" experience but is used frequently, especially in sports psychology and increasingly in business, to help people improve their performance and achieve clarity about their goals and plans.
The exercise should take about 15 minutes. Remember to use value-free language that leaves it up to the participants to specify what they see. Don't, for example, talk about cars, buses, and bicycles; just ask them to notice how people move around. Don't use words like "school" or "hospital"; participants' image of an ideally healthy community may not include what we now call hospitals and schools.
* **Ask to write down a list of the images that they found most powerful surprising enjoyable, or in any other way.**
If you are dealing with a non-literate population, and we have done workshops for homeless men and for students in English-as-a-second-language classes, ask them to make a list in their head.

This is perhaps the most magical moment of the workshop. For five minutes or more, you can hear a pin drop! Once people have completed their lists, take a coffee break.

* **Divide people into groups of six or eight, keeping the groups as mixed as possible.**
Ask each group, together with a facilitator, to move to one of the blank flipcharts that are pinned or taped to the wall. They will use these sheets to draw their picture of the ideally healthy community.

* **Ask all members of the small group to briefly describe one item from their list.**
This could be their favorite, the one that surprised them most, or whatever. This allows for a quick exploration of the range of ideas among the group and gives some sense of what themes will have to be portrayed in the picture.

* **Take 30-40 minutes to do a group drawing.**
Encourage people to draw anything they like. Others can add to it or amend it if it doesn't fit with their vision, but they can't delete it. The aim is to arrive at something that reflects a shared vision within each small group.

Encourage all members of each group to participate in the drawing. Inform them that no adult can draw better than a seven-year-old child, so they shouldn't be embarrassed by the child-like nature of their collective enterprise. (A golden rule here is that architects, planners, engineers, and professional artists are not allowed to draw first, since they don't draw like seven-year-old children and will intimidate the others.) Avoid the use of words as much as possible. Urge people to use symbols instead (dollar signs, for instance, instead of the word "money" or "wealth").

About 20 minutes into the exercise, encourage people to look at their lists and see if there are important themes or issues from their image that are missing. Participants usually find this a lively and often amusing exercise.

* **Have each group present their drawing.**
The presenter should be selected by the small group and should not be that group's facilitator. It is useful to videotape this section of the workshop for future reference, to be able to recall accurately what was said and to present the results to other interested groups in the community.

* **Ask participants to identify the common themes that recur in the pictures**
Write these on a flipchart at the front of the room. If there are a lot of themes, try and group them without getting too broad and vague. These themes become the basis for identifying priority actions and even for establishing work groups for follow-up, which can take place as another half-day session on the same day, or as a separate half- or full-day workshop.

-Dr. Trevor Hancock
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One of the most serious problems facing the nation's poor is access to affordable food. A plethora of programs currently exist whose sole purpose is to deal with food issues. Yet few of these programs offer solutions on a scale that is commensurate with the problem. Food activists and concerned citizens often are well aware of the problems and inequities of today's food system but few understand the economic forces that shape the system they seek to alter.

The information presented in this report is intended to lay a foundation for understanding the forces and trends that affect the cost and availability of food. Both the farm and marketing sectors of the food system are analyzed. As the first part in a new TNW series on urban food systems, the report provides the kind of information that food system reformers must have in order to create new strategies at an appropriate scale.

by Paige Chapel

Supplying food to consumers is the nation's largest industry, employing 18 million people. Although farmers account for only 3 percent of the U.S. population, they produce enough food to feed 220,700,000 U.S. citizens each day and supply more than 85 percent of the world's surplus food. In the U.S. alone, $345.7 billion was spent on food and beverages in 1980.

Chicago is located in one of the most productive farm states in the nation. Illinois' farm sector ranks as the nation's fourth largest when measured by agricultural cash receipts. Although the state encompasses only 1.6 percent of the nation's land area, it produces 9 percent of the nation's farm products (crop and livestock). It is number two in soybean, corn and hog production. 1980 cash receipts by farmers for Illinois crops and livestock was nearly $8 billion—an important figure since two out of every five workers in Illinois are linked to the state's agribusiness sector through farming, food processing, transportation, marketing, banking, chemical and implement manufacturing businesses. Table I shows Illinois' major farm products and their percentage of total cash receipts.

Chicagoans do not have to go very far to see an Illinois farm. In the six county metropolitan area (Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, Will) there are 4,892 farms accounting for over one million acres of farm land. The cash receipts for these farms totalled $283 million in 1975. Cook County alone has 460 farms within its boundaries, accounting for over 53,000 acres of agricultural land and $29 million in cash receipts.

Although most Chicagoans may not believe it, Chicago is located in a region with some of the cheapest food prices in the nation. When compared to other Bureau of Labor Statistics regions, food prices for cereals and bakery products, meats, fish, eggs, dairy, and processed snacks were consistently lower than the average of the north central region. Prices for fresh fruits and vegetables tended to be moderately priced on the whole.

Considering that Illinois is a major grain and hog producing state (see Table 1), one would expect Chicago meat, cereal, and bakery product prices to be below or competitive with prices throughout the region. In a September, 1981 survey, Chicago meat and dairy prices were well below the regional average while the price of staples (flour, sugar, bread) and fresh fruits and vegetables were considerably higher than the regional average.

The Problem
Despite living in the breadbasket of the nation, an estimated half million Chicagoans suffer from inadequate diets each year. At Cook County Hospital alone, 200 of the 800-1,000 patients admitted daily to the emergency room are treated for starvation or nutrition deficiencies. Simple rationales of this phenomenon are the lack of dollars with which to buy food, limited access to food stores, consumption of poorer quality foods, or a combination of all three.

During 1972-74, the period of the most recent Consumer Expenditure Survey of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average U.S. urban wage earner ($10,20 thousand earned annually) spent close to 20 percent of his/her before-tax income on food, whereas consumers earning $5,000 or less annually spent closer to 40 percent of their wages on food. When taken from after-tax paychecks, the percentage of income spent on food is still higher. The situation is exacerbated by the steady rise in food prices, particularly for people on fixed incomes. Since 1967, food prices, in Chicago have risen 180 percent.

At Cook County Hospital alone, 200 of the 800-1,000 patients admitted daily to the emergency room are treated for starvation or nutrition deficiencies.

Access to affordable food is linked to two major components of the food system: production and marketing. The production component includes those processes and expenses on the farm that involve growing crops or raising livestock. Marketing consists of all the phases in the food system between the farmer and consumer, including the processing, transporting, wholesaling, and retailing of food products. The availability and affordability of food in the city is directly affected by where and how food is produced and marketed.

The Farm Sector
In 1978, 23 percent of all U.S. farms were located within standard metropolitan statistical areas. At that time, metropolitan agricultural areas produced 26 percent of the value of all food commodities sold in the
continental U.S. However, farmland in metropolitan areas is rapidly disappearing. One hundred thousand acres of Illinois cropland are lost each year through conversion to suburban housing, office buildings, industrial plants, shopping centers, schools, parks, cemeteries, golf courses and other developments. Suburban sprawl not only occupies land, it also increases taxes for remaining farms. As land values soar, the already suffering profitability of farms decreases. The solution for many farmers is to sell their land to developers and relocate or give up farming for another occupation.

As farms move farther away from cities, transportation costs associated with food distribution increase and are passed on to the consumer. In 1980, 3,005,072 people living in Chicago consumed 4.4 billion pounds of food, over 12 million pounds each day. Hauling this amount of food into Chicago required an estimated 300 trucks each day. The cost of this food to Chicagoans was $3.1 billion, $166 million of which was for transportation. As energy and labor costs increase, the cost of transporting food to cities will continue to rise.

**TABLE 1:**
Illinois Cash Farm Income, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>% of Total Receipts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybean</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other crops (inc. vegetable 0.4)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock &amp; by-products</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Transportation is not the only energy-dependent component of agriculture. In 1979 the food industry used 16.5 percent of all energy consumed in the U.S. while farming accounted for only 17.6 percent of this quantity. In 1980, energy use on the farm accounted for 2.5 percent of the country’s total energy consumption. Yet in 1975, farmers were using 10 calories of fossil fuel energy to produce 1 calorie of food energy. The price they have had to pay has not been cheap. Since 1977, the cost of farm fuels and energy has risen 114 percent.

More often than not, the farmer absorbs part of the increased cost as well I as the consumer. The prices received by farmers for their goods have risen 40 percent since 1977 while the prices they pay for production expenses have increased 50 percent. Higher energy costs coupled with the doubling of interest rates since 1977 has resulted in a serious drop in farmers’ net income. The trend of prices paid by farmers rising faster than the prices they receive is likely to continue well beyond 1982.

