

Food Security and Food Policy Councils in Washington State

A Case for Coordination

By

Mary F. Rollins

A Capstone project presented in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Policy Studies
Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
University of Washington Bothell
2012

Table of Contents

Chapter 1—Statement of purpose	pg. 3
Chapter 2—Literature Review	pg. 8
Chapter 3—Methodology	pg. 13
Chapter 4—Results	pg. 15
Chapter 5—Discussion	pg. 35
Chapter 6—Summary and Conclusion	pg. 39
Work Cited	pg. 41
Appendices	
1. Veto of SSB 6343	pg. 44
2. Executive Order 10-02	pg. 45
3. Statement by Linda Drake before the Appropriations Committee	pg. 47

Chapter 1—Purpose of the study

Food Policy Councils

Food Policy Councils (FPCs) have become important mechanisms for developing integrated food policy at the state level throughout the United States. The State of Washington has been a slow percolating leader in the food policy arena and a growing cadre of food organizations have worked for years to gain a state policy council. In March of 2010, the house and senate of the State of Washington signed off on Senate Bill 6343 to establish a state-led Food Policy Council. Because Governor Gregoire had worked extensively to streamline Washington State Government, a new policy council enacted by legislation would have been counter-intuitive to the deletion of several councils and commissions.^{1 2} On April 2nd, the governor vetoed the bill citing the need for government reduction, but with the proviso to institute a more moderate FPC through an executive order (EO). On June 22, 2010, the governor signed Executive Order 10-02 insuring an FPC for the State of Washington—at least during her tenure. While not instituting an FPC in a strict sense, the EO attempted to examine food policy for the state more closely. The original senate bill would have set a permanent FPC into motion for the state while the EO, with its inherent limitations, was meant to codify existing information for wider dissemination through the production of a report.³ Whether the FPC under executive order will have the robust teeth of a legislative action will be the focus of this paper.

Food Policy Councils began to develop in the early 1980s in the U.S. (Harper, et al. 2009), seeking to bring together the efforts and interests of food focused groups in communities and governments. Because cities and towns lack a “Department of Food”, each organization or group that has a relationship to food had been acting without policy oversight. What an FPC can do is bring these

¹ <http://www.governor.wa.gov/priorities/reform/reformingbusiness.pdf>

² See Appendix 1

³ See Appendix 2

entities together to check bureaucratic waste. Another function of the FPC is as a clearing house of ideas. Many different organizations provide funding and organization to bring healthy food to those most in need; yet, there are still gaps in services that can be identified by an FPC. With an FPC, actors at the state level will be able to work through the bureaucracy to better utilize federal funds. For instance, there are 15 food assistance programs in the United States provided by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Until recently, the State of Washington used several departments to administer funds. There is no right or wrong way to begin an FPC. Many FPCs are bottom-up, grassroots led organizations with little-to-no funding. Others are backed by the will of a municipal entity, with staffing and funding coming directly from that governmental body. While sporting local flavor, each FPC seeks to minimize waste of resources in the food system. .

While there have been local FPCs in the State of Washington, until 2010 there had never been a coordinated effort at the state level. Executive Order 10-02 began to address the various gaps in the food culture of Washington State. Indeed one of the specific goals of the FPC for Washington State is to avail itself of more federal food program monies. This streamlining of services for the USDA distribution was intended to enhance the competitiveness of Washington State in pursuit of federal aid, as well as aid from foundations, to increase food security **(EO 10-02)**.

Government Action

Food Policy Councils are initiated in various ways. Sometimes the mechanisms that bring FPCs into effect are the very reasons that they fail or at very least are ineffectual. In Washington State, the Substitute Senate Bill 6343-an act relating to the establishment of the Washington food policy forum - had broad support, ranging from food and farming organizations, to child advocates. This wide spectrum of support fostered hope for the success of the bill and the ultimate policy council decisions that would have resulted. Fortunately, despite the veto of the bill and subsequent executive order reinstating a Food Policy Council, that initial broad support was still present. However, what remains

to be explored is the extent to which these relationships can be retained and enhanced. Early reports indicated a willingness on the part of food advocates to get behind the governor's plan and work together to bring about positive change in the food system and the ways in which it is managed.⁴

The adoption of Washington's FPC has elicited a change in how monies are allocated from federal programs through state mechanisms, specifically; General Administration (GA) has been responsible for disseminating the funds for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP), a program of the USDA. GA also administers the Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), another USDA program. In a concurrent bill ([SB 6341 - 2009-10](#)) one of the first steps was to turn the GA food programs over to the Washington State Department of Agriculture. This one move alone has the potential to result in fewer redundancies in the management of federal funds.

To fully understand whether or not these relationships will hold up under political scrutiny over time, I undertook an analysis of current state food policy councils that have similar political situations and constraints as exist in Washington State. The State of New York provided the best case to examine because its FPC was also instituted via Executive Order in 1997. In New York, the table was set with a five year food and nutrition plan in the early 1980s that was to be implemented in the late 1980s to early 1990s.⁵ A series of Executive Orders from Governor Spitzer, then Paterson, and most recently, Andrew Cuomo, established, and subsequently reinterpreted the scope of the FPC. Despite changes, the essential concept and goals of their FPC have remained intact, while each administration sought to put its own stamp on the process.

Food Security

Food security has become the common framework for referencing the underlying work of FPCs. "The World Food Summit of 1996 defined food security as existing 'when all people at all times have access

⁴ <http://naturalresourcereport.com/2010/06/washington-governor-signs-food-reporting-order/>

⁵ http://www.nyscfp.org/docs/CFP_DecemberReport_2007.pdf

to sufficient, safe, nutritious food to maintain a healthy and active life.’ Commonly, the concept of food security is defined as including both physical and economic access to food that meets people's dietary needs as well as their food preferences.”⁶ Very low food security has been used by the USDA as a measurement for what was formerly referred to as hunger.⁷

FPCs have helped identify several areas that could stimulate community food security. One of these is to begin with a community food assessment. The City of Oakland, California, after completing a food assessment, was able to identify areas known as food deserts—places where food was available but it was not healthful and/or culturally relevant. Armed with this information, Oakland’s FPC was able to coax businesses such as supermarkets and farmers’ markets into these areas.⁸

Along with FPCs, conducting food assessments, promoting farmers’ markets, and doing away with food deserts, food security can be obtained in a number of other ways. Utilizing Community Supported Agriculture (CSAs) and farm to cafeteria initiatives are two ways to strengthen farmers’ income base, as well as to reach under-served populations.⁹ According to Mike Hamm and Anne Bellows (n.d.), “community food security is a condition in which all community residents obtain a safe, culturally appropriate, nutritionally sound diet through an economically and environmentally sustainable food system that promotes community self-reliance and social justice.”¹⁰ Following the above recommendations communities could advance these criteria.

Because food security and FPCs go hand-in-hand, it is important to better understand the scope and process by which FPCs have been initialized throughout the United States. This capstone project analyzes all of the states that have current FPCs and their origination mechanism. It also takes into

⁶ <http://www.who.int/trade/glossary/story028/en/>

⁷ <http://blogs.smithsonianmag.com/food/2009/11/17/hunger-and-food-security-in-the-united-states/>

⁸ <http://www.oaklandfood.org/home/history>

⁹ http://www.foodsecurity.org/CFS_projects.pdf

<http://www.localharvest.org/csa/>

¹⁰ http://www.foodsecurity.org/views_cfs_faq.html

account the current political climate, how long the FPC has been in operation, and whether or not the financing and time constraints on the stakeholders has had a bearing on the robustness of the council.

Chapter 2—Literature review

Eugene Bardach (2009), in his seminal A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis, remarks that, “the working agenda of most policy professionals is set by complaints, threats, worries, and trouble” (7). He goes on to muse that opportunities that arise to confront change should not be squandered. Bardach explains that there are several ways in which this work might be accomplished. He titles one of the opportunities, “operations research strategies” (Bardach Page 8, 2009). This is the ideal situation found in the formation of a statewide FPC. Bardach asserts that, “by means of sequencing, timing, prioritizing, matching, clustering, and other such rationalizing arrangements, it may be possible to use a fixed stock of resources to achieve higher productivity than is possible otherwise” (page 8). While the departments within the state already have mechanisms in place to handle the flow of monies coming from the Federal government food programs, it can be argued that a much better streamlined and efficient job could be done with the input and oversight of an FPC.

