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ABSTRACT

Food Policy Councils (FPCs) have proliferated rapidly across the United States during the last ten to fifteen years. However, FPCs manifest through a wide array of governance structures and organizational characteristics. This includes, but is not limited to, classification as a 1) nonprofit organization, 2) grassroots coalition, or 3) government-embedded council. I seek to identify whether there are differences between these three types of FPCs in terms of their institutional and organizational characteristics, discourses, and strategies. Due to the diversity and growth of the FPC movement, implications of these differences in governance structure are not well understood. While some studies cite important benefits of formal government support, others have found that independence from government agencies allows FPCs greater ideological freedom. I analyze 24 case studies, which combines 2015 survey data with analysis of the missions, visions, goals, activities, and membership/partner information as found on FPC websites. Bivariate analyses using the same survey data, but with a larger sample of 173 FPCs, complement and provide context for the case studies. This research aims to contribute to the literature about FPCs, as well as agrifood movements generally, while providing a deepened understanding of the activities and dynamics of these unique community-government collaborations towards improved food policy.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to Carlo for his eternal patience and for believing in me always. My parents and my wonderful friends Paige, Jazz, Matt, Sarah, and Vicky have also been sources of great support and laughter during my graduate career, and for that I am grateful. I would also like to thank my advisor, Jeff Sharp, committee members Kerry Ard and Jill Clark, and all other faculty members from whom I have learned so much during my studies at the Ohio State University.
VITA

August, 1989 .......................... Born, Elkins Park, Pennsylvania

June, 2008 ............................. Cheltenham High School, Wyncote, Pennsylvania


2015-2017 ............................. Graduate Assistant, The Ohio State University

Field of Study

Major Field: Environment and Natural Resources

Specialization: Rural Sociology
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract ........................................................................................................................................... ii

Acknowledgements ......................................................................................................................... iii

Vita................................................................................................................................................ iv

List of Tables .................................................................................................................................... vii

List of Figures ................................................................................................................................. ix

Chapters:

Chapter 1: Introduction .................................................................................................................. 1

Chapter 2: Literature Review and Hypotheses .............................................................................. 8

Chapter 3: Data and Methods ......................................................................................................... 32

Chapter 4: Results .......................................................................................................................... 51

Chapter 5: Conclusions ................................................................................................................... 94

References....................................................................................................................................... 102

Appendix A: Survey ....................................................................................................................... 108
Appendix B: Food regimes/food movements framework...............................................112

Appendix C: Grassroots Case Study FPC Profiles .........................................................113

Appendix D: Nonprofit Case Study FPC Profiles ..........................................................122

Appendix E: Government-embedded Case Study FPC Profiles.................................131
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Number of FPCs formed in each year (1991-2015) ........................................38

Table 2: Frequency of Types of Connection to Government (all that apply) ............... 39

Table 3. Priorities by frequency of having been listed one of an FPC’s “top three” ....... 41

Table 4: Percentage of FPCs who say they collaborate with other FPCs ................. 45

Table 5. Selected Case Study FPCs .................................................................................. 49

Table 6. Regional breakdown of all subgroups ................................................................. 52

Table 7. Jurisdictional breakdown of all subgroups ......................................................... 53

Table 8: Types of connections to government (by frequency for all subgroups) .......... 54

Table 9. Number of connections to government for all subgroups............................. 56

Table 10. Percentage of FPCs in each subgroup that collaborate with other FPCs ....... 56

Table 11. Measures of political and civic engagement for all subgroups ......................... 57

Table 12. Frequency of each priority being listed as one of top three ......................... 58

Table 13. Institution ........................................................................................................... 63
Table 14. Key Actors .................................................................................................................66

Table 15. Discourse - most common concepts for all subgroups ..............................................71

Table 16. Discourse: Differences in common concepts across subgroups .............................71

Table 17. Priorities ......................................................................................................................74

Table 18. Grassroots: Successes and Policy Achievements ....................................................76

Table 19. Nonprofit: Successes and Policy Achievements .....................................................77

Table 20. Government-embedded: Successes and Policy Achievements ............................78

Table 21. Grassroots: Goals and Activities .............................................................................80

Table 22. Nonprofit: Goals and Activities .............................................................................81

Table 23. Government-embedded: Goals and Activities .......................................................81

Table 24. Summary of similarities between subgroups .........................................................87

Table 25. Summary of differences between subgroups .........................................................88

Table 26. Summary of Hypotheses and Findings ..................................................................93
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Outline: Chapter 2 .................................................................8

Figure 2. Operationalization of variables..................................................26

Figure 3. FPCs by organizational type......................................................36

Figure 4. Distribution of FPCs by jurisdiction ..........................................37

Figure 5. Frequency of total number of connections to government .............40

Figure 6: Distribution of responses concerning political engagement ..........43

Figure 7: Distribution of responses concerning civic engagement ...............44

Figure 8. Regional distribution of FPCs ..................................................46

Figure 9. Word cloud: Discourse of all subgroups ..................................69

Figure 10. Venn diagram: Overlap and divergence in FPC discourses .........73
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction to Food Policy Councils

Food systems present complex challenges involving many stakeholders. In response, Food Policy Councils (FPCs)—which vary by structure and makeup, have increasingly brought together community, industry, and government stakeholders over the last two decades, forming a unique type of alternative agrifood initiative (DeLind 1994; Feenstra 1997; Lacy 2000). As agricultural and food policy is often created at the national level, FPCs have aimed to link local concerns with state and federal decision-making by infusing debate around agrifood issues with input from their communities. However, it remains unclear how variations in organizational type or governance structure (i.e. non-profit, grassroots, government-mandated) may impact their effectiveness towards achieving these ends.

Food policy concerns are defined as “any decision made by a government agency, business, or organization which affects how food is produced, processed, distributed, purchased and protected” (Hamilton 2002). Because food systems touch all sectors of society, and influence everyone (Allen 2004), these various aspects of community life must be brought together for problems to be addressed holistically. Regardless, the
"failings of our food system have been seen as isolated problems, to be dealt with by a fragmented array of government and nongovernmental agencies at the state and local level" (Harper et al. 2009).

This has resulted in the perpetuation, or even the creation, of environmental and social harms that are further compounded by the undemocratic policy environment in which American food and agricultural policies have emerged (Allen 2004). For example, while the national rate of food insecurity in 2015 was 12.7 percent, the average from 2013-2015 ranged by state from 8.5% in North Dakota to as high as 20.8 percent in Mississippi (Coleman-Jensen et al. 2016). This and other food system problems vary across localities and cities as well, demonstrating the need for greater attention towards tailored local or state level solutions.

Food policy can "...provide frameworks and strategies to develop and maintain food systems that deliver nutritious food, are genuinely equitable and, importantly, are sustainable" (Sydney Fair Food Alliance 2009). However, to achieve this policy areas that have previously been dealt with in a disparate manner must be linked under a new food policy (Barling and Caraher 2002). FPCs may be able to facilitate this by working across sectors to address the food system, providing forums for discussion, creating new or supporting existing programs to address local needs, and participating in policy evaluation and advocacy (Clayton et al. 2015; Harper et al. 2009).

The first FPC was founded in Knoxville, TN in 1982. The formation of other FPCs in the 1980s was, in many cases, a reaction to decreasing state and federal funding for social welfare programs and an increasing need for food assistance (Scherb et al. 2012; Harper et al. 2009). Beyond fighting food insecurity, Fiser (2006) finds that FPCs
can connect urban and rural concerns as well as those of consumers and government, create democratic food policy, and provide a forum for debate about food issues. In fact, FPCs may have a unique, quasi-government role to play in, “…putting food topics on politicians’ radar, elevating discussions about food, making connections, and getting useful projects implemented” (Clancy et al. 2008).

As such, Barling and Caraher (2002) find that FPCs are an ideal way of providing “joined up” (holistic, systems thinking) food policy, but that one obstacle they may face is the, “confinement of policy initiatives into narrower departmental channels.” This may be explained in part by the ‘paradox of institutionalization,’ in which social movements must engage with the institutional world, while the institutionalization of their ideas may pose a threat to their ability to subvert dominant paradigms (Stammers 2009). While government-embedded FPCs may benefit from resources and legitimization, independent grassroots organizations may enjoy greater ideological and agenda-setting freedom. This has been recognized as a dilemma in alternative agrifood movements, particularly those operating under “right to food” and food sovereignty frameworks (Stammers 2009; Claey 2012). Whether this is the case for FPCs, however, has yet to be adequately and systematically examined.

**FPCs and Food Policy: Growing Energy at the Local Level**

FPCs have the potential to act as incubators for the creation of democratic food policy that promote the ideals of food justice and food security. They may provide spaces for what Marsden (2013) calls “place-based reflexive governance,” as well as a point of multi-organizational and multi-sectoral convergence within "delimited spatial regions" (Harper et al. 2009; Mooney et al. 2014). In other words, these organizations can provide
a forum for integrating interconnected food system problems by involving various stakeholders to create solutions and develop policy. Previous research has outlined evidence of FPCs doing just that (Mooney et al. 2014; Harris et al. 2012).

The need for greater intervention at the regional and local levels into the social dimensions of the food system, and the insertion of food and agriculture into the political agendas of local governments has received scholarly recognition as well (Barling and Caraher 2002; Lyson 2008). However, many find that city and regional planners often have low levels of involvement in, or knowledge about, food systems. Although they may increasingly serve on FPCs, planners often lack an awareness about how food systems interact with government responsibilities, despite the involvement of planning departments in the provision of other basic needs such as water and housing (Pothukuchi and Kaufman 2000; Abel and Thomson 2001; Clancy 2004; Roberts 2001; Pothukuchi and Kaufman 1999).

Growing interest in food systems within public health circles has been noted as well as among nutrition educators who want to be involved in food security matters and see FPCs as a point of entry (Hamm and Bellows 2003). Still, Clancy et al. (2008) note that the food system has low visibility to many policy officials and residents, and suggest that FPCs are an “underutilized tool for shaping the food system.” Despite this, in their study of 56 FPCs Scherb et al. (2012) found that existing FPCs often participate in the making of recommendations to state and local agencies, and sometimes the development of comprehensive food plans.

Additionally, Lang notes that public pressure is a potentially important source of change in the food system (2003). Concerned citizens from diverse backgrounds may
find an outlet for their concerns regarding food security and other food system issues through FPCs in which they can “act, not just think, like citizens with long-term commitments beyond the checkout counter/point of sale” (Lang 2003). As Patricia Allen asserts, the privileged and active involvement of those who suffer from food insecurity is essential to the development of problem definitions and meaningful solutions (2013). Lyson also asserts that “…community problem-solving, rather than economic competition, is the social foundation of sustainable agriculture” (2002).

The community problem-solving, “civic agriculture” (Lyson 2008), and democratic policymaking processes that FPCs can facilitate have the potential to support the nurturing of social capital development more broadly within a community, and as a new forum for solving a variety of community-based or social justice problems. Perhaps in recognition of this, FPCs are increasingly adopting the term “food citizen,” which invokes the notion that individuals have a right to food and a role in food democracy (Mooney et al. 2014) that could have implications for social justice more broadly.

FPCs may have the potential to provide what Salamon calls a form of “new governance” in which a more diverse set of actors and new institutions can be mobilized, often in partnership with the state, to solve public problems (2000). The FPC movement has already elevated the discourse and awareness around issues of food citizenship and sovereignty while promoting the democratization of food (Mooney et al. 2014). However, as Scherb et al. (2012) note, the lack of data about FPCs as part of a larger food policy movement limits the useful dissemination of information and, in doing so, can hinder planning efforts that seek to incorporation systems-thinking around food (2012).
**FPCs: Part of a Larger Alternative Agrifood Movement**

The agrifood system has been portrayed as both a “symptom and a symbol of how we organize ourselves and our societies” (Lang 1999). As part of a larger agrifood movement, FPCs may have an important organizational role to play in intentional efforts to promote food democracy and create a better agrifood system (Hassanein 2003; Schiff 2007). FPCs have been found to contribute to better monitoring of the food system and to encourage a more “holistic view of government’s role,” often carrying out research that is not likely to occur in traditional government structures (Clancy et al. 2008).

Furthermore, FPCs can educate officials and the public, influence poverty, improve program coordination and development, and engage in policy at the local, county, and state levels, where some of the most important agricultural policy activity is taking place (Halweil 2005). While FPCs are perhaps the strongest example of efforts to meld social goals with food system planning in policymaking in the U.S., many require more support (Anderson 2013; Halweil 2005).

In addition to affecting local consumers and fighting food insecurity, FPCs can empower farmers by making the support of new farmers a policy priority, creating financial opportunities for farmers of many backgrounds, and surveying and identifying existing efforts to support new and small farmers. They may also assess what agricultural and food infrastructure exists or is lacking in their area, identify and evaluate land resources, create robust urban agriculture policies, develop beginner farmer programs, connect with schools to support new farmers, expand direct marketing opportunities, and connect new or small farmers with local food entrepreneurs and artisans (Hamilton 2011).
Furthermore, the inclusion of farmers from diverse backgrounds and production practices into debates regarding policy is essential to identifying the needs of farmers, and FPCs may serve as the forum for that discussion (Clark et al. 2014). Additionally, scholars have noted that the presence of FPCs is associated with higher levels of social capital between farmers and nonfarmers, contributing to the overall social fabric of the community (Sharp et al. 2011). As such, FPCs have a place in a large agrifood movement that seeks to create a more equitable and sustainable food system, and may provide the opportunity to meld environmental and social justice movements around the universal need for food (Allen 2004).

This research seeks to contribute to a deeper understanding of how FPCs are working towards these aims by asking whether there are any associations between three common FPC organizational types (grassroots, nonprofit, or government-embedded) and the institutional and organizational characteristics, discourses, and strategies of FPCs. The following chapter (Chapter 2) provides a review of previous findings regarding these and other related dynamics, as well as defines the dependent variables and theoretical framework used here. Chapter 3 outlines the data and methods employed in exploring this research question, and is followed by a results section (Chapter 4) which presents findings first from survey data (N=173) and then from case studies (N=24). Finally, Chapter 5 includes a discussion of the significance, limitations, and implications of this research.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides a theoretical and empirical background for the approach taken in this research towards the question of if and how different organizational forms are associated with differences in the institutional and organizational characteristics, discourse, and strategies of FPCs. This chapter also reviews previous empirical findings regarding certain aspects of these relationships as well as the trends in FPC organizational structures more broadly, aiming to put these in dialogue with the theoretical perspectives from the social movements and alternative agrifood movement literatures that have guided and informed this research.

Figure 1. Outline: Chapter 2
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The structure of this chapter is outlined in Figure 1 above and begins with an introduction to previous findings regarding the variation in organizational forms and institutional characteristics of FPCs broadly. This is followed by a discussion of why these variations are important and where FPCs fit in relation to government agencies, alternative agrifood movements, and social movements. I then introduce the conceptual framework applied in this study and conclude by presenting hypotheses, which are informed by the literature reviewed in this chapter.

Diversity in the FPC movement: variations in organizational characteristics

The diverse manifestations of FPCs in communities across the United States have been noted in previous research, as has the need for a deeper understanding of the types, trends, or impacts of governance or organizational structures of FPCs. The rapid proliferation of FPCs makes the need for a deeper understanding even more critical to identify the best practices (including organizational structure). Community Collaboration Theory suggests that, although the institutional characteristics of FPCs will likely vary to some degree in accordance with local needs and assets, certain characteristics of structure and process will tend to function more effectively, regardless of local social, political, and economic circumstances (Schiff 2007). Furthermore, FPCs can avoid perpetually “reinventing the wheel” by networking and sharing lessons (Halweil 2005).

In addition, new social movement theory tells us that new movements are distinguished by their participants’ struggle to create new social identities and to establish new democratic spaces for “autonomous social action in civil society” through the reinterpretation of norms and development of new institutions (Scott 1990). These insights demonstrate first, that there is much to be gained from the identification of the
consequences of certain governance structures or organizational characteristics and
secondly, that FPCs are unique as efforts to identify these practices are concerned, both
because of the newness of the FPC concept itself and because of their common aim to
directly impact policy and interact with government.

Moreover, a defining characteristic of the FPC movement in recent years, has
been rapid growth in the number of FPCs within the United States. There were an
estimated 15 FPCs in North America in 2000 (Allen 2004), 150 in 2011 (Scherb et al.
2012), and there are over 200 in the USA and 50 in Canada at present. General trends
among North American FPCs in recent years include this rapid growth, a larger
percentage of FPCs that are independent (not tied to government agencies, although at
times receiving some type of government support), and the founding of state FPCs (in
contrast to local/community based councils) in more than half of US states (Mooney et
al., 2014). Some findings concerning the tradeoffs of certain FPC attributes follow, but
there remains much to be understood about these dynamics as they exist within FPCs
(Schiff 2007).

One example of the diversity of governance structures within the FPC movement
regards jurisdiction. While most FPCs serve one geographic area, some may represent
more than one overlapping geographic area, i.e. city and county. One study from 2012
that surveyed 56 FPCs around North America found within their sample, 32% of FPCs
served a city, 43% worked at the county level, 23% served a region, and 18% worked at
the state level (Scherb et al. 2012). That study also found that 16% of FPCs that were
sampled had been in existence for less than one year, 32% had been formed 1-3 years
earlier, and 52% had been in operation for more than 3 years (Scherb et al. 2012). Scherb
et al. (2012) also note that older FPCs tend to work more on federal policy issues, as well as focus on problem identification, public education, and the endorsement of others’ policies, while newer FPCs are more likely to develop their own policy proposals (Scherb et al. 2012).

FPCs also vary in their relationship to local government, access to staff and funding, the backgrounds of the individuals who make up their membership, and methods of member selection. Scherb et al. (2012) found that 63% of FPC members had been self-selected, 25% nominated and voted into an FPC, 27% appointed by someone in authority, and 11% became members through other means. As the food system is made up of interactions between stakeholders from production, processing, distribution, consumption and waste, FPCs would ideally include representatives from each of these sectors (Dahlberg 1994). Nonetheless, Harper et al. (2009) find that representatives from processing and waste are unlikely to serve on FPCs, and Mooney et al. (2014) suggest that the agricultural production sector is often underrepresented.

Strong social capital (mainly, members’ personal and professional working relationships in the community), as well as the existence of a community “champion,” were found to be important contributors to the effectiveness of the FPC Walsh et al. (2015) studied in making the needs of the community heard. Additionally, Clayton et al. (2015) found that, overall, partnerships were beneficial to FPCs in achieving their policy goals, in that they tended to augment visibility and credibility, help FPCs to focus their policy agendas, link FPCs to key policy inputs, and gain stakeholder support. However, they also note that certain partnerships can be a hindrance when partners have less or disproportionate influence and/or are less engaged in the food system (Clayton et al.
2015). Meanwhile, Allen (2004) finds that FPCs have tended to remain marginalized due to lack of funding and institutional support, and that alternative agrifood movement organizations generally may shy away from certain initiatives in fear of alienating funders.

In their efforts to build new framings and institutions, FPCs represent a new manifestation of the alternative agrifood movement, serving as “social laboratories” for “radical pragmatism” (Hassanein 2003). FPCs must create an identity that allows them to work within civil society and be critical of the status quo. Differences in FPC institutional practices and decisions are important because they can result from, or foster, certain assumptions that ultimately serve to legitimize or perpetuate pre-existing power relations as well as impact the overall capacity of an FPC (Allen 2004).

Due to these variations, and the lack of clear understanding regarding their implications, there continues to be a need for further research on several aspects of FPCs as organizations. This includes study of the efficacy and factors of success for FPCs (Scherb et al. 2012), what makes some FPCs more effective than others (Scherb et al. 2012), and the development of a system of evaluation for FPCs (Dahlberg 1994; Cleveland 2014), a process which this research may inform. Additionally, Mooney et al. (2014) note a need for more comprehensive study of “current macro-level trends in the FPC movement examination that considers broader functions and the interaction of governance type, scale, mission, and region.”

**Social Movements & Resource Mobilization Theory**

Not only does the study of organizational perspectives provide insight into the deliberations and views of the individuals they represent, but organizations are also likely
to be more influential than individuals (Allen 2004). As organizations, FPCs fit into Scott’s definition of a social movement as “a collective actor constituted by individuals who understand themselves to have common interests and a common identity” (1990). More specifically, FPCs are part of the larger Community Food Security (CFS) movement, which seeks to create community-based food systems, grounded in regional agriculture and local decision-making, by utilizing a food-system approach (Allen 2004). FPCs, as a part of a larger social movement, may be one of the most promising social forces for providing resistance to the global integration of the agri-food system, as well as to the decline of “… household forms of agricultural commodity production, and to the structural blockages to achievement of sustainability” (Buttel 1997).

In these efforts, FPC stakeholders may play an important role in the work an FPC prioritizes or is able to achieve. This is supported by resource mobilization theory, which emphasizes the importance of the resources necessary for the initiation, development, and mobilization of organizations, including individuals, formal and informal organizations, leaders, funding, and communication networks (Morris 1986). Resource mobilization theory has also traditionally placed emphasis on societal supports and constraints of social movements, organizations’ linkages to other groups, their dependence upon external support for success and the tactics used by authorities to control or incorporate movements (McCarthy and Zald 1977).

Resource mobilization theory further recognizes that significant dilemmas arise for organizations when choosing between tactics, as one tactic may achieve one aim while conflicting with another, and that these decisions are often influenced by “inter-organizational competition and cooperation” (McCarthy and Zald 1977). An example of
such a tactic, for an organization that aims to create alternatives to the status quo, but also maintain a degree of policy influence, is government affiliation. Another such challenge may arise in striking the balance between broad coalition building and a commitment to certain, potentially controversial, ideals.

FPCs may seek to resolve this tension as described by Kurtz (2003): “popular organizing theory has held that the best coalitions avoid conflict and organize around a lowest common denominator on which the majority can agree.” However, Altemose and McCarty (2001) point out a potential cost to the avoidance of this conflict. In organizations that participate in the simplification of ideas to the lowest common denominator (i.e. food access) to create broad coalitions and avoid conflict, radical agendas are often abandoned (Altemose & McCarty 2001). While loose definitions may allow for coalition building, Allen (2004) warns that vague definition increases vulnerability to co-optation or misinterpretation, may hinder efforts toward movement objectives, and allow for the reproduction of inequalities within the present food system by the CFS movement itself. Taken together, these insights suggest that organizational characteristics may be indicative, if not direct components, of the processes an FPC engages in and the work that results. Moreover, as policy-related councils, this might be extended to suggest that relationship to government may be a particularly relevant point of influence on the activities for FPCs in particular.

The degree to which social movement organizations collaborate with, or create opposition to, established institutions such as government agencies may have important consequences for their activities and effectiveness. Social movements, in order to create social change, must either integrate into existing institutions or create new forms of
institutions, independent from the interests and priorities of those that already exist (Allen 2004). However, the institutionalization of social movements such as CFS, while often seen as “smart, practical politics”, may reshape their practices and processes in a manner that ultimately contradicts their goals regarding sustainability and social equity (Allen 2004).

Relationship to Government: A Paradox?

A particularly contested issue is the degree to which FPCs should be formally embedded in local government. In other words, how can FPCs balance working with government, while avoiding some of the disadvantages outlined by the “paradox of institutionalization” (Stammers 2009)? This paradox is defined by Stammers (2009) as the dynamic in which social movements must engage with the institutional world, while the institutionalization of their ideas poses a threat to their ability to subvert dominant paradigms. For example, Scherb et al. (2012) note that FPCs that work from within government face specific challenges to engaging in the policy process (i.e. lack of knowledge about food systems in the government agency hosting them).

This dilemma has been recognized in alternative agrifood movements (Stammers 2009; Claeys 2012), but it is unclear to what extent this has presented a challenge for FPCs. Allen (2004) points out this tension, noting that the dilemma exists between “pursuing oppositional goals and gaining the institutional acceptance necessary to make incremental progress” and suggests that grassroots FPCs may be better able to provide an “oppositional” push on the status quo. Moreover, Benford and Hunt’s (2003) conceptualization of a "social problems marketplace” illustrates that political insiders may have more ability to make claims and connections to policy makers, while
independent social movement organizations are often seen as outsider claims-makers with fewer resources and connections.

Both the potential advantages and disadvantages of more formal institutionalization on a practical level are real and should be accounted for. Previous research regarding the dynamics of various organizational types of FPCs, particularly regarding being embedded in government, is reviewed here. Advantages include the findings that the more “institutionalized” an FPC is, the more likely it will be to have access to funding and staff support, political legitimacy/capital, coordination across government departments, and potential policy review and/or planning powers (Clancy et al. 2008; Dahlberg 1994; Burgan and Winne 2012; Walsh et al. 2015). Schiff (2007) found that FPC participants often felt that recognition by government was a critical and deciding factor for the creation of their organization.

Although close government partnerships may provide some important benefits to FPCs, there may also be significant trade-offs to such a strategy, the impact of which are not entirely understood (Barling et al. 2002; Morris 1986). Previous findings indicate that FPCs embedded in government may make policy recommendations that are less responsive to community needs and may be vulnerable to fluctuating support with changing administrations (Burgan and Winne 2012). They may also have less access to diverse sources of funding, lack of control by activists, bureaucratic inefficiencies, less leeway to be critical of existing policies, reduced resiliency and political infighting (Harper et al. 2009; Walsh et al. 2015; Burgan and Winne 2012).

Some respondents in Schiff’s (2007) study expressed concerns that government affiliation may have made it more difficult for their FPC to collaborate with other non-
government organizations or that operating within a system while simultaneously proposing alternatives to that system was a major challenge. Furthermore, McCullagh and Santo (2012) report that some FPC members worry that their affiliation with government alienates certain community members; particularly those who have been affected or felt neglected because of structural discrimination as well as farmers and some residents who simply want government out of their lives. Moreover, Allen (2004) finds utilization of framings and discourses around social equity and social justice to be more prevalent among nongovernmental institutions in the alternative agri-food movement.

In their study on a selection of government-embedded FPCs, Clancy et al. (2008), note that defining the institutional structure of any FPC is challenging, and that unique challenges arise when attempting to do so within pre-existing government structures. Some have suggested that nonprofit structures may best accommodate FPC work, allowing them to assert grassroots public pressure, as local governments’ budgets tighten in many cases. Walsh et al. (2015) found a grassroots structure to be of great benefit to the FPC they studied, noting that FPCs with government-appointed members “face bureaucratic challenges and can be less resilient.” Clancy et al. (2008) also point out that “hybrid” institutional structures can be more pragmatic, but are not without their own hurdles, such as the bringing together of diverse voices in a productive manner.