Not only is the current food system dependent on increasingly expensive resources, but its dependence on those resources makes it vulnerable to shortages and political and economic disturbances. The U.S. currently imports 40 percent of its fuel. An energy shortage or reduction of 10 percent would result in a 55 percent increase in the price of fresh fruit and vegetables. In a major crisis, perishables would disappear from grocery stores almost immediately. Under normal buying patterns, stores with floor areas of 10,000 square feet or more might have canned goods for as long as a week; smaller stores without storage space would be empty sooner. If panic buying occurred, consumers could empty all the stores in less than a day.

Since 1975, the farm-retail price spread has added $70 billion of the $100 billion increase in consumer expenditures on food.

Dependence on fossil fuels and other non-renewable resources permeates U.S. agriculture. Most biocides and fertilizers utilize petroleum-based chemicals. Each year, farmers use 61/4 pounds of pesticides for every person in the U.S. at an annual cost of $839 million. In addition, 111 pounds of synthetic fertilizers are spread on each acre of cropland, amounting to 210 pounds of fertilizer for every person in the nation. Without the use of these chemicals, crop yields would drop an estimated 50 percent.

Perhaps one of the weakest links in the current food chain is the tenuous supply of non-renewable resources that compose synthetic fertilizers. Consider the fertilizers that supply crops with three essential plant nutrients: phosphorous, potassium, and nitrogen. The current consumption rates of phosphate fertilizers will deplete our rock phosphate supply by the year 2000. The U.S. produces less than 25 percent of the potash used on farms - production is expected to drop to 10 percent within 20 years. Nitrogen fertilizers are made from natural gas. As the price of natural gas is deregulated, farmers can expect the price of nitrate fertilizers to increase.

Phosphate fertilizers illustrate the vulnerability of a food system that relies on foreign supplies. All phosphate fertilizers contain sulphur. The U.S. currently imports part of its sulfur from Poland, Iran, and Iraq - countries in the midst of political and economic crises. The unstable political climates in these nations have resulted in the decreased mining and export of sulfur, which in turn has created a shortage of sulfur on the world market and an increase in sulfur prices. Simultaneously, phosphate fertilizer prices have soared, if the already tense political climate between the U.S. and any of these nations flared such that sulfur was no longer exported to this country, U.S. agriculture would be detrimentally affected.

Clearly, the American food system operates within a delicate balance of environmental limitations and international relations. A shortage of one or more of the critical resources needed to produce and transport food could have a devastating effect on cities and particularly on low-income consumers.

As a hedge against an expensive and vulnerable food system, urban gardening projects have sprung up in cities across the nation. A survey conducted by the Gallup Organization for Gardens for All estimates that 38 million households in the U.S. had food gardens in 1981, accounting for 47 percent of all American households. The food produced in home gardens has an estimated retail value of $16 billion. (Statistics on Chicago’s gardening program are not yet available.)

But vegetable gardens only supply a small part of the American diet; and production only accounts for one component of the food bill. The price that consumers pay at the grocery check-out line reflects both the farm value of the raw commodity and the charges by various segments of the...
The marketing bill has accounted for more than 50 percent of the increase in food prices since 1975, the farm-retail price spread has added $70 billion of the $100 billion increase in consumer expenditures on food, while the farm value has only added $30 billion (see Figure 1). A small part of the higher consumer expenditure is due to the 1 to 2 percent increase in the volume of food purchased by consumers as a result of the decrease in food consumed away from the home. However, the bulk of the increase was caused by rising labor costs and by the rising price of inputs bought by the food industry from nonfarm sources (e.g., paper, plastic, metal, energy, etc.).

Three economic factors determine the size of the marketing bill: productivity, food industry costs, and profit. Productivity in the food industry can have a significant impact on food prices. For example, tomato canneries are faced with higher input costs for energy and metal cans. If productivity (the number of cans of tomatoes produced per unit of inputs used) remains constant then the increased energy and container costs would be passed on to consumers. However, if a cannery reduced its energy bill and streamlined its truck loading operation, a smaller input of energy and labor would be used per can produced. This would offset part of the higher production costs and would hold down the retail price of canned tomatoes.

Since labor costs are the largest contributing factor to the marketing bill, most food industries attempt to improve worker output per hour. Labor productivity is affected by available technology and skill and motivation of the work force.

In the last decade productivity increased in the food manufacturing sector while it decreased in the food retailing industry. There are several reasons for these trends.

Manufacturers have switched to fewer and larger plants and have invested in modernized equipment, all of which reduce labor hours. On the other hand, supermarkets have introduced long hours and new services (bakeries and delicatessens) to compete for food sales. Expansion measures accounted for a 13.4 percent increase in labor hours between 1972 and 1979, while sales increased only one percent. As a result, a number of national retail chains have operated at a loss in recent years.

Increases in the retail price of food largely reflect rising costs faced by the food marketing sector (see Figure 2). Following the trend of the last ten years, the farm value accounted for approximately one-third of the retail price of food. The remaining two-thirds makes up the farm retail price spread or the "marketing bill."

A description of each component of retail food prices follows:

Labor. By far the largest component of the marketing bill, labor costs make up 45 percent of the 1981 total and accounted for two-fifths of the increase in the marketing bill. During the first nine months of 1981, total hourly earnings in the food industry rose 10.8 percent.

Packaging. Eight cents out of every food dollar is spent on packaging. In 1980, major increases in the cost of plastic resins, tin cans, glass, and
paperboard drove up the bill for food packaging by more than 14 percent. The increase in packaging costs in 1981 moderated to 7.6 percent due to adequate supplies of paperboard products and petroleum.

**Transportation.** Higher rates for rail and truck transport pushed the cost of transporting food up 13 percent in 1981, accounting for 6 percent of the retail price of food. This increase was slightly below the rise in the 1980 cost.

**Energy.** The fastest rising component of the marketing bill, although still one of the smallest, is fuel and electricity. In 1981, energy costs accounted for almost 6 percent of the marketing bill and 4 percent of consumer food expenditures. Energy prices averaged 19.5 percent between September 1980 and September 1981, compared to a 17.8 increase between 1979 and 1980.

**Other.** The remainder of the bill includes a variety of minor expenses that are incurred during the processing and marketing of food. Individually, they are small, but when added together they make up a major component of the marketing bill (24 percent in 1981). These costs include plant and equipment depreciation, rent, TV, radio, and newspaper advertising, repairs, bad debts, contributions, property taxes and insurance, and interest. Costs in this category increased at the general inflation rate in 1981.

Profits for all sectors in the food marketing industry made up almost 6 percent of the marketing bill in 1981, and 4 percent of the price of retail foods (see Figure 2). After-tax profits as a percentage

An energy shortage or reduction of ten percent would result in a 55 percent increase in the price of fresh fruit and vegetables.

As in most recent years, the costs of labor, packaging, transportation, and energy were responsible for three-fourths of the increase in food processing and marketing costs. Figure 3 shows the relative increase in input prices for the food marketing industry in 1980. (Note: these increases are cumulative, not averages.)

Profits for all sectors in the food marketing industry made up almost 6 percent of the marketing bill in 1981, and 4 percent of the price of retail foods (see Figure 2). After tax profits as a percentage of sales have remained stable during the last three years and as a result have not added directly to the rising cost of food. While some national retail food chains (A&P, Food Fair) have operated at a loss in recent years, the after-tax margin

for retailers as a whole has continued to average about one percent of sales. The margin for food manufacturers continues to average slightly above 3 percent as it has for the last four years. Based on the USDA's projected components of retail food prices (see Figure 2), Chicagoans paid farmers $961 million for food in 1981. The remaining 2.2 billion consumer food dollars paid for the marketing bill. The dollars paid to each sector of the marketing industry are shown in Table 2.

When individual commodities are compared, their farm values and marketing bills vary greatly (see Figure 4). Generally, perishable commodities that require the least amount of slicing, processing, and packaging (such as eggs, poultry, dairy, and meat products) have smaller marketing bills. Commodities such as bread, pasta, canned goods, and frozen foods require more handling and inputs than raw foods. Consequently, the majority of the consumer expenditure for these items pays for the marketing component. Commodities with smaller marketing bills are not necessarily less expensive; this merely means that a greater portion of the consumer expenditure goes directly to farmers.

**Summary**

The U.S. may be one of the richest agricultural nations in the world yet millions of Americans go hungry each year. Furthermore, our agricultural wealth is based on the consumption of limited resources and a competitive and increasingly expensive manufacturing industry. Chicago is among hundreds of U.S. cities that sit at the end of a food pipeline - a pipeline that is highly dependent on transportation and energy.

