

FOOD ACTION PLAN SYNTHESIS

Prepared for Slow Money Northwest

by Haley Millet

24 February 2015

INTRODUCTION

The Pacific Northwest is a leader in food systems development with agendas that are innovative and rapidly evolving. As separate actors in the region generate plans and policies, it is important to view these efforts as connected and mutually affective. To gain a snapshot of what is moving in the area, this report analyzes the following documents for themes, trends, and distinctions:

- City of Seattle Food Action Plan
- King County Executive's Top 20 Action Items for 2015-2017
- Washington Food Systems Roundtable Food Action Plan
- Multnomah County Food Action Plan
- Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Food Action Plan
- Luma Consulting Report Landscape Scan of Food Systems, for investors
- Whatcom Food Network Community Food Assessment
- Clark County Food System Council Policy Roadmap
- Snohomish County Sustainable Lands Strategy Report

In addition to the above list, several other regional actors are in the process of developing food action plans including the Kitsap Food Policy Council, Spokane Food Policy Council, and the Community Farm Connection (CFC) out of north central Washington. These actors and their goals thus far were analyzed based on website content rather than a published document.¹

The documents were analyzed based largely on text related to goals, actions, and indicators. They range in format and detail, from fully formed food action plans to succinct bulleted lists to narrative research reports. The Snohomish County Sustainable Lands Strategy Report is particularly unique because it focuses exclusively on land management, but has implications for the food system nonetheless. The actors represent a full spectrum of stages in food action plan development. For instance, Clark County may have the gateway goal to “Develop/define a vision for urban agriculture in Clark County” while the City of Seattle fine-tunes the city property database to “develop additional site criteria to more readily identify vacant or underused parcels suitable for urban agriculture”. Together, they present the diverse yet cohesive picture of food system trends in the Pacific Northwest.

THEMES: FOOD SOVEREIGNTY AND COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Throughout these plans run the overarching themes of food sovereignty and community participation. First, rather than food security the plans carry themes of food sovereignty and equity. Food security alone implies an environment where “all people at all times have access to sufficient, safe, nutritious

¹ Links to documents and content analyzed for this report are included in Appendix 1.

food to maintain a healthy and active life.”² Food sovereignty extends the definition to include critical lenses like cultural appropriateness, local sourcing, sustainability, and social equity among others. These buzzwords appear in one form or another in nearly all of the reports.

Generally, the plans seek to cultivate a food system which is both local and equitable: to *concentrate* production and sourcing for increased regional sustainability and self-sufficiency, and to *expand* access to food for all peoples (especially youth, low income, and minority groups).

A second, more varied theme is the question of community participation in these food system changes. While each plan mentions some community involvement, the extent and nature of that participation varies; implications of this will be discussed in the conclusion. Examples of the spectrum include:

- The Multnomah report presents itself as a “framework to guide collaboration and stakeholder efforts,” spotlighting existing community projects and providing a list of “Food Citizen Actions” pertaining to each category of actions. This gives individuals and communities a direct conduit for participation in meeting County goals.
- King County Executive’s Top 20 Action Items for 2015-2017 focus on government actions, but these actions are informed through “build[ing] on conversations with diverse stakeholders and communities” and “conven[ing] partners to better understand how poverty, inequities, and other costs lead to food insecurity.”
- The Luma report calls for investors in the community to form a “collective impact network” and establish an agenda based on regional plans in order to coordinate investment efforts.
- The Whatcom Food Network includes an overarching goal of “Collaboration and Participation” with indicators that include, for example, the number of Whatcom Food Network members.

KEY ACTIONS

The plans call for a variety of actions to build a more sustainable and equitable local food system. This report does not cover every single action in the plans, but focuses on main trends and categories. Upon analysis, nine key actions emerge:

- Preserve and improve rural farmland
- Support new and small-scale farmers
- Increase urban agriculture
- Improve regional food infrastructure
- Increase institutional procurement of local foods
- Increase access to fresh, healthy foods
- Encourage a culture which values local food
- Prevent food waste
- Aggregate funds to support regional common agendas

KEY ACTION
Strategy Trend
• Example / Indicator

² FAO (1996) Rome Declaration on World Food Security. United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. Retrieved from <http://www.fao.org/docrep/003/w3613e/w3613e00.HTM>

In this section, each key action is presented with a discussion of strategy trends for execution and specific examples (see legend above). A summary of the plans and the key actions they propose is presented by the spreadsheet in Appendix 2. Clarification of how synonyms and proxies are categorized into these broader key action categories is available in Appendix 3. It is important to note that these actions are not taken on in isolation from one another; rather, they overlap and complement in their efforts.