Mendes’ (2006) work in Canada, shows that close relationships to, or integration into, local government can bring permanence and levers of power in the creation of food policy. However, rather than support a dichotomous view of this relationship, she posits that there may an 'equilibrium point' which helps to determine, "what to institutionalize
and what not to in finding a locally-appropriate balance between ordinances ‘from above’ and flexible citizen dynamics ‘from below’” (Mendes 2006). This ‘equilibrium point’ perspective may aid FPCs as they seek to improve the food systems of their communities. In summary, some FPCs may struggle to balance the taking advantage of resources available to them through existing institutions with the fostering and sustaining of a sense of grassroots community ownership (Campbell 2013).

Furthermore, this debate may be made more complex by the fact that evaluations of effectiveness necessarily depend on what goals are set. Exploration of these relationships should be informed by an awareness that while some FPCs act as coalitions for alternative agrifood movements, others may be bringing together alternative and conventional food system actors (Mooney et al. 2014). Examples of these differences include capacity building versus programming, divergent frameworks around ‘food security’ vs. ‘food justice’, food access vs. economic development, and ‘alternative’ vs. ‘oppositional’ approaches.

For instance, grassroots FPCs may be better able to provide an “oppositional” force to the status quo within the food system (Allen et al. 2003), while formally institutionalized FPCs may be more likely to engage in activities that fit better within the neoliberal conventional structure, i.e. food access (Hassanein 2003). As Mansbridge (2001) argues, “… a group's structural position in a complex of power relations affects both its likelihood of developing an oppositional consciousness and how its movement will develop.” In other words, there may be qualitatively significant differences in the type of work FPCs are involved in depending upon this relationship and other characteristics; effectiveness may not be a matter of efficiency but of substantive focus.
Despite a subset of literature that deems government mandate as important, if not essential, to FPC formation, survival and success, Mooney et al. (2014) note that since 2009, newly-founded FPCs are increasingly independent. Two camps have seemingly emerged in the literature, with some findings touting the benefits of close government affiliation, and others providing support for more informal, grassroots, or community-based approaches. For this reason, Scherb et al. (2012) call for more research on how FPCs are situated in communities, as well as on how FPCs that are not embedded in government engage in policy to determine whether that arrangement is advantageous.

The jury seems to be out in the scholarly discourses, as well as the non-profit/activist sphere, as to whether there is a general “best” structure for FPCs, as well as if and how government relationships influence these and similar organizations. This is due in part to the fact that there is little research on these dynamics as well as to the rapid growth in number of FPCs in recent years. Morris (1986) writes that, although formal organization is an important feature of successful local movements, “existing movement literature is unclear as to whether mobilization of social protest is facilitated more by formal bureaucratic organizations or loosely organized groups.” This continues to be the case in the alternative agrifood movement. For this reason, Mooney et al. (2014) call for research on if and how alternative agrifood movements can converge with conventional institutions without getting “lost in conventionalization.”

This is especially interesting question in light of the aforementioned observation that more and more FPCs are being founded as independent organizations as well as the possible reality of a ‘paradox of institutionalization’ or an ‘equilibrium point’ in regard to connection to government. Moreover, because of differences in agenda-setting
processes, framing, and meaning work, similarly—“productive” or active groups may be working towards different goals or under different framings, producing different results in their communities. Furthermore, analysis of alternative discourses and practices around the agrifood system has not kept up with their proliferation in communities, and a greater understanding and evaluation of these new organizations is necessary to ensure they are not actually perpetuating the inequities they aim to eliminate (Allen 2004).

Food Regime-Food Movement Matrix: Food Security or Food Justice?

Still, FPCs can help citizens come together to bridge the “…divide between advocacy and practice” (Holt-Giménez & Shattuck 2011). To understand how FPCs are attempting to do so within the larger alternative agrifood movement and, if or how organizational type correlates with variations in FPC work, I draw upon Holt-Giménez and Shattuck’s “Food Regime-Food Movement Matrix” (2011). This framework describes four types of problem definition and action frameworks within the alternative agrifood movement, listed from left to right, and ranging from Neoliberal to Radical and from food enterprise to food sovereignty (see Appendix B). Holt-Giménez and Shattuck (2011) list FPCs under two of the four orientations, food security and food justice. The first falling under the “Corporate Food Regime”—subtype “Reformist” and the latter falling under “Food Movements”—subtype Progressive.

The two leftmost orientations, food enterprise and food security, are classified as Neoliberal and Reformist, respectively, and are both under the umbrella of the “corporate food regime.” Holt-Giménez classifies the food enterprise approach as being characterized by increased industrial production, corporate monopoly, GMO promotion, land grabbing, and internationally-sourced food aid. The food security approach is
concerned with improving access to food through mainly neoliberal means, such as increased production (often tied to GMOs and other technological inputs), but puts some focus on the support of medium-sized farms and locally-sourced food aid (Holt-Giménez 2010).

The rightmost two are food justice and food sovereignty, designated progressive and radical, respectively, under the umbrella of “food movements.” Food sovereignty is concerned with the human right to local control over production of food which is locally sourced, sustainable produced, culturally appropriate, and democratically controlled (Holt-Giménez 2010). Food justice lies somewhere between food security and food sovereignty, supporting a ‘right to food’ through sustainable production, local foods, agro-ecological agriculture, and enhanced safety nets.

Food security, food justice, and food sovereignty are seen (at times juxtaposed and at other times used interchangeably) most often in discourses about alternative agrifood movements. Food security is the term most often utilized in the scholarly discussion about FPCs as well as in the publications of FPCs themselves. Again, under Holt-Giménez and Shattuck’s definition, food security is primarily motivated by, or through, work involving changing the food system within the neoliberal economic system (2011). This may explain why FPCs have been the subject of some criticism revolving around a lack of involvement in broader social justice issues, which would necessitate and promote more holistic or intersectional approaches.

However, as previously mentioned, Holt-Giménez and Shattuck (2011) list FPCs as participant institutions for both the food security and food justice approaches, suggesting that FPCs can have influences that vary in the degree of “opposition” posed to
the dominant food system. In fact, Holt-Giménez and Shattuck (2011) posit that organizations acting in the Progressive (food justice) trend may be able to push a Polanyian counter-movement that would reform the corporate food regime. This suggests that FPCs can engage in either type of work, or both, and should not be presumed to belong wholly to one or the other. If FPCs adopt the food security conceptualization as outlined by Holt-Giménez and Shattuck (2011), the scope of their work may be limited to that which can be done within the currently dominant system.

Nonetheless, as FPCs are intended to work on policy issues and partner with, if not operate from within, government, the food security orientation may present itself as the most manageable option for many FPCs. A parallel might be drawn between Holt-Giménez and Shattuck’s (2011) matrix and the discussion of ‘alternative’ vs. ‘oppositional’ movements as undertaken by Allen et al. (2003). Allen et al. (2003) characterize those movements that seek to cause structural reconfiguration of the agrifood system as ‘oppositional,’ while those that are ‘alternative’ are "limited to incremental erosion at the edges of the political-economic structures” that currently make up the dominant system. Allen (2003) also mentions that this degree of opposition may be related, limited or facilitated, at least in part by the structure of the FPC.

The Progressive trend, as conceptualized by Holt-Giménez & Shattuck aligns closely with Allen’s (2004) characterization of the Community Food Security (CFS) movement. This movement often opposes “anti-hunger” efforts, associating them with corporate or government efforts to perpetuate market dysfunctions that rely upon increased production of food without addressing underlying issues of equity and social inequality. In other words, the anti-hunger paradigm, present in the Reformist effort to
minimize the social harms of market externalities without restructuring the market itself, seeks to implement short-term, “band-aid” solutions to fight hunger, while the CFS movement and Progressive trend aim to create a just food system that empowers marginalized social groups.

In summary, substantive differences or orientations in the type of work various FPCs are engaged in may contribute to, or be a product of, their problem-definition regarding food system issues, and this framing may be related to their organizational structure. Structural and organizational relationships may be important influences on the problem definition and agenda-setting processes, activities, and capacities of FPCs as community organizations, and on social movements generally, as suggested by organizational development theory (Schiff 2007; Dick 2002; Allen 2013).

Organizations with different structures or orientations may not be objectively more or less effective than others, but may simply be operating under different paradigms or towards goals that are differently-conceptualized. Consideration of the ‘paradox of institutionalization,’ Holt-Giménez’s (2010) conceptualizations of food security and food justice, in parallel with the distinction between ‘alternative’ and ‘oppositional’ movements made by Allen et al. (2003), and the potential for ‘reflexive governance’ (Marsden 2013), may be useful in examining the forms and functions of FPCs across North America.

**Conceptual Framework & Operationalization of Variables**

The framework, as developed by Holt-Giménez and Shattuck (2011), contains six variables: discourse, model, key actors and institutions, approach to the food systems crisis, and key documents. For the purposes of the case study portion of this research, all
of these, except for key documents, are incorporated into investigation of FPCs that are nonprofit, grassroots, and embedded in government. Key documents for individual FPCs often include bylaws, but there are no overarching documents that guide the FPC movement which is how Holt-Giménez and Shattuck (2011) conceptualize the key documents variable.

Examples of these documents include the *World Bank 2008 Development Report* for Neoliberal and Reformist trends, *International Assessment of Agricultural Science and Technology for Development* (IAASTD) for the Progressive trend, and the *Peoples’ comprehensive framework for action to eradicate hunger* and *UN Declaration of Peasant Rights*, among others, for the Radical trend. Key actors are understood here to mean the members and partners of an FPC. Holt-Giménez and Shattuck (2011) list key institutions for each trend (i.e. International Monetary Fund for Neoliberal, U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization for Reformist, Coalition of Immokalee Workers for Progressive, La Via Campesina for Radical), FPCs being just one of those for the Reformist and Progressive trends.

The institution variable as used by Holt-Giménez and Shattuck (2011) describes the types of organizations in each trend (such as FPCs for the Reformist and Progressive trends). This study focuses only on FPCs, and thus the institution variable will involve a more detailed accounting of some of the elements of organizational structure within FPCs. This includes type and number of connections to government, technical assistance needs, jurisdiction, whether an FPC collaborates with other FPCs, and how they see civic and political engagement in relation to the success of their work. Key actors are represented through the members and partners of FPCs. The discourse, which in Holt-
Giménez and Shattuck’s framework have four potential orientations (food enterprise, food security, food justice, and food sovereignty), will be represented in this study by the mission and/or vision statements published by FPCs in the case studies.

Finally, the model as described by Holt-Giménez and Shattuck (2011) embodies the “ideal” type of food system for each trend. In looking at the priorities, goals/activities, successes and policy achievements of the FPCs, this “model” variable is merged with the “approach to food system issues variable” (and will be referred to with the modified name “approach to food system issues”), as it represents the methods through which an organization sets out to create its respective “ideal” food system. These elements (priorities, goals/activities, successes, policy achievements), may reveal how an organization perceives, prioritizes, and strategizes around finding solutions to problems in the food system (Allen 2004), thus providing insight into this new variable, “approach to food system issues.”

Using this framework, with the modifications described here, we can classify and compare the institutional and organizational characteristics, discourses, and strategies of FPCs across subgroups (nonprofit, government-embedded, grassroots) according to the dependent variables: institution, key actors, discourse, and approach to food system issues. The independent variable of interest is the organization type according to the respondent’s selection on the survey as: nonprofit, government-embedded, or grassroots. The dependent variables are institution, key actors, discourse, and approach to food system issues, and are measured as follows in Figure 2:
By applying an adapted version of this framework, this research will analyze the three dominant organizational types of FPCs (grassroots, nonprofit, and government-embedded) to detect if and how organizational type is associated with differences in key actors, discourse, institution, or approach to food system issues. Because Holt-Giménez and Shattuck (2011) list FPCs as potentially falling under both the Reformist and Progressive trends, each trend is described in their words below for reference:

Reformist: “While the ‘mission’ of Reform is to mitigate the social and environmental externalities of the corporate food regime, its ‘job’ is identical to that of the Neoliberal trend: the reproduction of the corporate food regime. Reformists call for mild reforms to the regime, for example through an increase of social safety nets, consumer-driven niche markets, and voluntary, corporate responsibility mechanisms.” In other words, this trend is
“…broadly oriented toward state-led assistance and seeks to regulate, but not directly challenged market forces.”.

**Progressive:** “Many actors within the Progressive trend advance practical alternatives to industrial agri-foods, such as sustainable, agroecological and organic agriculture and farmer–consumer community food networks – largely within the economic and political frameworks of existing capitalist food systems. This is often coupled with calls for the right to food and food justice for marginalized groups self-defined by ethnicity, gender and socio-economic status, or the desire for pleasure, quality, and authenticity in the food system.” Further, this trend “…is based primarily in the middle and working classes of the global North, and has particular appeal to youth.”

Holt-Giménez & Shattuck (2011) describe the corresponding discourses as follows:

**Food security:** “…rooted in modernization theories of state-led development left over from the import substitution industrialization (ISI)/ ‘development states’ of the Third World, and the neo-Keynesian ‘development decades’ of the 1960s-1980s promoted by Northern governments (Preston 1996, Rapley 1996).” Focused around efforts to “mainstream less socially and environmentally damaging alternatives into existing market structures (FAO 2009b).”

**Food Justice:** “…grounded in an empowerment orientation in which the poor, oppressed and underserved assert their rights through the power of self-respect and community organization (Alkon and Norgaard 2009, Levkoe 2006, Morland and Wing 2007).” Additionally, “The food justice movement itself emerged from the environmental justice movement (Bullard et al. 1994), working class communities of color dealing with diet-related diseases (Herrera et al. 2009) and critiques of structural racism (Allen 2008, Self 2000).”
**Gaps in the Literature**

A firm understanding of the role of FPCs as a unique type within the alternative agrifood movement must be established. While a lack of consensus around the structural definition of FPCs (including government relationship) may have contributed to early growth, a lack of clarity may now serve as a barrier for existing and new organizations in creating and understanding role and structure (Schiff 2007). Better insight into what governance structures work best where, and/or how these differences correspond with differences in FPC activity, may be gained, as well as an overall clearer picture of how and to what degree FPCs are partnering with their local governments today.

Previous empirical and theoretical work has failed to answer the questions raised here in an integrated manner. Much of this work has either focused on “effectiveness”, narrowly-defined as the number of policy deliverables observed, or has critiqued FPCs and/or similar organizations for exhibiting behaviors that are either too ‘alternative’ or too ‘oppositional’ without attention to how form may relate to these behaviors or vice-versa. By combining these approaches, the existence of a ‘paradox of institutionalization’, in which FPCs must balance the potential benefits and limitations of working from within or closely with government, or, alternatively, an ‘equilibrium point,’ can be tested. This can be done by not only taking into account the prevalence of direct policy achievements, but by also considering a wide range of FPC goals.

Previous research has often dealt with smaller sample sizes, has focused only on government-mandated FPCs (Clancy et al. 2008), or has focused on more in-depth case studies, while this study combines survey results with case studies of FPCs of three main organizational types. The availability of these data makes it possible for the updating of
what is known about FPCs in North America and for a contribution to an understanding of the dynamics of FPC organizational structures.

FPCs represent a unique effort to bring together community members, alternative agrifood activists, policymakers, farmers, and food industry representatives to create a better food system, and as such, the study of FPCs may require new theoretical perspectives and conceptualizations (Mooney et al., 2014). Because FPCs seek to create new and unique partnerships, and vary widely in the ways that these partnerships manifest, there is great potential for the study of these relationships, which may also be extended to the social movements literature more broadly. With these considerations, this research seeks to address the research question listed below.

Research Question

The research question guiding this study, for which hypotheses are listed in the subsequent section, is as follows:

- Is there an association between organizational type and differences in:
  - Institutional and organizational characteristics (institution & key actors)?
  - Discourse?
  - Strategies (approach to food system issues)?

Hypotheses

Considering previous findings regarding the tendencies of different organizational attributes for FPCs, I expect to find some variation in institutional and organizational characteristics, discourse, and approach to food system issues variables across subgroups
Institutional & Organizational Characteristics

- **H2**: Government-embedded FPCs will exhibit greater institutional support and access to resources compared to the other two subgroups, which will exhibit reduced access to resources, particularly staff and funding.

According to the paradox of institutionalization hypothesis and previous findings, government support can be crucial to FPC formation and success and nonprofit and grassroots FPCs, without formal government status or support, may face greater barriers to obtaining certain resources.

- **H3**: Nonprofits may enjoy greater access to institutional partnerships, and access to greater funding opportunities compared to grassroots.

As a legally-regulated type of organization that benefits from certain tax and funding opportunities, with the potential to provide or facilitate an ‘equilibrium point’ governance structure that both partners with government and retains independence, nonprofits may benefit from greater access to resources than grassroots FPCs.

Discourse

- **H4**: Discourses will generally fit into the corresponding food security and/or food justice orientations.

Holt-Giménez and Shattuck list FPCs under the Reformist and Progressive trends, with corresponding food security and food justice orientations. This hypothesis is also supported by the literature around Community Food Security that lists FPCs as firmly rooted in that movement and its goals and orientations (Allen 2004).

- **H5**: Government-embedded FPCs may exhibit a weaker commitment to
social justice issues more broadly.

Again, the paradox of institutionalization hypothesizes that non-governmental FPCs may have greater agenda-setting freedom and create more space for activist voices that may propose ‘oppositional’ orientations or activities.

**Strategies**

- **H6:** Government-embedded FPCs will exhibit a greater tendency to engage in activities that conform more closely with the Reformist trend than the other two subgroups.

  The ‘paradox of institutionalization’ hypothesis would suggest that FPCs that are housed in government agencies may be in some ways constricted to a narrower and less ‘oppositional’ set of goals and activities. Key actors are more likely to be government officials, and thus more likely to promote viewpoints that are informed by established government programs and priorities, which are often aligned with Reformist tendencies. Resource mobilization theory suggests that key actors, and resources more broadly, are meaningful inputs into an organization’s activities and capacity.

- **H7:** Nonprofits and/or government-embedded FPCs may enjoy greater success or effectiveness when compared to grassroots FPCs (see H2/H3).
CHAPTER 3: DATA AND METHODS

Drawing on and adapting the food regimes-food movements framework (Holt-Giménez & Shattuck 2011), this paper analyzes characteristics of FPCs across North America, exploring how they engage in their communities as well as the policy domains within which they are active. Exploration of these dynamics includes bivariate analyses of survey data on a sample of 173 FPCs from the Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future Food Policy Network project as well as case studies of 24 FPCs selected from the survey sample and divided into three subgroups based on organizational type (nonprofit, grassroots, government-embedded). Due to the rapid growth in number of FPCs over the years, the availability of this survey data, along with the more detailed case studies, provides the opportunity to address core questions surrounding structure and activity that have yet to be adequately addressed in the literature.

In this chapter, I introduce and describe the two sets of data used in this research, as well as provide descriptive statistics for the samples and details regarding the analysis of the data. The first portion of this study utilizes survey data to explore the research question and certain aspects of the dependent variables for a sample of 173 FPCs. Of these 173 FPCs, 61 are grassroots, 75 are nonprofit (or housed in another nonprofit), and
37 are government-embedded (including embedded in extension). The first part of this chapter describes the survey and the sample, and outlines some basic characteristics of the sample. Chapter 4 presents the results of bivariate analyses conducted using SPSS on the survey data, to provide context for the case studies and to reveal any associations between organizational type and those elements of the dependent variables captured by the survey. These bivariate analyses of the larger survey sample exclude biggest successes, policy achievements, and needs/technical assistance, which appear in the case study content analyses. The second part of this chapter describes the case study portion of this research, including the process of case selection, data collection, and analysis. Case studies of 24 food policy councils, 8 from each organization type subgroup, were conducted.

1. *Survey and Descriptive Statistics*

The data for the first portion of this research come from the Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future (CLF) Food Policy Networks (FPN) project, which conducts an annual survey of FPCs in North America. This survey/directory was started in 2013 and is one of the only hubs of information on FPCs across North America. The purpose of the FPN project is to build “…the capacity of local, state, regional, and tribal food policy organizations.” The survey is conducted online (www.foodpolicynetworks.org) and respondents were asked to complete it on behalf of their FPC. Emails were sent to FPC contacts and listservs by CLF staff annually in July asking that they complete the survey or update previously entered responses. To keep pace with the formation of new FPCs around the country, CLF staff made active efforts to contact or include FPCs who had not been included in the surveys of previous years. This included relying on knowledgeable...
informants for assistance in identifying FPCs that may have been missed and then contacting those FPCs directly. If FPCs did not respond to multiple email messages, council contacts were called.

Data from U.S. participants in 2015 are utilized, as the U.S. data were more complete and this research is most interested in the U.S. context. Some FPCs included in the dataset had not actually responded to the 2015 survey (but had 2014 data listed) and were designated as such. These cases were removed from the sample, as were those FPCs which were not classified as “active.” This data has the benefit of representing a large portion of the US population of FPCs, however, it of course does not provide an understanding of the various perspectives of individuals who work on or with an FPC or the dynamics that exist within them. Furthermore, while most of the survey data was complete, there were some cases with missing data for certain questions, lowering the sample size for those variables.

Survey questions sought basic demographic information (name, state, year formed, jurisdiction), organization type, connections to government (no connection, government-seated, government-appointed, government-funded, government-supported/sanctioned, government-created, or any combination of those), collaboration with other FPCs, top three priorities, measures of civic and political engagement, and open-ended questions concerning technical assistance needs, biggest successes, and policy achievements.

Connection to government is considered both in terms of sheer number of connections an FPC has with government as well as the type of connection(s). The data was received in an Excel spreadsheet, which was coded for analysis using SPSS. Although region was not included in the survey, each FPC was coded by region, using the U.S. Census
classification (Northeast, Midwest, South, West), as was used by Scherb et al. (2012).

Presentation of survey questions and descriptive statistics begins below with the independent variable of interest, organization type.

Organization Type. Respondents were prompted to select their organization type with the following prompt: “Organization type (select the option that best describes your group):”. A drop-down menu included “Non-profit,” “Housed in another non-profit,” “Grass-roots coalition,” “Embedded in government,” “Embedded in extension,” “Embedded in a university/college,” “Convener of FPCs in a region,” or “Other” from which respondents chose. FPCs that listed themselves as being “housed in another non-profit” were added to the nonprofit subgroup for this study, and the two FPCs embedded in extension were added to the government-embedded subgroup. FPCs that selected “other”, “convener of FPCs in a region” (if this was the only type selected), or “embedded in a university” were removed, as there were only 4 of these total and they did not fit directly into any other subgroup.
In Figure 3 we see that the overall breakdown of FPCs by type was 35.3% grassroots (61 FPCs), 43.4% nonprofit (75 FPCs, including those that are housed in another nonprofit), and 21.4% government-embedded (37 FPCs).

*Jurisdiction.* Respondents were also asked to classify the scale at which their FPC works with a prompt that reads “Type of Council:” and to which they could select “Native American Tribal Council,” “State (U.S.),” “Province/Territory (Canada),” “County,” “City/Municipality,” “Region,” or “Both Local and County.” This characteristic is heretofore referred to as “jurisdiction,” for which descriptive statistics are displayed in Figure 4 below.
The most common response for this question was “County” with 35.8% of FPCs reporting that they work at the county scale. Regional FPCs made up 19.7% of the sample, followed by “City/Municipality” at 17.9%, “Both Local and County” at 14.5%, “State” at 9.8%, and “Native American Tribal Councils” making up 2.3% of the sample.

*Year Formed.* Another question asked, “What year were you formed?” Table 1 below shows the distribution of responses to this question. Only 4 of the FPCs in this sample were formed in the 1990s, while 75 formed during the 2000-2010 period, and 98 were created in 2011 or later. The 2010-2013 years are when the greatest percentages of these FPCs were formed, relative to other years. In fact, a full 56.1% of the FPCs in this
sample were formed between 2010 and 2013, while only 30% were formed in the nearly 20 years previous and 13.9% were formed from 2014 to 2015. In other words, more than 70% of the FPCs in this sample were formed during the last 6 years listed above, while only 30% were formed in the almost two decades before then. Finally, we see that in the three years preceding the survey, 29.5% of FPCs were formed, meaning that 70.5% of the sample FPCs had been in existence for three or more years by the summer of 2015.

Table 1. Number of FPCs formed in each year (1991-2015) (N=173)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of FPCs</th>
<th>Percentage of total sample (N=173)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of FPCs</th>
<th>Percentage of total sample (N=173)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Connections to government.* For “Connection to government (choose all that apply),” respondents could check off “No connection to government,” “Government-seated (government employees are members of council),” “Government-appointed (members are appointed by a government official),” “Government-funded (government directly funds FPC work),” “Government-supported/sanctioned (government-provides in-
kind donations),” “Government-created (FPC created by Executive Order or similar action),” and/or “Other.”

Table 2: Frequency of Types of Connection to Government (all that apply) (N=173)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Connection to Government (all that apply)</th>
<th>Number responded “Yes” (% of all FPCs) (count)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government-seated</td>
<td>33.5% (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No connection</td>
<td>30.6% (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-supported/sanctioned</td>
<td>28.3% (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-created</td>
<td>23.1% (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-appointed</td>
<td>16.2% (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-funded</td>
<td>12.1% (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.5% (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that, overall, the most common connection to government was to have government officials who sit on the council. Following that, was to have no connection to government whatsoever, and then to be government-supported or sanctioned. FPCs created by government made up 23.1% of the sample. While this is not one of the most common connections, it may be an influential connection for FPCs to have, and applies to nearly one quarter of the FPCs. The least common connection, besides “Other”, was government-funded. Finally, 16% of FPCs had their members appointed by government agencies or officials.
Figure 5. Frequency of total number of connections to government (N=173)

Figure 5 shows that the most common number of connections to government was one at 39.9% of FPCs reporting one of the above connections to government, followed by no connection at all at 29.5% of FPCs. Beyond two connections, the proportion of FPCs at each level steadily declines, with 16.8% of FPCs reporting two connections, 9.2% reporting three, 3.5% reporting four connections, and only 1.2% of the sample reporting five connections to government.