On one hand, the urban food chain is based on a distant supply system that points to the need for local, energy- and resource-efficient food production. On the other hand, it is made up of a marketing system that will require the elimination of middle marketing steps in the food chain and the development of alternative industrial processes if prices are to be reduced.

Urban agriculture programs potentially could produce fresh vegetables and fruits. This is currently being done on an individual basis in Chicago. Larger scale, community "farm" projects have yet to succeed in Chicago or in other U.S. cities. While urban gardens do have some impact on the availability of and consumer expenditure for food, the average Chicagoan does not live by fruit and vegetable alone. The American diet largely consists of meat, fish, dairy, grain, and every manner of processed foods. While some fruits and vegetables can be grown locally, grain crops require large tracts of land for sufficient impact on local consumption. And the raising of livestock for food purposes is prohibited by the Chicago Board of Health unless it is used for personal consumption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing Component</th>
<th>% of Chicago Food Bill</th>
<th>Food $ Spent in 1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>961 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel &amp; Electricity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2: 1981 Chicago Food Marketing Bill**
For More Information

This first installment was condensed from a longer report authored by Paige Chapel. Copies of the full 20-page report, complete with footnotes and additional charts, are available for $2.00 from the Chicago Food System Research Project, Center for Neighborhood Technology, 570 W. Randolph, Chicago IL 60606, (312) 454-0126.

The second installment of this TNW special report on the urban food system will examine more closely these production limitations. Included will be a report on Chicago's metropolitan food system centering on the farming origins of the Chicago market basket and current trends within the marketing sector itself. Also featured will be a national view on the need for urban food planning. Part III of the series will cover consumer access questions at the retail level, as well as a look at alternatives such as food cooperatives. Programs for the hungry poor will also be examined. Part IV will attempt to review the state of the art in urban food planning in other locales. In addition, this final installment will conclude the series by suggesting some new solutions urban residents could undertake to assure a continuing supply of quality, affordable food in the future.

FIGURE 3. Relative Increases of Input Prices for the Food Industry in 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuels and electricity</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term Interest</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All input prices</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from 1979</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4. Farm Share of Retail Food Prices

- Poultry and eggs: 56%
- Dairy products: 52%
- Meat products: 51%
- Average for market basket of farm foods: 37%
- Fats and oils: 20%
- Fruits: 26%
- Processed foods and vegetables: 18%
- Bakery and cereal products: 18%

Farm value is the amount received for quantities of food commodities less the allowance for reproduction equivalent to the retail 1980 costs.
Metro Agriculture: Meeting Local Needs?

by Paige Chapel

Food is the most basic element of life. It is the foundation of a productive, healthy society. Yet as we learned in the first installment of The Food Files ("Complex Forces Shape Our Urban Breadbasket" TNW V. 5 #7), urban dwellers exist on a food chain linked to an intricate transportation network, distant resources and a sophisticated market economy-a food chain that few consumers understand or have access to, except at the checkout counter.

Although food is important to everyone who eats, the nature of our food system does not rank as a burning consumer issue. For example, although organic farming methods and health food shops seem more common, many city residents are unaware of the nutritional quality of the food they consume or are simply unable to afford better diets.

It is easy to understand why residents of the Chicagoland area might not be conscious of their food system. Chicago is located in the nation’s, indeed the world’s breadbasket. Illinois is the largest agricultural exporting state in the country, Illinois farmers feed the world.

Most urban consumers have little to do with the production of the food they eat. Few of us have seen empty grocery store shelves when we go to buy our foodstuffs. Where our food comes from and where it will continue to come from is of little concern to us as long as there are no visible signs of scarcity or starvation.

However, if we look more closely at the food system, we can begin to see serious problems that are not readily apparent on the surface-the kinds of problems that have serious impact on producers and consumers alike.

Many years have come and gone, as have many farmers, manufacturers and retailers, since Chicago was hog butcher to the world. Each year, the
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As the Center for Neighborhood Technology’s Food Program Coordinator, Paige Chapel has spent the last four years as the Center’s urban ag specialist, providing technical assistance and research to numerous community organizations.

Chicago area loses land that was devoted to the production of food; fewer Chicagoan, are employed by the food industry as more warehouses and factories leave Chicago and more and more of the retail food market becomes concentrated in fewer corporate headquarters.

This second installment of The Food Files will examine current agricultural production in the Chicago Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). We will also take a look at the origins of the Chicago market basket and brief IV review trends in Chicago's food marketing sector.

Agriculture in the Chicago SMSA

Despite Chicago's reputation as a major urban area, the six-county metror region (see Figure 1) supports a substantial agricultural economy. As of 1978, over one million acres of land in the SMSA were devoted to agricultural use (see Table 1). In Cook County alone, there were 450 farms accounting for 51,164 acres of farmland.

Interestingly, a fairly diverse range of food commodities are commercially produced in the SMSA, including beef, pork, mutton and lamb, chicken, turkey, dairy, eggs, seven different grains, 24 different vegetables, eleven different fruits, not to mention mushrooms and honey.

Meat and dairy production is concentrated in Kane and McHenry Counties where approximately three-fourths of all the beef and pork produced in the SMSA originates and where 81 percent of the SMSA dairy herd is raised. 86 percent of the area's egg production is concentrated in Lake and Will Counties.

By far, the vast majority of farm production in the SMSA is in grains, with corn being the principle crop. Will County led the area in total corn and soybean production in 1978. Overall, Kane, McHenry, and Will Counties were the largest grain producers in the SMSA, not surprising considering that these counties are also the leading farm districts (see Table 1 below).

The commodity in which Cook County excels when compared to other SMSA counties is vegetable production. Cook is a leading grower of snap beans, beets, broccoli, cabbage, carrots, cauliflower, collards, eggplant, mustard greens, sweet peppers, radishes, spinach, squash, tomatoes, and turnip greens.

One might speculate that the reason for this diverse cornucopia is Cook County farmers' proximity to direct market outlets such as farmers' markets and large roadside stands that serve urban and suburban Chicagoans. Other counties that are major vegetable producers include: McHenry County in cabbage, sweet corn, dry onion, and pea production, and Kane in peas.

Lake and McHenry are the major fruit producing counties in the SMSA, accounting for the bulk of the apples, grapes, pears, plums, pumpkins, raspberries, strawberries, and watermelons grown.

Although Cook, Lake, and McHenry lead the SMSA in vegetable and fruit production, most of Chicago's produce is imported from regions of the U.S.

Production/Consumption Ratios

Based on the production data compiled by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT), 18.5% of the beef consumed in
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Figure 1. Chicago SMSA
Chicago is produced in the SMSA, 10.5% of the pork, and insignificant amounts of mutton and lamb, chicken, and turkey. Approximately 16% of the eggs eaten in Chicago are produced in the SMSA (largely in Lake and Will Counties).  

If all the grain grown in the metro-area was used exclusively for human consumption, the SMSA would have produced enough corn in 1978 to feed over one hundred cities the size of Chicago for an entire year. Oat production that same year could have fed a population five times the size of Chicago. Wheat and rye production equaled 8.2% and 20.3% respectively, of Chicago's consumption. SMSA barley production was equivalent to 50% of projected consumption. In reality, the vast majority of grain produced in the SMSA is used for livestock feed and is most likely exported.

Although 8.2% of the wheat consumed in Chicago was produced in the immediate area, Chicagans probably ate very little of it. Due to the differences in the uses of the various classes of wheat, a large share of Illinois production is shipped out of the state while western wheat is shipped into Illinois. In 1977, over 60 percent of the wheat used in Illinois flour mills was imported. According to agriculturist Lowell Hill at the University of Illinois, the characteristics of the baking and milling industry are such that Illinois' import-export trade in wheat is not likely to change in the near future.

As one might expect, an insignificant amount of produce is grown in the SMSA when compared to the quantities consumed. A few vegetables proved to be exceptions to this rule. Based on 1978 vegetable acreage in the SMSA and standard Illinois yields, the metropo-area produced 171% of the cabbage consumed in Chicago, 84% of the sweet corn, 29% of the eggplant, 85% of the peas, 26% of the tomatoes, and over 50% of the pumpkins. Of these crops, cabbage, sweet corn, peas, pumpkins, and tomatoes are used for processing and are shipped to other areas in the U.S.

The majority of the produce grown in the SMSA is used in canning by Green Giant and Libby, McNeil and Libby, Campbell Soup, and Del Monte.

Although these data do begin to paint a picture of Chicago's food system, they must also be taken in stride. Because only partial data were available in some instances, more food may have been produced than actually shown. At the same time, the data compiled by CNT does not take into account any loss or waste during transport between producer and consumer.