PRESERVE AND IMPROVE RURAL FARMLAND

Use zoning, taxation, and other leverage to protect existing rural farmland.

- **Example: City of Seattle**

“Continue to support Seattle’s role in conserving regional agricultural land through transferring development rights from farmland to urban areas.” This occurs through the Landscape Conservation and Local Infrastructure Program (LCLIP), in which urban developers buy development rights of agricultural land to gain urban zoning approvals.

- Indicator(s): Acres of land preserved through LCLIP

Improve access to water and other infrastructure.

- **Example 1: King County Executive Top 20 Action Items for 2015-2017**

“Address barriers to food production,” specifically water access: “Create a water management association such as a Watershed Improvement District in all agricultural production areas”

- Indicator(s): Net new acres of food. The goal is to “Add 400 net new acres of food production per year in King County (2% per year) for the next 10 years.”

- **Example 2: Whatcom County**

- “Coordinated water system plan - As tribes assess the quantity needed for their fisheries and overall ecosystem and establish their rights, Whatcom County will have a fuller picture of water availability. There will be an opportunity to attempt a coordinated water system plan.”

- “Unified water district for Whatcom County - The irrigation districts are working on creating one unified Water District for Whatcom County, to put more logic and energy into water issues and make planning more cohesive.”

- Indicator(s): Birch Bay and Drayton Harbor Commercial Shellfish Acreage Classifications (Approved, Conditional, and Prohibited)

Improve environmental management techniques.

- **Example 1: Washington Food Systems Roundtable**

“Goal 10: Our agricultural practices protect and improve the planet's health for future generations”

- Indicator(s): (1) Percent of farmland enrolled in conservation program (and/or funds associated with

them. (2) Tons of topsoil lost per year due to erosion. (3) Total water usage (acre-feet) in agriculture.

- **Example 2: Snohomish County Sustainable Land Strategy**

Takes an integrated approach to land and water management; presents Net Gain Actions targeted to benefit both agriculture *and* salmon recovery. For instance, “Hydrology: develop watershed-based hydrologic management plans, including sediment management, forest cover, duff, etc.”

- Indicator(s): None

SUPPORT NEW AND SMALL-SCALE FARMERS

Reduce barriers to production. This includes land, certification, finances, equipment, inputs, and market access. Accomplish this through creating and/or supporting comprehensive technical assistance, incubator programs, cooperatives, mentorship/training, and third-party certification.

- **Example 1: King County Executive Top 20 Action Items for 2015-2017**

“One-stop agricultural technical assistance and economic development shop that would:

- “Assist with Production”: Access to land, equipment incubator programs, regulations, etc.
- “Assist with Marketing”: technical assistance, direct market connections, “Buy Local” promotions, sales facilitation, market intelligence, retail-readiness, value addition, etc.
- “Provide Market Services”: Food safety regulations, organic certification, tradeshow assistance, infrastructure (storage, processing, etc.)

- Indicator(s): Number of new farms per year, with the goal of 25 new farmers per year

- **Example 2: Snohomish County Sustainable Land Strategy**

“Farm Project Approvals: Obtain programmatic or streamlined approvals for farming activities that meet SLS guidance, best practice, and conservation plan”

- Indicator(s): None

- **Example 3: Multnomah County**

“Goal 12.3: Support business practices that promote opportunity. Support third-party certified products of businesses that promote opportunity and justice for farmers and food system workers (e.g. Fair Trade Food Alliance, Fair for Life certifications)”

- Indicator(s): Average wage paid to farm laborers, with the goal of a 10% increase by 2025

Support and stabilize farmers markets

- **Example 1: Kitsap Food Policy Council**

“Distribution/Marketing: Farm stands/markets/food hubs would become viable and vibrant community gathering places to buy local foods.”