Priorities. The question concerning priorities was worded as follows: “What are the FPC’s current top three priorities?” Respondents could then select from “Food Production (Urban and/or Rural Agriculture, Gardening, Land Use, Zoning),” “Education,” “Purchasing (Farm to School, Farm to Institution, Cottage Food Industry),”
“Healthy Food Access (SNAP Incentives, Healthy Vending, Nutrition),” “Fitness,”
“Anti-Hunger,” “Food Waste,” “Economic Development (including Food Hub),”
“Networking,” “Food Producer/Processing Support,” “Other.” A few FPCs provided
more than three responses for this question, and a few did not select any answer at all.
The priority as “Food Producer/Processing Support” was not listed in the Excel
spreadsheet (in which the data was received) as a top priority for any FPC, however
“Food Hub” was written for some cases, and both “Food Hub” and “Economic
Development” had been coded with the same letters, so they are combined. Furthermore,
as there were no responses for “Food Producer/Processing Support,” it will not appear in
further discussions of priorities for the purposes of this research.

Table 3. Priorities by frequency of having been listed one of an FPC’s “top three”
(N=173)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percentage of FPCs that responded “Yes”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Food Access (SNAP Incentives, Healthy Vending, Nutrition)</td>
<td>73.4% (127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Production</td>
<td>48.6% (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>43.4% (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing (F2S, FSI, Cottage Food)</td>
<td>35.3% (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>33.5% (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development (including Food Hub)</td>
<td>20.2% (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Hunger</td>
<td>18.5% (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.7% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Waste</td>
<td>8.1% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>2.3% (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top three most common priorities are in bold
In Table 3 above, we see that Healthy Food Access was by far the most frequently cited among the top three priorities of FPCs in the sample. In the second and third spots are Food Production and Education. Interestingly, only 20.2% of FPCs listed Anti-Hunger as one of their top three priorities. This may be a result of the Healthy Food Access option being so popular, and this representing anti-hunger efforts for many FPCs. Another noteworthy finding is that a third (33.5%) of FPCs list Networking as one of their top three priorities. This may speak to an area of opportunity and potential in the FPC movement. Fitness was the least popular priority, with only 2.3% of the FPCs in this sample listing it as one of their top three priorities.

Civic and Political Engagement. The two questions concerning engagement were structured so that respondents were asked to respond “Never”, “Rarely”, “Occasionally”, “A moderate amount”, or “A great deal” to the following:

a. “To what degree will your FPC need to civically engage the community to accomplish your top three priorities? Civic engagement is organized voluntary activity focused on community problem solving and helping others. Select one response.”

b. “To what a degree will your FPC need to politically engage to accomplish your top three priorities? Political engagement is activity meant to influence government action, either through affecting the making or implementation of public policy or through the selection of the people who make those policies. Select one response.”
A small number of cases had missing data for the collaboration and civic and political engagement variables, resulting in a smaller number of total cases in the descriptive tables that follow.

Figure 6: Distribution of responses concerning political engagement (N=168, 5 missing)

FPCs in the sample rate political engagement (Figure 6) as being very important to their work, with 39.3% answering that their FPC will need to politically engage “A great deal” to accomplish their top three priorities. The second most common answer was “A moderate amount” at 26.6%, followed by “occasionally” at 16.2%, and “rarely” at 8.7% of FPCs. Only 6.4% of FPCs in the sample responded with “never” and a response was missing for this question for 5 FPCs.
Civic engagement (Figure 7, below) was even more often rated as something FPCs would need to participate in “A great deal” to accomplish their priorities, with 60.1% (104 FPCs) responding with this option. “A moderate amount” was selected by 21.4% of FPCs, followed by “occasionally” at 7.5%, 2.3% answering “rarely,” and 5.8% selecting “never.”

Figure 7: Distribution of responses concerning civic engagement (N=168, 5 missing)

Survey respondents were also asked to answer either “Yes” or “No” to the question: “Do you work or collaborate with other FPCs?” Most FPCs in the sample responded that they do collaborate with other FPCs, while only 13.3% answered that they did not, and 10.4% did not respond to this question, as shown in Table 4 below.
Table 4: Percentage of FPCs who say they collaborate with other FPCs (N=155, 18 missing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration with other FPCs</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76.3% (132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.3% (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>10.4% (18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collaboration with other FPCs. There were three open-ended questions regarding technical assistance needed (often referred to as “needs” in this paper), biggest successes, and policy achievements. Regarding technical assistance, FPC respondents were asked “What kind of technical assistance is needed by the FPC?” Then, respondents were asked to “Please describe the FPC’s biggest success to date. Note: This may be the same as last year.” The third open-ended survey item prompted was worded as follows: “Please list your policy achievements.”

Distribution of FPCs across regions. Respondents were not asked about their FPC, but were coded according to U.S. Census regions based on their indicated state location. In Figure 8 below, the breakdown of FPCs across regions shows that the greatest portion of FPCs are in the West (32.9%). The South has the second largest proportion of FPCs at 26.6% located in that region, followed by the Midwest at 22%, and finally the Northeast just a bit lower at 18.5% of total FPCs being located there.
II. Case Studies: Selection, Data Collection, and Analysis

This section provides information about the case study portion of this research, such as how case study FPCs were selected, as well as how data about them was collected and analyzed. Descriptive information about the final sample of 24 FPCs, 8 from each subgroup, is provided as well.

Case selection. Twenty-four cases were selected from the sample described above based on three subgroups of “organizational type”: nonprofit (including those that are housed in another nonprofit), grassroots, and government-embedded (two FPCs were embedded in extension and were added to this group, but neither was ultimately in the final sample for the case studies). FPCs who were in existence for less than 3 years were removed from the potential sample of case studies, as the aim was to compare FPCs
which were beyond the initial stages of organizational establishment. FPCs for which there were missing survey responses were excluded from the sampling process as well.

Next, eight FPCs were chosen per subgroup through the generation of random numbers that selected individual case identification numbers. Cases were selected this way to provide enough FPCs of each organization type so that comparisons might be made or trends within and across subgroups illuminated. When an FPC was found to have little or no information available online, it was replaced through utilization of another random number. This occurred for 1-3 FPCs per subgroup, and may indicate bias in the results of this research in that FPCs that have a greater capacity for online communication, and perhaps greater resources overall, may be overrepresented, while those without that capacity or that rely upon other methods of outreach and communication may be underrepresented.

Data collection and analysis. Once the final cases had been selected, information for each FPC was collected from their website and/or Facebook page and organized into one chart per organization. Each chart constituted a profile of the FPC, which included their organizational type, state, jurisdiction, region, year of formation, connections to government, membership, mission/vision, goals or activities, top three priorities, rating of the importance of civic and political engagement to their work, whether they collaborate with other FPCs, their biggest successes, policy achievements, and technical assistance or needs. Information for each of those categories above that were part of the survey were gathered from each FPC’s response to those questions, while the mission/vision statement
and goals and activities were gathered from the FPC websites directly, copy and pasting as to preserve the original wording of these elements.

While all FPCs had some sort of mission and/or vision statement, not all had a specific list of “goals” which is why activities was added. Although not listed as goals, the projects or activities an FPC is working on provides insight into their aims. When available, information on partners and funders was also collected, however in many cases there was no such information of the FPC websites. These charts, thus, included information from the demographic and open-ended portions of the Johns Hopkins survey as well as from documentation found online. They were then imported into nVivo (and divided based on the three subgroups) so that they could be coded for content analysis according to the food regime/food movements framework elements of institution, discourse, key actors, and approach to food system issues (Holt-Giménez and Shattuck 2011). This qualitative data provides more detailed insight into the operations of FPCs than the survey data can provide, adding depth to our understanding of their goal orientations and approach to the food system. Nonetheless, the information that could be found online for each FPC was not uniformly abundant. In other words, some FPCs had more extensive websites and levels of general online presence than others, and thus more detailed information was often available for those organizations.

**Sample & Descriptive Information.** The final sample of 24 FPCs (Table 5) includes FPCs from 17 states, with 6 FPCs in the Northeast, 5 in the South, 7 in the Midwest, and 6 in the West. The cases selected had an overall average number of 6.12 years in existence. Broken down by subgroup, this comes to 5.25 years on average for government-embedded FPCs, 7.6 for those in the nonprofit group, and 5.4 years for those
in the grassroots group. FPCs in existence for less than 3 years were excluded from the case study sampling process.

Table 5. Selected Case Study FPCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grassroots</th>
<th>Nonprofit</th>
<th>Government-Embedded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duval County Food Policy Council (Jacksonville)</td>
<td>Charlotte-Mecklenburg Food Policy Council</td>
<td>Austin-Travis County Sustainable Food Policy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headwaters Food Sovereignty Council</td>
<td>Chicago Food Policy Advisory Council</td>
<td>Cass Clay Food Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Food Policy Council</td>
<td>Cumberland County Food Security Council</td>
<td>City of Hartford Advisory Commission of Food Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima County Food Systems Alliance (Tucson)</td>
<td>Detroit Food Policy Council</td>
<td>Denver Sustainable Food Policy Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah-Chatham Food Policy Council</td>
<td>Metro Omaha Food Policy Council</td>
<td>Homegrown Minneapolis Food Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit County Food Policy Coalition (Akron)</td>
<td>Oakland Food Policy Council</td>
<td>Mayor's Initiative for a Healthy and Sustainable Food System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Durham Farm and Food Network</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Food Policy Council</td>
<td>New Haven Food Policy Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston Food System Council</td>
<td>Southeastern NC Food Systems Program/Feast Down East*</td>
<td>Philadelphia Food Policy Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*also a convener of other FPCs in the region

The most common jurisdiction, or scale, at which FPCs said they work was “City/municipality” (9 FPCs), with “County in close second at eight FPCs. Additionally, 5 FPCs indicated that they work at both the “Local and County” level, while only 2 work on the regional scale. It appears that many who responded “County” also do city-focused work in the most populous city of that county, where they tend to be located. Of the 24, only one was in a rural area (Headwaters Food Sovereignty Council in Bemidji, Beltrami County, MN – this is also the only regional FPC). Nonetheless, and as previously
mentioned, many of these councils (grassroots FPCs) work on the “County” or “Local and County” levels, so while they may be in urban areas, they may also be working with and in rural communities.

The grassroots subgroup was mostly county-level, but contained the only rural FPC, which is also one of the 2 regional councils in the sample. The government-embedded group was dominated by FPCs who work at the city/municipality level in urban places. The nonprofit group was also, of course, all FPCs who were at least headquartered in urban areas, and almost evenly split between county and city/municipality jurisdictions with 1 regional FPC. Of those that were government-embedded, only one did not have their members appointed by a government agency or official.

The majority (4 out of 6) of those FPCs located in the Northeast were government-embedded, while the other two were nonprofit. On the other hand, no FPCs in the South were government-embedded; two were nonprofit and three were grassroots. In the Midwest, three were nonprofit, two were grassroots, and two were government-embedded. Finally, the West had one FPC that was government-embedded, three that were grassroots, and one nonprofit.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

I. Results: Survey Data

This section presents results regarding associations between organization type and those elements of the framework components (institution, approach to food systems issues) covered, at least in part, by the multiple-choice questions of the survey. These include jurisdiction, types and numbers of connections to government, collaboration, civic and political engagement, and top priorities. Some elements of the research question can be answered for the entire sample of 173 FPCs, although aspects of some variables depend on open-ended survey responses as well as content collected from FPC websites, both of which were only analyzed for the case study FPCs (and are addressed in the subsequent section).

Tables 6-11 summarize results for each subgroup of elements of the institution variable by subgroup, while Table 12 does the same for priorities, an element of the approach to food system issues. As such, these results can shed light on the hypotheses (1, 2, 3, and 6) concerning these two components of the research question. Moreover, these results thus provide a point of reference or context for the case studies regarding those qualities which are covered by the multiple-choice survey questions. The case
studies explore these relationships in more detail. Region is also included in this analysis, although it was not included in the original survey. Table 6 below displays the breakdown of FPCs included in the 2015 survey data (N=173) by region and organizational type.

Table 6. Regional breakdown of all subgroups (N=173)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Grassroots (N=61)</th>
<th>Nonprofit (N=75)</th>
<th>Government- Embedded (N=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not statistically significant

Most common response is in bold, second most common is italicized

Regional breakdown of each organizational type

Table 6 above shows that, of all grassroots and nonprofit FPCs in the sample, the greatest proportion of each are in the West at 34.4% and 36%, respectively. The grassroots and nonprofits FPCs were a bit more likely than the government embedded FPCs to be located both in the South and the West, while they were less likely to be in the Midwest and the Northeast, compared to the government-embedded FPCs. These differences are neither large nor statistically significant, and thus do not lend support for Hypothesis 1, that there will be differences between subgroups in terms of their institution, of which region one aspect.

Any differences may reflect trends in local or state government structures by region that influence the relationship between government agencies and efforts to create or sustain local food policy councils. There may be differences between regions or
isomorphism of government structures within regions that influence this, but due to the absence of any previous literature regarding the diffusion of FPCs across space, this is no more than a hypothesis.

Table 7. Jurisdictional breakdown of all subgroups (N=173)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grassroots (N=61)</th>
<th>Nonprofit (N=75)</th>
<th>Government-Embedded (N=37)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American Tribal Council</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Municipality</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Local and County</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of FPCs</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>N= 173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 26.880; p<.01

Most common response is in bold, second most common is italicized

In Table 7 we see the breakdown of jurisdictions, or scales at which FPCs work, and how these differ across organizational types. These comparisons may shed light on Hypothesis 1, that there will be differences in institutional and organizational characteristics across subgroups. The results on this measure were statistically significant at the p<.01 level. Overall, county was the most common response regarding the jurisdiction at which FPCs work, followed by region, then city or municipality, then both local and county, then state at 10.2% and finally, Native American Tribal Council at (2.3%). It follows, then, that county was also the most common response for all three subgroups. However, city and municipality was only slightly behind county for government-embedded FPCs (and at double the rate of city/municipality for nonprofit and grassroots), and nonprofits appear to have more variation in jurisdiction than grassroots.
In both the nonprofit and grassroots groups, about a quarter of FPCs indicated that they serve an entire region, while none of the government-embedded FPCs said the same. This is presumably due, at least in part, to the fact that there are no regional governments. Only one of the grassroots FPCs worked at the state level while 16% of nonprofits and 10.8% of government-embedded FPCs did. Local FPCs may be able to scale up their work through state or regional FPCs, so the finding that more of the state level FPCs were nonprofit than government-embedded suggests that there may be a greater role for state governments to play in coordinating and advocating for food policy needs in their states. Because of these moderate and statistically significant differences between subgroups regarding jurisdiction, some support is found here for Hypothesis 1 as it concerns the institution variable.

Table 8: Types of connections to government (by frequency for all subgroups) (N=173)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connections to government (all that apply)</th>
<th>Grassroots (N=61)</th>
<th>Nonprofit (N=75)</th>
<th>Government-EMBEDDED (N=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government-created***</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-funded**</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-appointed***</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-seated</td>
<td><strong>48.6%</strong></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-supported/sanctioned*</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td><strong>48.6%</strong></td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No connection***</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significance at p<.05, ** significance at p<.01, ***significance at p<.001

Most common response is in bold, second most common is italicized

Table 8 shows the prevalence of each type of connection to government per subgroup. Several of these measures yielded statistically significant results, although not all did. Interestingly, nonprofit FPCs were slightly more likely to list government-supported/sanctioned as one of their connections to government than government-
embedded FPCs were. Both groups listed government-supported/sanctioned as a connection to government 20% more often than grassroots FPCs did, lending support to Hypothesis 3, that nonprofit FPCs may have stronger institutional partnerships than grassroots FPCs. Unsurprisingly, two-thirds of government-embedded FPCs reported that they were government-created, while fewer than 15% in each of the other groups reported the same. Moreover, the government-embedded group had a much higher rate of government funding and having members appointed by government officials than the other two groups did. This last point lends support to Hypothesis 2, that government-embedded FPCs would have greater access to institutional support such as funding.

In all three groups, a third or more of FPCs reported having government officials as part of their memberships, while grassroots FPCs had the highest frequency of responses claiming “No connection”, with nonprofit just a bit behind, and government-embedded with no such responses. Given the statistically significant differences on several of these measures, these results suggest that FPCs may exist on a broad continuum in their relationship to government, with grassroots FPCs generally being the least closely linked, government-embedded being the most closely partnered with government, and nonprofits in between, and as such lends support for both Hypotheses 2 and 3. Overall, there is greater similarity between the nonprofit and grassroots groups, except as regards the proportion of FPCs per subgroup that are government-seated, which is constant across all organization types.
Table 9. Number of connections to government for all subgroups (N=173)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grassroots (N=61)</th>
<th>Nonprofit (N=75)</th>
<th>Government-Embedded (N=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of connections to government</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-test statistic = 51.129, significant at .01 level

Table 9 displays the mean number of connections to government per subgroup, via a one-way ANOVA analysis. The means for the grassroots and nonprofit subgroups are 0.84 and 0.85, respectively, while that of the government-embedded subgroup is 2.54 connections. This finding is statistically significant, and supports the hypothesis that government-embedded FPCs will have higher numbers of connections to government. This lends support for Hypothesis 1 in that organization type is related to variation in institutional and organizational characteristics. Furthermore, these results may also provide implicit support for Hypothesis 2, that government-embedded FPCs will have more access to institutional resources or political capital.

Table 10. Percentage of FPCs in each subgroup that collaborate with other FPCs (N=165, 8 missing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grassroots (N=53)</th>
<th>Nonprofit (N=67)</th>
<th>Government-Embedded (N=35)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage that answered yes</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not statistically significant

*x=missing cases (all percentages exclude missing cases)

On average, about 85% of FPCs responded that they did indeed collaborate with other FPCs. A significant difference in collaboration rates would lend support for Hypothesis 1, that organization types are associated with divergent institutional characteristics. However, this number was only slightly higher than average in nonprofit
FPCs at 88% and only slightly lower in government-embedded FPCs at 80%. Overall, the subgroups are more or less the same on this measure, with an overwhelming majority in all three groups stating that they do collaborate with other FPCs and no statistical significance, thus providing no support for Hypothesis 1.

Table 11. Measures of political and civic engagement for all subgroups (N=168, 5 missing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Engagement</th>
<th>Grassroots (N=59)</th>
<th>Nonprofit (N=72)</th>
<th>Government-Equipped (N=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not statistically significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Engagement</th>
<th>Grassroots (N=59)</th>
<th>Nonprofit (N=72)</th>
<th>Government-Equipped (N=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not statistically significant

*Most common response is in bold, *x=missing cases (all percentages exclude missing cases)*

Table 11 summarizes results for two other aspects of the institutional and organizational characteristics: measures of civic and political engagement across subgroups. Results show that government-embedded FPCs answered that political engagement was essential to their work “A great deal” about 10% more often than both other two groups. Meanwhile, grassroots organizations more frequently answered “Never” or “Rarely” to this question than both other two groups. Nonetheless, differences were not found to be statistically significant. Furthermore, all subgroups appear to deem civic engagement to be very important, even more important on average
than political engagement, in the achievement of their goals, and so support for Hypothesis 1 is not found.

FPCs also value political engagement highly, across subgroups. However, in addition to having the greatest frequency of “A great deal” responses for political engagement, government-embedded FPCs had the highest frequency of answering in the same manner for civic engagement among the three main groups. Although these results are also not statistically significant, it is interesting to note that the grassroots FPCs, on average, lagged behind the other two groups on both of these measures of engagement. Given that proportions of FPCs answering “A great deal” are the largest in all subgroups and for both measures, these findings do not provide support for Hypothesis 1, but it is interesting to note the emphasis on civic engagement relative to political engagement generally, and the relatively higher and lower commitment to political engagement among government-embedded and grassroots FPCs, respectively.

Table 12. Frequency of each priority being listed as one of top three for each subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Grassroots (N=61)</th>
<th>Nonprofit (N=75)</th>
<th>Government-Embedded (N=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Food Access</td>
<td><strong>73.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>68%</strong></td>
<td><strong>83.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Production**</td>
<td><strong>36.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>48%</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td><strong>44.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td><strong>32.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Hunger</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Waste</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development (including Food Hub)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td><strong>37.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.3%</strong></td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significance at p<.05, ** significance at p<.01, ***significance at p<.001

Top 3 priorities are in bold, fourth italicized
Top priorities represent one element of the approach to food system issues variable, and this analysis may shed light on Hypothesis 6, which states that government-embedded FPCs will exhibit a greater tendency to engage in activities that conform more closely with the Reformist trend than the other two subgroups. Here we see more similarity across groups than we do differences, with FPC priorities characterized by a commitment to local foods and to basic community food security. Furthermore, most of these results are not statistically significant.

For all three groups, Healthy Food Access, Education, and Food Production were frequently cited top priorities, albeit to varying degrees. Table 12 shows us that the top three priorities, on average, for those FPCs that are nonprofit organizations (or are housed in other nonprofit organizations) were Healthy Food Access (68%), Education (49.3%), and Food Production (48%). After those, Purchasing (44%) and Networking (37.3%) were common. While not a most common top priority of any subgroup, Economic Development (including Food Hub) was listed most frequently by the non-profit subgroup, at 24%.

Grassroots FPCs most frequently listed Healthy Food Access (73.8%), Education (44.3%), and Networking (37.7%) as the top three priorities for their organizations. Food Production was also relatively common in this subgroup, although much less so than in the government-embedded FPCs, at 36.1%. Those FPCs embedded in government listed Healthy Food Access (83.8%), Food Production, (70.3%) and Purchasing (32.4%) as their top three priorities most often, with Education and Anti-Hunger just behind at 29.7% of these FPCs having listed them as one of their top three priorities.

Interestingly, the only statistically significant finding on this measure concerns
the difference between the grassroots and nonprofit subgroups and the government-embedded subgroup in frequency of listing Food Production as a top priority. Although Food Production was a top priority for all three, 70.3% of government-embedded FPCs listed it as a top priority, while only 48% and 36.1% of nonprofits and grassroots, respectively, listed it as such. Given the Progressive, or Community Food Security, rejection of anti-hunger strategies and market-based solutions to food insecurity, this provides support for Hypothesis 6, that government-embedded FPCs may have somewhat more Reformist orientations or tendencies than the other two subgroups.

The government-embedded group also listed Healthy Food Access as a top priority most often. However, Education was listed as a top priority 15-20% more often in nonprofit and grassroots groups than in government-embedded FPC. Nonprofits were more likely to list Purchasing as a top priority than the other two groups. It is also worth noting that government-embedded FPCs listed Networking as a top priority half as often as FPCs in the other two subgroups, while citing Anti-Hunger more often than the other two groups.

These results show strong convergence around the 3-4 top concerns of FPCs generally, and thus do not provide strong support for Hypothesis 1 regarding significant differences between subgroups on the approach to food system issues variable, despite nuanced differences in priorities such as Networking and Anti-Hunger. With the strongest support for hunger alleviation and food provision priorities found in the government-embedded subgroup, a higher frequency of listing Food Production as a top priority that is statistically significant, and this subgroup exhibiting a relatively lower commitment to Education (although not statistically significant), there is moderate support for
Hypothesis 6, that government-embedded FPCs have more Reformist approaches.

In summary, the results of these bivariate analyses provide some insight into Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 6. There is moderate support for differences between subgroups in terms of the institution variable in the results displayed in Tables 6-11. As the subgroups were created based on another type of institutional characteristic, organizational type, this is perhaps to be expected. However, within subgroups there is quite a bit of variation on many measures, so these analyses test the assumption that organization type is associated with other trends in institutional characteristics and finds that organization type is associated with differences in some of these, such as connections to government. Overall, regarding Hypothesis 1, we see that these subgroups of FPCs are more similar than dissimilar, providing little support for this hypothesis.

Regarding Hypothesis 2, these results do suggest that government-embedded FPCs have somewhat greater access to funding (and potentially other institutional resources) than the other two subgroups. They also suggest that nonprofits may have slightly increased access to the same resources when compared to grassroots FPCs, as proposed by Hypothesis 3. Finally, while the most common top three to four priorities were consistent across subgroups, the degree of concentration on food production and relative lack of attention to other priorities such as education and networking among grassroots FPCs suggests moderate support for Hypothesis 6.

II. Results: Case Studies

This chapter presents results from the 24 case studies of FPCs from the three subgroups (grassroots, nonprofit, government-embedded) to examine the institution, key actors, discourse, and approach to food system issues that these FPCs are pursuing. The
aim in doing so is to test all hypotheses guiding this research.

**Institution**

In their work, Holt-Giménez & Shattuck (2011) list FPCs as potential institutions for both the Progressive and Reformist trends. Since this research concerns only FPCs, the institution component included here is meant to provide a deeper understanding of the organizational operations, assets, scope, and needs. Results may provide support, or lack thereof, for all hypotheses concerning institutional and organizational characteristics (Hypotheses 1, 2 and 3). Hypothesis 1 posits that there will be differences in these qualities across subgroups, Hypothesis 2 suggest that government-embedded FPCs will have greater evidence of access to institutional resources and partnerships, and Hypothesis 3 expects that nonprofit FPCs may, relative to grassroots FPCs, experience relatively closer relationships to government and greater access to institutional resources.