Finally, it is somewhat unrealistic to talk about SMSA farm production in relation to Chicago alone. City residents consume an estimated 42% of the total food eaten in the six-county area. Since one out of every five Chicagans is deemed statistically hungry, Chicago may consume even less of its share of the SMSA diet. Despite these discrepancies, it is clear that a very diverse market basket is produced in the immediate area surrounding Chicago.

### Origin of Chicago's Food Basket

Tracking the movement of food into Chicago is not as easily accomplished as determining the kinds and quantities of food produced in the metropolitan area. Federal and state agricultural census surveys do not include the destination of farm commodities. As such no accurate data exist on the origin of most of the food consumed by Chicagans. However, general assumptions can be drawn based on production data from Illinois and its neighboring states, including Wisconsin, Iowa, Indiana, and Michigan.

Illinois produced 183.1% of the beef consumed in Chicago in 1981, 896% of the pork, and 142% of the lamb and mutton. Based on these figures and the fact that Iowa is a major livestock center, one can assume that a major share of the meat consumed in Chicago originates in the two-state area.

The SMSA produced a fraction of the eggs consumed in Chicago. Total Illinois egg production, which is concentrated in the northeastern and southwestern parts of the state, is equivalent to 150% of the city's consumption. Needless to say, the bulk of Illinois' eggs are not routed solely to Chicago. The local giant in poultry and therefore a major source for the Chicago market is Indiana. Iowa and marketing sectors.

Private corporations also affect the movement of food from producer to consumer. An example of such a company is Heinold Hog Markets, headquartered in Kants, Indiana. Heinold, a subsidiary of DeKalb AgResearch, handles 6% of all U.S. hogs from producer to packer. It operates 90 markets in the Midwest for producers and sells to packing houses through three sales offices in Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri.

Related corporations handle similar functions vis-a-vis cattle and other livestock at public stockyards in Kansas City, Omaha, and Sioux City, and the national stockyards in St. Louis. In Illinois, smaller market places are located in Joliet, Springfield, and Peoria. Despite the demise of the Chicago stockyards, the majority of Illinois' USDA certified meat packing plants are in the Chicago area.

The distribution of dairy products in the United States is determined by Federal Market Order Areas (FMOA). The Chicago FMOA includes two-thirds of Wisconsin and the northern part of Illinois.

### TABLE 1. Number of farms and farm acreage in Chicago SMSA, 1978.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>#FARMS</th>
<th>TOTAL FARM ACREAGE</th>
<th>%LAND IN FARMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>51,164</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuPage</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>44,908</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>250,469</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>95,265</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>269,121</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>364,072</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4,835</td>
<td>1,074,999</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illinois (see Figure 2). Almost twelve million milk consumers live in the FMOA, one-quarter of which represents the Chicago market share. Wisconsin produces 93% of the milk consumed with the remaining 7% produced in northern Illinois. Although enough milk was produced in the SMSA in 1978 to provide 40% of the fluid milk consumed in Chicago, part of that quantity was converted into other dairy products.

The South Water Market only provides fresh produce for smaller, independent retailers and for Chicago-area restaurants.

Wisconsin produces 93% of the milk consumed with the remaining 7% produced in northern Illinois. Although enough milk was produced in the SMSA in 1978 to provide 40% of the fluid milk consumed in Chicago, part of that quantity was converted into other dairy products.

The market share of five Midwestern states (Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota) at Water Street has also declined by 30% since 1972 from 17-2% of total unloads to 12%, turning the market into more of an interregional terminal.

As one might expect, most of the fresh produce sold at Water Market originates in the Pacific and Southeastern regions of the U.S. However, a significant amount (30% or more) of potato, cabbage, squash, beet, mushroom, cranberry, and blueberry unloads originated in the Midwest in 1980. Because this data only accounts for produce marketed on Water Street and does not include the large quantities of goods that pass directly through retail chain warehouses, the origin of all Chicago produce cannot be pinpointed. However, based on Illinois and Midwest production statistics, a reasonable assumption is that a large share of Chicago’s produce is grown outside of the Midwest.

The Chicago area may witness a reversal in the trend of decreasing local produce production if fuel prices continue to increase after the current oil glut. Between 1963 and 1975, the trucking industries share of inter-regional produce transport increased from 64% to 83% of the market marking a subsequent decrease in shipments by rail. Extreme or prolonged increases in gasoline prices would result in higher prices for imported produce. Such an economic


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Company(ies)</th>
<th>Crops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bevildere</td>
<td>Green Giant</td>
<td>Peas, sweet corn, freezing facilities for a number of items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Chicago</td>
<td>Campbell Soup</td>
<td>Mushrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson City</td>
<td>Stokely - Van Camp</td>
<td>Lima beans, sweet corn, peas, kidney beans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havana</td>
<td>Del Monte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicklaus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libby, McNeill &amp; Libby</td>
<td>Green beans, pumpkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoopeston</td>
<td>Stokely Van Camp</td>
<td>Lima beans, sweet corn, peas, kidney beans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joan of Arc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milford Canning</td>
<td>Asparagus, sweet corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>Libby, McNeill &amp; Libby</td>
<td>Lima beans, sweet corn, peas, kidney beans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Libby, McNeill &amp; Libby</td>
<td>Green beans, pumpkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeville</td>
<td>Joan of Arc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochelle</td>
<td>Del Monte</td>
<td>Lima beans, peas, pumpkin sweet corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb</td>
<td>Del Monte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendota</td>
<td>Del Monte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Island</td>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td>Tomatoes, cucumbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossville</td>
<td>Rossville Canning</td>
<td>Asparagus, sweet corn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chicagoans. Raw commodities consumed by provide a substantial portion of the food consumed by Chicagoans in one year is estimated.

Using 1980 population data for the City of Chicago and the last available U.S. per capita consumption data (1979), consumption of 52% for meat production; 5% would be fed to chickens for egg production, and the remaining 18% would be used as livestock feed for the dairy herd.

Land estimates are necessary to produce most of Chicago's food. A summary of the land estimates can be found in Table 3.

As of 1978, slightly more than one million acres were used for agriculture in the SMSA. The total farmland needed to produce the food consumed by Chicagoans in one year is approximately 920,000 acres. Based on this projection, the six-county metro-area could provide a substantial portion of the raw commodities consumed both directly and indirectly by Chicagoans.

Of the approximately 920,000 acres, 93% would be used for grain production with the remaining 7% being planted in fruit and vegetable crops. 25% of the grain crop would be used for human consumption not included for the production of cheese and ice cream. (Data was not available for the conversion of fluid milk to other dairy products.) The data included in Table 3 are based on crops and livestock that are indigenous to Illinois Agriculture. Citrus fruits, rice, and seafood are a few of the commodities that not produced in Illinois because of climatic constraints and therefore are not included in the land projections.

Based on the available data, the generous consumption projections and the partial land estimates, the six-county metro-area has the potential to produce a major portion of the food consumed in Chicago. Although the potential does exist, the food produced in the SMSA does not all end up in Chicago. Over 7.1 million people live and eat in the metroarea. Obviously, a large share of the farm commodities end up in the stomachs of Chicago suburbanites.

Most farmers are more concerned with the prices they receive for their goods than the final destination of those goods, particularly given the current depression in the farm economy.

Perhaps a more appropriate question to ask when examining the SMSA agricultural base is how large an area is required to feed all the people residing within that area and what changes must occur in the market place to encourage farmers to sell their commodities to local consumers, manufacturers, and wholesalers.

### Chicago SMSA Land Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMODITY GROUP</th>
<th>EST FARMLAND</th>
<th>1978 SMSA REQUIRED ACRES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meats</td>
<td>446,000</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>44,400</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>155,900</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grains</td>
<td>211,200</td>
<td>878,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>1,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Veg.</td>
<td>38,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processed Veg.</td>
<td>14,990</td>
<td>11,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>920,390</td>
<td>1,074,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perishability of produce is of paramount concern to processors.** Consequently, processing plants tend to be located in vegetable producing regions to decrease the distance between producer and manufacturer. As of 1977, the majority of vegetable canners in Illinois were located in the northeastern part of the state (see Table 2). Most likely, a large share of the canned produce consumed in Chicago originated in north-eastern Illinois.

In summary, with the exception of fresh vegetables, and fresh and processed fruits, most of Chicago's food including meat, dairy, poultry, and grains originates in the Midwest. By determining the average crop yields in northeastern Illinois and the feed requirements of livestock., the number of acres required to locally produce all the food consumed in Chicago can be estimated.