- Indicator(s): None

- **Example 2: Luma report**

- “Identify allowable locations for farmers markets to operate and consider permitting markets to operate on city-owned property”

- “Streamline permitting fees and remove barriers to establishing and maintaining a farmers market.”
- “Define farmers markets”
- Indicator(s): None

INCREASE URBAN AGRICULTURE

Identify and increase use of underutilized or vacant land for food production

- **Example 1: City of Seattle**
“Prioritize food production as a use of land... Working within the City’s property database, develop additional site criteria to more readily identify vacant or underused parcels suitable for urban agriculture”
- Indicator(s): Acres of city-owned land used in food production
- **Example 2: Luma report**
“Define and clarify urban agricultural land uses and activities in city codes and develop implementation strategies to increase urban agriculture.”
- Indicator(s): None

Support community efforts to increase urban agriculture

- **Example 1: Multnomah County**
“Goal 3.3: Fund opportunities for urban food production. Develop funding opportunities for urban food production (e.g. urban farm hub, neighborhood demonstration centers, community gardens, OSU Extension programming) such as a bond measure, service district, or capital campaign.”
- Indicator(s): Number of municipally-operated community garden plots per capita, with the goal of a 20% increase by 2025.
- **Example 2: Clark County**
“Advocate for comprehensive and sustainable urban agriculture initiative that effectively addresses protection and recognition of urban agriculture as a viable land use and important component of neighborhood sustainability”
- Indicator(s): None

IMPROVE REGIONAL FOOD INFRASTRUCTURE

Assess existing regional food storage, processing, and distribution resources. Identify needs and fill in gaps.

- **Example 1: Spokane Food Policy Council**
“Current Work: Food System Study – Inventorying our agricultural resources, distribution infrastructure, regional economy, and the players acting within the regional food shed.”
- Indicator(s): None

- **Example: Puget Sound Regional Council**

“Assess and develop strategy to improve number, access to, and viability of local food processing centers. Collaborate with economic development organizations to develop more regional food centers for aggregation, distribution, processing, sales (e.g., food hubs)”

- Indicator(s): None

Increase regional coordination and connect small and mid-size farmers to the system

- **Example 1: Luma report**

“Increase access to new markets and distribution mechanisms for farmers by building scale-appropriate ways for small farmers to access bigger wholesale markets.”

- Indicator(s): None

- **Example 2: City of Seattle**

“Explore the need for local and regional food-processing facilities, cold storage, and other food-related infrastructure. Increased coordination and aggregation of local produce from small and mid-size farms is a key element in expanding markets for these businesses and increasing the number of venues selling local food. Coordinate with partners in exploring opportunities to work together to meet these needs.”

- Indicator(s): None

INCREASE INSTITUTIONAL PROCUREMENT OF LOCAL FOODS

Integrate institutional procurement into policies for public and private actors (governments, businesses, restaurants, schools).

- **Example 1: Puget Sound Regional Council**

“Convene local experts and actors in healthy local food procurement policy. Pursue a Good Food Purchasing Pledge for government institutions and major private sector purchasers, or add value to ongoing purchase policy work”

- Indicator(s): None

- **Example 2: Multnomah County**

“Goal 15.4: Develop a regional alliance of institutional purchasers that implements a set of purchasing goals and guidelines, metrics as a basis of comparison between sustainably and unsustainably produced food, model purchasing language, and incentives that promotes the purchase of regional food and drives the market to develop more supply”

- Indicator(s): Number of school districts with Farm-to-School programs, with a goal of implementing the programs in all 8 districts by 2025.

- **Example 3: Clark County**

- “Assist convenience store owners to leverage purchasing power to get fresh produce and set up a distribution method.”
- “Support tax abatements to stores carrying a certain amount of healthy goods.”

- Indicator(s): None

Increase direct farmer-to-institution relationships

- **Example: King County Top 20 Action Items for 2015-2017**
“Increase awareness and knowledge of sourcing locally: Increase farmer-to-institution connections and explore and support creation of new markets in the institution sector.”
- Indicator(s): “i.e. 20% of all healthy food procurement should be local.”

INCREASE ACCESS TO FRESH, HEALTHY FOODS

Focus on youth, low-income, and “priority” populations

- **Example 1: Washington Food Systems Roundtable**
“The next generation is the healthiest ever”
- Indicator(s): (1) Percent of children ages 2-4 with a healthy weight. (2) Percent of 10th graders with a healthy weight. (3) Percent of infants who breastfeed for at least six months.
- **Example 2: Puget Sound Regional Council**
“Assess and advocate for all farmers markets in every city to accept WIC and EBT. Advocate to establish regional “Fresh Bucks” Program. Convene relevant parties”
- Indicator(s): None

Improve geographic proximity to sources of healthy food

- **Example: City of Seattle**
 - “Promote the location of healthy food access points, such as grocery stores, healthy food retail, farmers markets, food gardens, and farms, within walking or bicycling distance from homes, work places, and other gathering places.”
 - “As criteria in evaluating transportation projects, include safe and convenient pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connections between residential neighborhoods and community gardens, food banks, grocery stores, and farmers markets.”
- Indicator(s): Percent of Seattle residents within one-quarter mile of a healthy food access point