In looking at the “institution” of the selected FPCs as represented in Table 13 (below), we see that, as a group, the grassroots FPCs have the lowest number of connections to government (0-1), while the nonprofit subgroup displays a greater frequency of connections to government (1-2), with government-seated and government-supported/sanctioned listed most often, providing support for all three hypotheses listed above. The subgroup of FPCs that are embedded in government all reported 2 or more connections to government, with government-created and government-appointed being most common. In both the nonprofit and grassroots subgroups, 1 FPC reported receiving government funding, while 3 in the government-embedded group did.
Table 13. Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Grassroots</th>
<th>Nonprofit</th>
<th>Government-embedded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections to Government</td>
<td>Most have 0 to 1 connections. 3 of these FPCs have no connection, 2 have “other”, 2 are supported, 1 seated and 1 funded.</td>
<td>Most have 1 to 2 connections. Most common types: seated and supported, followed by created, and then one answer for each of funded, appointed, other, and none.</td>
<td>Almost all have two or more connections, some have 4 or 5. Created and appointed being most common, then supported, then seated and funded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic and Political Engagement</td>
<td>5 answered “A great deal” to both, 3 answered “A moderate amount”</td>
<td>7 answered “A great deal” and 1 “A moderate amount” to civic; 6 answered “A great deal”, 1 “A moderate amount”, and 1 “Occasionally” to political</td>
<td>5 answered “A great deal” to both, 3 answered “A moderate amount”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate?</td>
<td>5 yes, 3 no</td>
<td>All yes</td>
<td>5 yes, 3 no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>Admin/staff (1) Assitance with: networking/web presence/social media/marketing (4) community engagement and diversity (2) strategic planning/finances (2) F2S and government food procurement (1) developing targeted policies (1)</td>
<td>Staff (1), funding (1) Assistance with: policy research, development and analysis (4) website design and social media (2) marketing and communications (2) trainings: racial equity &amp; for working group co-chairs (2) grant-writing (1) measurement and evaluation of food system change (1) educational resources (1)</td>
<td>Funding (2), staff (1) Assistance with: Governance/FPC structure/strategic planning (3) Policy info (2) food system assessment and evaluation (2) Communications (1) community engagement (1) capacity building training for appointed members (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>6 county, 1 regional, 1 city and county</td>
<td>4 city/municipality, 2 county, 1 regional, 1 city and county</td>
<td>5 city/municipality, 3 city and county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Northeast: 0 South: 3 Midwest: 2 West: 3</td>
<td>Northeast: 2 South: 2</td>
<td>Northeast: 4 South: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest: 3 West: 1</td>
<td>Midwest: 2 West: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All subgroups indicated that civic and political engagement were important to their work, with slightly more of the nonprofit FPCs answering “A great deal” for both types of engagement than in the other two subgroups. Similarly, most FPCs across all subgroups said that they do collaborate with other FPCs; only 6 answered that they do not, 3 of these are in the grassroots subgroup and 3 in the government-embedded group. These two measures do not provide support for any of the above hypotheses, as FPCs in all subgroups overwhelmingly rated both types of engagement as something their organizations need to involve themselves in “A great deal” as well as indicated that they do collaborate with other FPCs.

Regarding jurisdiction, grassroots FPCs were most likely to work on the county level, while most of the government-embedded FPCs work on the city/municipality level (and the rest at the city and county scale). The nonprofit subgroup was a bit more diversified on this measure. While 4 of these FPCs work on the city/municipality scale, 2 work on the county level, 1 at the regional scale, and 1 on the city and county level. This finding provides support for the association of differences in institutional characteristics with organization type, as posited by Hypothesis 1. This hypothesis is also supported by the regional distribution of these FPCs which, like the larger sample, differs by organization type. For example, government-embedded FPCs are found more in the Northeast and Midwest, grassroots are more commonly found in the South and West, and the nonprofit subgroup is a bit more diverse.

As far as needs listed by respondents, staff was mentioned in all three subgroups, consistent with the Scherb et al. (2012) finding that lack of staff is often cited by FPCs as a barrier to success. Meanwhile funding was listed as a need by the government-
embedded and nonprofit subgroups, but not by the grassroots FPCs. Assistance with social media and online communication was often cited by FPCs in the grassroots and nonprofit subgroups. Interestingly, this was not listed by the government-embedded FPCs. These FPCs often had pages hosted on government websites, and had a lower rate of listing “Networking” as a top priority, and perhaps for this reason do not see this as an area of need. Across all three groups, information on specific policies and food system assessment was cited as a need. Community engagement was cited as something with which grassroots and government-embedded FPCs need support, while training for council members was something seen as a need by nonprofit and government-embedded FPCs. Overall, most of the needs listed by FPCs were consistent and overlapping across subgroups, and thus no support is found for Hypotheses 1, 2, or 3 on this measure.

Despite many similarities in terms of needs, collaboration, and measures of political and civic engagement, these findings provide some support for Hypothesis 1, that FPCs will differ in institutional characteristics by subgroup, the main differences concerning connections to government, jurisdiction, and region. The findings regarding connections to government lend support to Hypothesis 2, that government-embedded FPCs may have greater access to political capital and other institutional resources, although the needs expressed by this subgroup are neither fewer nor very distinct from those of the other two subgroups. In fact, government-embedded FPCs did express a need for funding that was not present in the grassroots subgroup. Regarding Hypothesis 3, nonprofits are observed to have somewhat closer relationships to government than grassroots FPCs (connections to government), which might theoretically increase their access to resources and/or political capital. Despite this, nonprofits did not exhibit a
lesser need for funding than grassroots FPCs.

**Key Actors**

Table 14. Key Actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actors</th>
<th>Grassroots</th>
<th>Nonprofit</th>
<th>Government-embedded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Most common: university/college representatives (7), farmers/farming/farmer’s markets representatives (6), food banks (5)</td>
<td>Most common: university/college representatives (6) and health/public health agencies (6)</td>
<td>In many cases, half or majority is made up of government officials. Most common types: city officials (6), health officials (6), university/college representatives (5), extension (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next extension, county government, chefs, and public health agencies (3 each). Strongest prevalence of spots just for community members.</td>
<td>Then nutrition representatives/dietitian (5)</td>
<td>Some spots for community members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners (when available)</td>
<td>Other NGOs, United Way, universities (i.e. OSU), hospitals, private companies (i.e. Aramark), county and city agencies, healthcare organizations.</td>
<td>Extension, NGOs, universities, county government.</td>
<td>NGOs, extension offices, land trusts, farm organizations, food banks, university programs, consultants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As further elements of institutional and organizational characteristics, key actors are examined for all three subgroups to further test Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3. In some cases, steering committees or boards were identified with only the name of the individuals serving on it, and no information about their backgrounds or professional/community roles. When individuals represented a specific institution, that FPC was categorized as having representation from that sector as displayed in Table 14. Steering committees ranged in size from having just 4 or 5 members up to 35 members. In all three subgroups,
it was common to have both members who represent or come from other NGOs (both food related and other – Asian Services in Action, NAACP, community development corporations, etc.) as well as to have private citizens or residents serve as members. In fact, by percentage of members, individuals employed at or representing other NGOs were the most common type of member.

While there was quite a bit of overlap in terms of the types of individuals that serve as members on FPCs across subgroups, there were some differences as well. These differences are primarily the dominance of government officials in government-embedded memberships, and the greater inclusion of farmers or farm organization representatives in grassroots FPCs, lending support to Hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 1 states that subgroups will differ across key actors, but support may also be found here for the idea that government-embedded FPCs may have greater political capital and connection to government, because of these key actors, as expressed in Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 5, which is intended to pertain more to the “strategies” variables of this research, states that grassroots and/or nonprofit subgroups may represent broader coalitions than government-embedded FPCs and may thus find support in these results regarding key actors. In other words, the results regarding the membership of FPCs show support for Hypothesis 1, as they do differ across subgroups, and Hypothesis 2, as the memberships of government-embedded FPCs were characterized by a significantly greater presence of government officials. No support is found here for Hypothesis 3, as the nonprofit and grassroots subgroups have very similar representation within their memberships.

For those FPCs that had publicly-available information about other organizations
they partnered with, common partners were other NGOs, but sometimes included hospitals, universities, and private companies as well. Very few FPCs appeared to have any staff at all. Information regarding staff members, and/or funders an FPC may or may not have, was often not available. A description of what was found for those few that made that information public follows. In the grassroots subgroup, no staff members or information regarding funding was available, except for the Durham Farm and Food Network which has received grant support from the United Way. The United Way is also cited as a fiscal sponsor by an FPC in the nonprofit group (Summit County Food Policy Coalition). Other FPCs in the nonprofit group for which funding information was available are Charlotte-Mecklenburg and Oakland. The former lists BlueCross BlueShield of NC, Bank of American, Burt’s Bees, Wells Fargo, Foodbuy Innovative Procurement, and the Mecklenburg Medical Alliance and Endowment as “sponsors.”

The Oakland Food Policy Council listed as funders the Alameda County Public Health Department as well as various foundations, including The Y & H Soda Foundation, The San Francisco Foundation, The Rose Foundation, Kaiser Permanente, Clif Bar Family Foundation, and the Clarence E. Heller Charitable Foundation. The Pittsburgh Food Policy Council has 5 staff members and 3 interns. Of the government-embedded subgroup, the Philadelphia Food Policy Advisory Council was the only organization with this information available, reporting one staff member, 1 Americorps VISTA volunteer, and funding from the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission and various private foundations. Because of the incomplete quality of the data regarding partners, funders, and staff, as well as the similarities in that data that was available, support is not found for Hypotheses 1, 2, or 3, as differences regard partners, funders, or
staff in these findings.

*Discourse*

This section presents findings regarding the discourse of FPCs across subgroups resulting from content analysis and concerning Hypotheses 1, 4, and 5. The most commonly used words are shared across all three subgroups, suggesting that the discourses of these organizations, regardless of organization type, are more similar than they are divergent. This provides support for Hypothesis 4, and places the discourses of these FPCs broadly within the food security and justice orientations.

Figure 9. Word cloud: Discourse of all subgroups (words with 3 letters or fewer excluded)

Figure 9 visually represents the discourse of all three subgroups. Note that “food” has been removed from the later tables in this section, as it was sure to show up in every
group and was thus not meaningful. The generation of the world cloud below, however, did not allow for the removal of the word “food” without the simultaneous removal of all words with four or more letters, which would eliminate words like “safe” and “just.”

The discourses of the three subgroups shared their most common concepts, providing a lack of support for the idea that subgroups would differ regarding their discourses, part of Hypothesis 1. Overall, most these concepts fit best with the food security discourse as described by Holt-Giménez & Shattuck, with the nonprofit group’s inclusion of words such as “equity,” “action,” “responsible,” and “opportunity” perhaps evoking greater notions of food justice. This confirms Hypothesis 4, that the discourses of all three subgroups would fit into food justice or food security framings. While the grassroots and government-embedded groups do include “just” and “educate”, respectively, their discourses are more characterized by notions of production and the creation of fairer conditions within current market structures, as embodied by the food security orientation.

However, it is interesting to note that the same two groups include “health,” an element of the food justice movement’s historical emergence from environmental justice (Bullard 1994; Herrera et al. 2009). These, more nuanced, findings provide some support for Hypothesis 5, that grassroots and nonprofits FPCs may have more diverse or holistic orientations and greater attention to broader social justice issues, while government-embedded FPCs may conform more to Reformist or food security agendas. Surprisingly, though, in terms of the discourse results provided above, the nonprofit subgroup appears to be the most unique, exhibiting a discourse more attuned to food justice than the other two subgroups.
Table 15. Discourse: most common concepts for all subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Common concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listed by 4 or more FPCS in all subgroups (in no particular order)</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable/sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed by 3 or more FPCs in all subgroups (in no particular order)</td>
<td>Economic/economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment(al)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutrition/nutritious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve(ment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 above shows the most common words used in the mission and vision statements of FPCs in all three groups. Frequency is according to the number of FPCs that utilized the word, not the absolute number of times any given word appeared. We see that “sustainability”, “local”, and “access” come up frequently, mentioned by 4 or more out of 8 FPCs per subgroup, in all three subgroups. This is consistent with the finding that the top three priorities reported across all three groups in the larger sample were Healthy Food Access, Food Production, and Education, although sustainability does not come up explicitly in the priorities and education is only listed in the first cluster here for the nonprofit subgroup. Below the top three are listed those words that were included in the mission and/or vision statements of exactly three FPCs in all subgroups, for honorable mention.

Table 16. Discourse: Differences in common concepts across subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Grassroots</th>
<th>Nonprofit</th>
<th>Government-embedded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concepts unique to subgroups, listed by at least 3 FPCs in that subgroup</td>
<td>health, productive/productive, affordable,</td>
<td>hunger, equity/equitable, educate, urban,</td>
<td>health, affordable, just/justice, safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in order of frequency)</td>
<td>farm(er)/(ing), secure/security, region(al)</td>
<td>responsible, just/justice, productive, opportunity, region(al), action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 displays the most common concepts present in the mission and vision statements of the FPCs in each subgroup after removing the common top concepts in Table 15. Only concepts that appeared in three or more FPCs in a subgroup were included in Table 16. Differences between groups can be seen in that “affordable” and “health” only appear in the grassroots and government-embedded subgroups. The grassroots group is also the only subgroup for which “farm” and “secure” (and stemmed words) appear on this chart (there may have been 1-2 uses of it in other groups, but here only words used by 3 or more FPCs are displayed). Additionally, “just”/“justice” are part of the discourse of the nonprofit and government-embedded subgroups, but not that of the grassroots FPCs.

The nonprofit group is unique in that it is the only subgroup in which “hunger,” “urban,” “equity,” “action,” “responsible,” and “educate” (and stemmed words thereof) are used frequently enough by the FPCs within to be included in Table 16. The government-embedded group diverges from the other two only in that it is the only subgroup in which “safe” (and stemmed words) appear with any frequency. Only the grassroots and nonprofit subgroups include the words “productive/production” and “region(al).” When initially compiling this data, it became apparent that, due to order of frequency (even beyond 3-4 FPCs per subgroup,) the emphasis of the nonprofit FPCs appears to be characterized more by a commitment to sustainability and environmental goals relative to the other two groups, for which food access, health and local foods are paramount.

Finally, a Venn diagram summarizing the many areas of convergence, and few areas of divergence, in FPC subgroup discourse is presented below in Figure 10. In the
Venn diagram, terms utilized by 3 or more FPCs per subgroup are included. Some of these also represent their stemmed versions, such that “farm” also represents “farmer” and “farming” and “secure” also represents instances of “security.” This is also the case for “economy” (“economic”), “environment” (“environmental”), “nutrition” (“nutritious”), “improve” (“improvement”), “region” (“regional”), “productive” (“production”), “equity” (“equitable”), and “just” (“justice”).

Figure 10. Venn diagram: Overlap and divergence in FPC discourse by subgroup

Interestingly, “rural” does not appear the discourse of any subgroup. The only FPC of the 24 selected cases to use that word, in any of the texts analyzed here, is the Southeastern NC Food Systems Program/FEASTDOWNEAST, in stating that its president and cofounder is a rural sociologist, and that it “…includes both rural and urban counties to maximize market opportunities and profits for farmers”, and that the region it
serves is the “…most ethnically diverse region in North Carolina and in Rural America.”

Approach to Food System Issues: Priorities

This section reports findings regarding the priorities of case study FPCs, which is one element of their approach to food system issues as operationalized for this research, by subgroup. These findings provide insight into Hypotheses 1 and 6, the latter being that government-embedded FPCs will exhibit a greater tendency to engage in activities that conform more closely with the Reformist trend than the other two subgroups.

Table 17. Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grassroots*</th>
<th>Nonprofit</th>
<th>Government-embedded**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most common priorities</td>
<td>Healthy Food Access (6), Purchasing (5), Food Production (4)</td>
<td>Food Production (6), Healthy Food Access (5), Purchasing/Education (4)</td>
<td>Food Production (8), Healthy Food Access (6), Purchasing/Anti-Hunger (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other priorities</td>
<td>3 for Education and 3 Networking. None for Anti-Hunger, Fitness, Food Waste, Economic Development (including Food Hub), or Other.</td>
<td>1 for each: Economic Development (including Food Hub), Networking, Anti-Hunger, Food Waste, &amp; Other. None for Fitness.</td>
<td>1 for Food Waste, 1 for Economic Development (including Food Hub) and 1 Other. None for Education, Fitness, Networking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*one FPC in this group did not select any priorities **three FPCs in this group selected 4 priorities

Table 17 above displays the most common priorities for each subgroup.

Generally, the top 3 priorities for all 3 groups follow what was found in the analysis of the larger sample. Instead, Anti-Hunger makes it into the top three for government-embedded FPCs, and Purchasing is a top three priority for grassroots and nonprofit subgroups. After the top three, we see that there were 3 responses for Education and Networking each in the grassroots subgroup. In other words, while all three groups share similar top priorities, the grassroots and nonprofit groups are more like each other in their nearly absolute exclusion of Anti-Hunger as a top priority (although the nonprofit group
does list it twice).

Additionally, the government-embedded subgroup does not list Education as a top priority at all, while Education does come up for several FPCs in the other two subgroups. Strong support for Hypothesis 1 is not found here, as FPCs of all subgroups are found to converge in their identification of top priorities often. Nonetheless, there are some differences between subgroups, particularly when looking at government-embedded FPCs relative to grassroots and nonprofits FPCs which, as in the survey results, are more concerned with Education and Networking. This relative lack of concern with issues other than food production/food access among the government-embedded subgroup also provides moderate support for Hypothesis 6, suggesting a somewhat more Reformist strategy among FPCs of this organizational type.

**Approach to Food Systems Issues: Successes & Policy Achievements**

Next, I examine the successes and policy achievements of case study FPCs, two further elements of their approach to food systems issues, according to subgroup. As such, these analyses aim to test Hypotheses 1, 6, and 7.

Table 18 displays summary information for the aggregated successes and policy achievements of FPCs in the grassroots subgroups. Among their successes are the creation of markets that facilitate SNAP redemption, receipt of a health-oriented grant, the promotion of local foods and food systems education, and efforts for community engagement and the development of partnerships within. The policy achievements for this group include ordinances to allow urban farming and the serving of school garden food in the cafeteria. They also include policies to facilitate food production at home and in urban environments, but unlike the other two subgroups, the grassroots group included
policy regarding sugar-sweetened beverages.

Table 18. Grassroots: Successes and Policy Achievements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successes</th>
<th>Policy/Legislation (8): community gardens model policy; sugar-sweetened beverages policy; passed food charter, UDO to include commercial agricultural use for land; city gardening/urban farming, homestead &amp; urban beekeeping, composting; school garden food in cafeteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational (2): emergence as operational backbone organization fostering programs within two networks (one tribal, one nonprofit coalition); receipt of American Planning Association’s Plan4Health grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Foods/Food Security (3): successful mini-market pilot in low income neighborhood where SNAP was accepted and a nutrition incentive provided; made changes to school food contract; food needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (2): created native-foods version of USDA’s MyPlate as a photo project; local foods campaign outreach and awareness month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community (5): well-attended public forum inviting community to join task forces and develop council; food systems collaboration, networking, and partnership; convened Anchor Institutional Round Table event, held public forum, formed urban farm committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below, in Table 19, we see that the nonprofit subgroup’s successes include the acquisition of funding for staff, the creation of Food Hubs, increased SNAP redemption, research and reports regarding land usage and sale, and community engagement and education programs, also characterized by cross departmental and cross-organizational partnerships. This first success, funding for staff, was also mentioned by the government-embedded group, but not for the grassroots subgroup, despite staff being listed as a need by all three groups. As policy achievements, the nonprofit subgroup reports the passage of legislation to improve compost policies, create a seed library, and improve zoning ordinances for urban agriculture, farmer’s markets, and procurement. Furthermore, one FPC in the nonprofit group reports having supported a minimum wage measure in their city.
Table 19. Nonprofit: Successes and Policy Achievements

| Successes | Organizational (3): funding for staff/Americorps member (2); strategic plan development (1)  
Local Foods/Food Security (7): Food Hub creation (1); school garden and nutrition curricula (1); food assessment used by other local organizations (1); white papers and reports regarding city-owned land and land sale process (2), project to increase SNAP/EBT usage at farmer’s markets (2)  
Community (9): successful partnerships with county government, extension, health department, school district and other organizations on local food campaigns (3), awareness events (1), and good food procurement (2); hosted forums on policy issues (2); developed 3 county FPCs (1) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Achievements</td>
<td>Policy/Legislation (10): supported passing of two bills to revise compost policy (1); seed library; recommendations to and collaboration with city to revise, create, and amend urban agriculture/mobile farmer’s market zoning ordinances (6) and to shift towards procurement that follows Good Food Purchasing Policy (1); compost policies, Right to Grow campaign and legislation (1); supported increased minimum wage measure (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, Table 20 (below) shows that the government-embedded subgroup’s successes have included the aforementioned funding for staff, a Joint Powers agreement which allowed for more authority and direct opportunity for input on policy, the creation of a bus route to link residents with grocery stores, the planting of edible forests, increased funding for SNAP outreach and enrollment as well as a “double dollars” program at farmer’s markets, and having provided support for statewide initiatives. Among their policy achievements are the creation and revision of ordinances for food-producing animals and cottage food sales, the passage of a healthy vending policy that applies to all municipally-owned machines, and the successful lobbying of a state congressional delegation for Commodity Supplemental Food Program funding ($2.8 millions) to feed the food-insecure elderly.
Table 20. Government-embedded: Successes and Policy Achievements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successes</th>
<th>Organization (2): Food Systems Director position/funding for two years &amp; implementation plan; Joint Powers Agreement in 2014--more authority and opportunity to focus on policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community (3): creation of bus route linking residents to grocery stores (1); survey of grocery stores in community (1); hosted food policy and the next mayor forum (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Foods/Food Security (5): provided support to statewide food systems initiatives (1); planting of edible food forests in city parks (1); ensuring that food access and food systems planning is included in city comprehensive plan which has supported increased funding for initiatives (1); food finder guide to link residents with food pantries, soup kitchens, farmer’s markets, senior meal sites, etc (1); increasing funding for SNAP outreach and enrollment as well as for “double dollars” programs at farmer’s markets (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Achievements</td>
<td>Policy/Legislation (7): passed healthy vending policy for all municipally owned machines (1); successfully lobbied state congressional delegation for funding ($2.8 millions) of Commodity Supplemental Food Program to feed hungry seniors (ongoing) (1); worked with city council to pass ordinances approving cottage food sales and zoning for food producing animals, updated city’s urban farm ordinance (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the successes and policy achievements of all three subgroups, there are a number of common threads. In fact, the subgroups appear to have more in common than areas in which they diverge, providing no support for Hypotheses 1 and 6. All three groups report participating in the creation and revision of many zoning ordinances for the areas they serve. These commonly include measures related to urban farming, food producing animals, composting, community gardens, and cottage foods. All three subgroups also report having held public forums to educate and engage their communities in food system issues and policies as well as engaging in projects that aimed to increase SNAP redemption, funding, and usage at farmer’s markets.

The government-embedded subgroup is unique in that only in this group were there reports of join powers agreements, the creation of city infrastructure such as the bus route, the planting of edible forests in city parks, the creation of a vending policy that applied to all municipal machines, and the securing of funding from a state congressional
delegation. While it is not clear through what processes these ends were reached, these achievements might be interpreted as evidence that government-embedded FPCs benefit from political inroads or capital that may be less accessible to independent FPCs, thus lending support to Hypothesis 7.

**Approach to Food Systems Issues: Goals and Activities**

The last element of approach to food system issues, goals and activities, are explored in this section as they pertain to each subgroup and in relation to Hypotheses 1, 6, and 7. Table 21 below summarizes these for the grassroots subgroup. This subgroup’s goals and activities involve the creation of a just and equitable food system that provides local, sustainably-produced, and nutritious food for all. These FPCs also stated education, the development of youth programs and improved transportation systems. A theme that came up often in the goals of these FPCs was the building of community capacity, through the growing of a local food movement and well-informed advocates. Environmental sustainability was another theme, along with the expressed desire for some of these FPCs to impact nutritional habits through the creation of policies and guidelines. Job creation and the fostering of more cooperative local economic structures were also listed as guidelines, along with specific organizational goals such as strategic planning, leadership, and financial stability.
| Goals & Activities | Community (4): build capacity and educate; involve youth needs; presentation to business/community leaders to enlist support for policies that support equitable access, sustainable production, and understanding of local healthy food; effective transportation systems |
|--------------------|Environment (1): connect people to their food and environment while preserving farm, forest, and rural lands |
|                    | Food Security (3): encourage food preservation, seed-saving, community gardening (2), and home cooking; create a just food system that provides equitable access to local, nutritious food for all by responding to community needs and connecting people and organizations; increase capacity for farmer’s markets to accept SNAP |
|                    | Local Food (4): foodshed that reflects diverse cultural traditions of region, in particular indigenous food and landscape; develop food system that is abundant, cooperatively-managed, accessible, diverse, and sustainable and contributes to the well-being, self-sufficiency, balance and learning of the region through more diversified production systems; conduct a food system needs assessment; expand opportunities for local producers so that they are economically and environmentally sustainable; network local food entrepreneurs; F2I (2); organize local foods movement; develop informed advocates; season extension; renewable energy technology; improve government food and beverage procurement; |
|                    | Policy (2): beekeeping/animal/urban ag zoning policies in city; review and recommend policies |
|                    | Health (6): policies that will help people incorporate local food into their everyday lives; recommended daily consumption of fruits & vegetables; sugar sweetened beverage policy, education on local and healthy food (3); “food as medicine,” school wellness initiative |
|                    | Economic (3): more diverse transactions (including bartering and regional exchange); local foods-related small businesses and cooperatives; job creation through growth of long term economic vitality within food system |
|                    | Organizational (2): implement strategic plan; provide leadership and financial stability for long-term success |

The nonprofit subgroup, as represented in Table 22 below, lists the improvement of public health, community education, and youth programs among their goals. These FPCs also explicitly discuss energy efficiency and the protection of natural resources as goals for the food system they envision. Furthermore, FPCs in this subgroup list the
development of improved infrastructure for local food production and distribution, the protection of land and the environment, and the development of policies that support these as goals. Moreover, these FPCs list support of local business, fair wages, and safe working conditions for food safety issues, as well as local economic development more broadly as goals in their work.

Table 22. Nonprofit: Goals and Activities

| Goals & Activities | Community: greater public health (2); develop youth programs (1); communicate and engage with public and key decision makers (2); build partnerships across agencies, departments, non-profits, communities, and local businesses (3); build local advocacy and organizing capacity (1); partner with other cities to increase statewide resources and promote policies that will improve state food system (1); create centralized communication hub (1) |
| | Environment: promote energy efficiency and reduced energy consumption (1); preserve farmland and open spaces (3), protect environmental resources (4); minimize fossil fuel consumption and GHG emissions (1) |
| | Food Security: increase public “food literacy”(6); increase food security/eliminate hunger (healthy, nutritious and affordable food for all) (6) |
| | Local Food: 30% city food provided locally (1), “closed-loop” food system (2), link farmer and consumer, identify needs and opportunities; encourage food production through school gardens, rooftop and backyard gardening, edible landscaping, and agricultural incubator projects (1); F2S (1); drive up demand for local, healthy food (1); promote regional agriculture, farmers markets, and related infrastructure (5) marriage of environmental, social and economic sustainability/responsibility in food production (1) |
| | Policy: develop “well-integrated” food policies, implementation strategies, zoning codes and city budget that enable and preserve healthy local food system (5) |
| | Economic: support local economy through local businesses (1); fair wages and safe working conditions for food industry workers (2); reasonable profits for all members of food system (1); competitive returns to investors and landowners (1); economic development (3) |

Finally, the goals and activities of the government-embedded subgroup of FPCs can be found in Table 23 below. Again, these FPCs are interested in youth programs, as well as health and nutrition-related aims. Many list eliminating hunger through the provision of safe food for all residents as a main goal, as well as ensuring that the price of
food is affordable and that SNAP redemption is increased. Regarding food production, these FPCs note that the identification of land that can be used for agriculture and gardening, food mapping, procurement, and infrastructure development as goals. Policy that allows for this through the facilitation of food producing animal ownership, cottage foods, local procurement for schools, composting, and farmer’s markets are stated aims or current projects. Lastly, local economic development was a stated goal of several of these FPCs, with workforce development listed at least once.