**The six-county metro-area could provide a substantial portion of the raw commodities consumed by Chicagoans.**

**Perishability of produce is of paramount concern to processors.** Consequently, processing plants tend to be located in vegetable producing regions to decrease the distance between producer and manufacturer. As of 1977, the majority of vegetable canners in Illinois were located in the northeastern part of the state (see Table 2). Most likely, a large share of the canned produce consumed in Chicago originated in north-eastern Illinois.

In summary, with the exception of fresh vegetables, and fresh and processed fruits, most of Chicago's food including meat, dairy, poultry, and grains originates in the Midwest. By determining the average crop yields in northeastern Illinois and the feed requirements of livestock., the number of acres required to locally produce all the food consumed in Chicago can be estimated.

**Perishability of produce is of paramount concern to processors.** Consequently, processing plants tend to be located in vegetable producing regions to decrease the distance between producer and manufacturer. As of 1977, the majority of vegetable canners in Illinois were located in the northeastern part of the state (see Table 2). Most likely, a large share of the canned produce consumed in Chicago originated in north-eastern Illinois.

In summary, with the exception of fresh vegetables, and fresh and processed fruits, most of Chicago's food including meat, dairy, poultry, and grains originates in the Midwest. By determining the average crop yields in northeastern Illinois and the feed requirements of livestock., the number of acres required to locally produce all the food consumed in Chicago can be estimated.

**Perishability of produce is of paramount concern to processors.** Consequently, processing plants tend to be located in vegetable producing regions to decrease the distance between producer and manufacturer. As of 1977, the majority of vegetable canners in Illinois were located in the northeastern part of the state (see Table 2). Most likely, a large share of the canned produce consumed in Chicago originated in north-eastern Illinois.
controlled by the top four firms. Canned specialties, cereals, flour, biscuits, crackers, cookies, sugar, chocolate, flavorings, vegetable oils, and coffee are among the commodities they handle. Wholesalers who handle meat and produce tend to be less concentrated than general grocery wholesalers. Dairy and grain trade are the highest concentrated branches of wholesale food trade.

Thirteen percent of the city's work force is employed by the food industry. Between 1967 and 1977, the number of firms and employees in Chicago's food manufacturing and retail sectors steadily declined, adding to the area's unemployment and shifting the source of Chicago's processed foods to more distant locales. The number of food manufacturing establishments decreased 19% during that period with a 22% drop in employees. Overall, Chicago lost 31% of all its manufacturing jobs and 13% of the firms. While the number of all retail food stores (specialty markets, produce stands, grocery stores, etc.) dropped 39% and the number of jobs decreased by 13%, full-line grocery stores reduced in number by 41% but increased in the number of employees by 8%, pointing to the increased concentration in retail sales among larger, full-line food stores. Data for Chicago wholesale firms is not available. Between 1963 and 1972, the number of wholesalers in Cook County declined by 25% but the number of jobs increased by 13%.

Overall, Chicago lost more food manufacturing plants and retail stores than did the total manufacturing and retail sectors. However, fewer jobs were lost in the food industry. In general, food companies have decreased in number but increased in size resulting in greater concentration of the market.

The third installment of The Food Files will discuss some of the implications of these shifts in the food marketing sector. We will take a closer look at consumer access questions at the retail level and at retailing alternatives such as food cooperatives. The special problems facing the hungry poor of our urban centers will also be reviewed.

A market that is highly concentrated in large corporations is less adaptable and resilient in times of economic, social or political stress and tends to be slower in responding to consumer needs and concerns.

The fourth and final installment will review the state of the art in urban food planning in other locales. In addition, we will examine some new suggestions urban residents could undertake to assure a continuing supply of quality, affordable food in the future.

For More Information

This second installment was condensed from a longer report authored by Paige Chapel. Copies of the full 30-page report, complete with footnotes and additional charts, are available for $2.00 from the Chicago Food System Research Project, Center for Neighborhood Technology, 570 W. Randolph, Chicago IL 60606. (372) 454-0126

Many thanks to Ken Anderson for his major research contributions for this article.
special report: The Food Files -- III

In the first two installments of The Food Files, we have taken a look at forces and trends affecting the urban breadbasket beginning with the farmer, continuing through the marketing sector and ending with an overview of metropolitan agriculture with an eye towards better planning in the food industry. While many in the industry consider Chicago's food system to be a model for the rest of the country, we have also learned that the system which serves so many so well does have gaps in its delivery system.

This third installment analyzes why some 20 percent of Chicago's population is not served well by our urban breadbasket. Paige Chapel's lead story reviews the problems of consumer access for inner-city communities that pertain not only to Chicago but to many other urban centers as well. Then we look at two programs established to deal with hunger (food stamps and pantries) and why both approaches have some shortcomings. Finally we have a quick look at food cooperatives for the elderly.

Let Them Eat . . . What They Can Get

by Paige Chapel

Hunger is an issue that most Americans associate with the swollen bellies of Biafran children. It is not the kind of social malaise we would expect to find in a city where America's amber waves of grain are bought and traded daily.

Yet hunger is a state of existence for a growing number of urban Americans. To understand the complex forces that affect access to food, we must look at who is hungry and how they are served by the food system.

Although Illinois is the agricultural exporting capital of the nation and Chicago is a major world center of the food industry, starvation in Chicago is increasing at an alarming rate. In 1979, an estimated 500,000 Chicagoans were--statistically hungry--that is, without food aid, they would have suffered from severe malnutrition. According to a more recent U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) estimate, the hunger count has grown to 650,000.

Chicago's Hunger Bill

Translated into everyday numbers, this means one out of every five Chicagoans is in need of food assistance. As unemployment and inflation continue to increase and government food programs are cut, bread lines and soup kitchens will become more common sights in U.S. cities. Until that time, hunger in the city will remain invisible to the public at large.

While not solving the problem of hunger, the food aid provided by federal, state, and local governments, as well as by private community groups masks the severity of the situation. In 1981, Chicagoans spent more than $310 million on direct food aid for the city's poor through the Food Stamp Program, Women, Infants, and Children Supplemental Food Program (WIC), the City's Emergency Family Food Program, and through private food pantries. When compared to the $3.2 billion Chicago consumers spent on food at home in 1981, the cost of alleviating hunger was equivalent to 10 percent of our food bill. And that's only the top of the grocery basket.

To get a more complete picture of the cost, the plethora of smaller public and private food programs would have to be included as well as the substantial cost of administering them. Yet the problem still remains. Despite the hundreds of millions of dollars spent on reducing starvation, one-fifth of Chicago's residents continue to suffer from inadequate diets.

The Menu

One reason often cited for hunger is that poor people don't know how to buy food or don't know enough about nutrition. But when the buying patterns of low-income consumers are compared to those of other shoppers, the two market baskets do not vary substantially. In reality, few Americans consume what the USDA deems a healthy, well-balanced diet.

It is wrong to assume that only the nation's poor do not know how to eat well. A case in point is junk food. While it is often asserted that low-income consumers squander their food dollars on junk food, several USDA studies have shown that they spend no more than other shoppers.

The only major difference between the low-income and the average American diet is in the consumption of meat. Based on data from the federal Food Stamp Program, low-income shoppers spent 35.2 percent of their food dollars on meat compared to 32.8 percent spent by consumers as a whole.

In general, poor families buy cheaper cuts of meat, fewer fresh fruits and vegetables (but more canned goods), and fewer dairy products than the majority of American families. If low-income people are starving it is not because they are inferior shoppers but because they eat basic, sub-standard American meals like the rest of us, only in smaller quantities.

The Budget

One factor that does affect the quality of the low-income diet is the inflexibility of the family budget and the instability of food prices. Food is one of the few basic necessities over which consumers have some financial control. For low-income shoppers, the money left after the big bills are paid (rent and utilities) must be stretched to cover the weekly grocery list. If food prices jump one week, they do without or with less of certain foods. Unlike most Americans, their diet often reflects the fluctuation in the cost of living at a gut level.

Another consequence of an inflexible food budget is the inability to take advantage of savings from bulk buying. Although purchasing food in quantity may be cheaper in the long
In response to a cry by low-income blacks that they were being overcharged by neighborhood grocery stores, a number of local organizations have conducted studies on food prices in different areas of Chicago. By comparing the prices of identical items at similar types of stores, they concluded that food prices did not vary significantly between neighborhoods based on race, income, or location. What these groups failed to examine was how much prices varied between different types of stores and how those stores were distributed throughout the city.

In 1980, the Chicago Urban League determined that where a consumer shops can significantly affect his/her grocery bill. The best values were found at smaller chain stores, which were slightly cheaper than the large chains, followed by independent food stores. As might be expected, convenience stores had the highest food prices.