Governor Gregoire has spent the past few years cutting redundancies from the state government. In 2005, with Executive Order 05-02, Government Management Accountability and Performance (GMAP), Governor Gregoire mechanized the way in which Washington State Government governed itself. The Pew Trust rated Washington State an A- for this work.¹¹

GMAP and other mechanisms for reducing the size of government have earned Governor Gregoire accolades from many camps.¹² Governor Gregoire has reduced redundancies on many fronts including “eliminating 95 boards, commissions and advisory committees” (page 1)¹³, as well as restructuring state agencies. When the legislature enacted SB 6343 establishing an FPC for the state, Governor Gregoire, according to a well-placed source, felt that another council would be a redundancy,

¹¹ http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/gpp_report_card.aspx

¹² <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2007/04/citistat.html>,

<http://www.governing.com/poy/2007-Public-Officials-of-the-Year.html>

¹³ <http://www.governor.wa.gov/priorities/reform/reformingbusiness.pdf>.)

and therefore vetoed the legislation (Rollins, 2010).¹⁴ Shrewdly, however, Gregoire agreed to enact a quasi FPC by executive order. Through other bills, both state and federal (e.g., HR 4971, federal urban agriculture bill, and State Senate bill 6335 releasing church property from taxes for hosting farmers' markets, among others), food issues were not going away. Especially with the closure of Interstate 5 due to flooding in 2007 and 2009, residents were concerned about food delivery and distribution.¹⁵ It could be argued that urban agriculture, as a direct or indirect result, has jumped exponentially in the Seattle area.¹⁶ Bardach's claim of "latent potential for creating value" along with "the mechanism(s) for extracting and focusing that potential" come into play in best practices for the State of Washington (Bardach, 2009 page 101). Bardach uses the example of "shared maintenance for parks (that) takes advantage of potential gains from trade and the opportunity to use barter as substitute for cash payments" (page 101, 2009). For Washington to fully realize the potential from federal food subsidies, as well as to grow the number of farmers and farmland, including the urban landscape in the equation, pooling the knowledge and resources found in an FPC would accomplish these goals.

"Drafting a political scenario is more an art than a science," states Arnold Meltsner in *Political Feasibility and Policy Analysis* (1972, page 860). A feasible political scenario for a food policy council for Washington State most likely took into account all of the past actions of the governor with respect to reduction of government, as well as the input from other actors with relation to sustainability. Legislators were influenced by their constituencies to pass the law and the governor was influenced by her own actions and advisers to veto the law. The ultimate compromise of an executive order reinstating a truncated version of the bill was the eventual result of a convergence of "policy consensus and conflict" (Meltzer, 1972, page 863). Meltsner (1972,) describes political compromise as the "golden triangle" of a "recurring alliance between bureaucracy, clientele and legislative committee"

¹⁴ Rollins, M,(2010). Interview with a public policy professional May 10th 2010

¹⁵ http://seattletimes.nwsources.com/html/localnews/2004055856_stormmainbar06m.html

¹⁶ <http://www.foodfirst.org/en/node/2970>

(864). According to a well-placed source, not everyone was happy with the bill or subsequent executive order. There was resistance from some department heads who already believed that enough was being done through their agencies to combat hunger and obesity issues (Rollins 2010).¹⁷

However, the ultimate players in Washington's food policy council, as mandated by the EO, are the Departments of Health, Agriculture, and Social and Health Services as well as the Conservation Commission and the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). They were tasked with working collaboratively between 2010 and 2012 to prepare and deliver a report to the governor and legislators "which provide(s) an assessment of existing data and identifies remaining gaps and opportunities in Washington State food policy" (EO 10-02). This work was intended to ultimately involve input from members of the food community.

The work of state level FPCs has been studied by several universities as well as by grassroots organizations. Drake University has a long history of documenting this work and has made the information available through their website.

According to the Drake University 2005 State and Local Food Policy Project:

- Food Policy Councils can address a variety of issues not normally examined or implemented from within government.
- Food Policy Councils convene individuals and government agencies that do not typically work directly with each other, nor become involved when farm and agricultural policy is discussed.
- Food Policy Councils can examine issues which often go unexamined; such as the effectiveness of food assistance programs and the causes of hunger in a society.

¹⁷ Rollins, M, (2010). Interview with a member of the Washington Sustainable Food & Farming Network May 7th 2010

- Food Policy Councils can enter into a more comprehensive approach to analyzing food system issues which recognize the inner-workings between different parts of the food system and the need for coordination and integration of actions if policy goals are to be achieved.
- Food Policy Councils capitalize on the ability of individuals to control their own destiny by using institutions they control, empowering them to take charge of their future.¹⁸

Drake University Law School has also taken on a project of mapping FPCs across the country. The listed FPCs are self-reporting, so the information needs constant updating.¹⁹ To spread information about FPCs and food choices, several universities engage in public education. For example, Washington State University has a curriculum devoted to food and food systems,²⁰ and the University of Washington's Center for Public Health Nutrition (CPHN) has a website devoted to research and information on healthy choices relating to food.²¹

While there are some scholarly sources for information regarding the functioning FPCs, mostly dissertations, the bulk of information comes from online sources provided by grassroots organizations, for example, the Washington Sustainable Food & Farming network, which was extremely instrumental in championing the proposed legislation that led to Governor Gregoire's establishment of the WA FPC via executive order.²² Country-wide organizations such as the Food Security Coalition and Food First (which, among its other ventures, was an "incubator" for the City of Oakland FPC) have greatly

¹⁸ <http://www.statefoodpolicy.org/?pageID=qanda#WhatCanAFoodPolicyCouncilDo>

¹⁹ <http://www.law.drake.edu/centers/agLaw/?pageID=fpcDataBase>

²⁰ <http://king.wsu.edu/foodandfarms/Whatisafoodsystem.html>

²¹ <http://depts.washington.edu/uwcphn/>.

²² <http://wsffn.org/>

contributed to the body of information on FPCs²³ and the USDA has recently launched an interactive website devoted to food issues.²⁴

The scope and breadth of food information for study is enough to fill volumes. Gregoire, acting under the rational actor theory of public policy, while trying to avoid the tragedy of the commons, is using “public choice,’ the application of self-interest as an explanation of individual and political decisions” (Hird, Reese, Shilvock page 3). My goal in this paper is to explore the political implications of Governor Gregoire's veto of the FPC bill and subsequent executive order. This capstone project aims to take a look at all of the states that now have a functioning FPC, and whether or not they were generated via grassroots, legislature or gubernatorial proclamation or executive order. Existing FPCs will be analyzed in relation to length of existence, financing, support and time constraints of participants and political climate, to assess if the councils are more robust based solely on how they were generated or is their effectiveness also tied to these other factors.

²³ <http://www.foodfirst.org/en/history>, <http://www.foodsecurity.org/>

²⁴ <http://ers.usda.gov/foodatlas/>

Chapter 3 – Methodology

Data Collection

The data collection for this paper consists of a review of literature and legislation in a newly burgeoning field. In addition, to further my understanding of the work of FPCs, I attended several information sessions hosted by various non-profit and government entities to learn how to perform food assessments in my community, what a food policy council could do, and how to stay involved at the grassroots level. I then began accessing websites from universities with food policy manifestos, and reading blogs and policy papers from grassroots organizations. Through this research I discovered a group of food scholars were collaborating on a major paper titled: “Food Policy Councils, Lessons Learned.” The resulting document provided guidance and clarity for the direction of my project. Along with succinctly compiling what FPCs were, the paper also documented several FPCs across the country through the use of surveys. I was able to piggyback off of some of this information in formulating my criteria for robustness tests.

To understand the process of implementing the executive order establishing FPCs in Washington State, I completed extensive research by reading through federal and state statutes on food policy, as well as reading the new legislation emerging from the US Senate and Washington State government. I chose to conduct a more detailed analysis using New York for its relative similarities to Washington State with regard to FPC initiation. I was able to access the online information for the New York State Council on Food Policy, which has the current council information as well as archived history.

New York had a robust grassroots network of people interested in food issues that prodded the FPC to state prominence, as did Washington. New York's governor instituted a food policy council by EO that was subsequently renewed by the next governor. This continuity has ensured a robust food

policy council, however, the political climate in Washington State and New York may differ in that area, and further research would need to be done.

I wanted to compare what other states of similar size, population and income were doing with state run FPCs. I initially identified states with FPC by searching the online data bases from Drake University Law School and Food Security, which maintain interactive maps of state and local FPCs. I began by culling the state only FPCs. Data collected on each state with an FPC included: a) how the FPC was established, b) the year of initiation, c) whether or not the FPC is still active, d) the number of members, and e) the current governor's party affiliation. This latter characteristic could be used to measure how much legislation was enacted due to the efforts of the FPC. I also wanted to see if a democratic or republican administration seemed to make a difference. While attempting to quantify robustness of a council based on whether or not it was started by executive order, legislative ordinance or grassroots efforts, I took into account the length of time an FPC was in operation, funding sources, the number of members and time constraints of the membership.

I then decided to use all available states that had FPCs and compare them, regardless of other geographic information. If a website was listed for a particular FPC, I would go to that website and see if I could find information about ongoing work. I wanted to be certain that the information from the websites was accurate and when I could not gather the needed information from the websites, I contacted the person listed, either by phone or email, and got more information from them if available.