Table 23. Government-embedded: Goals and Activities

| Goals & Activities | Community: youth coalition building (1), community engagement (2); ensure community voice in local food policy decisions (1); share information (1); end health disparities/improve health (2); educate healthy vendors on nutritional guidelines (1) |
|--------------------|Environment: soil best practices (1); improve recycling and composting systems (2) |
|                    | Food Security: eliminate hunger (4) & ensure improved access to a wide variety of safe and nutritious food is available for residents regardless of economic status, location, or other factors beyond a resident’s control (1); ensure price of food remains at approximate state level (1); increase SNAP redemption (1); ensure food justice (1) |
|                    | Local Food: identify and make available city and other land for food production (2); support urban agriculture & community and school gardens (3); food mapping (1); examine all aspects of local food system (1); good food procurement (1); improve aggregation and distribution infrastructure (1) |
|                    | Policy: zoning for food-producing animals (2), cottage foods (2); 50% locally procured food policy for school system (1); multiple policy blueprints regarding residential gardening, farmer’s markets, composting, urban chickens, and more (1); zero waste white paper (1) |
|                    | Economic: economic development (2); food businesses and workforce development (1) |

Taken together, there are more similarities between the goals and activities of the three subgroups than differences. There are few instances in which a goal or activity was listed, or listed with any frequency, in one subgroup and not in the others. This means
that there is little support for Hypotheses 1 and 7, in that there do not appear to be substantial differences in this aspect of strategies (approach to food system issues) based on organizational type. Overall, the case study FPCs appear to be working towards community food security and a food system that provides sufficient healthy food for all. Most are also explicitly interested in achieving local economic development, and at least one FPC in each subgroup mentions jobs, labor conditions and wages or workforce development. All three subgroups have goals and/or activities that relate to health and nutrition, youth, procurement (including Farm to School and Farm to Institution programs), and zoning ordinances to facilitate community food production, land protection, and composting.

Scherb et al. (2012) found that one primary activity of FPCs was educating the public, which is supported by the goals and activities of the nonprofit and grassroots groups, but is less evident in the government-embedded subgroup here and in earlier results around top priorities. Another area in which the three subgroups are not uniform regards the environment. The nonprofit and grassroots groups’ goals and activities more often referenced environmentally sustainability and the protection of soil, air, and water. These were less present in the government-embedded subgroup (although it was the only one in which a “zero waste” policy was mentioned).

Government-embedded FPCs appear to experience more success with infrastructure-related goals and activities (i.e. bus routes, city parks), providing moderate support for Hypothesis 7. The grassroots subgroup was unique in its inclusion of explicit nutritional guidelines or policies (i.e. sugar-sweetened beverage policy) as well as basic organizational stability objectives as goals. This could be a result of the more ambiguous
structure of grassroots coalitions relative to nonprofit organizations or government-embedded FPCs, for which there are more rigid and structured blueprints and requirements, as well as potentially greater opportunities for grant funding. If this is the case, this finding would also provide some support for Hypothesis 7. Alternatively, this may be a function of the resources available to the FPCs in the case studies individually and not a function of organizational type.

III. Summary of Results

This section will review the findings from both the survey results and the case studies together for each subgroup, to summarize what has been observed in this research and identify consistent trends or divergences.

Grassroots. The grassroots subgroup exhibited similar regional trends in both the case studies and survey sample results. With five out of eight of the grassroots case study FPCs responding to the political and civic engagement question with “A great deal”, the case studies are in keeping with the survey results and have a higher rate of responding in this way. Five case study FPCs in this group said they do collaborate with other FPCs, which is a bit lower than the survey result of 84.9% of grassroots FPCs who responded “Yes” to this question.

The number of connections to government in the grassroots case study FPCs, at 0 to 1, follows the trends of the survey results. However, in the survey results government-seated was the most common type of connection, while in the case studies no connection was most common. The grassroots FPCs selected as case studies overwhelmingly work at the county level, while only 44.3% of the grassroots FPCs in the survey sample work at this scale. Finally, priorities for the grassroots subgroup were largely consistent between
the survey results and case studies, the only difference being that, in the case studies, “Purchasing” was one of the most commonly mentioned top priority, taking the place of “Education” from the survey results. In other words, the grassroots FPCs in the case studies listed “Purchasing” as a top priority more often than grassroots in the survey sample, and listed “Education” less often.

*Nonprofit.* Regionally, the nonprofit case study FPCs were like the survey sample in that the Midwest and Northeast were more common than the South and West. Like the grassroots subgroup, this subgroup exhibited even higher rates of responding “A great deal” to the questions regarding civic and political engagement. This may be a result of purposive sampling that sought relatively active FPCs and have well-established online presences. All case study FPCs in this subgroup said they collaborate with other FPCs, again outpacing the survey sample nonprofit FPCs of which 88% reported collaborating with other FPCs.

The number of connections to government was also in keeping with the survey sample results in that the most common response indicated one connection; however, in the survey sample more FPCs had zero connections while in the case studies a greater proportion had two connections. The most common types of connection were constant with government-supported/sanctioned and government-seated reported most often. The FPCs in the case study nonprofit subgroup more commonly work at the city/municipality level than FPCs of the same subgroup in the survey sample. Case study findings regarding top priorities were in keeping with top priorities from the survey results for this subgroup, with “Food Production,” “Purchasing,” “Education,” and “Healthy Food Access” all frequently cited.
Government-embedded. Half of the government-embedded FPCs from the case studies are in the Northeast, followed by two in the Midwest, and only two in the South and West. This follows the survey sample trend of these FPCs being more common in the Northeast and Midwest, although the Northeast may be overrepresented here. This subgroup’s case studies had identical responses to those of the grassroots subgroup regarding civic and political engagement in the case studies to the grassroots subgroup, which in both cases outpace the frequency of answering “A great deal” in the survey sample. Five out of eight case study FPCs in this subgroup indicated that they do collaborate with other FPCs, lower than the 80% who indicated collaboration in the survey sample.

Almost all case study FPCs in this subgroup have two or more connections to government, while some have four or five. This is in keeping with the survey sample trend in which government-embedded FPCs overall have a greater number of connections to government than the other two subgroups, although a full 27% of FPCs in the survey sample have only 1 connection to government. In both instances, government-created and government-supported are the most common types of connection to government. Five of the FPCs in this subgroup selected as case studies work at the city/municipality level, while only 32.4% of FPCs in the survey sample do the same. County was the most common jurisdiction (35%) in the survey sample for government-embedded FPCs, but no FPC selected as a case study in this subgroup works at the county level. The other three case study FPCs in this subgroup work at both the local and county level.

All eight government-embedded case study FPCs listed “Food Production” as a top priority. This was also one of the most frequently listed top priorities in the survey.
sample, but Healthy Food Access was more common in the survey sample. Another
difference between the case studies and survey sample is that, in the case studies, “Anti-
Hunger” comes up as one of the most frequently listed priorities (5 of out 8 FPCs), while
in the survey sample it is tied for fourth most common with “Education” (at 29.7% each),
which is not a common top priority in the case studies for this subgroup. This subgroup is
the only one to commonly list “Anti-Hunger” as a top priority in the case studies, which
is in keeping with the same subgroup’s higher frequency of listing this priority in the
survey sample as well.

**Does Organizational Type Matter? Comparing Subgroups across Institution, Key Actors, Discourse, and Approach to Food System Issues**

Table 24. Summary of similarities between subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All subgroups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution</strong></td>
<td>Civic and political engagement generally rated as being important to FPC work. Most FPCs report collaborating with other FPCs. Need for staff, funding, capacity building, trainings, policy research/information, support with communications, networking, community engagement, and online presence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Actors</strong></td>
<td>Members include many representatives of local NGOs, universities, or government as well as community members. Partners include extension, universities, NGOs (food banks in particular).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discourse</strong></td>
<td>Sustainability, local, access. Economic/economy, community, environment(al), nutrition/nutritious. Food justice orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach to food system issues</strong></td>
<td>Priorities of Healthy Food Access, Purchasing, Food Production. Economic development was not a frequent top priority in any subgroup, but local economic development and job creation come up as part of goals. Achievements and goals revolve around zoning and urban food production ordinances, increased SNAP redemption, partnership building, local procurement projects, and local foods campaigns. Common goal was to create an information hub and communication infrastructure with community partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returning to the research question, I summarize findings regarding differences (or lack thereof) between the subgroups in terms of the framework components: institution
(case studies and survey sample), key actors (case studies), discourse (case studies), and approach to food systems issues (case studies and survey sample).

Table 25. Summary of differences between subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grassroots</th>
<th>Nonprofit</th>
<th>Government-EMBEDDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution</strong></td>
<td>Fewest connections to government. Most common connections being government-supported/sanctioned, seated, or no connection. More commonly located in South and West. Most likely to work at county level.</td>
<td>Low numbers of connections to government, but higher than grassroots. Most likely to be government-supported/sanctioned or seated. More commonly located in South and West.</td>
<td>Greatest number of connections to government. Most likely to be government-appointed and/or created. More heavily located in Northeast and Midwest. More likely to work at city/municipality level, none at regional scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Actors</strong></td>
<td>Greatest mention of farmers or farm organization representatives as well as community members as members.</td>
<td>Membership more inclusive of public health and nutrition professionals.</td>
<td>Large proportion of membership consisting of government officials. Then university and extension professionals. Least direct representation of farmers or community members evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discourse</strong></td>
<td>health, productive/production, affordable, farm(er)/(ing), secure/security, region(al)</td>
<td>hunger, equity/equitable, educate, urban, responsible, just/justice, productive, opportunity, region(al), action</td>
<td>health, affordable, just/justice, safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach to food system issues</strong></td>
<td>More likely to list Networking and Education as a top priority. Goals and activities more inclusive of specific nutrition-related targets.</td>
<td>More likely to list Networking and Education as a top priority. Broader food security aims with greater inclusion of environmental targets.</td>
<td>More likely to list Anti-Hunger as a top priority. Goals and activities centered around hunger alleviation and local economic development. Somewhat greater success evident in changing local infrastructure (i.e., city land, transportation) and securing funding from higher levels of government for certain initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24 above summarizes the similarities across subgroups for each of the four variables, while Table 25 describes the differences observed between subgroups on these measures. These tables are intended as a point of reference for the discussion of similarities and differences on each variable that follows.
Institution. Regional differences are apparent in that government-embedded FPCs are more frequently located in the Northeast and Midwest, while grassroots and nonprofit FPCs are more frequently situated in the South and West. This may reflect differences in local government practices and resources across regions (or isomorphism within), and may have implications for the strategies and resources available to FPCs in different regions. While county was the most common jurisdiction across the board, this was especially the case for grassroots FPCs. Government-embedded FPCs were more likely than any other subgroup to work at the city/municipality scale as well as at the state level.

This is perhaps due to a mirroring of government structures at those scales, and may be useful observation in thinking about how FPCs of various organizational types may face different challenges in scaling up their efforts in terms of local, state, and federal policy issues. Furthermore, while 24.5% of grassroots FPCs and 25.3% of nonprofit FPCs in the survey sample work at the regional scale, none of the government-embedded FPCs do. Again, this may be in response to the lack of regional governments to facilitate such an effort, but may indicate an important role for grassroots and nonprofit FPCs in coordinating regional efforts.

Unsurprisingly, government-embedded FPCs generally have more connections to government than FPCs that are either nonprofit or grassroots coalitions. Overall, the nonprofit subgroup has more connections to government than the grassroots coalition, which might support a broad understanding of these three subgroups as a being on a spectrum of “institutionalization,” with grassroots being the least institutionalized, government-embedded the most and nonprofit in between. Furthermore, the types of connections differ; nonprofit and grassroots FPCs are likely to have government support
or government representatives serving in their memberships, while government-embedded FPCs are more likely to have been created by government and to have government-appointed members. This has often been presumed to be the case in the literature, but is supported by these results, and may have meaningful impacts on the work of these FPCs. Most FPCs rated civic and political engagement to be very important to their work, most reported collaborating with other FPCs, and many listed staff and funding as organizational needs. All three groups reported needing support with communications, online presence, networking, and social media.

**Key Actors.** Across all subgroups, common FPC members include university/college representatives, local government officials, and private citizens. The grassroots group appeared to lead in terms of representation on behalf of farmers, farmers’ organizations and farmer’s markets as well as spots reserved for community members at-large, followed by the nonprofit group, and finally the government-embedded subgroup where these types of members were rarer. The nonprofit group saw membership more greatly inclusive of public health and nutrition professionals, while the government-embedded subgroup had memberships dominated by city and county officials (often elected by a mayor or other elected representative), university/college representatives, and extension agents. Common partner organizations for all three subgroups were other NGOs (often food banks), extension, universities, and county and city government agencies.

**Discourse.** The discourses of all FPCs in this set of case studies heavily involve the terms “access,” “local,” and “sustainable/sustainability.” The following terms were employed by all three subgroups, although in some groups they were more prevalent in
some subgroups than in others: “economic/economy,” “community,” “environment(al),” “nutrition/nutritious.” The words “improvement,” “health,” and “affordable” were in use by three or more FPCs in both the grassroots and government-embedded subgroups. The same is true for “region(al)” and “productive/production” for the grassroots and nonprofit subgroups, while this applies for “just/justice” in the nonprofit and government-embedded subgroups only. The only word that was used by 3 or more FPCs in the government-embedded subgroup and not in any other group was “safe.” On the other hand, FPCs in the nonprofit subgroup used the words “opportunity,” “action,” “educate,” “equitable,” “urban,” and “responsible” more than FPCs in either of the other two subgroups. Finally, the grassroots subgroup was unique in that it was the only subgroup in which 3 or more FPCs utilized the terms “farm/farmer/farming” and “secure/security.” Taken as whole, the discourses of all three subgroups were largely representative of food security, with the nonprofit subgroup employing more elements of a food justice discourse.

Approach to Food System Issues. While top priorities were very similar across the three groups, within these selected FPCs, the government-embedded group did exhibit a greater tendency to list anti-hunger as a top priority, while the other two groups were more likely to list education as a top priority. Given the attention that local food systems have received as potential sources for economic development, we might expect to see a greater prevalence of economic development being listed as a top priority. Nonetheless, it was not a common top priority in any subgroup in either the case studies or the survey sample results. Successes and policy achievements for all three groups included many
partnership-building activities, local foods campaigns, and ordinances or other legislation to facilitate local food production and sale.

Goals and activities mirrored these, but also often included local procurement aims and projects. For the grassroots subgroup, the approach to food systems issues was more likely to include specific nutrition-related targets, although under a broader umbrella of community food security, than the other two subgroups. The nonprofit group focused broadly on issues of community food security and there was greater mention of environmental sustainability. Finally, the government-embedded subgroup approach focuses around eliminating hunger and spurring local economic development, despite the latter not being listed as often as a top priority in this subset of FPCs, and this subgroup appears to have experienced slightly more success in securing funding, achieving tangible outcomes (i.e. bus route), and securing city land.

A common goal overall was the creation of a communication or resource-sharing infrastructure or “hub” through which community partners could pool information and collaborate more effectively. This is not surprising given the frequency with which needs related to networking and information about specific policies were listed. This suggests that investment in greater networking opportunities for FPC members be seriously considered so that FPCs can share information about successes and failures of these “experiments among hundreds of locales and regions” (Mooney et al. 2014). Taking these findings into account, Table 26 (below) is provided to summarize the hypotheses presented in this research and whether, or to what degree, support was found for each.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Support found?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional &amp; Organizational Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1</strong>: FPCs of different organizational types will vary in terms of institutional and organizational characteristics, discourse, and strategies.</td>
<td>Little support. There are more areas of convergence among FPCs of all subgroups than differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2</strong>: Government-embedded FPCs will exhibit greater institutional support and access to resources compared to the other two subgroups, which will exhibit reduced access to resources, particularly staff and funding.</td>
<td>Mixed. Government-embedded FPCs in case studies appear to have equal problems with lack of resources such as funding and staff, but survey results show higher frequency of “government-funded” connection to government and overall closer relationships to government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3</strong>: Nonprofits may enjoy greater access to institutional partnerships and/or funding opportunities compared to grassroots.</td>
<td>Little support, although nonprofits did exhibit a somewhat lower need for basic organizational stability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discourse</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4</strong>: Discourses will fit into food security and/or food justice lenses (Reformist and Progressive)</td>
<td>Strong support. Mostly food justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5</strong>: Government-embedded FPCs may exhibit a weaker orientation towards social justice issues more broadly.</td>
<td>Little support. Discourse less diverse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6</strong>: Government-embedded FPCs will exhibit a greater tendency to engage in activities that conform more closely with the Reformist trend than the other two subgroups.</td>
<td>Moderate support. Greater within-group uniformity in food provision-related approach to food system issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H7</strong>: Nonprofit and government-embedded FPCs may enjoy greater success or effectiveness compared to grassroots (see H2 &amp; H3)</td>
<td>Mixed support. These subgroups exhibited somewhat greater organizational stability &amp; policy activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS

Discussion

FPCs: Progressive or Reformist? Considering the findings regarding the four framework components (institution, key actors, discourse, approach to food system issues), all three subgroups fit best into the “Progressive” trend as outlined by Holt-Giménez and Shattuck’s (2011) framework. In addition to strategies that are in line with many “Progressive” goals, the discourses of these FPCs fit most neatly into a food justice orientation, which is associated with the Progressive trend. It is clear from these results that, overall, FPCs are situated within the Community Food Security movement.

There are however, definite elements within the practices of each group that are more reminiscent of the “Reformist” trend. This may be a result more of the practical struggle between long-term goals and the need to alleviate food insecurity in the present than of any major differences in philosophical orientation. As sociologist Parker Palmer (2011) writes, “A movement’s success is signaled by a slow accretion of small changes in the system of institutional rewards and punishments by which all societies exercise social control.” Like all actors and organizations, FPCs must navigate this system.
FPCs appear to fit somewhere between the two trends, with individual FPCs along a spectrum. Nonetheless, of the three groups, the government-embedded subgroup appears to be situated slightly closer to the Reformist trend than the other two subgroups because of its more concentrated focus on hunger alleviation, production, and local economic development. However, it is worth noting that there is quite a bit of variation within each group, particularly the grassroots subgroup. For example, while some of the FPCs in this subgroup had a nutrition-oriented perspective and worked closely with public health departments to develop nutrition guidelines and similar outputs, others operated from a food sovereignty perspective, advocating for cooperative regional exchange and alternative market transactions, such as bartering. By and large, FPCs appear to be converging on similar issues and with similar goals and orientations towards food system issues. This finding highlights both the need and potential for greater networking opportunities among FPCs actors as well as the potential for an increased focus on broader issues of social inequity within the FPC movement.

**Social Justice and Economic Development.** Achieving food justice, or food security, involves the consideration of several factors beyond sufficient food production. Moreover, organizations that focus too specifically on hunger may be less successful than those with more systems-based approaches (Allen 2004; Dahlberg 1994). The strong focus on food production and access further suggests that the FPCs in this study, and perhaps to a somewhat greater degree those in the government-embedded subgroup, fit between the Progressive and Reformist trends, and may explain some of the critiques of FPCs that see their work as not being sufficiently radical, oppositional, or concerned with social justice.
As previously mentioned, “Economic Development” was not one of the most commonly listed top priorities of any FPC subgroup. Liz Tuckermanty, director of the USDA Community Food Projects Program has noted that this is a weak link in those projects as well (Allen 2004). Additionally, the finding that government-embedded FPCs were most likely to focus on “Anti-Hunger” may suggest the understanding of social justice and food insecurity as an issue of food accessibility, as opposed to one of basic economic equity. Allen warns that over-reliance on emergency food provision can perpetuate the notion that food insecurity is being adequately addressed (2004).

Despite the presence of social inequalities throughout the agrifood system, Allen (2004) notes that American alternative agrifood movements have tended to be somewhat silent regarding the “structure of social inequities” as these issues may prove too contentious for many organizations. Other scholars have noted an absence of connection between food systems issues and social justice within FPCs and similar institutions (Mendes 2007; Allen 2013). Another critique of alternative agrifood movements has been the elevation of the environment over issues of social equity and labor (Allen 2004). This is not challenged by the findings in this research, as the environment was more commonly a theme than human rights or labor conditions. Furthermore, the data presented here suggest that farmers and food service workers are often not included in food policy council activities to the extent that they could, and many would argue should, be.

These critiques suggest that FPCs might work to place more emphasis on more fundamental issues of social equity with awareness that the market system that created food insecurity is unlikely to contain the solutions to food insecurity and environmental
unsustainability within it (Allen 2004). Moreover, new strategies for help FPCs better engage food system stakeholders and community members across these divides may be necessary. For their part, Holt-Giménez and Shattuck warn that organizations within the Progressive trend, such as FPCs, are vulnerable to co-optation by the corporate food regime if they do not develop proper partnerships with organizations in the more food sovereignty and social justice-oriented Radical trend (2011). Overall, the findings of this study do not refute this view, but also highlight the ways in which many FPCs are working to create more holistic and inclusive solutions to inequities in the food system.

Presumably, many of these FPCs struggle to balance a desire to create profound social change with the necessity of working towards incremental, achievable goals. Again, this tension is often made more difficult by a lack of resources. Nonetheless, as Allen (2004) asserts, “alternative agrifood movements will not be able to change American food and agricultural policy unless they can somehow overcome the characteristic inertia of the federal government in this policy area and somehow overcome or outmaneuver the structures of power and privilege that originally created continue to maintain these policies.”

Study Limitations and Future Research

Limitations include the fact that data used in this study are not well-suited to detailed understandings of intricate relationships on the interpersonal level and how they might affect the work of various FPCs, nor to the exploration of issues related to jurisdiction or scale that may influence FPCs differently (i.e. state vs. city/municipality government-embedded FPCs). These data also represent a cross-section of FPCs in the United States at one point in time, and are thus unable to capture any evolutions that may
have occurred over time both in FPC structures and orientations. It may be that the dominant political or cultural climate influence the problem-definition and strategies of FPCs in ways that fluctuate with changing public discourses.

A key criticism of alternative agrifood movement organizations has been the narrow range of participants found within them (Allen 2004). Furthermore, literature shows that power dynamics surrounding race-based and socioeconomic inequalities may play a role in the capacity and decision-making of FPCs. Homogenous memberships often do not accurately represent those who are often most affected by food system dysfunction and food insecurity (Allen 2004). In addition, the gendered dynamics of the agrifood system and movements that seek to change it are not incorporated into this work, but warrant greater attention.

Unfortunately, these aspects of FPC makeup are not covered in the data used in this research, and are not within the scope of this work. The case studies, while providing a more detailed view of 24 of the FPCs represented in the sample, do not produce generalizable results and may not provide as in-depth of an understanding of FPC framings as desired. Future surveys may be expanded by the inclusion of questions aimed to shed light on these key demographic and funding components. Alternatively, future research might overlay these or similar data with demographic data (race, income, etc.) about the communities in which FPCs are present (or absent).

Moreover, in some cases the top priorities of a subgroup did not necessarily directly reflect the work they were observed to be involved in and striving towards. This highlights the need for better measures regarding the challenges faced, and successes
won, by FPCs. Additionally, a detailed exploration of FPC funding sources, or lack thereof, and how this influences their activities and outcomes is needed.

Other directions for future research might also include the comparison of rurally-located FPCs with those in urban areas, to explore whether they differ in terms of activities, makeup, resources, or the types of community qualities (i.e. dominant type of agriculture or industry, level of food insecurity, presence of food deserts) that are associated with their presence. Future research should push further into the questions raised here as well as into ways that FPCs and similar organizations might bridge the goals and voices of Community Food Security circles with those of sustainable agriculture, which are often separate (Allen 2004). Such efforts might benefit from more detailed surveying of, and/or interviews with, FPC members and the challenges faced by FPCs in working towards their goals and engaging with food system stakeholders.

**Significance and Implications**

In highlighting both the differences and common trends across subgroups of FPCs by organizational type, this research has sought to inform community efforts and local government strategizing towards the creation of democratic food policymaking processes. Overall, this study finds FPCs of all organization types sharing more similarities than differences. However, insights into the challenges and differences in resources often present across subgroups may be useful not only in thinking about the development and maintenance of healthy food systems, but also as a model for work on other community issues and in the cultivation of social capital.

Some support has been found for hypotheses regarding a somewhat more “Reformist” nature of government-embedded as well as for previous findings that these
FPCs may have greater access to resources or political inroads, although all three
subgroups needed greater funding and support generally. Unsurprisingly, government-
embedded FPCs seem to work more closely with government, so that tendency is
confirmed. However, overall, this study finds FPCs often engaging in similar activities,
towards similar policy objectives, and in the face of similar obstacles. This may suggest
that the “best” organizational type for any FPC depends more on their local
circumstances than on the inherent attributes of any one type.

However, the idea that a hybrid type of structure, or ‘equilibrium point,’
concerning relationships to government, is beneficial for FPCs may find support in the
results of this research. Nonprofits were found to have somewhat more diverse
discourses, projects and activities, perhaps more so than government-embedded FPCs as
a group, while maintaining autonomy regarding membership and a somewhat greater
tendency to have government partnerships and resources than grassroots FPCs. This
suggests that FPCs of the three organizational types may be located not only on a
spectrum related to their orientation as Progressive or Reformist, but also in terms of the
practical implications of their governance structures.

This research also highlights the need for greater networking opportunities and
communication infrastructures within the FPC movement, as shown through the direct
expression of these as necessities by respondents who often included them as a top
priority, goal, or activity for their FPC. Another important implication of this research is
the suggestion that FPCs and organizations doing similar work aim to incorporate broader
social justice issues and problems into their framings, perspectives, and solutions.
The FPC movement might be served by, and serve communities better through, greater attention to economic development, rural places, and the development of greater diversity (of all types) within their organizations. While this research was unable to reveal demographic characteristics of membership, previous literature has suggested that FPCs would benefit from memberships with greater diversity in terms of race/ethnicity and socioeconomic class, and support is found in this research for previous findings that FPCs could be significantly more inclusive of various professional backgrounds, particularly farmers and food industry workers.