The Market

The history of the retail food industry illustrates the significance of the Urban League's not-so-surprising findings. In the last twenty years, large supermarkets have replaced smaller neighborhood grocery stores by offering cheaper prices and better services to customers. That trend began to reverse in the aftermath of the 1968 riots. In 1970, 133 chain stores operated on Chicago's predominantly black South and West Sides. By 19811 only 56 stores remained.

As the large chains left the inner city for more profitable suburban and higher income areas, many neighborhoods were left without competitively priced supermarkets and in some instances, without food stores of any kind. The result: area residents must buy food at a few smaller, independent and higher priced stores that survived the original influx of the larger chains. In order to shop at stores with cheaper food prices, those with no means of private transportation must pay a premium for getting to and from distant supermarkets. The Urban League's 1980 report on food prices reflects the seriousness of the situation (see table). While 40 percent of Chicago's population is black, only 32 percent of all food stores are located in predominantly black neighborhoods. More importantly, blacks are served by less than one-fourth of the city's chain stores- those stores with lower prices and greater product variety. And the situation continues to worsen.

Conclusion

It is an absurd contradiction that in the midst of the nation's breadbasket there is a serious food crisis that is unrecognized by all except those who lack the capital and clout to change it. Although programs currently exist to deal with the situation, the solutions have tended to be piecemeal. New and vigorous political action is needed to address these issues.

Earlier this year, A & P, once a major chain in the area, closed thirty Chicago supermarkets, 14 of which were on the city's South and West Sides. To the majority of Americans, the lack of food stores may not present the urgency of a natural disaster or a war, but to the nation's poor, inadequate access to food is a reality that threatens their daily existence.
Item-Pricing Laws Pushed by Alliance

The National Alliance of Supermarket Shoppers has announced that it is spearheading the fight for state legislation requiring supermarkets to put individual price markings on their products.

Supermarkets all over the country are converting to computerized cash registers equipped with electronic scanners. At the present time, there are more than 5,000 supermarkets that have this equipment and industry sources estimate that by 1985 one-half of the supermarkets will be using these computerized checkout systems.

"The problem for consumers is not the equipment, but rather the supermarket operators who have installed the computers and also have removed individual item price markings," explained Barbara Spanton, NASS Deputy Director. "This has become possible because the scanner identifies the individual item from its Universal Product Code (UPC Symbol) and then the computer provides the price from its memory and sends it to the cash register. With individual price markings no longer necessary in order to ring up a consumer's purchases, many supermarket operators view the elimination of item pricing as a quick way to cut costs and increase profits.

Comparison Shopping Thwarted

"For supermarket shoppers who find that the supermarkets in their area are eliminating item prices, the consequences are grave," commented Spanton. "Their ability to effectively comparison-shop - between items in different aisles, between canned and fresh, between fresh and frozen - is substantially diminished. Their ability to recognize that the computer price rung up on the cash register may not be the same as the price on the shelf is substantially diminished. All of this adds up to consumers being placed in the position of 'shopping blind,' without the benefit of the pricing information they have a right to receive. For shoppers who have physical problems and can't stoop down to look at bottom shelf price signs or who can't see top shelf signs, the consequences are even more disastrous.

"The supermarkets that are eliminating item price markings are telling their customers that computers don't make mistakes," Spanton continued, "but NASS files hold an enormous number of letters from consumers testifying to the fact that computers are just as fallible as cashiers and, when they make a mistake the error is made again and again until someone catches the 'computer' error. At a time when consumers are increasingly interested in shopping effectively and saving money, we refuse to allow thoughtless supermarket operators to eliminate item pricing," stated Barbara Spanton. "To prevent this, we are working with local consumer groups and providing them with the information they need to get legislators interested in this issue. In addition, we are serving as a clearinghouse for item pricing information and we are publishing a newsletter that will be sent to every interested consumer organization."

For More Information

Individuals, legislators and consumer groups that are interested in the item pricing issue can obtain more information by writing to: Barbara Spanton, The National Alliance of Supermarket Shoppers, 591 Middle Neck Rd., Great Neck NY 10023, (516) 466-6970.

Guide Details Urban Food Marketing Alternatives


by Karin Rønnow

Problems of inner-city food marketing are serious but changeable. As a result of federal consumer food aid programs being cut, supermarket chains pulling out of the inner city, and development grants for urban businesses being dropped, high quality, affordable food in the city is becoming less and less accessible.

The Community Nutrition Institute’s guide to alternative marketing strategies functions as a guidebook to possible improvements in the food market on a community level. The goal of this "how-to" manual was to "bring together all of the pieces of information in a clear and concise manner for the purpose of instructing and informing community-based consumer organizations." It acts as a guide for community groups to finding an antidote (remedy) to urban food access problems.

The authors note that "without any doubt, the inner city presents a difficult and risky environment for food retailing." The guide provides ideas and alternatives to the reader, in each case presenting a case study and action checklist to further aid community groups in the implementation of similar actions. Resources are listed to guide groups to contacts that may be helpful.

The first step is saving what is already there. Ideas and ways that a community can save a floundering supermarket are identified, indicating that cooperation and discussion with store managers and/or the city officials can lead to a joint venture takeover that will save the supermarket from closing.

After a supermarket has left the neighborhood, a joint venture supermarket is one viable solution. "Together the community group and the supermarket firm (with the help of government agencies, private lenders and technical consultants) attack the planning, financing and operating problems which are unique to the inner city. The joint venture supermarket is a special solution to a unique set of problems." Here the guide points out the importance of a committed and well-organized neighborhood group. The neighborhood group plays a vital role in financing and control of the
neighborhood supermarket throughout the whole process.

Supermarkets consumer cooperatives, the idea of member control for member profit, are recognized as being the "largest and most sophisticated" form of food co-op. Another way to meet the food buying needs of a low-income population, co-ops have a unique set of problems that all participants must be aware of. Specifically, "the supermarket co-op must maintain a delicate balance between its dual role as a membership organization and a business enterprise."

Farmers look for a better profit and new markets for their goods, and consumers look for higher quality food that costs less; hence, the Farmer's Market. Such "direct farmer to consumer markets give both what they want by cutting out the in-between costs of food packing, shipping, handling, processing, wholesaling, distributing, advertising, and retailing." Farmer's Markets also aid in the localization of food production and distribution, an important factor in our increasingly vulnerable food system.

Other ideas are presented at the end, portraying comprehensive programs as well as highly innovative ideas such as computerized pre-order co-ops.

There are solutions. Marketing methods exist that can make access to higher quality, lower priced foods possible. One clear common point is emphasized throughout: that community group support and consistency is a vital factor in any of these endeavors.
VI. LINKING FOOD SYSTEM POLICY ISSUES TO OTHER COMMUNITY ISSUES [F-13]

In this section you will find materials on how food systems related to economic development, community development, and to the development of "healthy cities."

A. Food-related economic development. [F-13]

1. The importance of food in a local economy. One of the most systematic works here is one commissioned by the Philadelphia Food and Agriculture Taskforce. An abstract is included. The full reference is: Ross Koppel, *Agenda for Growth: The Impact of Food and Agriculture on the Economy of the Delaware Valley*, Philadelphia: Food and Agriculture Taskforce, 1988.

2. Micro-enterprises. Little systematic work has been done here. Perhaps the most useful overview is that done in a report by the Toronto Food Policy Council. The full reference is: Toronto Food Policy Council, "Stories of Micro Food Enterprises and Implications for Economic Development." Discussion Paper #5, October 1995.


For more information [current] on the National Civic League, see:
- Home page: www.ncl.org
- Publications list: www.ncl.org/publications/publications.html

C. Healthy Cities. The Healthy Cities and Communities Program was originated in Europe through the World Health Organization. Some of the many potential links between the healthy cities movement and local food systems work are seen in the short history of the Toronto Food Policy Council included in section IV.B.5. above.

For more information on the Healthy Cities Programs in the U.S., contact:

- WHO Collaborating Center in Healthy Cities
  IARCH
  1111 Middle Drive, NU 236
  Indianapolis, In 46202
  Phone: (317) 274-3319
  Fax: (317) 274-2285
  EMail: Citynet@indyvax.iupui.edu
EATING THROUGH THE REGIONAL ECONOMY: FOOD AND AGRICULTURE IN THE DELAWARE VALLEY'S LABOR FORCE, MARKETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the impact of the food and agricultural sectors on the economy, labor force and infrastructure demand of the Delaware Valley.

-- Employment in food, agricultural and horticultural work engages between twenty to twenty-five percent of the Delaware valley's workforce.