Public awareness of food systems and food security are becoming increasingly broad. As the scope of my research dealt primarily with state-wide FPCs, I was able to assimilate a great deal of information about the inner workings of these councils. Thus, in the discussion of my findings, my interpretation is mixed in with the data.

Chapter 4—Results

The listing of states and significant criteria that have entered into a statewide food policy council are presented in an Excel spreadsheet (Table 1). The table contains information collected to assess the robustness level for an FPC. Commencing with sorting out which of the 50 states have a state wide FPC, I found 23 states. Below, I highlight the standing of each state's FPC, presenting the information in alphabetical order by state. Two states, Iowa and Montana, have multiple listings due to restructured FPCs.

Table 1. Food Policy Council robustness, by state.

States	Date Formed	Formation Type	Governance Details	Current governor party affiliation	Number of members	Length of time in operation	Robustness scale 1-5 (5=most robust)
Arizona	?	Independent	Statewide 501 (c) (3) non-profit with Executive Board and Staff	Republican	?	?	3
Arkansas	Dec-09	Independent	Independent. Originated as non-profit tax exempt now overseen by Winrock US	Democrat	?	?	1
Colorado	2010	Legislative Mandate	SENATE BILL 10-106 Governor appointed 13 member council	Democrat -2011	13 council members	1 1/2 years	3
Connecticut	1997	Legislative Mandate	Embedded in the Depart. Of Agriculture by the state legislature ²⁵ -	Democrat -2011	12 commissioners	14 years	4

²⁵

Governor buy-in important per Linda Drake email.

Table 1. Food Policy Council robustness, by state, continued.

States	Date Formed	Formation Type	Governance Details	Current governor party affiliation	Number of members	Length of time in operation	Robustness scale 1-5 (5=most robust)
Florida	October 17, 2010	Independent	Independent	Republican-2011	9 board members	1 1/2 years no activity on the website since July 2011	2
Georgia	New Council formed Dec. 2011	Independent	Independent Georgia Health Policy Center (GHPC) at Georgia State University was awarded a one-year grant to coordinate	Republican-2011	6 original council members all volunteers with no set terms	Less than 1 year- new council forming due by June 2012	3
Hawaii	Nov-10	Independent	Independent	Democrat	12 Board members	1 1/2 years	4
Illinois	8/18/2009	Legislative Mandate	Public Act 096-0579	Democrat	32 member task force	2 years	4
Iowa-archive 2000-2006	2000	Executive Order no.16	Governor appointed -General Assembly originated New Governor did not re-up the EO	Democrat	28 member committee	6 years then change of governor	1
Iowa	3/1/2011	Restructured	Becoming 501 (c) (3) non-profit with Executive Board and Staff 2012 (with Kellogg Foundation Grant)	Republican-2011	17 member board of directors	1 1/2 years	4
Kansas	Sept. 29, 2005	Inactive	Public-Private Partnership Governor Initiative "Healthy Kansas" Works with the Governor's office possibly defunct with new governor	Republican-2011		6 1/2years	4

Table 1. Food Policy Council robustness, by state, continued.

States	Date Formed	Formation Type	Governance Details	Current governor party affiliation	Number of members	Length of time in operation	Robustness scale 1-5 (5=most robust)
Maine	1/1/2006?	Inactive	See Blog site big changes in Maine Food Policy-litigation against farmers by the State of Maine and Maine Dept. of Agriculture	Republican-2011	up to 35 proposed	?	1
Massachusetts	2007	Legislative Mandate	17 member council some governor appointed (2007 As the Massachusetts Food Policy Alliance 2010 became law as MA Food Policy council)	Democrat	17	1 1/2 years	4
Michigan	2005	Executive order	Current governor appointed new members and reappointed old members EXECUTIVE ORDER No. 2007-44 November 21st 2007 after rescinding in its entirety EXECUTIVE ORDER No.2005 - 13	Republican-2011	25	7 years	5
Montana	2007	Inactive	The Council has a cooperative relationship with the Governor's Montana Food for Montanans Initiative Established in 2007 as a result of the governor's food and agriculture summit	Democrat	17	3 years	1

Table 1. Food Policy Council robustness, by state, continued.

Montana	?	Restructured	MFSC originated with Governor, Grow Montana is an Independent organization with financing from Kellogg Foundation and a local philanthropist. Montana Food System Council (MFSC) became defunct. A new NGO, Grow Montana, is taking over where other council left off.	Democrat	forming		3
New Mexico	2003	Legislative Mandate	House Joint Memorial 45 requesting participation between stakeholders in the New Mexico food and Agricultural Policy Council ²⁶	Republican-2011		189 years	4

²⁶

<http://www.nmlegis.gov/sessions/03%20Regular/memorials/house/HJM045.pdf>

Table 1. Food Policy Council robustness, by state, continued.

States	Date Formed	Formation Type	Governance Details	Current governor party affiliation	Number of members	Length of time in operation	Robustness scale 1-5 (5=most robust)
New York	2007	Executive order	Operated through the NYS Department of Agriculture and Markets Coordinator changes with the change of Governor. Brought to State consciousness by Gov. Mario Cuomo in 1984,(as early as 1975) NYFPC formed under Gov. Spitzer 2007 with E.O. Cont, with Gov Paterson and now Gov. Andrew Cuomo	Democrat -2011	21	5 years	5
North Carolina	August 28, 2009	Legislative Mandate	Approved by the NC State Legislature NC G.S. 106-830 Senate Bill 1067 ²⁷	Democrat	24	2 1/2 years	4
Ohio	August 7, 2007	Executive order	Independent Chaired by the department of Agriculture public private partnership. Created by Executive Order 27S August 7, 2007 by then Democratic Governor Strickland	Republican-2011	27	4 1/2 years	1
South Carolina	17-Mar-06	Independent	Independent (sponsored by Department of Agriculture; Board of Directors nominated every 3 years). Has all the powers provided to it by statute or otherwise granted by executive order or by the powers vested in the Commissioner of Agriculture.	Republican-2011	9	6 years	4

²⁷

<http://www.ncga.state.nc.us/EnactedLegislation/SessionLaws/HTML/2009-2010/SL2009-530.html>

Table 1. Food Policy Council robustness, by state, continued.

States	Date Formed	Formation Type	Governance Details	Current governor party affiliation	Number of members	Length of time in operation	Robustness scale 1-5 (5=most robust)
Utah	?	Inactive	Utahans Against Hunger (UAH) Workgroup members presented information on food policy councils at the Utah Nutrition Council (UNC) on September 23rd, 2010	Republican			2 1/2 years
Virginia	April 24, 2009	Independent	Independent Virginia Food System council 501 (c) (3) was incorporated on October 14, 2009 born out of a statewide Food Security Summit (Charlottesville, May 11, 2007).	Republican	24	2 1/2 years	4
Washington	June 22, 2010	Executive order	Governor vetoed Substitute Senate Bill 6343 establishing a FPC in its entirety April 2,2010 The EO established a committee to produce a paper outlining the need for an FPC.	Democrat	25 in the original bill down to 5 agencies with the executive order	1 1/2 years	3

Synopses of State Food Policy Councils:

Alaska Food Policy Council (AFPC, Robustness=4) Alaska has a 1 and ½ year old FPC which was formed with 11 board members. A working group of 24 members put together a strategic plan looking ahead as far as 20 years. The makeup of the working group came from several sectors of the food industry including manufacturers, farmers, union representatives, government representatives, tribal groups, food banks, consulting firms and university affiliates. The strategic plan document outlines a 3 year plan to begin integration of food policy across all sectors of Alaskan life.

Alaska currently has a resolution before the governor to establish a state food resource development working group with one of the mandates being to interface directly with the AFPC. I gave the robustness ranking of 4 to the AFPC based on several factors: ease of research, strength of participants' involvement and ability to affect government. The fact that the FPC is relatively new and therefore untested for longevity was the reason for the 4 instead of 5 ranking. The FPC funding source was not readily apparent. The new structure also did not account for division of labor. These two factors have been useful indicators of council health and therefore could not be used in this particular evaluation.

Arizona Food Policy Coalition (AFPC, Robustness=3) The AFPC is an offshoot of a broader 501 (c) (3) organization, Community Food Connections (CFC). The AFPC has recently received a grant from MAZON: A Jewish response to Hunger, and have used the grant monies to hire a consultant to facilitate the coalition. While CFC is a going concern, the AFPC is still in the process of becoming viable. Due to the lack of structure, but the promise of a workable coalition, along with the support of CFC, AFPC has earned a robustness rating of 3.

Arkansas Food Policy Council (AFPC, Robustness=1) The AFPC has received a 1 on the robustness scale due the lack of information on any website and the inability to connect with any member, former

or otherwise. There is a website that has not been updated in two years, but the documents contained therein shed little light on the structure or make-up of members. Apparently, the membership for the 501 (c) (3) organization was minimal. There is a reference to the control being facilitated currently by Winrock Corporation but that information was not forthcoming. There is still a mention of the AFPC on the Arkansas Department of Health website, but there are no usable links.