Innovate and experiment

- **Example 1: King County**
“Develop or support development of food innovation districts or food terminal. Identify funding sources for business plans and feasibility assessments, assist in recruitment of ‘anchor’ tenants, explore potential incentives for streamlining development)”
- Indicator(s): Demand (\$) for locally-produced food, with the goal of doubling demand from \$93 million to \$186 million in 10 years.
- **Example 2: Community Farm Connection**
CFC recently merged with Education Agriculture Together of Wenatchee to serve north central Washington including Chelan and Douglas counties. Through AmeriCorps*VISTA the organization

has started a Community Harvest gleaning project that connects those experiencing hunger in the community direct with fresh produce from local farmers.

ENCOURAGE A CULTURE WHICH VALUES LOCAL FOOD

Focus on youth and education

- **Example 1: City of Seattle**
“Promote healthy food, especially in low-income communities and with youth, through education and collaborative efforts”
- Indicator(s): Value of local food sold at Seattle farmers markets or other direct-to-consumer activities
- **Example 2: Whatcom Food Network**
 - “Whatcom Farm to School (F2S) & Whatcom County School Districts – Whatcom F2S and all Whatcom County school districts are working together with many other organizations to increase the amount of local food served in schools and to educate the next generation about the value of local food.”
 - “Bellingham School District Central Kitchen – With the passage of the Bellingham School District Bond in 2013, there is an opportunity to build a central kitchen with increased capacity for cooking with fresh local foods. The kitchen will serve the district, and potentially other institutional buyers.”

Focus on consumer choice and ethics

- **Example: Luma Report**
“Shift goals and metrics that drive the regional food system by empowering individuals to make food purchasing choices that are good for their bodies, the planet, and farmers – rather than just purchasing on price and convenience – and measuring shared metrics towards this end.”
- Indicator(s): None

Promote local foods as part of community identity

- **Example: Multnomah County**
“Goal 14.1: Promote Oregon and the Portland metro region’s reputation as being at the forefront of the local and sustainable food movement”
- Indicator(s): Total farm sales in region (\$), with the goal of a 20% increase by 2025.
- **Example 2: Kitsap County**
“Promotion: Help Kitsap residents understand, maintain and enhance features that support the entire local food system.”
- Indicator(s): none

PREVENT FOOD WASTE

Work with institutions

- **Example 1: King County Top 20 Action Items for 2015-2017**
“Develop a sustainable and local sourcing toolkit for restaurants, grocery stores, and institutions that will include: Farm-to-Table 101, Buy Local promotion materials, Lean Kitchen information, and expand prepared food rescue and gleaning programs.” The Lean Kitchen program gives restaurants tools for minimizing food waste.
- Indicator(s): amount of food wasted, with the goal of decreasing by 25% in 10 years
- **Example 2: Whatcom Food Network**
“Towards Zero Waste - Sustainable Connections and SSC [Sanitary Services Corporation] are working together toward zero waste in Whatcom County, business by business.” This program provides technical assistance and promotional materials for businesses who commit to reduce waste by 50%.
- Indicator(s): Compostable waste collected by Sanitary Services Corporation Food Plus Program

Connect food surplus with food need

- **Example: Multnomah County**
“Goal 8.3: Connect surplus food with need by expanding food bank donation channels, connecting gleaning programs to interested communities, and expanding what food banks can accept to meet the needs of the community”
- Indicator(s): SNAP participation rate, with a decrease to 5% by 2025.

Increase composting – residential and beyond

- **Example 1: City of Seattle**
 - “Explore the benefits of collecting garbage every other week, and yard/food waste weekly.
 - Establish food waste recycling or composting at municipal facilities.
 - Continue to promote backyard composting.”
- Indicator(s): Percent of Seattle’s food waste diverted for composting or recycling
- **Example 2: Clark County**
“Advocate for and support increasing compost availability at public events.”
- Indicator(s): None

AGGREGATE FUNDS TO SUPPORT REGIONAL COMMON AGENDAS

Work through investment

- **Example: Luma Report**

“Investors should consider the momentum and collective energy put into these efforts and decide if there are shared interests for addressing food system issues. We recommend, particularly, investigating whether or not the Washington Food System Roundtable can become the beginning of a statewide collective impact network... Investors should become a collective impact network and use the vision to inform a common agenda.”