---

Percentage of the Workforce in Food, Horticulture & Agriculture, 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workforce Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food, Hort. &amp; Ag.</td>
<td>416,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Workforce</td>
<td>1,639,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workforce</td>
<td>2,056,256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight County Philadelphia PMSA
Table EPN 1 with Ag. Workers added

-- The estimated combined annual payroll of food, horticulture and agriculture in the Delaware Valley is 5.15 billion dollars, or 17% of the area's total annual payroll.

-- The combined estimated 1988 sales and value added for food, horticulture and agriculture in the retail, wholesale and manufacturing sectors totals 20.8 billion dollars, or 21.9% of the combined total retail, wholesale and manufacturing value added.
-- Estimated 1988 Delaware Valley retail food and restaurant sales will total approximately 11.1 billion dollars, or about 32% of all retail sales.

-- Estimated wholesale trade in food and related products will total approximately 7.6 billion dollars, or about 19% of all wholesale trade.

-- Estimated food and kindred products represent between 10.1% and 16% of regional manufacturing value added, or about 3.4 to 2.1 billion dollars.

Percent of Firms Engaged In
Food, Hort. Or Agr. Activity

Source: County Business Patterns

-- Some 13% of all firms in the region are involved in food, horticulture and agriculture.
-- 44% of all retail firms are in food, horticulture and agriculture.
Percentage of Workforce Sectors Engaged in Food or Horticulture Activity
(PI portion of Philadelphia PMSA, 1986)

Source: PA Dept. of Labor

-- Over 50% of all retail workers are involved with food, horticulture or agriculture.

Venture Capital Expenditures
Delaware Valley, 1983 - 1985

Source: Delaware Venture Group

-- Food-related enterprises are the third highest category of all venture capital expenditures, representing $7,825,000, or 17%, of expenditures for the period.
Travel Related Food Expenditures
Philadelphia

Source: PA Bur. of Mktg & Promotion, Travel Division

-- Food is the visitor's largest expense, accounting for 25.7% of all costs. Food costs are more than three times that of lodging, entertainment or shopping, and higher than either automobile or public transportation costs.

-- A growing proportion of the cargo handled by area ports is comprised of food, horticultural and agricultural products.

Food, Horticulture and Agriculture as a Percentage of Non-Fuel Imported Cargo, Philadelphia Port

Source: Philadelphia Port Corp Study

-- Food and agricultural products accounted for about 27% of non-fuel tonnage entering the Ports of Philadelphia in 1987.
Food and Horticultural Cargo as a Percentage of Cargo at Philadelphia International Airport

Source: Phila Intl Airport Marketing Dept.

-- Food and horticultural products comprise almost 8% of all airport cargo.

-- Transportation of food, agricultural and horticultural items is about 37% of all "non-personal" truck traffic.

Food, Horticulture and Agriculture and Delaware Valley Truck Transportation
(As a % of Non-Personal Truck Transportation)

Source: Derived from US Dept of Transportation Data

-- Food, agriculture and horticulture-related truck traffic equals about 4.4 million miles per day, or 6.9% of all daily vehicular traffic in the eight-county Delaware Valley.
-- About 57% of our trash stream is generated by food and horticultural activities.

-- More detailed analysis shows that about 8% of the waste stream is comprised of food, 33% is food packaging and food handling material, and 16% of the waste stream is yard waste.
The Philadelphia Food Distribution Center is a major food and agricultural hub for the region and beyond -- routinely serving areas as far away as upstate New York, Pittsburgh and Virginia.

Despite the suburban and urban character of the Philadelphia area, agriculture represents an important part of the region's social, economic and ecological life. There are about 5,200 farms in the metropolitan area selling over $400 million worth of agricultural products and paying almost $68 million to their workers.

The Fairmount Park Commission and the Philadelphia Recreation Department oversee about 10,000 acres of land within the City. In addition, the Penn State Urban Gardening Program encompasses over 500 urban gardens. "Philadelphia Green," a project of the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society, currently supports the largest comprehensive community gardening program in the nation-serving over 700 inner city groups and more than 1200 gardening projects.

The Philadelphia Flower Show, a world famous horticultural event, must be counted among the major attractions of the area. It attracts almost a quarter of a million visitors each year and generates over $22 million in horticultural sales.

In 1987 approximately $16.8 million worth of food was distributed via emergency food centers, soup kitchens and shelters. A network of public and private organizations provide that food to the homeless, poor and hungry in the Philadelphia area.

The annual dollar value of the Philadelphia public school district’s child nutrition programs is $44.4 million. The Philadelphia Archdiocese serves $3.0 million worth of food.

In addition, there are about 36,000 participants in the WIC (Women, Infants and Children) nutrition program in Philadelphia. They receive almost $14 million each year.

In the five Southeastern Pennsylvania counties the combined contribution of Food Stamps to the local economy is $207.4 million, or 38.4% of the total food stamp program in Pennsylvania.

There are a wide variety of secondary and post secondary educational programs in the Delaware Valley addressing food, agriculture, and horticulture.

About a fifth of all vocational education programs in the Pennsylvania Commonwealth are directly targeted at food, horticulture and agriculture. If we consider programs that are somewhat involved in these areas (e.g., refrigeration mechanics) the percentage of programs “addressing” food, horticulture and agriculture almost triples.

In addition, the Philadelphia City School system offers many programs that train students exclusively for food, horticultural and agricultural occupations.

Demand for workers for several food and horticultural jobs is expected to grow in the next several years. Moreover, many of these jobs are entry level and provide opportunities to those without extensive credentials and experience.
This is a work in progress. The Toronto Food Policy Council is interested in discussing the issues and strategies presented here as part of its on-going efforts to improve the food and agriculture system in Canada, and to help create food security. Please forward any comments, an requests for additional copies, to the Toronto Food Policy Council, 277 Victoria St., Room 203, Toronto, ON M5B 1W1 This report was researched and coauthored by Annette Verhagen and Ruth Knight.
Stories of Micro Food Enterprises

Other Toronto Food Policy Council Discussion Papers in this series

1. Reducing urban hunger in Ontario: policy responses to support the transition from food charity to local food security

In this discussion paper we present an evolutionary series of policy initiatives designed to reduce the need for food banks. These initiatives recognize both the government's fiscal dilemmas and the responsibility of many sectors of society for both the current problem and the potential solutions.

Date: November 1994, 35pp

2. Health, wealth and the environment. the impacts of the CUSTA, GATT and NAFTA on Canadian food security.

Little attention has been given to the effect of trade arrangements (CUSTA, NAFTA, GATT) on Canadian food security issues, particularly for large urban areas such as Metro Toronto. Food security exists when all citizens have access to an appropriate, affordable and nourishing diet. New trade arrangements must be put in place that respect the foundation principles of food security: equitable wealth generation, environmental sustainability and the health of communities.

Date: August 94, 27pp

3. If the Health Care System Believed You are What You Eat: strategies to integrate our food and health systems.

Our health care system does not recognize the extent to which hunger and poor food choices create problems and increase acute health care expenditures. We propose strategies to integrate our food and health systems so that health care costs are reduced in the long-term and population health improves.

Available Late 1995

4. Setting a new direction: changing the agricultural policy making process

Many current problems in agriculture are a result of a flawed public policy system. We provide some examples of those flaws and propose changes to the agricultural policy making system.

Date: May, 1995, 40pp
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Stories of Micro Food Enterprises

Executive Summary

The agricultural economy of Ontario is changing. Large-scale industrial agriculture has had its success, but at a cost. The province has lost a significant amount of processing capacity in the last few decades, particularly in fruits and vegetables and beef. Farm prices for many raw commodities have been at historically low levels, and net farm income poor. As part of a program of farm supports, governments have been encouraging farmers to both diversify their operations and explore value added opportunities. The success, however, of such efforts is not yet evident.

There is a growing market for food of higher quality. Following years of accepting the standardization and industrialization of food, consumers are increasingly demanding of producers, processors, and distributors foods with more taste, greater variety and more nutritional value. Associated with this is a growing market for products of local farmers and a greater desire to buy foods from the region where people live. Increasingly, consumers are associating higher quality with a reduced distance between producer and consumer. As well, the rapidly changing ethno-racial mix of the Ontario population has created demands for new foods processed in different ways.

New approaches, falling under the rubric of Community Economic Development (CED), are emerging, driven in part by the failure of global competitiveness strategy and mass production systems to meet local needs. Within this framework lie new micro food enterprises, usually operating with less than $250,000 in sales.