Colorado Food System Advisory Council (CFSAC, Robustness=3) The 13 member council was originated through a senate bill. The membership of the council consists of government agency representatives, a rural development expert, and representatives from academia as well as members from several other aspects of the food industry. The council is facilitated by a third party consulting firm and holds regular meeting throughout the year. The council is specifically tasked as an advisory council and does not make policy but may influence policy. Of the main goals of the CFSAC is to coordinate with the regional councils throughout the state. A summer tour was initiated by the council in 2011 to visit the other food policy councils as well as learning more about how two federally administered programs, Women, Infants and Children (WIC) and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Programs (SNAP) (formerly Food Stamps) were being meted out at farmer's markets.

The CFASC members are not paid, however there is a fund to reimburse travel expenses and administrative costs that is to be gained through grants and federal funding available to food policy councils, however, if funding runs short, then the council is required to cease meetings until funding resumes. In this advisory capacity, CFSAC appears to be functional; however, the act which established the council will automatically review a sunset clause in 2013, thereby disbanding the council. Although the council is functioning well with a fairly decent website and appears to be funded, given the sunset rule I have given the council a 3 on the robustness scale.

Connecticut Food Policy Council (CFPC, Robustness=4) Founded in 1997 by legislative action, as the first statewide FPC, CFPC consists of 12 commissioners who are chosen by senate affiliation and also from representatives of the government agencies that have a direct effect on food priorities for the state. Also serving are academics and food related businesses and organizations throughout the state. Most of these positions have remained occupied by the same person over the lifespan of the council, with minimal turnover. A member from the department of consumer affairs is a consistent participant even though that position is not named in the legislation. There are a few volunteer members who do not vote but are vital to the discussions. Housed at the Department of Agriculture, the main thrust of the council is policy enactment with the legislature and as a consultative body on any food issues before the legislature as well as making recommendations to the governor.

CFPC has sustained periods of being under-financed. Although founded in a year in which the governor was a republican, had it not been for a stalwart supporter in the state senate, the program might not have been funded at all. The subsequent republican governor was also not as interested in food issues and as a matter of course was attempting to eliminate the council in 2009 with House Bill 6375. With the massive budget cuts experienced by many states in 2011, the CFPC was not allowed to spend any money until December of that year. Consequently, without constant updating due to the loss of administrative support, and as it was out of compliance with other state websites, the CFPC website went down. With a new administration concerned about food issues, and renewed funding, a consultant is once again bringing the website back and it will soon be operational.

I give the CFPC a 4 on the robustness scale due mainly to the fact of funding constraints. The membership is dedicated and passionate. With the successful blockage of House Bill 6375, the commitment through the legislature is binding for the foreseeable future.

Florida Food Policy Council (FFPC, Robustness=2) Begun in 2010 as a non-profit, FFPC appears to be under development. While initial offerings on the still operational website shed light as to membership requirements and the bios of the 9 member board of directors, there is little else to suggest that much is forthcoming. There is a statement to the effect that there are projects in the offing. The membership is driven by donations that are tax deductible. I give the FFPC a 2 on the robustness scale due to the fact that there still is a website and a promise of future movement.

Georgia Food Policy Council (GFPC, Robustness=3) In June 2010, the first GFPC met to discuss a comprehensive list of concerns across the food spectrum. The original all-volunteer council had a six member executive board with no definitive governing structure. There is little known regarding the outcome of these initial discussions. However in December of 2011, with a one-year grant, the Georgia Health Policy Center (GHPC) at Georgia State University was tasked with reinstating the GFPC. To that end, the GFPC has already held two meetings with several more planned. The outcomes are to work up a statewide plan to implement suggestions, establish a website, and secure non-Atlanta area participants. While this fledgling FPC only has one year of funding, the deliverables are not formidable, yet not knowing the exact structure of this new council and bearing in mind the termination of funding I have given the council a robustness rating of 3.

Hawaii Food Policy Council (HFPC, Robustness=4) Utilizing small grants, a teach-in was held in July 2011 that resulted in the formation of the HFPC. A fledgling volunteer organization with technical savvy, the HFPC 12 member governing board met with a consultant in February 2012 to begin the process of building a sustainable FPC. Once the board has implemented the core functions of the FPC, a concerted effort will be made to bring other representatives of the food system in Hawaii to be a part of the board. Through another small grant, HFPC is mapping supporters throughout the Islands. They have also spearheaded a fund-raising campaign to ensure a modest operating budget. As an advocacy

group to impact legislation, HFPC has garnered support for several bills making their way through the legislature.

I am giving the HFPC a 4 on the robustness scale due to the fact that although this is a volunteer organization prone to the vagaries of membership and time constraints, the skill of technical savvy on the website indicates a high level of involvement. Also the fund-raising mechanisms are unique and creative. The goals are large but the steps taken are measured. The other deciding factor was the short length of time that the council has been in existence. This may be a honeymoon period of enthusiasm that may wane for the volunteers.

Illinois Local Food, Farms and Jobs Council (ILFFJC, Robustness=4) Established by public act in August of 2009, the ILFFJC consists of a 35 member board of directors from government and non-governmental agencies and organizations. The 29 non-governmental positions are appointed by the governor for staggered 3 year terms. The Department of Agriculture is tasked with providing support to the council with staffing where applicable and office space or conference needs. The original bill allows for applying for and establishing a 501 (c) (3) organization. The current consensus has been to move forward with that option. Funding is separate from the state and new funding sources are being explored.

On March 16, 2012, an event co-sponsored by the new council was held in Chicago to explore the ramifications of a complete food system analysis. Local food policy councils paired with the state-wide councils in an effort to ascertain strategies for sustainable food systems moving forward. With a highly accessible website, backing of the governor and move to a non-profit status with plans in place to attain significant funding, I awarded a 4 on the robustness scale. Only 2 years old, the council has not had a long time to prove itself, but it appears to be ripe for long-term sustainability.

Iowa Food Systems Council (IFSC, Robustness=4) Originally titled the Iowa Food Policy Council, IFSC was instigated in March of 2000 by US Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack, when he was governor of Iowa. With the signing of Executive Order 16, the council of 21 members from governmental and non-governmental sectors, was tasked with bringing recommendations to the governor within one year and then was to be disbanded unless the governor chose to continue. The council functioned with administrative support from the Agricultural Law Center at Drake University and funding from the university, private, federal and state partnerships. Three subsequent executive orders were given by Governor Vilsack in order to continue the work of the council. In 2006, with the change of governors, the council was no longer active.

Governor Chet Culver, a democrat, postdated Governor Vilsack, however Culver's passions were with alternative energy uses and was also involved in getting federal monies for flood relief. When approached in 2007 and 2008 for an executive order to continue the council, none was forthcoming. In 2008, a broad swath of stakeholders came together to begin to discuss food systems once again. In 2010, with a one-year grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, the stakeholders were able to continue their work of building an FPC that would be sustainable. With administrative support from the University of Northern Iowa, Center on Health Disparities, the council reconvened under their new title IFSC. A 17 member board of directors oversees the new 501 (c) (3) organization, as of March 2011, with state officials joining in a non-voting capacity. A membership drive has begun to garner funding.

The new council has issued a report card and a blueprint to follow for the State of Iowa that makes recommendations as to how to improve Iowa's food system. The document released in February, 2011 and titled "Cultivating Resilience," was made available to stakeholders and the newly installed republican governor, as well as other state official and constituencies.

I gave the new Iowa Food Systems Council a 4 on the robustness scale, due to the short length

of the council, but owing to the commitment of the stakeholders and the ability to garner support from the non-profit sector.

Kansas Food Policy Council (KFPC, Robustness=1) US Secretary of Health and Human Services, Kathleen Sebelius, when she was governor of Kansas, convened a Healthy Kansas Initiative in November of 2004. This was a continuation of a program she began when she held the office of Insurance Commissioner. With United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) grant money, and funded through the Kansas Rural Center (KRC), a two-year pilot program was launched to bring together a diverse group of stakeholders to examine the food system of Kansas. Governor Sebelius gave in-kind support from governmental agencies with regard to staffing. She also requested the cooperation of several state agencies including the Rural Life Task Force. With the governor's leadership role, academia, non-profits, government entities and the private sector came together to explore 3 major areas: Regional Food Systems, Food Security and Human Health and the Environment.