Finally, Morris (1986) writes that movement centers that exist for one purpose may provide organizational frameworks that allow for proliferation of future movements. Mooney et al. (2014) agree, writing "We would contend that, in the end, this might be one of the most important roles of FPCs in the construction of alternative/oppositional practices: that they serve as incubators and diffusion mechanisms of a potentially diverse range of experimental practices.” The creation of a better agrifood system requires the development of alternative institutions and practices, and FPCs provide a point of entry and engagement for people from many walks of life to begin this process, as well as to integrate environmental and social issues into a unified coalition around food (Allen 2004). A deeper understanding of how these organizations can partner with local government and meaningfully engage with their communities may contribute to the potential of FPCs to deepen democracy while providing a mechanism for the linking of local needs to larger policymaking processes (Mooney et al. 2014).
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APPENDIX A: SURVEY

Food Policy Network Directory Survey

Description: Since 2013, FPN has conducted an annual survey of food policy councils across the U.S. and Canada. The survey collects information on the structure, governance, technical assistance needs, and engagement of FPCs along with contact information. The survey is posted on the [FPN website](#) so that councils can update their information at anytime, however we do significant outreach during the summer for the annual update. We rely on the directory from the previous year to contact councils about updating their information.

Below are the survey questions:

Check ‘Yes’ if all information is correct (For councils already in the directory).

Type of council:
- Native American Tribal Council
- State (U.S.)
- Province/Territory (Canada)
- County
- City/Municipality
- Region
- Both Local and County

Official name of FPC:

What is the current status of your FPC? (Only councils which are Active or In Development will be listed in the directory.)
Active
Inactive
In development

What year were you formed?

Primary contact:
First and last name, relationship to FPC
Mailing address or P.O. Box
City
State or Province
Country (USA, Canada, United Kingdom, Australia, Other)
Email address
Phone number

Alternative contact:
First and last name, relationship to FPC
Street address or P.O. Box
City
State or Province
Country (USA, Canada, United Kingdom, Australia, Other)
Email address
Phone number

FPC website(s): Provide the web address(es) to online information about your FPC, including social media such as Facebook and Twitter.

Organization type (select the option that best describes your group):
Non-Profit
Housed in another non-profit
Grass-roots coalition
Convener of Food Policy Councils in a region
Embedded in government (e.g., county or provincial organization)
Embedded in a university/college
Embedded in an extension office
Other (describe in the text box below)

Connection to government (choose all that apply):
No connection to government
Government-seated (government employees are members of council)
Government-appointed (members are appointed by a government official)
Government-funded (government directly funds FPC work)
Government-supported/sanctioned (government provides in-kind donations)
Government-created (FPC created by Executive Order or similar action)
Other

Has your organization structure changed over time?
Yes
No

Do you work or collaborate with other FPCs?
Yes
No

What are the FPC’s current top three priorities?
Food Production (Urban and/or Rural Agriculture, Gardening, Land Use, Zoning)
Education
Purchasing (Farm to School, Farm to Institution, Cottage Food Industry)
Healthy Food Access (SNAP Incentives, Healthy Vending, Nutrition)
Fitness
Anti-Hunger
Food Waste
Economic Development (including Food Hub)
Networking
Food Producer/Processing Support
Other

What kind of technical assistance is needed by the FPC?

Please describe the FPC's biggest success to date (Note: This may be the same as last year.)

Please list your policy achievements.

Where, how or from whom would you like to receive information that would help inform the FPC about specific issues?
Food Policy Network Listserv
Food Policy Network website
Comfood Listserv
Other

To what degree will your FPC need to civically engage the community to accomplish your top three priorities? Civic engagement is organized voluntary activity focused on community problem solving and helping others. Select one response.
Never
Rarely
Occasionally
A moderate amount
A great deal

To what degree will your FPC need to politically engage to accomplish your top three priorities? Political engagement is activity meant to influence government action, either through affecting the making or implementation of public policy or through the selection of the people who make those policies. Select one response.

Never
Rarely
Occasionally
A moderate amount
A great deal
APPENDIX B: FOOD REGIMES/FOOD MOVEMENTS FRAMEWORK (HOLT-GIMENEZ 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Food Regime</th>
<th>Food Movements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Politics</strong></td>
<td><strong>Neoliberal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discourse</strong></td>
<td>Food Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Institutions</strong></td>
<td>International Finance Corporation (World Bank); IMF, WTO; USDA; (Villas) Global Food Security (Ulf); Green Revolution; Millennium Challenge; Heritage Foundation; Chicago Global Council; Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation; Feed the Future Campaign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Model</th>
<th>Corporate</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach to the food crisis</strong></td>
<td>Increased industrial production; deregulated corporate monopolies; land grab; expansion of GM crops; public-private partnerships; liberal markets; international sourced food aid</td>
<td>Same as neoliberal but with increased medium and some locally sourced food aid; more agricultural aid but tied to GM crops and bio-fortified climate-resistant crops</td>
<td>Right to food; better safety nets; sustainably produced, locally sourced, food, agriculturally based agricultural development</td>
<td>Human right to food sovereignty; locally sourced, sustainably produced, culturally appropriate, democratically controlled focus on UN/FAO negotiations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C: GRASSROOTS CASE STUDY FPC PROFILES

1. Duval County Food Policy Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Meetings: 4th Thursday of month 5:15-6:30 open to public Funded: not listed Partners: Healthy Jacksonville Childhood Obesity Prevention Coalition, Healthiest Weight Florida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grassroots, formed 2011</td>
<td>Government-supported/sanctioned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Members**
The DCFPC Advisory Board shall advise and provide guidance to the planning and operation of the council. All members of the Advisory Board shall be General Members. It shall consist of a maximum of 15 to 17 members, initially drawn from representatives of the following organizations: ("founding members"): 1. Duval County Health Department 2. UNF Brooks College of Health 3. Nemours Children's Clinic 4. Second Harvest Food Bank of North Florida 5. St. Vincent's Healthcare 6. Breaking Ground Educations Services Page 7. Duval County Public Schools 8. Ruckus Advertising 9. Health Planning Council 10. University of Florida 11. City of Jacksonville 12. Southern Food Policy Advocates Three (3) additional seats on the Advisory Board will be added to the founding members, with selection based on a decision of the founding members in the following categories: 1. Farmer 2. Duval County Based Wholesale/Retail Food Business (eg: chef, restaurant owner, store, local distributor) 3. Northeast Florida (not exclusive to Duval county) Institutional (eg: hospital) entity Three additional (3) seats on the Advisory Board will rotate every two years with representation selected from the General Membership with one seat designated to represent the faith-based community. The Advisory Board will designate one of its member representatives as Chair of the Advisory Board.

**Mission**
"The organization has a mission of promoting food systems that support improved nutrition and public health; increase access to all safe and wholesome food; and strengthen and expand the regional farm and food economy."

Three Taskforces: Institutional Food and School Nutrition Urban Agriculture Food System Assessment

**Goals**
- Duval County Food Policy Council Priorities: • Establishing guidelines for sugar-sweetened beverages served in childcare settings, consistent with the recommendations of the American Academy of Pediatrics, and encouraging water as the preferred drink of choice. • Defining recommended daily consumption of fruits and vegetables. • Food and beverage procurement by government. • Increasing capacity for farmer’s markets to accept electronic Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) Benefits. When SNAP Benefits changed from paper vouchers to
2. Headwaters Food Sovereignty Council

**NAME:** Headwaters Food Sovereignty Council  
**STATE:** MN  
**JURISDICTION:** Regional  
**REGION:** Midwest

| **Organization Type** | Grassroots, formed 2008  
75 partner/members, no info on funding or meeting times |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connections to government</strong></td>
<td>No connection— but website a umn.edu address? Not much recent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members</strong></td>
<td>75 member/partners listed on website—mostly farms, distributors, processors, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mission**

Mission: "The Headwaters Food Sovereignty Council will provide a foundation for food sovereignty and security by developing leadership in the 10 county/three reservation food shed. to build partnerships and connections between local growers, businesses, and consumers with an emphasis on sustainable food production, improving local economies, increasing access to under-served and at-risk communities, and creating a healthy and just food system for everyone within the Headwaters Food Shed Region."

Vision: "The Headwaters region – rich in wild plant and animal life and diverse, sustainable agricultural production – provides an abundant, healthy, affordable and accessible food supply for its residents. Food is cultivated, gathered, prepared and preserved in ways that honor the traditions of the people who live here. Our regional foodshed reflects robust gardening and gathering traditions; has adequate redundancies and diversity; uses scale-appropriate, ecologically supportive technologies; and strengthens community vitality and economies. This work will heal individuals, families, communities, intercultural connections, and the land."

See strategic plan for "values"

**Goals**

These long-term goals are further delineated by a series of key attributes of the future Headwaters region foodshed. As a result of our efforts, we would like to contribute to the development of an abundant, cooperatively managed, accessible, diverse, sustainable food system that contributes to the well-being, self-sufficiency, balance and learning of the region. We will see:

- An emergence of more diverse economic transactions, including greater level of regional exchange and bartering
- An understanding of food as medicine
- An increase of food preservation, home cooking with local fresh foods, seed-saving, community gardens, wild harvesting and gathering, and collective ownership
3. Marin Food Policy Council

**NAME:** Marin Food Policy Council (109)
**STATE:** CA
**JURISDICTION:** County
**REGION:** West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Grassroots, formed 2012 – except its website is on U of California’s cooperative extension site. Meetings Tuesdays 3-5 PM Government-seeded, government-funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections to government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Members** | STEERING COMMITTEE:  
Alexandra Danino  
Lori Davis  
Julia Van Soelen Kim  
Becky Gershon  
Lauren Klein  
Reba Miigs  
Bonnie Nielsen  
Steve Schwartz  
29 MEMBERS- ORGs listed below  
SI: Marin Food Bank  
Samsama  
UC Cooperative Extension, Marin  
SF Marin Food Bank  
UC Cooperative Extension, Marin  
Marin Health & Human Services  
UC Cooperative Extension, Marin  
Interfaith Sustainable Food Collaborative |
| **Mission** | "The Marin Food Policy Council (MFPC) was founded to address issues connected to food production, access, distribution, and nutritional health, affecting the county’s 248,794 residents. The Council serves a unique purpose that is not duplicated by any other body in Marin, bringing together the local food system stakeholders in a roundtable format that allows for information exchange, resource identification, and prioritization of needs. It examines the health, sustainability, and quality of life of Marin residents through the lens of community food security, and develops targeted policies and practical solutions based on a systems approach to solving food access issues. The Council works to provide a cooperative framework for action that addresses food policy issues and assists residents in increasing understanding of their food system. Food policy development is a systemic approach to the cultivation of a sustainable and equitable food system. It fosters policies that shorten the distance from farm to table while benefiting the land, economy, and well-being of all residents." |
| **Goals** | None listed exactly, but meeting agendas and notes are available online. Recent agendas list that in 2015 the focus themes were equitable access and youth needs/school nutrition. For 2016 they are equitable access (sugar sweetened beverage policy) and production (farm to institution). |
4. Pima County Food Systems Alliance

**NAME:** Pima County Food Systems Alliance [Tucson] [152]  **STATE:** AZ  **JURISDICTION:** County  **REGION:** West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Grassroots, formed 2011</th>
<th>Meeting times, partner orgs, funding not listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections to government</td>
<td>No connection, but: &quot;PFC&amp;A was launched as a collaborative effort between staff at the University of Arizona (UA) Meat and Milk Zuckerman College of Public Health (MEZOPH) and the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona (CFB). Both organisations were, in part, supported by the federal stimulus grant Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW). PFC&amp;A has also received support and guidance from other members of the University of Arizona community as well as the general public.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Members**
- Leadership council, Debbie Weigandt, is a farmer, freelance writer, and food/farm activist. She is a farmer, co-owner of Sleeping Frog Farms and co-founder of the Farm Education Resource Network (FERN). Dora Martinez considers herself a Food Justice advocate, a Semilla, a farmer, an Organizer, and a man of 3 goats works with food bank and neighborhood garden collective, Sheila Bustamente project manager/business analyst at the University Arizona College of Medicine – Arizona Health Sciences Center. Megan Mills-Nova is a graduate student in the School of Geography at University of Arizona, Rosalva Fuentes is the Farm to Child Outreach Coordinator at the Community Food Bank and Coordinator for the Border Studies Program at Earnhardt College (degree in Nutrition), Melissa Gant currently runs a Food and Nutrition Program at Emerge Center Against Domestic Abuse, Nick Henry directs a department at the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona that focuses on creating long-term solutions to hunger through farmers’ markets, gardening, farming, and culinary training.
- Jennifer Stoshower is a freelance food marketing and brand development specialist, and holds a Masters degree in Food Culture & Communication from the University of Gastronomic Sciences, Megan Kimble is the managing editor of Edible Bay Area, a local foods magazine serving Tucson and the borderlands, Elizabeth Mikeos has been a Chef Instructor at Pima Community College for 10 years, Chris Massarella manages the Farm to Child program at the Community Food Bank, Peter Warren is the Urban Horticulture Agent for the Pima County Cooperative Extension and the University of Arizona, Amanda Hilton is a graduate student at the University of Arizona. She studies applied environmental anthropology and focuses on foodways and agriculture in the Southwest, Kyle Rogers Assistant Dean of Finance for the University of Arizona Libraries/sustainable and local food truck, Ca’na Schlaflie has worked for over 13 years in the field of Agriculture. After graduating with a degree in Horticulture from New Mexico State University, she moved to Tucson in 2007 to develop and manage the Marana Heritage Farm, a 10 acre education/demonstration farm. Since Fall 2011, she has worked as the Food Production Manager for the San Xavier Cooperative Farm on the Tohono O’odham Nation, Kelly Watters is a market educator, community convener. She discovered these skills forming the Santa Cruz River Farmers Market and building grassroots networks in the borderlands while working many years at the Community Food Bank. Now at the Food Conspiracy Co-op, she is working to build literacy in food, health, and cooperatives with co-op members and the Tucson community.
### Mission

"PCFA aims to achieve an integrated, regional food system that promotes community-based strategies to increase access to healthful food."

**VISION:** An integrated, regional, secure food system that is environmentally sound, supports farmers, fosters economic development and expands access to healthy food for all including low income people and children in Pima County. By 2017, PCFA emissions that:
- Investment in local foods drives economic development;
- Policy incentives promote biodiversity and agroecology;
- Food producer networks/education exists at all levels of production;
- Distributing and marketing networks connect local producers and consumers;
- Access to healthful, affordable food for all;
- Food education and production at a neighborhood level;
- Powerful partners advocating for local food at all levels, and
- Awareness of how food affects health.

**MISSION:** Engage community partners to understand and develop our food system through the following strategies:
- Education: Creating opportunities for coalition members, their families, friends, neighbors, schools, and elected officials to learn about the importance of sustainably growing and eating healthful food as well as relevant food policy issues.
- Networking: Having a space to meet and learn from other food councils and individuals in the community who are involved in community-based food projects and programs.
- Outreach: Meeting with and inviting other individuals, organizations, agencies and policy makers to collaborate around the goals of the group.
- Policy change: Determining what governmental, institutional, and corporate policies are barriers to or opportunities to improve the conditions involved in growing and eating sustainable, local, and healthful food. Work to promote healthy and sustainable policies based on community-wide collaboration.

**VALUES:** The PCFA’s work is guided by the following values: Understanding, Accessibility, Cooperation, Economic Resilience and Environmental Health.

### Goals

**STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS:** Between 2012 and 2013, the PCFA will accomplish its mission and move towards its vision by:
- Developing informed and effective Local Food Advocates, Expanding Opportunities for Local Food Producers, Connecting People to Their Food and Environment

**Top 3 priorities**
- Food Production (Urban ag, gardening, land use, zoning)
- Education
- Healthy food Access (SNAP Incentives, Healthy Vending, Nutrition)

### Engagement

- Political: A moderate amount
- Grassroots: A moderate amount

### Collaborate?

No

### Biggest Successes

- "Helped craft policy language allowing school garden produce to be served in the cafeteria. Created native foods version of USDA’s MyPlate as a photo project."

### Policy Achievements

- "Helped craft policy language allowing school garden produce to be served in the cafeteria. Currently advocating for passage of friendlier urban ag zoning policies in Tucson."

### Technical Assist

"How to engage and include broader community."

---

## 5. Savannah-Chatham Food Policy Council

**NAME:** Savannah-Chatham Food Policy Council (178)  **STATE:** GA  **JURISDICTION:** City & County  **REGION:** South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Grassroots, formed 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections to government</td>
<td>No connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mission

"Our Vision
For all Savannah communities to eat affordable, nutritious, locally and sustainably grown food.

Our Mission
The mission of the Savannah Chatham County Food Policy Council is to coordinate and communicate efforts that develop, support, and promote policies that impact equitable access, sustainable production, and widespread understanding of healthy local food."

### Goals

- None listed, but have a local food survey, support Food Day, are completing a food system needs assessment, zoning that allows residents to keep animals/bee's, a community garden initiative, and has supported school wellness initiatives

### Top 3 priorities

- Food Production (Urban ag, gardening, land use, zoning)
- Purchasing (FS, F3, Cottage Food)
- Healthy Food Access (SNAP Incentives, Healthy Vending, Nutrition)
6. Summit County Food Policy Coalition

**NAME:** Summit County Food Policy Coalition (Akron) [191]  
**STATE:** OH  
**JURISDICTION:** County  
**REGION:** Midwest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Grassroots, founded 2009. &quot;Summit Food Coalition is a not for profit entity operating under the fiscal sponsorship of United Way of Summit County.&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections to government</td>
<td>Other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Members | BETH KNORR, DIRECTOR- has spent the majority of her adult life working in the local food and farming realms, inhabiting various roles such as organic vegetable farmer, farmers' market manager, and local food business owner.  
KATIE FRY, STEERING COMMITTEE CHAIR- 13 years as the owner/operator of a certified organic farm led to her present interest in the Food Coalition  
JILL OLDHAM, TREASURER- Director of Network Partners & Programs for the Akron-Canton Regional Foodbank  
Other steering committee members with no bios, one got into food systems through being a Master Gardener Volunteer, a few others have bios detailing how they became interested in food/ag but no institutional background/representation |
| Mission | "Mission  
Summit Food Coalition works to improve access to healthy food for all Summit County residents, and spur economic opportunities for farmers and food entrepreneurs.  
We are a coalition of organizations and individuals who are passionate about helping everyone in our community find local food sources, and eat more healthfully." |
| Goals | "We work to improve Summit County residents' overall health and quality of life through local food in four focus areas:  
Education: We create a culture of healthy eating through outreach programs that teach people how to grow, use and sell local food.  
Policy: We review and recommend policies that will help people incorporate local food into their everyday lives.  
Access: We connect organizations and people to help build a food system that makes local, nutritious food available to every Summit County resident throughout the year.  
Food Economy: We bring together local food entrepreneurs to network, share ideas, and provide mutual support."  
*"In 2015, the community foundation funded a series of strategic planning sessions that included individuals and representatives from more than 60 organizations, including local entrepreneurs, waste management"
7. The Durham Farm and Food Network

**NAME:** The Durham Farm and Food Network (195)  
**STATE:** NC  
**JURISDICTION:** County  
**REGION:** South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Grassroots, formed 2011. “Who We Are: The Durham Farm and Food Network is a grassroots, county-wide collaborative group of diverse, committed, and engaged residents and organizations.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Connections to government | Coordinating council is made up of 9 at-large members and 2 of each action circle. Names are available for action circle members but not institutional affiliation. The 9 at-large members are:  
Laura Pest – Durham Co-op Market  
Steve Saltzman – Self-Help Credit Union  
Cordell McGary Jr. – Chef  
Diamond Riley – Durham Co-op Market  
Braedyn Mallard – North Carolina Central University  
Rochelle Sparkes – Caroline Farm Stewardship Association  
Marc Dreyfors – The Forest Foundation  
Karen Hahn – Durham Resident  
Steven DeMou – Durham Resident |

| Members | Coordinating council is made up of 9 at-large members and 2 of each action circle. Names are available for action circle members but not institutional affiliation. The 9 at-large members are:  
Laura Pest – Durham Co-op Market  
Steve Saltzman – Self-Help Credit Union  
Cordell McGary Jr. – Chef  
Diamond Riley – Durham Co-op Market  
Braedyn Mallard – North Carolina Central University  
Rochelle Sparkes – Caroline Farm Stewardship Association  
Marc Dreyfors – The Forest Foundation  
Karen Hahn – Durham Resident  
Steven DeMou – Durham Resident |

| Mission | “Mission: The Durham Farm and Food Network will use the whole systems approach to create partnerships, develop policy, educate, and advocate for improvements to the local food system to encourage a healthy community, environmental stewardship, and economic development.” |

| Vision | “The Durham Farm and Food Network envisions a healthy community committed to local food and farms, environmentally responsible initiatives, and accessible food for all residents.” |

| Goals | “Current Action Circles:  
Health Action Circle – Working to ensure the health and well being for all Durham residents by connecting people, food, and the land to promote health and wellness.  
Economy Action Circle – Working to create jobs by growing and sustaining the long-term economic viability within Durham’s food system.  
Justice/Food Access/Hunger Action Circle – Working to create a just food system that provides food for all by improving equity and responding to the needs of the Durham community.” |

---

**Top 3 priorities**  
Healthy Food Access (SNAP Incentives, Healthy Vending, Nutrition)  
Education  
Economic Development (incl. Food Hub)

**Political and Civic Engagement**  
Political: A great deal  
Civic: A moderate amount

**Collaborate?**  
Yes

**Biggest Successes**  
“Successful pilot of a mini-market in a low income neighborhood where SNAP was accepted and a nutrition incentive provided; passage of a food charter”

**Policy Achievements**  
“Passed Food Charter.”

**Technical Assistance**  
“Strategic planning; recruiting diverse participants”

---

**Partner orgs:**  

**Funders:** not available

**Meeting time:** not available
8. Thurston Food System Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME: Thurston Food System Council (196)</th>
<th>STATE: WA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION: County</th>
<th>REGION: West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Organizations**
- Thurston Food System Council
- Thurston Prosperity Council
- Thurston County Public Health and Social Services
- Thurston County Resource Stewardship Department
- Thurston Conservation District
- Taylor Shellfish
- Sustainable South Sound
- South Sound Community Farm
- Oly Kravt
- Olympia Farmers Market
- Mason WSU Extension
- Helsing Junction Farm
- Gilbux
- Greater Olympia Slow Food
- Enterprise for Equity
- Corona Communications

**Mission**
- Mission:
  
  Our mission is to grow a vibrant local food economy, ensure broad access to healthy foods, and steward the environment in the South Sound.

  Vision:
  
  A thriving food system where everyone in our community enjoys and values food that is healthy, nourishing, local, affordable, culturally appropriate, sustainably produced and wisely managed.
Goals
None listed, but see project printout

Top 3 priorities
Food Production (Urban ag, gardening, land use, zoning)
Purchasing (F2S, FS, Cottage Food)
Economic Development (Incl. Food Hub)

Political and Civic Engagement
Political: A moderate amount
Civic: A great deal

Collaborate?
No

Biggest Successes
“Convening an Anchor Institutional Round Table”

Policy Achievements
“Get back to us next year”

Technical Assistance
“Admin/Staff”

Meeting times: Wed 9.30-11.30 AM
Partner orgs: Thurston Economic Development Council
Thurston WSU Extension
Thurston County Food Bank
South Sound Senior Services
Mason General Hospital
Evergreen State College Campus Food Coalition
Community Foundation of South Puget Sound
Aramark
and More...

Funders:

MISC:
“Decision Making
The South Sound Food System Network strives to make decision by consensus. Consensus-based decision making is in keeping with the inclusive nature of the network, which relies on the voluntary, aligned actions of independent participants in order to meet its mission. Consensus is defined as participants being able to “live with and support” the proposed decision or action. Decisions made by the group can be revisited with the consent of the group.
Should the network be unable to achieve consensus, the group commits to exploring why participants are unable to support the proposed decision. Only as a last resort will the group resort to majority-minority voting in order to be able to move forward. Support by a simple majority of participants present at a council meeting is required to pass a vote. Making decisions by majority-minority voting will be the exception rather than the rule.”

“Operating Norms
The South Sound Food System Network is inclusive. The South Sound Food System Network is a voluntary coalition of organizations and individuals. No formal application for membership is required. The network encourages broad community engagement and the participation of organizations and individuals to better connect diverse perspectives and sectors within the food system.”
APPENDIX D: NONPROFIT CASE STUDY FPC PROFILES

1. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Food Policy Council

**NAME:** Charlotte-Mecklenburg Food Policy Council (35)  **STATE:** NC  **JURISDICTION:** City & County  **REGION:** South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Nonprofit, formed 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections to government</td>
<td>partner orgs/funders not listed (see sponsors below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings: not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government-seat, Government-supported/sanctioned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Members**

"Director: Erin Brighten- adjunct faculty member in the Health and Physical Education Department at Central Piedmont Community College, active member of Slow Food Charlotte, Carolina Farm Stewardship Association, Southern Foodways Alliance, Foundation for the Carolinas Robinson Foundation for Civic Leadership, the Community Leadership Council of Toxic Free NC and she is on the board of the Mecklenburg Extension Friends of Agriculture and the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Fruit and Vegetable Coalition.

Nicole D. Peterson- Associate Professor of Anthropology at UNC Charlotte, Jodi Helmer- freelance journalist and author, Erin Jane Ilman- attorney at Bradley Arant Boult Cummings LLP, Reggie Singleton- health educator with the Mecklenburg County Health Department, Katherine Metz- freelance research consultant to non-profits and small businesses, Megan Liddle Sude- Director of Uptown Neighborhoods with Charlotte Center City Partners, Karina Gonzalez- Registered Dietitian, Elizabeth DeBraga- Project Manager at Compass Group, Marisa Falgen- Financial Analyst at Footjoy, Young-Sun Roth - Senior Vice President, Process Design Manager at Bank of America"* They also have many member son their "panel of experts" and a list of partner organizations

**Mission**

"The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Food Policy Council exists to advocate for policies that build a sustainable, equitable and healthy local food system. The goals of our council are to enhance the health of our citizens, strengthen local economies and market opportunities, and reduce hunger and food insecurity.