- Indicator(s): None

Work through grants

- **Example: PSRC** “Search for grant funding”

- Indicator(s): None

DISTINCTIONS: DIRECTIVE, SUPPORTIVE, COORDINATIVE APPROACH

From the examples given, it is clear that the purpose and audience of each report is obviously and closely linked to its plan. It is important to acknowledge the role that each plan or actor assumes in order to best understand their goals. These actors seem to present themselves in directive, supportive, and/or coordinative roles.

To begin, the city and county policy plans take a directive role by producing their own goals with clear indicators and often timelines as well. On the other hand, the Luma and PSRC reports take a more supportive role -- they reference numerous other plans throughout their texts and seek to come alongside those plans. For example, the Luma report calls for investors to form a collective impact network in order to coordinate investments based on regional agendas, using the Washington Food Systems Roundtable as a starting point. PSRC calls for the revision and generation of policy blueprints to assist government agencies in achieving their goals. Finally, organizations like Community Food Connection and Kitsap Food Policy Council articulate their coordinative role, creating connections and providing information for existing relevant actors in the field. These three roles are not static or mutually exclusive by any means. The Washington Food Systems Roundtable and Whatcom Food Network may play a coordinative role by connecting actors from different regions, but they also play a directive role with their own goals and specific indicators. Roles will likely morph over time as well: the Clark County Food Systems Council seems to play a supportive role as most actions call to “advocate” or “encourage” policies in other sectors that will influence the food system. As momentum builds, they may find themselves in more of a directive role by generating policies and indicators of their own.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The documents and action plans analyzed in this report are unique from one another in approach, scope, and detail. However, all present common initiative towards nine key actions in order to create a more sustainable and equitable local food system. Based on this analysis, final recommendations include:

- Connect well-established food policy actors with beginning ones. What can actors in the earlier stages like Spokane and Clark Counties learn from Multnomah or King Counties? What processes and strategies worked well? What were the main challenges and pitfalls?
- Many of these actors advocate similar actions across overlapping or identical geographic areas. For example, nearly every King County Executive Priority is also present in the Seattle Food Action Plan. Additionally, both mention identical or similar program ideas for addressing those priorities. Such actors should consolidate efforts in order to simplify projects and use resources most efficiently.
- Focus on the most highly supported actions (again, see Appendix 2). These include (1) Preserve and improve rural farm land, (2) Increase access to fresh, healthy foods, and (3) Encourage a culture which values local food. Gather stakeholders to share their specific strategies for tackling these objectives, evaluate strategies that are already underway, and propose improvements or new routes.
- Focus on uniquely supported but lucrative actions, namely to Aggregate funds to support regional agendas – this is recommended only by PSRC and the formative Collective Impact Network of investors proposed by Luma. Connect these supportive actors with viable recipient-collaborators to guide and hone financial efforts.
- Consider the role of mid-size food businesses in these Key Actions. Institutional Procurement, Improved Infrastructure, and Increased Food Access are goals towards which small/beginning farmers may struggle to contribute. On the other hand, local mid-size farms have real potential to provide consistent and reliable supply for a farm-to-institution program, or supply retail outlets in target communities. What supports and mechanisms can be harnessed for existing mid-sized actors that will realize this potential? How can we help grow small and beginning farmers into viable mid-size farms?
- Concerning the common themes, explore definitions and importance of Community Participation. Convene representatives from different actors and discuss the topic: To what extent is citizen action necessary in the cultivation of a sustainable, equitable local food system? In what ways is public awareness being raised? To what extent is the agency prepared to facilitate and support community-led projects?

The common goals and ideas included in these plans provide an ample basis for movement forward as a region. With more actors such as Kitsap, Spokane, and CFC developing their own local plans, opportunities for supporting and coordinating a more sustainable and equitable local food system are only expanding.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: SOURCES

City of Seattle Food Action Plan

<http://www.seattle.gov/environment/food/food-action-plan>

King County Executive's Top 20 Action Items for 2015-2017

Washington Food Systems Roundtable Food Action Plan

Multnomah County Food Action Plan

<https://multco.us/multfood>

Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Food Action Plan

http://www.psrc.org/assets/11958/food_policy_action_plan_10_2014.pdf

Luma Consulting Report Landscape Scan of Food Systems

Whatcom Food Network Community Food Assessment

<http://whatcom.wsu.edu/ag/foodnetwork/aboutus.html>

Clark County Food System Council Policy Roadmap

<http://www.clark.wa.gov/public-health/about/foodsystemscouncil.html>

Snohomish County Sustainable Lands Strategy Report

<http://snohomishcountywa.gov/2194/Sustainable-Lands-Strategy>

Kitsap Food Policy Council

<http://kitsapfoodchain.org/>

Spokane Food Policy Council Council

<https://beta.spokanecity.org/blog/2014/11/21/what-food-policy-in-spokane-means-for-you/>