In May of 2011, the executive director of the Kansas Rural Center (KRC), Daniel Nagengast, stepped down after 20 years. Nagengast filled out a survey for the policy council write up “Lessons Learned” and stated at that time, 2009, that the council was viable. It is unclear how the council functioned beyond the initial two-year funded project. His leadership will be continued in a new executive director; however there was also a change in governors at the same time. The new republican governor is interested in increasing large scale agribusiness and shale oil fracturing (fracking) with horizontal drilling. While KRC funding continues for adjunct projects such as “Our Local Foods” and “Legislative and Policy Watch Program,” it is difficult to ascertain if the KFPC is functioning in its original iteration.

The RPC utilizes a blog known as the Rural Papers, writing about legislation and other concerns of the non-profit. Perusing this blog, I was unable to find any current work done by the council. The

council may have been absorbed into the broader work of the RPC. There is no information as to membership, other than the two original chairpersons, or current funding. I am giving the KRC a 5 in the robustness scale, however I am attributing a 1 to the KFPC only due to the fact that there is still a link for it on the KRC website. While the link is still active, a chance of reinstituting the KFPC is possible.

Maine Food Policy Council (MFPC, Robustness=1) In the summer of 2005, a Food Policy Conference was held hosted by the governor's wife and the Eat Local Foods Coalition (ELFC). It was discussed at the conference what a Maine Food Policy Council would look like and a working group was formed to flesh out the idea. In January of 2006, under the auspices of the commissioner of the Maine Department of Agricultural, Food and Rural Resources, the working group along with an advisory committee, produced a document outlining recommendations and goals for a newly developed FPC.

While the MFPC is still considered on the books, there is little or no publically available information about its work. According to one blog entry from ELFC in November of 2010, Russ Libby, Executive Director of the Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association (MOFGA), was named as chair of the MFPC, but no further posts. I am giving the MFPC a 1 based on the possibility that there may be a council still on the books that is either grinding away slowly or has become defunct with a new governor.

Massachusetts Food Policy Council (MFPC, Robustness=4) In 2007 the Massachusetts Food Policy Alliance (MFPA) was formed. MFPA is a group of more than 30 organizations that support the work of FPCs. In 2008 MFPA and American Farmland Trust began working together to establish a state -wide FPC. In 2010 the State of Massachusetts passed House Bill 4568 enacting the MFPC. The 15 member

council will be represented by the legislature, government agencies and 5 positions appointed by the governor from within the food sector of the state. Each member will serve a three year term. There is also to be selected an advisory committee that serves at the behest of the council. The council is responsible for an annual report; however, the bill did not specifically address how the council would be financed. The current governor is not seeking reelection in 2014. The website is linked through the Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources and is minimalist, but user friendly. I give the council a 4 on the robustness scale due to ease of website use and member terms.

Michigan Food Policy Council (MFPC, Robustness=5) An executive order in 2005 established the MFPC for the State of Michigan using a W. K. Kellogg Foundation grant. Jennifer Granholm was the sitting governor and in 2007 wrote a new executive order suspending the original order and creating a new order. The new order requires that the Director of the Department of Agriculture be the chair of the council, and further that the financial responsibility as well as management of the council be funneled through the Department of Agriculture. The members of the council are from a broad range of governmental, including the department of corrections, non-governmental, academic, labor and food stakeholders and all serve without financial remuneration, however expenses can be reimbursed. Current terms for the 25 member council expire in 2015, and there is a link from the new governor's website for the council listing membership and link back to the 2007 executive order. In February 2012, the new governor appointed three new members and reappointed one member. The council is still partially funded by a Kellogg grant. I give the MFPC a 5 in the robustness scale. At 7 years, the council is the third longest running council of the councils I ranked. Given that the new governor, from a different political persuasion, fully embraced the council, it is likely to flourish in the coming years.

Montana Food System Council (MFSC, Robustness=1) Montana has several different groups

working on food policy issues. Grow Montana began as a broad coalition in 2005 with grant money from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation to promote economic development policies that were community centric, as well as shifting resources to a more sustainable food model. In March, 2007 current governor Brian Schweitzer, convened a Food and Agriculture Summit attended by 300 people from all areas of the food realm. From this summit was formed the 17 member MFSC. The governor then passed Montana Food for Montanans Initiative (MFMI). This initiative ensured that five state agencies would work with the newly formed volunteer MFSC. Working with an initial budget of \$40,000 dispensed through the Department of Health, most of the money was spent on consultants. While the 17 volunteers were passionate about food policy, they were local players on a state stage. They squandered the role they had in having access to the state department heads. They were never able to move the council in a positive direction due to inexperience and lack of statewide cachet. The remaining money is now being channeled through the Department of Agriculture.

By contrast, Grow Montana has become well situated to spearhead a new FPC. Their volunteers have statewide relationships and the savvy to use their connections. Grow Montana was the leader in the now national movement modeled after the Peace Corps and Americorps, called FoodCorps, where a volunteer gives a year of service to under-served populations helping them to become more connected to their food.

The MFSC website is now non-operational and the council itself is not functioning effectively. A possibility of a new council operating as a non-profit, but facilitated through Grow Montana, could be in the offing. I give the MFSC a 1 on the robustness scale. They have money left over and passion in their respective jurisdictions, but not statewide. I give Grow Montana a 3 as it is robust on its own, being in existence for 7 years and likely taking on a new FPC. The governor will remain in office until 2013.

New Mexico Food and Agriculture Policy Council (NMFAPC, Robustness=4) At 9 years, New Mexico has the second longest running FPC of the states I followed. Grassroots activists worked to pass legislation in 2003 establishing the NMFAPC. In recognition for the work that the stakeholders were engaged in, the senate voted on House Joint Memorial 45, basically placing the state's imprimatur on the newly burgeoning council. It also formally encouraged state agencies to cooperate fully with the council. The 18 member council flourished under the same governor since its inception. With the change of governor, the priorities of government may have changed. While there is no recent activity on the Farm to Table website that houses the councils work, the site does not indicate that the council is no longer functioning. Pam Roy, the Farm to Table Executive Director is also the director of the NMFAPC. I give the council a robustness grade of 4 due to its long running history, its dedication by its director and the inactivity on the website since the change in governors.

New York State Council on Food Policy (NYS CFP, Robustness=5) Founded by executive order in 2007 and renewed by executive order through two subsequent democratic governors, the NYSCFP has been in continuous operation for 5 years. The 21 member council is operated through the NY State Department of Agriculture and Markets Coordinator. This position changes with the change of governor. The council members are representative of government, academia and food stakeholders from around the state.

Food policy in New York State has a long history of activism and government involvement. As early as October 1975, a task force was formed to try to revive the family farm in New York State. The Task Force on Farm, Food and Nutrition Policy convened to try to insure good nutrition for all New Yorkers. This task force oversaw the enactment of legislation that would affect New Yorkers to the present day. Much of the language in the task force mandate reads much the same as FPC mandates today.

In 1984, then Governor Mario Cuomo instituted the New York State Council on Food and Nutrition Policy. The council was tasked with developing a 5 year plan to assist with improving the options for healthful nutrition for all New Yorkers, especially the most vulnerable. The state plan covered the years 1988-1992. Whereas the 5 year plan relies heavily on hunger alleviation, the modern FPCs have relied more heavily on accessing local foods. The NY SCFP is no exception. The main goal of the council is to ensure the maintenance of family farms and the availability of locally produced fruits and vegetables, as well as dealing with food infrastructure that supports all New Yorkers. The newest annual report to the governor is not yet listed on the website, however the website is maintained and user friendly. I rate the NY SCFP a 5 on the robustness scale. Although the turnover on governance is frequent, the council maintains continuity and its recommendations for food policy legislation are often followed through with the governor.

North Carolina Sustainable Local Food Advisory Council (NCSLFAC, Robustness=4) The North Carolina Sustainable Local Food Advisory Council was born of a legislative action in August of 2009. The 24 member council was tasked with making recommendations to the governor regarding food policy legislation that could benefit all North Carolinians. Annual reports are filed for the governor and the council had an automatic sunset date of July 31, 2012. In the 2012 report, the council makes the recommendation that the sunset of the council be delayed until July 21st, 2017. The work of the council has been effective, according to the report and the council would like to continue serving the state in the same manner. A request was also made for a full time staff person to assist with the needs of the council. The current governor is up for reelection in 2012 with a term limit of two terms. The NCSLFAC receives a 4 on the robustness scale for ease of research, published reports, and a wish to continue. The drawback would be a change in governor; however, if the council were to get the requested extension to the sunset rule, the council would be operational into the next gubernatorial

term.

Ohio Food Policy Council (OFPC, Robustness=1) Touted in a 2009 Earth Day op ed piece as a bold way forward to sustainability for Ohio, the council was created by Executive Order 27S August 7, 2007 by then Democratic Governor Strickland. Chaired by the department of Agriculture this independent council was a public-private partnership. The 27 member council operated for 4 ½ years until a new governor. There is now no mention of the council anywhere on the government websites.

A bill was introduced in the House in May of 2011 to create the Ohio Sustainable Food Advisory Council. It is unclear whether or not it passed. Ohio receives a 1 on the robustness scale, primarily due to the lack of information.