Our mission is to strengthen our community by:

- Serving as a forum for discussing food issues
- Building relationships in the food system
- Educating, advocating for, and communicating policy issues
- Acting as a primary information source for food related issues"*
2. Chicago Food Policy Advisory Council

**NAME:** Chicago Food Policy Advisory Council  **STATE:** IL  **JURISDICTION:** City/Municipality  **REGION:** Midwest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Nonprofit, formed 2002</th>
<th>Meetings: not listed</th>
<th>Funders: “details coming soon”</th>
<th>Partner Orgs: not listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections to government</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERIKA ALLEN - Chicago and National Programs Director-Growing Power, JOSE OLIVA - Co-Director-Food Chain Workers Alliance, RODGER COOLEY - Executive Director of the International Network for Urban Agriculture-Professor at Illinois Institute of Technology, MEGAN KLEIN - FarmedHere, BRANDON JOHNSON - Economist, DANIEL BLOCK - Director of the Fred Blum Neighborhood Assistance Center &amp; Professor at Chicago State University, PAULA RODERICK - Attorney, SEEDS (Southside Education and Economic Development Systems)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The Chicago Food Policy Action Council (CFPAC) facilitates and informs the development of responsible policies that improve access for Chicago residents to culturally appropriate, nutritionally sound and affordable food that is grown using environmentally sustainable practices.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Also see vision pdf |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From vision: “By 2021, the City of Chicago will have created a thriving, comprehensive, and just food system due to its forward thinking, commitment to a healthy and productive city, well-integrated food policies, and its partnerships across departments, agencies, non-profits, communities, and local businesses. A healthy food system will be a vital part of everyday life across Chicago and will contribute to the well-being of all residents.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Priority areas: food access, community development and engagement, economic development, creating infrastructure, sustainable environment, education. More details on website/pdf. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 3 priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Production (Urban ag, gardening, land use, zoning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Food Access (SNAP incentives, Healthy Vending, Nutrition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Cumberland County Food Security Council

**NAME:** Cumberland County Food Security Council **STATE:** ME **JURISDICTION:** County **REGION:** NE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Nonprofit, formed 2011 Funding, Partners, and Meeting times not listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections to government</td>
<td>Government seated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Hann-Executive Director, Cumberland County Food Security Council, Ron Adams Maine-Farm and Sea Cooperative, Karen Curtis-ME DHHS Food Supplement Program Manager, Kathy Poulin-ME DHHS Office of Aging &amp; Disability Services, Tim Fuller-Formerly Healthy Portland, City of Portland, Judy Gatchell-Independent Nutrition Consultant, Larry Gross-Southern ME Area Agency on Aging/Executive Director, Mary Turner-Mid Coast Hunger Prevention Program, Craig Lapine-Cultivating Community/Executive Director, Stephanie Aquillina-Cultivating Community/Growing Access, Growing Communities Program Manager, Kristen Mako-Good Shepherd Food Bank/President, Kathy Helming-Good Shepherd Food Bank/Agency Relations Director, Clara Whitney-Good Shepherd Food Bank/Communications Director, Barbara Nichols-Westbrook Public Schools Nutrition Service Director, Joanna Moore-Crosswalk Community Outreach/Executive Director, Richard Rudolph-Fomerly Rippling Waters Farm/Executive Director, Micah Russell-Persons's Town Farm at St. Joseph's College/Manager, Amy Russell-Catherine's Cupboard Food Pantry at St. Joe's/Director, Kathleen Savoie-UHCE Coop Extension/Associate Extension Professor, Amy With-UHCE Cooperative Extension/Extension Educator, Michael Norton-Hannaford Supermarkets/Director, External, Sheri Stevens-Hannaford/Community Relations Specialist, Zoe Miller-Opportunity Alliance/Healthy Lakes HMP Director, Lynn McGrath-GA/Health Team Leader (WIC, Summer Food Program), Sarah Murphy-OA/Healthy Lakes Nutrition Ed Coordinator, Donna Yellen-Prelle Street/Chief Program Officer, Michelle Lamm-Prelle Street/Maine Hunger Initiative Manager, Anne Nadoz-Goodywill NNE/Program Manager, Kelly Osborn-Goodywill NNE/Executive Director Workforce Services, Mary Zwolinski-Wayside Food Programs/Executive Director, Don Morrison-Wayside Food Programs/Operations Manager, Laura Hamilton-Wayside Food Programs/Metrics Coordinator, James Cloutier-Cumberland County Government/Commissioner, Peter Crichton-Cumberland County Government/County Manager, Susan Wittorf-Cumberland County Government/Commissioner, Nadeen Daniels-CC Government/Grants and Projects Liaison, Carol Carrillo-Independent Leadership Development Consultant, Dawud Ummah-NAAAC/Coordinator, Caroline Paras-Greater Portland Council of Governments, Neal Allen-Greater Portland Council of Governments, Bethany Beausang-Congresswoman Pingree's Office, Emily Hortense-Congresswoman Pingree's Office, Dan Readon-Senator King's Office, Kate Norfleet-Senator Collins's Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Leadership Team #Non-voting Member
4. Detroit Food Policy Council

**NAME:** Detroit Food Policy Council (52)  **STATE:** MI  **JURISDICTION:** City/Municipality  **REGION:** Midwest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Nonprofit, formed 2006</th>
<th>General meetings quarterly Tuesdays 5:30-7:30</th>
<th>Funding and partner orgs not listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections to government</td>
<td>Government-appointed, government-created</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Members | The Detroit Food Policy Council was established in 2009 by unanimous approval of The Detroit City Council. The DPFC is an implementation, monitoring and advisory body and consists of twenty-one members, including thirteen (13) representatives from various sectors of the Food System, four (4) "at-large" representatives, one (1) youth representative and three (3) governmental representatives, one each from the Mayor's Office, City Council and The Department of Health and Wellness Promotion (DHWP). Members serve as individuals. Executive Committee Officers: Suzette Oliver, M.D., Chair- Nutrition and Well Being, Jerry Ann Hebron, Vice Chair-Farmers' Markets, Mariangela Padili, Treasurer- Urban Planning, Sandra Turner-Handy, Secretary- Environmental Justice Council Members: Lindsay Fleisch- Sustainable Agriculture, Jetoni Barber-At Large, Jermond Booze- Food Industry Workers, Garry Bulluck- Appointee-Mayo's Office Appointee, Tyler Chatman- Youth Representative, Anika Grove- Wholesale Food Distributors, Colin Packard- At Large, Eileen Harmin- College and Universities, Kirk Mayes- Emergency Food Providers, Tapfiri Rashid- At Large, Ailano Nyar Kasanga- At Large, Marisol Touchworth- 6-12 Schools, Velonda Thomas- PhD-Appointee - Department of Health and Wellness Promotion, Kathryn Lynch- Underwood- Appointee-Detroit City Council, Zaundra Wimberly- Institutional Food Providers |

| Mission | Not found - food map, organizing documents, meeting notes online. Purpose, as found in bylaws: "Community Food Security can be defined as the condition which exists when all of the members of a community have access, in close proximity, to adequate amounts of nutritious, culturally appropriate food at all times, from sources that are environmentally sound and just. The DPFC was established to affirm the City of Detroit’s commitment to nurturing the development of a food secure city in which all of its citizens are hunger-free, healthy and benefit from the food systems that impact their lives. This organization also affirms the City of Detroit’s commitment to supporting sustainable food systems that provide people with high quality food, employment, and that also contribute to the long-term well-being of the environment. This organization addresses the following areas, but are not limited to: Current access to quality food in Detroit, Hunger and Malnutrition, Impacts/Effects of an Inadequate Diet, Citizen Education, Economic Injustice in the Food System, Urban Agriculture, The Role of Schools and other Public Institutions, Emergency Response. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 3 priorities</th>
<th>Anti-Hunger</th>
<th>Economic Development (incl. Food Hub)</th>
<th>Networking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political and Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Political: A moderate amount</td>
<td>Civic: A great deal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Biggest Successes | "CFSC was one of eight councils selected in a highly competitive national process to participate as a Community of Opportunity in the Growing Food Connections initiative. This has led to a stronger connection with county government and new partners."
| Policy Achievements | "Supported increased minimum wage in city of Portland. Hosted forum on Child Nutrition Reauthorization with participation from USDA Northeast Regional Office, Hosted forum with USDA Undersecretary Kevin Concannon."
| Technical Assistance | "Effective public communication through web site and social media." |
### Goals
Three committees: education and engagement, research and policy, youth programs. Responsibilities and details for each can be found online.

### Top 3 priorities
- Food Production (Urban ag, gardening, land use, zoning)
- Purchasing (FSI, Cottage Food)
- Healthy Food Access (SNAP Incentives, Healthy Vending, Nutrition)

### Political and Civic Engagement
- Political: A great deal
- Civic: A great deal

### Collaborate?
Yes

### Biggest Successes
"Adoption of a three year strategic plan that will guide our activities and help us in the development of a long range plan."

### Policy Achievements
"The Detroit Food Policy Council worked in collaboration with the City of Detroit’s Planning Commission to draft the city’s urban agriculture ordinances that related to cultivation, co-host community meetings to gather input and educate citizens about agriculture and worked to get the ordinances passed. The Detroit City Council adopted the new ordinances in March, 2013. We are now working with the same partners to draft ordinances related to animals and to implement the newly passed ordinances. Find the ordinances here: http://www.detroitmi.gov/Portals/0/docs/legislative/cpc/pdf/Urban%20Ag%20Ordinance%20Amended_Apr2013.pdf The Detroit Food Policy Council issued a report entitled, The Public Land Sale Process in the City of Detroit: A Community Perspective, which documented concerns raised by residents in a public listening session and put forth recommendations for improving the process. The DPFC is currently participating in a Land Sale Work Group being led by the City’s Planning and Development Department. The group is developing policies for the sale of city owned land for agricultural purposes. The report referenced above can be found here: http://detroitfoodpc.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/DPFC%20Land%20Sale%20Process%20in%20Detroit%20.pdf"

### Technical Assistance
Technical assistance is needed in developing financial and employment policies, policy development, and evaluating and measuring food system change.

---

### 5. Metro Omaha Food Policy Council

**NAME:** Metro Omaha Food Policy Council **STATE:** NE **JURISDICTION:** County **REGION:** Midwest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Nonprofit, formed 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meetings: one was on a Thurs morning</td>
<td>Funds: not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner orgs: not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connections to government</th>
<th>No connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Members | Board of Directors: Mary Balluff is Chief of the division of Community Health and Nutrition Services at the Douglas County Health Department in Omaha, Nebraska. Barbara J. Dilly -community activist/teacher/scholar who works with people at the grass roots to understand and organize collaborative initiatives and an associate professor of anthropology at Creighton University. Elizabeth Goodman- has worked on seed swaps and library projects and is Production Assistant at Blooms Organic Farm in Crescent, IA and Manager of Main Street Market in Council Bluffs, IA and Youth Advisor at Beth El Synagogue. Steffen and his associates with Nebraska-Iowa Sustainable Growers (NISG) offer marketing and management services for locally grown sustainable foods intended for Omaha area food retailers and market researcher and farm owner. Gustave Von Roenn- permaculturalist, Omaha Permaculture |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>&quot;Mission: The Metro Omaha Food Policy Council (MOFPC) is dedicated to establishing an equitable, nutritious and sustainable local food supply for all residents. Through community awareness and engagement from all levels of the food system, we will affect policy that improves the environmental, economic and social conditions of our community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>We envision a just, equitable, and sustainable food supply.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>&quot;The Food Policy Council seeks to identify both the opportunities and challenges for a just, equitable, and sustainable local food system in the Omaha Metro area. Therefore, the MOFPC will focus on:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Establishing benchmarks for a successful food system including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Efficient production, processing, and distribution of healthy, affordable foods;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Fair wages and safe working conditions for food industry workers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Reasonable profits for all members of the food system;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Competitive returns to investors and landowners;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Effective soil, water, and wildlife management;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Sufficient access to healthy foods;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) Economic development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h) Improved health outcomes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) Positive environmental impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Identify needs and examine opportunities for improving the local food system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Develop related policy recommendations and implementation strategies.
4. Educate and communicate with the public and key decision makers.
5. Promote collaboration and linkages within local food system networks and provide a forum for discussion and coordination.
6. Become a clearinghouse for information and act as an advisory body

 **Top 3 priorities**
- Food Production (Urban ag, gardening, land use, zoning)
- Education
- Purchasing (F2S, FSU, Cottage Food)

 **Political and Civic Engagement**
- Political: A great deal
- Civic: A moderate amount

 **Collaborate?**
- Yes

 **Biggest Successes**
- "the council contributed a white paper regarding the use of City owned land for community gardens that became a city planning department RFP and a standard operating process."

 **Policy Achievements**
- "Seed library legislation passed in the NE unicameral"

 **Technical Assistance**
- "Information related to specific policies such as cottage foods"

6. Oakland Food Policy Council

**NAME:** Oakland Food Policy Council  **STATE:** CA  **JURISDICTION:** City/Municipality  **REGION:** West

**Organization Type**
Nonprofit, formed 2009

**Connections to government**
Partner orgs: HOPE Collaborative, People’s Grocery, and People United for a Better Life in Oakland (PUSBL)

**Government-supported, functioned, government-created**

**Members**
- Michele Beluo, Haven Bourque founded Oakland-based HavenAndMedia, Cat Chang leads an Oakland-based architecture and urban design firm, Lisa Chen - San Francisco Planning Department, Julie Cummings - Center for Urban Education about Sustainable Agriculture, Daniele DeWulf-Williams - Senior Community Development Specialist with City Planning In San Francisco, Renee Ray Ellis is a Senior Associate at the Build Healthy Places Network, Susan Elsworth - Alameda County Conservation Partnership, Jacqueline Gleason - Executive Producer and Host of a local food justice centered podcast called Real Food Real Talk, Hank Herrera is President & CEO of the Center for Popular Research, Education & Policy (C-PREP), Jen Matthews - polisTricking, Shain McGraw - freelance grant writer, researcher, and policy analyst in higher education and food systems, Armando Nieto - executive director of the California Food and Justice Coalition, Alyssa Plaza is a Marketing Specialist for Pacific Coast Farmers’ Market Association (PCFMA), Allison Plat - Director of Policy and Services at the Alameda County Community Food Bank, Farhana Seraj - Executive Director of CoFED (The Cooperative Food Empowerment Directive), Neil Thapar - staff attorney at the Oakland-based nonprofit Sustainable Economies Law Center, Sarina Elmusam, PhD is the author of India’s Organic Farming Revolution: What It Means for our Global Food System. Currently, she is a Senior Associate of Supply Chain Programming at School Food FOCUS, Sarah Ting - currently leads a community food storytelling project, Talk2Share, Sabrina Wu is the Project Director of the HOPE (Health for Oakland’s People and Environment) Collaborative, Reyna Yagi - Program Associate & Executive Assistant at Acta Non Verba: Youth Urban Farm Project, Jennifer LeBarre - Director of Nutrition Services for the Oakland Unified School District (OUSD), Rob Bernatow - Prior to UCCE, he was a Community Coordinator at the NYC Housing Authority’s Garden & Greening Program, Doug Bloch - Political Director with Teamsters Joint Council 7, Robyn Kumar works for the Alameda County Public Health Department in Nutrition Services, Thal Kline, City of Oakland Human Services Department Plus 1 staff member

**Mission**
The mission of the Oakland Food Policy Council OFPC is to establish an equitable and sustainable food system.

OPPC STRIVES TO CREATE AN OAKLAND WHERE:
- Every Oakland resident is within walking distance to healthy, affordable food
- Oakland residents from all communities are conscious of the impact of their food choice on their bodies, their families, their communities and the environment
- Oakland residents are active in food policy development and outcomes
- The Oakland food system is an engine for local economic development and involves local and regional agricultural communities
- Food, hunger, and food systems is a permanent part of the City of Oakland’s agenda
**Goals**

OUR GOALS ARE

- Increase food security in Oakland. We will work to ensure that no Oakland resident experiences hunger.
- Build greater public health in Oakland. We will support the development of balanced food environments that empower residents with opportunities to make healthy food choices and reduce environmental causes of obesity, diabetes, heart disease and other diet-related illnesses.
- Support local agriculture that is economically viable, environmentally sustainable and socially responsible. We will help make Oakland a market for processing and consuming local food, with the objective of having at least 30 percent of Oakland’s food needs sourced from within the City and the surrounding region.
- Promote energy efficiency and reduce energy consumption. We will promote local, sustainable food production, and help create a food system that reduces pollution and uses non-renewable materials, and will promote food scrap composting.
- Promote community economic development. We will foster development in the food sector that creates living-wage jobs and local ownership in many sectors of the food system.
- Increase public “food literacy.” We will promote the sharing of information that will allow communities to make food-related choices that positively influence public health, social responsibility and environmental sustainability.

**Top 3 priorities**

- Food Production (Urban ag, gardening, land use, zoning)
- Purchasing (S25, PI, College Food)
- Healthy Food Access (SNAP Incentives, Healthy Vending, Nutrition)

**Engagement**

- Political: A great deal
- Civic: A great deal

**Collaborate?**

Yes

**Biggest Successes**

- “The success of our Right to Grow campaign in passing policy that supports growing and selling food by right.”

**Policy Achievements**

- "Several recommended policies adopted that support growing food and accessing land.
  - City partnership to develop mobile food-vending policies that support low-capital small business ownership and distribution of affordable healthy food.
  - City partnership to support shift in procurement practices that are in line with Good Food Purchasing Policy.
  - partnership with Oakland Unified school district to support Good Food Purchasing Policy."

**Technical Assist.**

- "Communications, training in racial equity, policy analysis training"

---

**MISC:**

OFPC is predominantly grant-funded. Support from our funders helps us achieve our key goals:

- Ensure food security
- Advance public health
- Ignite equitable community economic development
- Protect our natural resources; and
- Benefit and respect those that grow, produce, make, and consume food.

Although some of our funding comes from individuals, the vast majority of our funding is generously provided by the institutions below.

OFPC is a council first, created and dedicated to the intention of all gatherings of the community to problem-solve, act and celebrate. Food is our focus and policy is our tool but we are nothing if not a gathering of the community first. That said, in our role as a food-policy council, we analyze and report on the Oakland food system from production through consumption and waste management. Perhaps most importantly, we bring together underserved community members, food-sector professionals, elected officials and city staff to develop food policy. Our work has always been rooted in community through workshops, listening sessions, and community surveys to ensure our priorities are aligned with what the community needs and wants. From the start we have allied with agencies such as HOPE Collaborative, People’s Grocery, and People United for a Better Life in Oakland (PUEBLO)
## 7. Pittsburgh Food Policy Council

**NAME:** Pittsburgh Food Policy Council (154)  
**STATE:** PA  
**JURISDICTION:** City/Municipality  
**REGION:** NE

| Organization Type | Nonprofit, formed 2009  
| Connections to government | Meetings 9-10:30, member organs listed below but not partners. Funding not listed but many sponsors for Food Day (see website)  
|                      | Government seated. “The Pittsburgh Food Policy Council, incubated at Penn State Center Pittsburgh, serves as a collaborative advisory organization, bringing together stakeholders from diverse food-related sectors to examine, develop and improve the food system of our city and region.”  
| Members | 5 staff members, 3 current interns. Working groups: Food and Health Equity, Regional Food Economy, Urban Ag  
|                      | Orgs represented on steering committee: PSU extension, Grow Pittsburgh, Just Harvest, Pittsburgh Works, DUN, Allegheny County Health Dept., UPAMC Children’s Hospital, Let’s Move Pittsburgh. See printed list for full list of member orgs.  
| Mission | **Vision & Mission**  
|                      | Vision Statement: The Pittsburgh Food Policy Council envisions a food system that benefits our community, our economy, and our environment in ways that are equitable and sustainable. The council serves as a collaborative advisory organization, bringing together stakeholders from diverse food-related sectors to examine, develop and improve Pittsburgh’s food system. It is committed to working with City officials and residents of Pittsburgh to develop food and urban agriculture policy. The council provides technical assistance, education, momentum and support on issues related to food production, food access, food distribution, health/nutrition education and urban planning.  
|                      | The Pittsburgh Food Policy Council is committed to a sustainable food and urban agriculture system that will:  
|                      | Enable Pittsburgh to become a leader in municipal/Regional food system programs  
|                      | Make positive contributions to our region’s economy, health & sustainability goals  
|                      | Encourage personal, communal and government food practices that foster local food production, access and distribution  
|                      | Promote food security through the elimination of hunger  
|                      | Protect our natural and human resources  
|                      | Create infrastructure support for the growth of community gardens & urban farming  
|                      | Create economic & employment growth opportunities for neighborhood residents  
|                      | Promote food equity for all neighborhoods through conscientious city planning and development  
|                      | Foster collaboration among and leverage support for the work of established stakeholders  
|                      | Celebrate our region’s multicultural food traditions and recognize the importance of diverse cultures”  
| Goals | **Current projects:** Urban Ag Zoning Code Revisions, EBT and the Pittsburgh Farmers’ Markets.  
|                      | *Goals: a. Make the elimination of hunger a highest priority by ensuring access to healthy, affordable and nutritious food for all Pittsburgh residents regardless of economic means.  
|                      | b. Ensure that the preservation and development of healthy local food systems are reflected in City budget priorities and spending policies  
|                      | c. Enact and maintain zoning codes that enable and preserve sustainable local food systems  

### Top 3 priorities
- Food Production  
  (Urban ag, gardening, land-use, zoning)  
- Purchasing (C2S, PSI, Cottage Food)  
- Healthy Food Access (SNAP Incentives, Healthy Vending, Nutrition)  

### Engagement
- Political: A great deal  
- Civic: A great deal  

### Collaborate?
Yes

### Biggest Successes
“Unanimous approval of zoning code amendments by City Council”

### Policy Achievements
- “Secured funding to hire 1.5 staff to increase the Council’s capacity and elevate its profile in our city and region; Partnership with Penn State Extension to develop and implement a marketing plan ‘Buy Fresh Buy Local’ for The City of Pittsburgh’s Farmers Markets that resulted in expanded outreach;  
  - Partnered with local anti-hunger advocacy organization, Just Harvest, to establish and subsequently expand the Fresh Access program which implemented SNAP / EBT payment systems to increase purchases of goods at farmers markets. The program grew from two pilot sights to check how many they have this year in a one year period;  
- Partnered with Pennsylvania Association on Sustainable Agriculture (PASA) and the Greater Pittsburgh Community Food Bank on their Harvest for the Hungry fresh food drive [September 2013];  
- Partnered with Grow Pittsburgh and others continued work with the City of Pittsburgh to improve our region’s urban agriculture zoning policies, specifically around sales of garden grown produce, bee and chicken keeping. The initial zoning code was penned in 2011 (check this), and will be revised to be more user friendly in the coming year. PPG partnered with Grow Pittsburgh and others in working with the City of Pittsburgh to improve our city’s urban agriculture policies in 2011. In 2014, we continue to work with the Pittsburgh Department of City Planning and Council members to make improvements to our urban agricultural zoning code that will decrease barriers to urban food production.”

### Technical Assist
“Working group co-chair trainings”
8. Southeastern NC Food Systems Program/Feast Down East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NAME:</strong> Southeastern NC Food Systems Program/Feast Down East (182)</th>
<th><strong>STATE:</strong> NC</th>
<th><strong>JURISDICTION:</strong> Regional</th>
<th><strong>REGION:</strong> South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Organization Type**
Nonprofit (also a convenor of FPCCs in a region), founded 2006

**Connections to government**
Government-funded, government-supported/sanctioned. "FEASTDOWNEAST is a grassroots, non-profit organization. It is a result of the Southeastern North Carolina Food Systems (SENFCS) Program, which was co-founded in 2006 by Leslie Housefeld, Public Sociology Program, University of North Carolina Wilmington, and Mac Legerton, Center for Community Action in Lumberton. The project started as an economic and community development initiative in response to the massive job loss and high poverty in Southeastern North Carolina. FEASTDOWNEAST has developed into a partnership of public and private institutions and agencies among eleven counties along and adorning the I-174 corridor east of I-95. This region is the most ethnically diverse region in North Carolina and in Rural America; and it is also one of the three major regions of persistent poverty in North Carolina. FEASTDOWNEAST includes both rural and urban counties in order to maximize market opportunities and profits for farmers."

**Members**
"Dr. Leslie Housefeld, President/Co-founder, is PhD Trained in Rural Sociology at North Carolina State University College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALS) and is Director of Public Sociology Undergraduate and Graduate Program at UNCW. Jane Steigerwald, RD, LDN, is the Executive Director of Feast Down East. Jane is a NC State Licensed and Registered Dietitian with a Master of Science Degree in Nutrition Education. Mollie Rouvey, Director of Processing & Distribution Program, works meticulously with farmers and chefs to ensure Wilmington area markets flourish with local farm products. Certified USDA harmonized GAP Internal Auditor and holds certifications in HACCP, Safe Serve and NCS Acidified Foods. Sarah Daniels, Associate Director, has a master’s degree in Public Administration from UNCw with a concentration in Nonprofit Management. Brittany Taggart, Food Hub Coordinator, holds a Bachelors of Science in Environmental Sciences from UNC Wilmington Erin Exminho, VISTA Service Member, is addressing food security issues and working to increase access to healthy foods in the underserved communities of Wilmington. Jordan Appel and Amber Ellis, FoodCorps Service Members, are building school gardens, teaching about nutrition, gardening and local agriculture in the classroom and helping bring more fresh local produce into the school cafeteria. Committees formed around topics as needed. There are also a few "service members" and interns."

**Mission**
"OUR MISSION
The mission of Southeast North Carolina Food Systems Program is to join farmers, agencies, institutions and businesses together to support, coordinate, expand and sustain the production, processing, distribution and consumption of local foods Doing so creates an economically-viable, regional food system that benefits farmers, businesses, food services and consumers in Southeastern North Carolina."

**Goals**
"FEASTDOWNEAST is an initiative established to create a fully integrated local food system. What does that mean, exactly? We help small and limited resource farmers gain access to markets such as restaurants, grocers, schools and hospitals, which means we shorten the distance between the farm and your fork.

And how do we do this?
The SENCS Program creates projects that provide the link between farmer and buyer, such as the Farm-to-Chef Program, where farmers and chefs create working relationships with one another; the SENCS Food Processing and Distribution Program that delivers farm products to restaurants, grocers, schools and hospitals; the Farm-to-School Program that links farmers to schools; and the FEASTDOWNEAST “Buy Local” campaign, which encourages people to buy locally produced foods.