From the 14 case studies presented here emerge many common themes:

- entrepreneurs find health regulations confusing, expensive and often irrelevant to their scale of operation
- marketing is frequently difficult and time confusing, as market channels for products that focus on locale and quality do not conform with dominant marketing approaches in the food system
- financing is always difficult and many entrepreneurs rely on family members and other forms of private financing
- equipment is not generally a problem because industrial overcapacity has created a significant used equipment market; modifications are, however, usually required
- entrepreneurs are frequently interested in collaborative and cooperative efforts, as these can increase volumes (frequently required by the dominant system), simplify distribution and reduce capital costs.

Some existing Ontario government programs are helpful, but many target larger scale operations. To encourage the development of this sector, we recommend enhanced government activity in financing, training, marketing and review of supply management and food safety regulations.
Stories of Micro Food Enterprises

Foreword

Why is the Toronto Food Policy Council (TFPC) distributing a series of discussion papers on food policy matters?

This Working Paper is written with the purpose of engaging the larger community in the debates around food policy issues. In fact, there are few policies in Canada which clearly bear the label of "food policy". There are, however, several policies which bear upon the food system in Canada, and the health and food security of Toronto residents, visitors, and workers. It is this range of policies which form our interests, and around which we frequently engage in debate.

TFPC members are drawn from several different sectors as well as political orientations. While we can readily agree on shared goals such as alleviating hunger, protecting our economic and environmental base, and valuing our communities and citizenry, we often differ on what we see as the problems and solutions. It is usually only after lengthy reflection and debate that a policy position emerges and strategies for implementation become clear.

Our discussion papers are designed to bring forward the less easily available data on the issues we struggle with. Historical information is often cited so that we can understand intentions and processes of change in the past. We frequently propose long-term solutions that some find difficult to imagine, but we believe strongly that a vision of a better society must be supported with the means for its attainment.

For us the questions of food policy, or policy related to food security, tug at both our minds and our heart. It is in the spirit of broadening the debate and listening to more voices that we are sharing these discussion papers.
This section includes graphics that Ken Dahlberg developed for various audiences. These were combined in a poster session given at the International Healthy Cities Conference, 1993. Most of the graphics have a separate file because of the memory required for each. Also, see the graphic at the end of section V.C.1. [F-11]

A. The graphic, ‘What are Food Systems,’ along with the text of the poster session in which it was used, “Local and Regional Food Systems: A Key to Healthy Cities” given at the International Healthy Cities Conference, San Francisco, December 1993. [F-14]

B. Other graphics used in the poster session that look at different level food systems.

1. Household Food Systems [F- 15 ]
2. Neighborhood Food Systems [F- 16 ]
3. Municipal Food Systems [F- 17 ]
4. Regional Food Systems [F- 18]
LOCAL AND REGIONAL FOOD SYSTEMS: A KEY TO HEALTHY CITIES

Kenneth A. Dahlberg, Dept. of Political Science
Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008

WHAT ARE LOCAL FOOD SYSTEMS?
WHAT DO THEY LOOK LIKE AT EACH LEVEL?

Household Food Systems [See graphic in F-16 ]

Neighborhood Food Systems [See graphic in F-17 ]

Municipal Food Systems [See graphic in F-18 ]

Regional Food Systems [See graphic in F-19 ]

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO MAKE THEM MORE SUSTAINABLE AND JUST?

-To provide food security for all local residents;

-To provide access to a variety of safe and nutritious food to all local residents;

-To provide local employment for farmers and food workers (typically 20%+ of a local economy);

-To provide a cushion of self-reliance against:
  -transport strikes;
  -major storms and disasters;
  -rising food prices from oligopolies;
  -rising fossil fuel prices and their multiplier effects.

-To create a biologically and culturally richer and healthier environment for ourselves and our grandchildren;

-To move from emergency hunger and feeding programs to hunger prevention programs.

HOW DO THEY FIT INTO HEALTHY CITIES?

-Both are based on the same goals of seeking to create more regenerative, sustainable, and just systems and societies.

-The cleaner air, water and soil systems needed for sustainable food systems benefit all populations, human and non-human.

-Healthier, safer, and nutritious food improves public health.
Greater knowledge of local foods and how they are produced safely is an important building block for better nutrition and diets.

Greater local self-reliance in food encourages local empowerment, equity and less stress.

Strengthening local food systems complements and enhances efforts to provide more green space in cities and to enhance rural landscapes.

HOW DO WE CREATE HEALTHIER LOCAL AND REGIONAL FOOD SYSTEMS?

- Grow more of our own food.
- Buy local food from farmers markets and u-picks.
- Encourage grocers, schools, and restaurants to use more local food.
- Support neighborhood programs for:
  - community gardens;
  - food pantries and soup kitchens;
  - community canning and nutrition programs;
  - community composting and recycling;
- Create or support city programs that promote:
  - farmers markets;
  - neighborhood empowerment and development;
  - farmland preservation;
  - local food processing;
  - local grocers, cafes, and restaurants.

*Consider Creating a FOOD POLICY COUNCIL to encourage and coordinate such efforts.

WHAT IS A FOOD POLICY COUNCIL?

It is a neighborhood, city, or county group that seeks to improve the local food system by:

- Coordinating and/or networking actions,
- Making policy recommendations,
- Organizing.
-Testifying and/or lobbying,

-Conducting or sponsoring policy research, and

-Doing many other creative things.

WHAT TYPES OF ISSUES DO THEY ADDRESS?

**Production**: promoting household & community gardens; seeking to preserve local farmers and farmland.

**Processing**: encouraging local food processors.

**Distribution**: promoting full use of available government programs (school breakfasts; food stamps; WIC, etc.);

- Coordinating emergency feeding systems (food pantries; soup kitchens, food banks, etc.);

- Ensuring availability of inner city supermarkets.

- Encouraging local farmers markets and promoting local produce.

**Use**: promoting healthy and nutritious meal preparation and the preservation of foods.

**Recycling and composting**: encouraging this throughout all phases of the food system.

**Waste disposal**: use creative approaches to minimize the wastes generated in each stage of the food system.
WHAT ARE SOME EXAMPLES?

Knoxville, Tennessee
St. Paul, Minnesota
Onondaga County, New York
Hartford, Connecticut
Toronto, Ontario
VII. FOOD SYSTEMS GRAPHICS [F-14 - F-18]
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A. The graphic, ‘What are Food Systems,’ along with the text of the poster session in which it was used, “Local and Regional Food Systems: A Key to Healthy Cities” given at the International Healthy Cities Conference, San Francisco, December 1993. [F-14]

B. Other graphics used in the poster session that look at different level food systems.

1. Household Food Systems [F-15]
2. Neighborhood Food Systems [F-16]
3. Municipal Food Systems [F-17]
4. Regional Food Systems [F-18]
HOUSEHOLD FOOD SYSTEMS

SUB-SYSTEMS:

Natural:  Energy, mineral, and nutrient flows
          Health of air, water, and soil systems
          Disease and pest problems

Social:  Economic - formal/informal; jobs/work; prices; values
          Political - ordinances - zoning; clean yard
          - health regulations - animals; gray water
          - practices - code enforcement
          - values

Socio-Cultural - gender and family roles
          - attitudes towards waste and garbage
          - food values and preferences
          - media advertising

Technical:  Tools and appliances ; skills and techniques (gardening, composting, cooking, canning, etc.)
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A. The graphic, ‘What are Food Systems,’ along with the text of the poster session in which it was used, “Local and Regional Food Systems: A Key to Healthy Cities” given at the International Healthy Cities Conference, San Francisco, December 1993. [F-14 ]

B. Other graphics used in the poster session that look at different level food systems.

1. Household Food Systems [F- 15 ]
2. Neighborhood Food Systems [F- 16 ]
3. Municipal Food Systems [F- 17 ]
4. Regional Food Systems [F- 18]
NEIGHBORHOOD FOOD SYSTEMS

SUB-SYSTEMS:

Natural: Health of air, water, and soil systems (pollution; streams; sewers; run off; lead deposition) Disease and pest problems

Social: Economic - jobs; barter systems; values
Political - ordinances - community gardens; zoning
- practices - code enforcement
- ward/precinct politics; values
- existence/power of neighborhood associations

Socio - Cultural - ethnic/religious homogeneity
- schools; values

Technical: Tools and machines; skills and techniques organizing and running programs
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3. Municipal Food Systems [F- 17 ]
4. Regional Food Systems [F- 18]
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VII. FOOD SYSTEMS GRAPHICS [F-14 - F-18]

This section includes graphics that Ken Dahlberg developed for various audiences. These were combined in a poster session given at the International Healthy Cities Conference, 1993. Most of the graphics have a separate file because of the memory required for each. Also, see the graphic at the end of section V.C.1. [F-11]
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