South Carolina Food Policy Council (SCFPC, Robustness=4) An independent council which originated in March of 2006, sponsored by the Department of Agriculture with a Board of Directors who are nominated every 3 years. The South Carolina Food Policy Council has all the powers provided to it by statute or otherwise granted by executive order or by the powers vested in the Commissioner of Agriculture. The council consists of 9 board members and according to their website, 3 of their board members have terms that extend into 2013.

The SCFPC serves as a forum for stakeholders to share ideas about food and food related issues that will benefit all South Carolinians. While the council is still active, since the new governor took over in 2011, there appears to be little activity on the website as to projects or meetings. I am giving this council a 4 on the robustness scale due to its longevity, but slowed presence on the broader stage with change of governors, although the commissioner of the Department of Agriculture, Hugh Weathers, remained the same.

Utah Food Policy Group (UFPG) Inactive—no information.

Virginia Food System Council (VFSC, Robustness=4) At a statewide Food Security Summit held in May of 2007 in Charlottesville, with help from the Secretary of Agriculture, the idea for a food system council was initiated. In April of 2009, the VFSC was adopted. In October of that year the council became a 501 (c) (3) organization. As with many of the other councils, one of the main goals for Virginia is a self-sustaining food system that serves all Virginians. The website for the council is colorful, bright and easy to navigate. The membership for the council is as varied as the food system itself. There are 24 members and an executive council, representing hunger issues, academia, growers, producers, health and retail and aging services. There is a donation link on the website and a link to Facebook that runs along the edge of the page as you scroll through each section—very effective marketing. I give the VFSC a 4 on the robustness scale due mainly the short length of time they have been in operation and their reliance on individual funding. The continuation also does not rely on who is governor.

Washington State (EO 10-02 made no provision for an FPC) In February of 2010, Substitute Senate Bill 6343 was passed almost unanimously to create a Washington food policy forum. Governor Gregoire returned the bill with a full veto explaining that there were too many redundant services being performed by state agencies and that the size of the council was too large. However, with the veto came a promise to establish a council that she felt was more in line with her streamlining policies. On June 22, Gregoire issued Executive Order 10-02 titled “Strengthening Washington's Food Systems Through Policy and Collaboration.” The only deliverable for the executive order was a paper due by December 31st, 2011. The paper was issued and available for the public in February 2012. The Inter Agency Working group (IAW) that produced the report recommended beginning a Food Systems

Roundtable with a 25 year vision. With the change in the governorship due in 2012, it will be a wait and see game as to what will come of the information. Because no council was formed out of the executive order, there is no test for robustness for Washington State.

Chapter 5—Discussion

Findings

Researching which FPCs are still viable has been as circuitous and complicated as the food system itself. Food Policy Councils: Lessons Learned has an addendum with charts depicting local, county or regional, and state FPCs that summarizes the results of surveys given to the FPCs (Appendix C, pages 52-3, shows the responders to the questionnaires). Each chart outlines which councils responded to the surveys and the status of the councils. This work was completed in 2009 and appears to be the most comprehensive document on the nature of Food Policy Councils to date. However, in the intervening time, many of the FPCs have changed. For example, in the time between when the questionnaire was completed in February 2009 and the publication of a report titled Iowa Food Systems Council: A Second Generation State Food Policy Council in Summer 2011.²⁸ Iowa reinstated a food policy council after the first became defunct when no new executive order was forthcoming with a change in governance. The new council has chosen to become a 501(c) (3) non-profit membership-based organization. One of the reasons for this decision was related to the council's organizational perpetuity and the ability to exist beyond lifetime or enrollment of those who begin it (Iowa Food Systems Council: A Second Generation State Food Policy Council, 2011, page 2).²⁹

The strength of an FPC did not seem to be influenced by its origin: there were no patterns seen in sustainability or robustness and whether the FPC was begun as a grassroots-independent movement or by legislation or executive order. Nor did the size of the committee have a direct effect on whether

²⁸ <http://www.iowafoodsystemscouncil.org/storage/History%20of%20the%20IFSC%202008-2011.pdf>
²⁹ Ibid.

the council was robust. Some FPCs were 8 to 10 people while others were 25 or larger. What might matter is the make-up of the council, however this was outside the scope of this study. Who was not included in the policy council might be just as important as who was there. I was very interested to see on one occasion the inclusion of aging services, while in another the inclusion of the prison system. The most common elements included in FPCs were representatives of state government departments with ties to food, health, education, farmers or food wholesalers. There was also some input from unions and tribal groups, as well poverty alleviation organizations.

Yet despite the diversity of history and structures among the FPCs among the states, there appear to be some immutable associations emerging from this research. There appears to be a link between robustness of an FPC and the degree to which factors of time and money were addressed in the formation of the FPC. Councils given more time to accomplish their work, and for staff to follow through with maintaining websites and scheduling conferences and producing materials were more robust. Similarly, the most robust FPCs received more funding for various projects, consultants and reimbursements for the time investments of FPC members. Many, if not most, of the councils were volunteers. Some council members served at the behest of the governor in their capacity as department heads or staff. Many of the volunteers were already involved in local or regional food or health projects in their own communities that took a great deal of their personal time and resources.

The ability to influence legislation seemed to be a common thread, no matter the genesis of the FPC. A few of the FPCs turned to outside consulting firms for day to day operations, while some FPCs had their business handled by university staff or government employees. While some FPCs had members with political clout due to their role, whether in government or with state-wide political connections, others had no state-wide affiliations and so did not understand the power that they held via access to state directors (Matheson, 2012).

Desired outcomes for the FPCs were almost consistent across the board; local food for local

people, and keeping food dollars within the state. These paired objectives drove most of the discussions and policy choices in the FPCs. Another policy aim was to better coordinate state agencies to eliminate redundancies and provide better mechanisms for receiving federal aid dollars. Two of these programs that have seen great success due to FPC input, has been the increase in the use of SNAP and WIC at farmer's markets.

Another goal that FPCs are attempting to foster is the preservation of farm land and the increase in mid-size farms through linking the farms to schools movement with the federal school feeding programs. This dynamic and growing policy is helping reshape how America feeds its children at school. Right now the number one supplier of elementary school food is the Department of Defense (DoD). More local suppliers are now filling the orders for the DoD Fresh program. These are just a few of the programs that are becoming more readily coordinated with the institution of state-wide FPCs.

One of the most clear findings from my research is that people who are passionate about food issues drive the discussion. Mark Winne, an advocate for FPCs for many years, spoke to this issue for Washington State prior to the legislature passing SSB 6343 to institute a Washington food policy forum. His book [Closing the Food Gap: Resetting the Table in the Land of Plenty](#), as well as his work in helping to produce the seminal report, “Food Policy Councils: Lessons Learned,” have been the touchstone for the food policy movement throughout the country. Winne was part of the original group who approached the Connecticut legislature to adopt the first statewide FPC in 1997. His continued passion to change the discussion about food in our country comes from years of working with food banks and trying to put a band-aid on hunger. Another high profile advocate is The First Lady, Michelle Obama, who has also been cited in a number of texts as reasons to invest in FPCs. Her “Let's Move” campaign, along with stimulus money to USDA and the CDC for obesity prevention programs, has led lawmakers and concerned citizens to put forth time and resources for changing the status quo of

food production and consumption in the United States.

While these findings are but a small contribution to the growing body of work on FPCs, many useful predictions about the robustness of FPCs can be gleaned from this assessment.

Limitations

The food policy arena is a moving target. Even though state-wide food policy has been discussed in some circles for decades, the new emphasis on state-wide and even regional and local councils has reached a fever pitch in the American consciousness. More NGOs are involved in scrutinizing the US farm bill, for instance, than at time in our history. The use of social media has made the discussions more accessible to a broader audience. Food policy discussions are becoming tied to everyday language and consumers are more informed about their choices. Webinars have become popular ways of disseminating information to the wider public.

As to my particular research, the ability to keep focused on the differing FPCs was intimidating. Many of the councils were similar enough that the data all began to look the same. The amount of new information that is being generated every day is also counterproductive to remaining focused on a single purpose.

The information itself is often spotty. Where one council has many ways to find out how it was formed or what the funding sources are, others do not, or require a treasure hunt to find the desired information. For example, if there is a *sunset rule* to the council itself that would ultimately affect the robustness of that council. That information is usually buried in the original documentation. Other councils might be absorbed or reabsorbed into the department or entity that was its genesis, but because the name remains on those websites, the council appears viable. I have found blogs by food groups to be most helpful in detecting whether or not FPCs are still operational.