The benefits of a sustainable food system are:
Supplies healthy and affordable food for everyone
Financially supports farmers, farm workers and other members of the food supply chain
Preserves farmland, open spaces and natural wildlife habitats
Supports the local economy by sustaining local businesses, keeping tax dollars in our area and creating jobs
Maintains and enriches our soil’s fertility
Conserves and protects the quality of our water and air
Safeguards our biodiversity
And minimizes fossil fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions"

**Top 3 priorities**
Education
Anti-Hunger
Purchasing (FSIS, FSI, Cottage Food)

**Political and Civic Engagement**
Political: A great deal
Civic: A great deal

**Collaborate?**
Yes

**Biggest Successes**
"Created a USDA designated Food Hub that services the needs of over 40 small scale farms."

**Policy Achievements**
"1. Helped develop 3 county-based food policy councils. 2. Town support of and operating space for the operation of the FDE Food Hub."

**Technical Assist**
"Educational resources for farmers and consumers. Assistance with GAP certification for farmers."

**Partner orgs:** add from print out
Funders: not available

**Meeting time:** not available
APPENDIX E: GOVERNMENT-EMBEDDED CASE STUDY
FPC PROFILES

1. Austin-Travis County Sustainable Food Policy Board

**NAME:** Austin-Travis County Sustainable Food Policy Board (11)  **STATE:** TX  **JURISDICTION:** City & county  **REGION:** West

| Organization Type | Embedded in government, formed 2008  
| Meet Mondays 6-8 PM, Funding/Partner Orgs not listed |
| Connections to government | Government-appointed, Government-funded, Government-created |
| Members | 13 (one vacant, 7/12 female), all of which are appointed by Mayor Steve Adler or by Travis County |
| Mission | "Advisory body to the City Council and Travis County Commissioners' Court concerning the need to improve the availability of safe, nutritious, locally, and sustainably grown food at reasonable prices for all residents, particularly those in need, by coordinating the relevant activities of city government, as well as non-profit organizations, and food and farming businesses."  
Scope: The scope of the Austin/Travis County Food Policy Board is far-reaching, encompassing the assessment and strengthening of the Austin/Travis County food system, as well as the accessibility and affordability of fresh food. The board is also charged with evaluating outreach and education efforts, improving the local food economy, and coordinating efforts between the City of Austin and Travis County. |
| Goals | 1. End health disparities and ensure food justice through research, advocacy, and policy for healing the Earth and all living beings.  
2. Ensure community leadership has a voice in Austin/Travis County policy decisions about sustainable, healthy food systems. |
| Top 3 priorities | Food Production (Urban ag, gardening, land use, zoning)  
Purchasing (FS2, FSII, Cottage Food)  
Healthy Food Access (SNAP Incentives, Healthy Vending, Nutrition)  
Anti-Hunger |
2. Cass Clay Food Commission

**NAME:** Cass Clay Food Commission (27) **STATE:** MN/ND **JURISDICTION:** City & county **REGION:** Midwest

| Political and Civic Engagement | Political: A great deal | Civic: A great deal |
| Collarate? | No |
| Biggest Successes | "Ensuring that food access and food systems planning is included in our city’s comprehensive plan. This has supported increased funding for initiatives." |
| Policy Achievements | "Increasing funding for SNAP outreach and enrollment; increasing funding for SNAP "double dollars" programs at Farmers Markets; updating the city’s Urban Farm Ordinance; involvement" |
| Technical Assistance | "We rely on Office of Sustainability staff as well as community members who assist with our working groups." |

Board recommendations and letters online, as well as relevant city resolutions/ordinances/proclamations. Agendas, minutes, supporting documents, and bylaws can also be found online. https://www.austintexas.gov/actlpb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Connected to government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embedded in government, formed 2010, relationship with UMN Extension</td>
<td>Meetings: Wednesday mornings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner orgs: Cass CLay Food Systems Advisory Commission, NW Regional Sustainable Development Partnership, UMN Extension, Clay-Wilkin Community Health Board, Partnership 4 Health</td>
<td>Funders: NW RSDP - $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-appointed, government-created</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| "The Cass Clay Food Commission (CCFC) is a joint effort of Fargo Cass Public Health, Clay County Public Health, and the extension services of Cass and Clay counties, working together to impact all levels of the food system to assure that area residents have access to safe, nutritious and affordable food. Members of the CCFC include elected officials from Cass and Clay counties, Fargo, Moorhead, West Fargo and Dilworth, as well as five at-large community members with an interest in, or expertise related to food systems."
| Kim Lipetzky, Fargo Cass Public Health |
| Gina Nolte, Clay County Public Health, Partnership 4 Health |
| Abby Gold, associate director, NDSU Masters of Public Health Program |
| Deb Haugen, nutrition consultant |
| Rita Uswath, Cass County Extension Service |
| Neile Hardin, University of Minnesota Extension |
| Megan Myrdal, project coordinator for the Cass Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission |
| Adam Ahlenburg, Metro COG, administrator for the Cass Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission |
| Joanne Baker, CCFS blueprint developer |
| Halli Durand, Cass County planner |
| Nikbi Johnson, North Dakota State University and University of Minnesota Extension |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Working to impact all levels of the food system to assure that residents have access to safe, nutritious, and affordable food.&quot; (from FB page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Purpose: The Cass Clay Food Systems Initiative formed the Cass Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission in late 2014 and began meeting in March 2015. The goal of the Commission is to work across jurisdictions in Cass and Clay counties to increase access to safe, nutritious, and affordable food by strengthening all aspects of the local food system. One of the key goals of this initiative is to address necessary policy and systems changes to improve the food system. The steering committee chose to develop a series of food policy blueprints, Community gardens, urban bees and urban chickens are topics selected by survey. Blueprints have been created on these topics.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Goals | “This group is tasked with examining the local food system, and identifying ways to improve access to healthy, local, and affordable food for all residents. Examining a food system takes into account all processes and infrastructure involved in food, including growing, harvesting, processing, packaging, transporting, marketing, eating, and disposal/waste.”

“Activities: The Commission approved two blueprints in 2015 (community gardens and bees), and have reviewed and discussed urban chickens. Three other blueprints are in the research phase including: residential gardening, farmers’ market, and composting. These will all be reviewed and approved in 2016.”

Outcomes: Already, two jurisdictions have made requests to move the issues forward in their communities. A Clay County Commissioner asked Commission staff to meet with county planning staff to establish an ordinance recognizing community gardens within the county. This work is still in progress. A Moorhead City Council person requested that the Commission staff present to the Council following the approval of the urban beekeeping blueprint. The steering committee sees the need to continue public education and input.” |
|---|---|
| Top 3 priorities | Food Production (Urban ag, gardening, land use, zoning)
Purchasing (F2S, F5, Cottage Food)
Healthy Food Access (SNAP Incentives, Healthy Vending, Nutrition) |
| Engagement | Political: a moderate amount
Civic: a moderate amount |
| Collaborate? | No |
| Biggest Successes | “A Joint Powers Agreement formed the Commission in 2014 (prior to that, the group operated as a Food Systems Initiative since 2010 with little political or legislative authority to bring about meaningful change to the development and expansion of the local food system within the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area). The inception of this Commission is a significant step in moving forward on more policy-focused work, as no policy achievements to date. Commission meetings officially began in March of 2015 and three (3) meetings have been held to date.” |
| Policy Achievements | “No policy achievements to date. Commission meetings officially began in March of 2015 and three (3) meetings have been held to date.” |
| Technical Assist | “Funding, Communications, Strategic planning, Evaluation” |

Metropolitan food systems plan: [https://www.cityoffargo.com/attachments/42a3f0b0-b197-4cb3-b292-5e4b5e620/food%20systems%20plan%20final%202013.pdf](https://www.cityoffargo.com/attachments/42a3f0b0-b197-4cb3-b292-5e4b5e620/food%20systems%20plan%20final%202013.pdf)


The Cass Clay Food Commission is an eleven (11) member Commission comprised of six (6) elected officials and five (5) at-large members. The elected officials are appointed from the following governmental boards:

- Cass County
- Clay County
- City of Fargo
- City of West Fargo
- City of Moorhead
- City of Dilworth
### 3. City of Hartford Advisory Commission of Food Policy

**NAME:** City of Hartford Advisory Commission of Food Policy  
**STATE:** CT  
**JURISDICTION:** City/Municipality  
**REGION:** Northeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Organization Type</strong></th>
<th>Embedded in government, formed 1991</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connections to government</strong></td>
<td>Government-funded, government-supported/sanctioned, government-created</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Members** |  
|--------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| **Hartford Food System’s Staff:**  
| The HFS staff includes:  
| Chrissy Matthews, Mobile Market Coordinator – ext. 105  
| Elaine Robedee, Development Director – ext. 109  
| Floyd Grier, Public Allies Member – ext. 103  
| Martha Page, MPH, CPH, Executive Director – ext. 102  
| Meg Hourigan, Policy Analyst, Hartford Food System Inc – ext. 100  
| Sarana Belk, Youth Coordinator – ext. 106  
| Shana Smith, North End Farmers Market – ext. 111  
| Tenaya Taylor, Office Manager, Hartford Food System Inc – ext. 101  
| Tilly Stovy, Little City Sprouts Coordinator – ext. 107  
| All staff can be reached at (860) 296-9325.  
| **Board of Directors:**  
| 2016  
| HFS is governed by a board of directors that is comprised of representatives from Connecticut businesses, government agencies, churches, and community organizations. The board’s primary purpose is to make policy, provide for long-term organizational development and financial oversight, and raise funds. It meets bi-monthly and holds regular committee meetings. Officers and new members are elected annually. The board’s composition reflects the broad diversity of the community it serves.  

#### Board Member Name & Professional Affiliation

- President, Marcia Formica, Resource Global Professionals  
- Vice-President, Terry Young, Share our Strength Cooking Matters  
- Secretary, Alex Koenigsberg, Creative Living Community of Hartford  
- Treasurer, Maryland Grier, Self-Employed  
- Vivian Martinez-Rivera, Barnes Aerospace  
- Kellie Fenton, Self-Employed  
- Adrian Myers, Cafe-Y LLC  
- Tamika Davis, Tunxis Community College  
- Amanda Bruno, Big Y Foods  
- Sheryl Horowitz-Kiefer, CAHIS  
- Executive Director, Martha Page, MPH, CPH, Ex Officio

#### Mission

"The City of Hartford Food Advisory Commission on Food Policy was established in 1991 to implement the recommendations of the Mayor’s Task Force on Hunger. Its purpose is to integrate all agencies in the city in a common effort to improve the availability of safe and nutritious food at reasonable prices for all residents. Hartford Food System provides staffing for the Commission and also serves as one of its members. As part of its advisory role to city officials, the Commission annually prepares a series of recommendations on food and nutrition issues. Recent recommendations include making improvements to the quality of mid-sized grocery stores, as well as implementing zoning ordinances to support urban agriculture and create healthy food zones." Partners with Hartford Food System (founded 1978)

#### Goals

1. To eliminate hunger as an obstacle to a happy, healthy and productive life in the city;  
2. To ensure that a wide variety of safe and nutritious food is available for city residents;  
3. To ensure that access to food is not limited by economic status, location or other factors beyond a resident's control; and  
4. To ensure that the price of food in the city remains at a level approximating the level for the state

#### Top 3 priorities

- Healthy Food Access (SNAP Incentives, Healthy Vending, Nutrition)  
- Anti-Hunger

#### Political and Civic Engagement

- Political: A moderate amount  
- Civic: A moderate amount

#### Collaborate?

- Yes
### Biggest Successes

“A major accomplishment of the HACFP was the creation of the L-Tower Avenue CT Transit bus route, which linked Hartford residents with Capoco Center in Bloomfield in 2000. Having identified the need for increased public transportation to grocery stores, the Commissioners conducted extensive surveys with CT Transit users to understand the ways that Hartford residents utilized CT Transit to access food. The Commission reached out to CT Transit about the importance of transit access for Hartford residents in accessing food and successfully advocated for the use of Jobs Access funds administered by the Capital Region Council of Governments to fund the creation of the new bus line, which linked residents in the North End of Hartford to Bloomfield and Manchester. During the first year of the L-Tower Avenue bus route’s operations, ridership increased over 100% from 4,978 passengers in September 2000 to 10,345 passengers in August 2001. The Commissioners continued to monitor the L-Tower Avenue route, and in 2001 when the route was cut back to hourly service to stretch out the remaining Jobs Access funds to keep the route in service, the Commission contacted several neighborhood groups and local legislators, in addition to conducting more surveys with CT Transit riders, to alert them to the need for perpetual funding for the route.”

### Policy Achievements

“Hartford Grocery Store Price Survey (1993-2011): A survey of grocery stores around Hartford was initiated by the Commission in multiple years. The survey tracked the quality, availability, and prices of grocery stores based on store size.”

### Technical Assist

“Further support to develop community engagement strategy”

### Community Partners

Hartford Food System relies heavily on cooperative working relationships with other organizations. While not complete, the following list of partners and collaborators represents a substantial cross-section of the groups and interests with whom Hartford Food System has recently worked.

### Policy and Advocacy

The City of Hartford Mayor’s Office, Hartford Advisory Commission on Food Policy, The Connecticut Food Policy Council

### Agriculture


### Food Security

End Hunger Connecticut!
FoodShare of Greater Hartford

### Community

Bitterly Forc Community Works, Southside Institutions Neighborhood Alliance, Knox Park, The Christian Activities Council, Leadership Greater Hartford, Community Solutions

### Public Health

City of Hartford Department of Health and Human Services, State of Connecticut Department of Public Health, The Connecticut Department of Social Services, University of Connecticut Center for Public Health and Health Policy, The Hispanic Health Council

### 4. Denver Sustainable Food Policy Council

**NAME:** Denver Sustainable Food Policy Council (SFP)

**STATE:** CO

**JURISDICTION:** City & County

**REGION:** South

**Organization Type:** Embedded in government, formed 2010

**Meetings:** 3rd Wed, open to public

**No info on funding or partner orgs**

**Connections to government**

Government-appointed, government-supported/sanctioned, government-created

**Members**


**Mission**

“Our mission is to foster food security for all community members and to promote a healthy, equitable and sustainable local food system (from production to distribution to access) with consideration for resource conservation, energy efficiency and waste recovery.”

“PURPOSE: Our purpose is to educate, raise awareness and build support for our food system; advise the city on laws, policies and programs; and promote food security and foster a Sustainable Food System.”

**Goals**

Policy areas currently working on: “City food city land”, “residential sales”, “increase SNAP reduction”, “food producing animals” (zoning). More details on website and place for public to submit ideas.

**Top 3 priorities**

- Food Production (Urban ag, gardening, land use, zoning)
- Purchasing (FS, FS, Cottage Food)
- Healthy Food Access (SNAP Incentives, Healthy Vending, Nutrition)
5. Homegrown Minneapolis Food Council

**NAME:** Homegrown Minneapolis Food Council (86) **STATE:** MN **JURISDICTION:** City/Municipality **REGION:** Midwest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Connections to government</th>
<th>Meetings: Wed., 5:30-7:30, no info on funding or partner org</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members</strong></td>
<td>Andrew Dahl-Minneapolis Dept. of Community Planning and Economic Development, Allison Meyer Seward Community Co-op, Beth Dooley-Author / Food Writer, Briana MacPhee-Cultural Liaison with the Latino Community at Minneapolis Public Schools, Caroline Devany-Store's Thrown Urban Farm, Cam Gordon-Minneapolis City Council Member, Devon Nolen-(Co-Chair) West Broadway Farmers Market, Donald Yarneke-University of Minnesota Extension/SNAP Education, Erick Garcia Luna-Mayor Hodges Office, Gayle Prest-Minneapolis Sustainability Office, Ginger Cannon-Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, Jilla Pessenda-Headwaters Foundation, Journey Gosselin-City Food Studio, Kate Seybold-Minneapolis Public Schools Culinary &amp; Nutrition Services, LeCora Bradford-Kesti Pilsbury United Communities, Latalia Powell-Appetite for Change, Martin Brown-Waite House, Miguel Goebel-Midtown Farmers Market, Pokou Hang Hmong-American Farmers Association, Patty Bowler-Minneapolis Health Department, Roe Reineberg-Minneapolis Health Department (Environmental Services), Ruheol Islam-Gandhi Mahal Indian Restaurant, Russ Henry-(Co-Chair)-Giving Tree Gardens, Saba Anduleam-Common Roots Café, Sue Hollomon-University of Minnesota Extension/Metro Food Access Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Mission** | "Statement of Vision: The Homegrown Minneapolis Food Council envisions a vibrant local food system that enhances the health of all residents, protects the earth, increases economic vitality, expands social connectedness, and improves food security. Statement of Mission: To continue to advance Homegrown Minneapolis, the Homegrown Minneapolis Food Council works to support all Minneapolis residents and increase access to quality food, address hunger and food insecurity, connect sectors of the food system, influence policy and decision making, and ensure an environmentally sustainable and socially just food system. To accomplish this, the food council: fosters City-community partnerships; convenes and engages diverse stakeholders to identify and propose innovative solutions to improve the local food system; provides ongoing guidance to the City on local food issues; and serves as a platform for collaborative, coordinated action." |

### MISC:

"IS THE SUSTAINABLE FOOD POLICY COUNCIL INDEPENDENT?
The Denver SFPC is a Denver Board and Commission, meaning that its members serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. As such, the Denver SFPC does not take positions independent of the Mayor's Office."
6. Mayor’s Initiative for a Healthy and Sustainable Food System

**NAME:** Mayor’s Initiative for a Healthy and Sustainable Food System (111) **STATE:** MN **JURISDICTION:** City/Municipality **REGION:** NE

| Goals | No goals listed, but 2014-2015 task forces: Animals-promoting policy changes to make it easier and more affordable for residents to keep domestic animals. Community Outreach and Engagement: This working group is reaching out to different communities, encouraging engagement in local food policy, sharing information about the Homegrown Minneapolis Food Council and its work, and creating a space for the community to provide feedback on food Council activities. It also supports the annual Open House and recently launched the Friends of Homegrown Minneapolis Food Council Facebook page. Local Food (Fruit and Vegetable) Aggregation and Distribution (Food Hubs): This group is exploring emerging and established efforts in the Twin Cities region to aggregate, store, process, and distribute local foods and fostering information sharing and connections between these efforts. **“The Food Hubs group conducted a survey of existing and emerging food hubs in the Twin Cities area and convened survey participants for a conversation in spring 2015. Land Access: This group is involved in finding more space for growers to grow food in Minneapolis. The group’s current focus is to find ways to make it easier for residents to access land for growing food. The working group emerged from strategic planning done by the Homegrown Minneapolis Food Council in early 2013, which was informed by community input at the December 2012 stakeholder event and the work done during the first two phases of Homegrown Minneapolis. Organics Recycling and Composting: This group is working on issues related to making compost and collecting organic wastes within the city.**

| Top 3 priorities | Food Production (Urban ag, gardening, land use, zoning) Healthy Food Access (SNAP Incentives, Healthy Vending, Nutrition) Food Waste Networking

| Political and Civic Engagement | Political: A great deal Civic: A great deal

| Collaborate? | Yes

| Biggest Successes | “Community-City collaboration and community engagement have enabled the Food Council to respond to and support community needs and opportunities, especially around urban agriculture, farmers markets and healthy food retail access.”

| Policy Achievements | “Urban Agriculture Policy Plan and text amendments, Farmland Ordinance Amendments, Honeybee ordinance amendments and Pollinator-friendly City resolution, Mobile Grocery ordinance, Staple Foods Ordinance, MN Seed Law revisions, Cottage Food Law sales expansion”

| Technical Assistance | “access to information about effective and available strategies”

| Organization Type | Embedded in government, formed 2012 Meetings: 4th Friday of each month 10:10-11:30 No funder or partner org info

| Connections to government | Government seated

| Members | Shaping Portland’s Food System is led by a Steering Committee, while at-large membership is open to any person, business or organization in Portland who wishes to collaborate toward the above purposes and values.

Steering Committee Members: Jeremy Bloom, Lisa Fernandes, Jonah Fertig, Ben Tettebaum, John Naylor, Jim Hanna (also on another?), Craig Lapine, Tim Fuller

| Mission | “Purpose: The City of Portland supports a host of initiatives to improve the health and sustainability of the food systems that support our community such as composting programs, community gardens, and the farmers markets. The City also supports increasing access to healthier food at schools, in neighborhoods, and at other community locations. To bolster these initiatives and improve the health and sustainability of the food systems that support our community, the Mayor has established the Mayor’s Initiative for a Healthy and Sustainable Food System to:

- Provide continued and increased public engagement in food-related policies and initiatives;
- Identify and implement positive changes in the community’s food systems and policies;
- Prioritize and respond to City and community identified needs for food system change and improvement; and
- Increase access to healthier food for residents.

Values: Food and water sustain life. Food is a shared need and an opportunity to bring together everyone in our community. The City of Portland has many roles in how our community maintains health and vitality through food. The City of Portland is committed to a food system that supports:

- Justice and fairness in all aspects of the food system
- Equal food access for disadvantaged people
- Healthy people
- Thriving local economies and jobs
- Vibrant gardens and farms
- Sustainable ecosystems
- Strong neighborhoods and communities
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7. New Haven Food Policy Council

**NAME:** New Haven Food Policy Council (129)  
**STATE:** CT  
**JURISDICTION:** City/Municipality  
**REGION:** NE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Connection to government</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embedded in government, formed 2005</td>
<td>Wednesday mornings</td>
<td>Government-appointed, government-supported/sanctioned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | *"The New Haven Food Policy Council is a volunteer advisory board for the City of New Haven. Our eleven Council members are New Haven residents, appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Aldermen. We are a collaborative group working to address local and regional food issues and the impacts on individuals, communities, businesses, the environment and local government."*


*Affiliate Council Members, are a growing group of organizations welcomed and invited by the NHFPC to actively participate in our work, broadening our information and community base. Affiliate members can participate in all work and decision making, but do not hold a vote" include: Bloom Services LLC, Cadence Consulting, Common Ground School, Connecticut Food Bank, Fresh Advantage, Get Healthy CT, Massaro Community Farm, New Haven Farms, New Haven Health Department, Yale Program for Recovery & Community Health, Yale Sustainable Food Project*

*"The Youth Coalition is composed of teens from multiple youth organizations, schools, and communities around New Haven who are engaged in the work of the NHFPC and in the Improvement of New Haven's food system. The NHFPC partners with individual teens and youth serving organizations to create a space for youth leadership around important food issues at the city level. The Youth Coalition also represents the New Haven branch of the Connecticut Food Justice Youth Corps (CT- FJYC), a statewide initiative hosted by the UConn Cooperative Extension System that empowers youth leadership around food issues throughout the state."*

*Mission: "To build a food system that nourishes all people in a just and sustainable manner."*
### Goals
None listed per se, but list of "current initiatives": New Haven Food Action Plan 2012, Community Engagement for Food System Improvement, Urban Agriculture, Food Month, Youth Coalition Building, Food Businesses and Economic Development, State Level Food System Work, School Food
Affiliated Projects: Healthy Corner Store Initiative CARE, Community Gardens New Haven Land Trust/Community Gardens, School Gardens – Grow New Haven a program of Common Ground, District Wide Wellness Committee New Haven Farms

### Top 3 priorities
- Food Production (Urban ag, gardening, land use, zoning)
- Healthy Food Access (SNAP Incentives, Healthy Vending, Nutrition)
- Anti-Hunger

### Political and Civic Engagement
- Political: A great deal
- Civic: A great deal

### Collaborate?
Yes

### Biggest Successes
"Creation of Food Systems Director position: Secured a commitment of $115,000 toward funding of the FSD position over a two-year period, as well as funding for the development of an implementation plan to set the groundwork for the position’s successful launch. In June 2015, the Board of Alders passed the 2015-16 city budget, which includes $50,000 (plus benefits) to fund the remainder of the position."

### Policy Achievements
"Commodity Supplemental Food Program: The Food Assistance Working Group was instrumental in lobbying the CT congressional delegation to advocate for funding from the federal government to support the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, which has been an unfunded initiative for years. We were successful in securing $2.8 million for the state to implement this program. It brings staple foods to approximately 2,400 hungry seniors. Of course, the need to feed hungry seniors is much greater. The delegation has committed to advocate for increased funding."

### Technical Assistance
"Research information, governance guidance"

---

### 8. Philadelphia Food Policy Advisory Council

**NAME:** Philadelphia Food Policy Advisory Council  
**STATE:** PA  
**JURISDICTION:** City/Municipality  
**REGION:** NE

#### Organization Type
Embedded in government, formed 2011

#### Connections to government
- Wednesdays 9-5
- Government-seated, government-appointed, government-created

#### Members
FPAC’s membership includes 27 to 35 appointed members and several ex-officio members. The Council is chaired by one ex-officio and one appointed member. The full body meets 6 times a year at general meetings, where members report out on project progress. FPAC projects take place on a subcommittee level, and all members are encouraged to serve on one or more of FPAC’s subcommittees that meet monthly. FPAC also has two staff members that drive the Council’s work forward between general meetings, manage general operations, and provide additional capacity for FPAC projects.


1 staff member, 1 Americorps VISTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mission: The Philadelphia Food Policy Advisory Council (FPAC) facilitates the development of responsible policies that improve access for Philadelphia residents to culturally appropriate, nutritionally sound, and affordable food that is grown locally through environmentally sustainable practices.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittees: Anti-Hunger, Food &amp; Health, Good Food Procurement, Urban Agriculture, Workforce &amp; Economic Development and Zero Waste. Also Governance &amp; Membership and Communications &amp; Outreach. See printed page for each.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 3 priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Production (Urban ag, gardening, land use, zoning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing (F23, F56, Cottage Food)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Hunger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political and Civic Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political: A great deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic: A great deal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biggest Successes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;FPAC hosted the &quot;Food Policy and the Next Mayor&quot; forum to engage members of the public and Philadelphia mayoral candidates on food policy issues. FPAC facilitated 15-minute discussions with mayoral candidates on their food policy views in front of Philadelphia residents.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| "Philly Food Finder Guides - a guide to Philadelphia food resources like food pantries, soup kitchens, senior meal sites, farmers’ markets, and more. Also available as an interactive map at www.phillyfoodfinder.org."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Capacity building trainings for appointed members.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funders: Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission, Leo & Peggy Pierce Family Foundation, The Claneil Foundation, Merck Family Fund, Partners for Places

No partner organizations listed.