Community Farm Connection (CFC)

<http://rfhresourceguide.org/Site/Community-Farm-Connection->

APPENDIX 2: SPREADSHEET OF FOOD ACTION PLANS AND KEY ACTIONS

	PRESERVE AND IMPROVE RURAL FARMLAND	SUPPORT NEW AND SMALL-SCALE FARMERS	INCREASE URBAN AGRICULTURE	IMPROVE REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE	INCREASE INSTITUTIONAL PROCUREMENT	INCREASE ACCESS TO FRESH, HEALTHY FOODS	ENCOURAGE A CULTURE WHICH VALUES LOCAL FOOD	REDUCE FOOD WASTE	AGGREGATE FUNDS TO SUPPORT REGIONAL COMMON AGENDAS
CITY OF SEATTLE									
KING COUNTY EXECUTIVE									
KCD 2015 EARLY ACTION PROJECTS									
WA STATE ROUNDTABLE									
MULTNOMAH COUNTY									
PSRC									
LUMA REPORT									
WHATCOM FOOD NETWORK									
CLARK COUNTY									
SNOHOMISH COUNTY SLS									
KITSAP COUNTY *									
SPOKANE*									
COMMUNITY FARM CONNECTION*									

Shaded square indicates the actor proposes this key action. Actors marked with * are in progress of developing action plans and were analyzed based on website content.

APPENDIX 3: BETTER UNDERSTANDING THE 9 KEY ACTIONS

The diction of many food action plans included in this spreadsheet does not exactly match the language of the 9 key action areas. In fact, word choice varies widely across many of the plans. This list clarifies how synonyms and proxies from the plans were cached into the broader categories of 9 key actions.

1. PRESERVE AND IMPROVE RURAL FARMLAND

Synonyms	Actions included
Protect, secure, increase, manage	Land rights Land use Development rights Infrastructure access (water, roads, etc.) Environmental/ecosystem health

2. SUPPORT NEW AND SMALL-SCALE FARMERS

Synonyms	Actions included
Stabilize, increase, grow Beginning, local, regional Producer, business	Improve loans and loan access Tax breaks "One-stop" service centers Equipment rental/sharing Technical assistance Incubator programs Cooperatives Training/mentorship programs To-scale food safety regulations Third party certification Streamlined market certification

3. INCREASE URBAN AGRICULTURE

Synonyms	Actions included
Recognize, define Prioritize Support, protect	Identify vacant/underutilized land Create legislation surrounding urban agriculture Support community efforts for urban agriculture funding and legislature

4. IMPROVE REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Synonyms	Actions included
Scan, inventory Coordinate, Aggregate	Assess existing infrastructure Increase access for small-to-midsize regional producers Encompasses transportation, cold storage, processing, packaging, food hubs, distribution

5. INCREASE INSTITUTIONAL PROCUREMENT

Synonym	Actions included
Encourage, promote Schools, hospitals, restaurants, grocers/retailers, government bodies	Legislate procurement policies for government bodies, public events Facilitate direct farmer-to-institution relationships

6. INCREASE ACCESS TO FRESH, HEALTHY FOODS

Synonyms	Actions included
Improve	Increase healthy food access points Increase healthy foods available at schools, childcare facilities, and youth programs Increase EBT/WIC acceptance at farmers markets Increase EBT/WIC enrollment Create food innovation districts or community food centers

7. ENCOURAGE A CULTURE WHICH VALUES LOCAL FOOD

Synonyms	Actions included
Educate Celebrate	Increase community education through community food centers/gardens/kitchens Hold public forums and discussions on food Integrate local food and food education into schools Improve brand and market strategies for local healthy food Plan events celebrating local foods

8. REDUCE FOOD WASTE

Synonyms	Actions included
Prevent	Increase municipal composting capacities Encourage household composting Create institutional guidelines for food usage and waste Increase and coordinate gleaning efforts

9. AGGREGATE FUNDS TO SUPPORT REGIONAL COMMON AGENDAS

Synonyms	Actions included
Gather Finance Invest Apply	Research opportunities for investment Coordinate a collective impact network of investors Apply for grants Create and publicize grant opportunities