Chapter 6—Summary and Conclusion

FPCs are an important tool for policy work. While not a lobbying group, per se, with its diverse clustering of participants, the FPC has the ability to drive food policy on a large scale. Future research could further elucidate what makes an FPC robust, which could then be used to strengthen the efficacy of these organizations. Some possible research options for further development could include;

- **Funding Mechanisms:** One of the major influences on robustness is whether the council is properly funded. Many of the FPCs had corporate sponsorship though the Kellogg Foundation while others rely on donations or dues from members, while still others were beholden to the whims of government. These funding mechanisms have sustainability issues themselves. Further research would be needed to see which funding is more robust.
- **University Input:** Many FPCs are tied to universities in that they rely on those relationships for research and updating of information. Determining whether an FPC owes some of its viability to the influence and support of universities could be a focus for further research.
- **Farmers Markets:** The increase in Farmers Markets in the United States may have been directly or indirectly tied to the work of FPCs. Quantifying these increases on the state or local level could be a very real boon to FPCs and their overall effectiveness in the policy realm. An adjunct case could be made for local food movements, the use of EBT or food stamp increases in buying fresh fruits and vegetables, and the sustainability of family run and mid-sized farms
- **Fiduciary Policy:** Tax monies and government subsidies are often held to scrutiny for being fiscally responsible. Oversight from FPCs could amount to increased savings through lessening of mismanaged Farm Bill funds, consolidation of resources from competing government agencies and a more open democratic process. The amount of money being saved or services

improved because of FPCs could be tracked through further research.

The implications for my study are that researchers can use this basic information as a starting point for further research. In order to enhance the work of FPCs, researchers might want to measure the influence these councils have on various aspects of the food continuum. This further research can either justify or negate the necessity for state or local governments to buy into establishing an FPC in their locale. Rather than adding to an inefficient bureaucracy, FPCs could have the capacity for streamlining governmental procedures in ways that are beneficial to the farmer, the consumer, and the health of the economy.

Works Cited

- Bardach, E. (2009). *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving* Third Edition. Washington DC: CQ Press
- Bensen, A. (November 17, 2009) "Hunger and food security in the United States" *Food & Think* Smithsonian.com Retrieved from <http://blogs.smithsonianmag.com/food/2009/11/17/hunger-and-food-security-in-the-united-states/>
- "Community food security programs: what do they look like?" *Food Security* n.d. Retrieved from [http://www.foodsecurity.org/CFS Projects.pdf](http://www.foodsecurity.org/CFS%20Projects.pdf)
- "Community supported agricultural." *Local Harvest* n.d. Retrieved from <http://www.localharvest.org/csa/>
- Drake, Linda. *Nutritionist and Program Director* UCONN Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) Department of Nutritional Sciences. Personal email correspondence. 28 Feb.-2 Mar. 2011.
- "Food security" *Trade, foreign policy, diplomacy and health*. n.d. World Health Organization Retrieved from <http://www.who.int/trade/glossary/story028/en/>
- "FPC database" *Agricultural Law Center*. n.d. Drake University Law School Retrieved from <http://www.law.drake.edu/centers/agLaw/?pageID=fpcDataBase>
- Garber, A. (Dec. 6, 2007). "I-5 flood repairs won't go quickly." *Seattle Times* Retrieved from http://seattletimes.nwsources.com/html/localnews/2004055856_stormmainbar06m.html
- Harper, A., Shattuck, A., Holt-Gimenez, E., Alcon, A., Lambrick, F. (2009). "Food policy councils: lessons learned" Development Report No. 21 *Food First/Institute for Food and Development Policy* Retrieved from <http://www.foodfirst.org/en/foodpolycouncils-lessons>
- Hird, J., Reese, M., Shilvock, M. (2004). *Controversies in American Public Policy* Third Edition

Belmont, California: Wadsworth/Thompson

Kibbe, Debra. *Senior Research Associate* Georgia Health Policy Center Georgia State University.

Personal email correspondence. 5-17 Mar. 2011

Matheson, Nancy. *Special Projects Coordinator* , Agricultural Marketing and Business Development

Montana Department of Agriculture. Personal interview. 7 Mar. 2011.

Meltsner, A. (1972). "Political Feasibility and Policy Analysis." *Public Administration Review* Volume

32. Number 6 (Nov-Dec., 1972): 859-67. Retrieved February 25, 2010, from

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/974646>

Member of the Washington Sustainable Food & Farming Network. Personal Interview. 7 May 2010.

"New York state council on food policy: connecting the dots" (2007). Retrieved from

http://www.nyscfp.org/docs/CFP_DecemberReport_2007.pdf

Nischan, M. (Spet. 27, 2011). "Let's make 'Let's Move' even better." Originally published in the

Atlantic. [http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2011/09/lets-make-lets-move-even-](http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2011/09/lets-make-lets-move-even-better/245669/)

better/245669/ Local Food, Farms and Jobs: Growing the Illinois Economy. Retrieved from

<http://foodfarmsjobs.org/2011/09/28/challenge-the-lets-move-campaign-to-strengthen-food-access-through-local-food/>

Perez, T., Rushing, R. (April 23, 2007). "The citistat model: how data driven government can

increase efficiency and effectiveness." *Center for American Progress* Retrieved from

<http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2007/04/citistat.html>

Pew Charitable Trusts, Pew Center on the States (March 3, 2008). *Grading the states 2008 report*

Retrieved from http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/gpp_report_card.aspx

Public Policy Professional. Personal Interview. 10 May 2010.

Reforming how we serve our customers—the people of Washington (2010). (Policy Brief)

Retrieved from <http://www.governor.wa.gov/priorities/reform/reformingbusiness.pdf>

“Timeline of events and accomplishments in the OFPC's formation and operation” (2009). *Oakland Food Policy Council History* Retrieved from <http://www.oaklandfood.org/home/history>

Walters, J. (2007). “Negotiator-in-chief: Christine O. Gregoire.” *2007 Public officials of the year* Governing the States and Localities Retrieved from <http://www.governing.com/poy/2007-Public-Officials-of-the-Year.html>

“Washington Gov. signs food reporting order: good food coalition applauds governor’s executive order as good step forward.”(June 25, 2010). *Natural Resource Report* Retrieved from <http://naturalresourcereport.com/2010/06/washington-governor-signs-food-reporting-order/>

Washington Sustainable Food and Farming Network n.d.<http://wsffn.org/>

“What can a food policy council do that is not already being done in government?” *State and Local Food Policy Councils*. n.d. Drake University Law School Retrieved from <http://www.statefoodpolicy.org/?pageID=qanda#WhatCanAFoodPolicyCouncilDo>

“What is a food system?” *WSU Extension*. n.d. Retrieved from <http://king.wsu.edu/foodandfarms/Whatisafoodsystem.html>

What is community food security? n.d. Retrieved from http://www.foodsecurity.org/views_cfs_faq.html

“Working to improve nutrition, physical activity and health in our communities.” *Center for Public Health Nutrition*. n.d. University of Washington Retrieved from <http://depts.washington.edu/uwcphn/>

Yellen, L. (June 9, 2010) “Urban agriculture initiatives in Seattle.” *Food First: Institute for Food and Development Policy* Retrieved from (<http://www.foodfirst.org/en/node/2970>)

Appendix—1. Veto of SSB 6343

VETO MESSAGE ON SSB 6343

April 2, 2010

To the Honorable President and Members,
The Senate of the State of Washington

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, Substitute Senate Bill 6343 entitled:

"AN ACT Relating to the establishment of the Washington food policy forum."

Improved coordination of efforts relating to our state food policy is needed. However, this bill identifies goals that overlap with existing state agency activities. This redundancy will lead to spending time and financial resources on issues already addressed by existing agency programs. In addition, this bill establishes a forum consisting of 25 representatives and charges the forum with addressing a broad range of food system goals over the next five years. Experience teaches that the large size of the forum combined with a broad range of issues diminishes the prospects for success.

While I have vetoed this bill, I am committed to a more focused examination of state food policy, food-related programs, and food-related issues. I intend to issue an executive order directing the Departments of Health, Agriculture, and Social and Health Services, along with a request to the Conservation Commission and the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, to work collaboratively with other agencies and non-governmental organizations, to:

- a. Pursue federal and other grant source funds to identify gaps and opportunities to address food security, nutrition, and health of Washington citizens;
- b. Explore ways to promote nutrition, especially for those who are most in need;
- c. Help educate the public and policy makers on the status of hunger in Washington State, and the role they play in addressing issues of food security, nutrition and health; and
- d. Collaborate and coordinate with private, public and governmental organizations to support realistic solutions to improving food security, nutrition and health for all Washingtonians; and,
- e. Help educate the public and policy makers on the importance of farmland preservation and the importance of promoting Washington-grown products to farmers' markets, food banks, and institutions.

For these reasons I have vetoed Substitute Senate Bill 6343 in its entirety.

Respectfully submitted,
Christine Gregoire
Governor

CHRISTINE O. GREGOIRE
Governor



STATE OF WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

P.O. Box 40002 · Olympia, Washington 98504- 0002 · (360) 753- 6780 · www.governor.wa.gov

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10-02

**STRENGTHENING WASHINGTON'S FOOD SYSTEMS
THROUGH POLICY AND COLLABORATION**

WHEREAS, a number of governmental agencies and programs of the state share goals and missions relating to food, nutrition, agriculture, health, and economic development through sustained agricultural production and improved access to nutritious foods;

WHEREAS, the current food system in Washington state is complex and directly affected by the activities and policies of multiple nongovernmental organizations, state agencies, and local governments, and a coordinated, systemic approach is necessary to improve the food security, nutrition and health of Washington's citizens;

WHEREAS, the percentage of young people who are overweight has tripled since 1980, and in Washington twenty-five percent of high school students and nearly sixty-one percent of Washington adults are either obese or overweight, and obesity contributes substantially to the burden of preventable illnesses and premature death;

WHEREAS, the Federal government has several initiatives focused on improving the nation's food security, nutrition, and health, including First Lady Michelle Obama's Let's Move campaign and the USDA's "Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food" initiative;

WHEREAS, our current economic climate and budget challenges require us to constantly evaluate state agency functions and structures and take steps to coordinate and streamline their operations; and

NOW THEREFORE, I, Christine O. Gregoire, Governor of the state of Washington, declare my commitment to improve coordination of efforts relating to our state food policy and hereby declare and direct the following:

1. The Departments of Health, Agriculture, and Social and Health Services shall work collaboratively with other agencies and non-governmental organizations to examine state food policy, food-related programs, and food-related issues. In addition, I request the Conservation Commission and the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction join as full partners in this effort.

2. These agencies shall produce a report to the Governor and Legislature which provides an assessment of existing data and identifies remaining gaps and opportunities in Washington State food policy to help address food security, nutrition, and health challenges faced by Washington citizens and to support realistic solutions to these issues. The report will be delivered by December 31, 2011.
3. The report is intended to help agencies, stakeholders and legislators:
 - a. Explore ways to promote nutrition, especially for those who are most in need.
 - b. Identify ways to educate the public and policy makers on the status of hunger in Washington State and the role they play in addressing the issue of food security, nutrition, and health.
 - c. Educate the public and policy makers on the importance of farmland preservation and the importance of promoting Washington-grown products to farmer's markets, food banks, and institutions.
4. It is the intent of this executive order to place the state in a favorable position to qualify for available federal funds, moneys from foundations, and other sources to address issues of food security, nutrition and health of Washington citizens.

This executive order will take effect immediately.

Signed and sealed with the official seal of the state of Washington on this 22nd day of June 2010 at Seattle, Washington.

By:

/s/

Christine O. Gregoire
Governor

BY THE GOVERNOR:

/s/

Secretary of State

Appendix—3

Statement of Linda Drake, Chair of the CT Food Policy Council, before the Appropriations Committee, February 17, 2009

I am here today to urge you to deny the recommendation of House Bill 6375 to eliminate the existence of the CT Food Policy Council. The Council was established by the Legislature in 1997 and charged with advising both the Governor and the General Assembly on issues of food security in our state and on legislation that may affect the state's overall food system.

Connecticut was the first state in the nation to create a Food Policy Council to “develop, coordinate and implement a food system policy.” More than 30 other states have followed our example in creating food policy councils.

Food policy addresses concerns such as: farmland preservation, urban agriculture, emergency food supplies, markets for local food, nutrition education, food safety, child nutrition, food assistance programs and inner-city supermarkets. Food policy links economic development, land use planning, environmental protection and preservation, farming, national security, health, economic and urban issues.

Our work is about good government. The Connecticut Food Policy Council provides a unique opportunity for representatives of state agencies and private organizations to discuss issues and to develop policies and government actions that influence the availability, accessibility, affordability, quality and safety of our food supply.

The Council is formally housed within the State Department of Agriculture. Members include Commissioners or designees from the state departments of Agriculture, Administrative Services, Education, Social Services, Transportation, and Public Health, as well as representatives from agriculture, anti-hunger programs, the University of Connecticut Cooperative Extension System and the retail and wholesale food industry.

We work across departmental boundaries to identify ways we can collaborate, breaking down bureaucratic barriers to accomplish the goal of food security for all Connecticut residents. There is no one easy answer to the issues of food security — improving it is a multi-stakeholder process, with implications across many industry sectors. It takes insight, involvement and a willingness to look at solutions in a new light.

The Council has a strong record of accomplishments over the past 12 years and has done its work with minimal state funding. The new Secretary of Agriculture, Tom Vilsack, outlined his proposals for federal action last week and called for establishing state food policy councils across the country.

While we recognize that in a time of fiscal austerity the state may not be able to fund the Council, we believe that it would be a serious error to eliminate its existence as proposed by the Governor in House Bill 6375. We urge you to keep the Council in existence. Some of its work can continue on a voluntary basis and with the interest of this new Secretary of Agriculture we may find that federal funding will be available to the states for food policy councils. Food is essential for life. We take it for granted, and we shouldn't. Connecticut needs to stay committed to addressing food security issues. My submitted testimony includes more detail and examples of accomplishments of the CT Food Policy Council.

WORK OF THE CONNECTICUT FOOD POLICY COUNCIL -1997 TO 2009

- Connecticut was the first to establish a state Food Policy Council. Since then more than 30 other states have followed our example. Connecticut's work has achieved national recognition. In 2006, the National Conference of State Legislators brought legislators from throughout the Northeast to Connecticut to see the work of the CT Food Policy Council in action.
- The Council has always done its work with minimal state funding, at the level of \$25,000 annually over the past few years.
- In 2006 **Home Plate: Putting Local Food on the Menu**, our conference for food service managers, chefs, restaurants, farmers, and dietitians from the public and private sectors identified significant issues about producing and marketing local foods in Connecticut. This has led to a major statewide initiative on meat processing.
- Plans to link eligibility for state assistance programs have resulted in more people getting food, more efficiently. Collaborations forged through the Food Policy Council have helped shorten the application for Food Stamps and improved linkages to the School Lunch and Breakfast programs.
- The farmland preservation program has been re-energized. The state's goal to preserve 130,000 acres of farmland had lost momentum with no farmland preserved at all during 1999. The Council's **Save the Land** Conference resulted in the creation of the Working Lands Alliance. Today the state is moving more directly to preserve prime farmland.
- Changes to bid processes have increased opportunities for local food wholesalers. Due to their involvement with the Food Policy Council, the University of Connecticut addressed an issue that was preventing Connecticut food wholesalers from bidding on University contracts — a "sole source" policy that gave all of the University's food supply business to one vendor. Eliminating this requirement helps locally-owned businesses compete for University food supply contracts.
- Improved access to food for seniors, urban, and low-income residents. Interdepartmental collaboration has resulted in several projects designed to improve access to food for Connecticut residents. The Department of Agriculture and Department of Social Services have expanded the Food Stamp program to include coupons for use by senior citizens at Farm Markets. The Food Policy Council also co-sponsored a public hearing, Barriers to Food Access in Connecticut, in March 2000 with State Rep. Barnaby Horton and the Hartford Advisory Commission on Food Policy. The hearing focused on a long-standing food problem in Connecticut, the lack of full-size, affordably priced supermarkets in or near low-income communities and the related issues of transportation.
- The Council collaborated with the Department of Transportation to produce the **Connecticut Farm Map** in 2002 a road-map guide to local produce. This very popular map that helps consumers and farm businesses was revised and reissued in 2005.
- In collaboration with the Department of Education, we produced **What's Cooking in Connecticut Schools**, with ideas for communities to help improve nutrition and physical fitness for Connecticut's children.

- The Council has produced substantive reports on **Food Security in Connecticut, Agricultural Directions in CT** and **Community Food Security in CT**, with a ranking of each of our 169 Towns.
- The Council's **Nutrition Education Summit** brought together leaders in the field of food and nutrition education to seek ways to enhance collaboration and work more effectively to address nutritional concerns of our families and kids. As a result of that conference, we created a new website for nutrition educators.
- The Council's **Food Safety** conference addressed the issue of consumer confidence that the food we are purchasing is safe to eat. This is a key ingredient in a secure food system. A result of the conference was the Council's recommendations to: increase the production and consumption of locally-produced food; examine the issue of labeling genetically-modified foods; coordinate and standardize food safety regulations; and further examine the consumer's role in food safety.

More information is available at the website of the Connecticut Food Policy Council
www.foodpc.state.ct.us

Linda T. Drake, M.S.
 Nutritionist and Program Director
 Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP)
 3624 Horsebarn Rd. Extension
 Dept. of Nutritional Sciences
 University of Connecticut
 Storrs, CT 06269-4017

Phone: 860-486-1783
 FAX: 860-486-3674
 EMAIL: Linda.Drake@uconn.edu