Making Good Food Work

April 19-21, 2011 · Detroit, Michigan

Conference Proceedings Report

June 2011

Authors
Lindsey Day Farnsworth, University of Wisconsin Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems
Amy Bruner Zimmerman, Green Link Consulting
Jess Daniel, C.S. Mott Group for Sustainable Food Systems, Michigan State University

Contributors
James Barham, Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA
Winona Bynum, Wayne State University Department of Dietetics
John Fisk, Wallace Center for Sustainable Food Systems at Winrock International
Mike Hamm, C.S. Mott Group for Sustainable Food Systems, Michigan State University
Joseph McIntyre, Ag Innovations Network
Susan Smalley, C.S. Mott Group for Sustainable Food Systems, Michigan State University

Sponsors
C.S. Mott Group for Sustainable Food Systems, Michigan State University
Michigan State University Land Policy Institute
Michigan State University Product Center for Agriculture and Natural Resources
The Farm Credit Council
USDA, National Institute of Food and Agriculture
W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Food & Community Program

Publication Layout and Design
Jessica Ladd, Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA

For inquiries or additional information, please contact:

C.S. Mott Group for Sustainable Food Systems at Michigan State University
517.432.1612
E-mail: mottgroup@anr.msu.edu

Wallace Center at Winrock International
Jeff Farbman
703.302.6610
E-mail: jfarbman@winrock.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

● ● ● ● ●

The Making Good Food Work Conference proceedings were designed to serve several functions:

1. Detail a new action-oriented conference structure

2. Document cutting-edge innovations and emerging themes in local and regional food distribution in the United States

3. Profile thirteen specific projects designed to improve access to good food and foster greater efficiency across local food supply chains

4. Identify the research, policy, and funding implications of these findings

Targeted at conference attendees, food systems professionals, policy-makers and funders, this document is intended to galvanize support for innovative food distribution initiatives, inform and reinforce grant proposals, and spur the development of additional resources for small and mid-size producers, local food entrepreneurs, and communities with inadequate access to good food. Here we provide a summary of each of the document's five stand-alone sections: Conference Structure, Key Themes & Findings, Project Profiles, Research & Policy Implications, and Resources. Additional information can be found in the full-length proceedings report and at the Making Good Food Work Conference website.

CONFERENCE STRUCTURE

The Making Good Food Work conference was conceived and designed to promote active problem-solving and to advance one of the goals of the USDA's Agriculture and Food Research Initiative —"to develop research, education and extension [to foster] sustainable programs on local and regional food systems that will increase food security in disadvantaged U.S. communities and create viability in local economies". The conference structure took inspiration from tech-oriented Startup Weekends, which are hands-on opportunities for entrepreneurs to fine-tune and vet their business ideas and take them from concept to launch in three days. Conference participants were enthusiastic about the action-oriented structure and valued the opportunity to substantively contribute to specific projects.

The objective of bringing this action-oriented conference model to the local and regional food distribution arena was to leverage food system and business expertise from across the U.S. to help catalyze thirteen local and regional food distribution and marketing initiatives and advance related research and policy agendas. Because the organizers recognized the marked differences between developing an online product or service and developing a food value chain, aggregation facility or mobile market (with many more stakeholders, partners, and physical logistics to consider), the model was adapted substantially to fit our intended goals and audience.

For more information on conference design, components, and facilitation, please refer to the detailed description of the conference structure and a summary of lessons learned on page 11.

KEY THEMES & FINDINGS

The question at the heart of the conference was: "How can we provide local and sustainably produced food to a greater number of consumers, especially those with inadequate access to healthy food, while creating new markets and ensuring fair returns for under-represented producers?" As several food business start-ups discovered at the conference, business models designed to help producers retain a larger percent of the retail food dollar typically operate at price points that make their products unaffordable to low-income markets. Conversely, business models such as mobile markets and corner store programs that are designed to improve access to and the affordability of fresh produce generally source from large (inter)national suppliers at terminal markets to keep retail costs low.

Following is a synopsis of other themes and findings from the conference, many of which address issues closely connected to the fair pricing dilemma. For additional information on these findings, please refer to the Key Themes & Findings Section.

- Many food business start-ups are looking for holistic ways to define and measure success as evidenced by conference participants' enthusiasm for developing more equitable supply chain relationships, triple-bottom line accounting, and new ways of financing and structuring business entities.

- Limited financial literacy and business acumen among food business start-ups and food security organizations points to a need for greater financial and technical assistance for food business start-ups with social and environmental missions.

- Asset-based and collaborative approaches to food-oriented community and economic development are favored in today's challenging economic climate.

- "Food hubs" show promise as a strategy for improving time and cost efficiencies in the aggregation and distribution of local and regional food.

- Enhanced communication within local food systems and across local food supply chains through the development of "communities of practice" and other pollinating and capacity building strategies could result in more efficient use of resources, better and more equitable supply chain management, and valuable network development and knowledge transfer.

- Programs designed to increase consumers' healthy food purchasing power can be beneficial to both low-income households and local food producers.

Efforts to resolve this fundamental tension between farmer profitability and consumer access will require innovations in small business financing, purchasing practices, subsidy structures, aggregation and distribution logistics, as well as the development of creative partnerships between different scales of operations and across food supply chains.

AWARDS

Project teams competed for three monetary awards. First place and second place awards were issued by a panel of expert judges. A People's Choice award was voted on by conference attendees. Issue-based teams competed for three non-monetary awards. Following is a list of the awardees. For more information about these and other projects, please refer to the Making Good Food Work Case Studies.

Project Awards
- The Village Market Place - First Place
- COLORS of Detroit - Second Place, People's Choice Award

Issue Team Awards
- Food Distribution, Social Justice, and Equity - First Place
- Coordinated Marketing Tool - Second Place
- Food Innovation Districts - Third Place

PROJECT PROFILES

Thirteen project and issue-based teams formed the core of the Making Good Food Work conference. Project teams typically focused on specific place-based food distribution start-ups while issue-based teams enabled researchers and organizations to co-explore specific logistical, social, or policy concerns pertaining to community and regional food distribution. The separation between project and issue teams was sometimes blurred as issue teams often developed toolkits and reports that helped further project team work. A brief description of each team is provided below. For more information on each project and links to additional resources, refer to Project Profiles on page 27.

COLORS of Detroit, Detroit, MI (2nd Place, People's Choice Award)
Restaurant Opportunities Center (ROC) of Michigan is a worker-owned cooperative dedicated to food quality, service excellence, and employee and worker-owner well-being in downtown Detroit. The group came to the MGFW conference seeking marketing assistance in advance of the September 2011 launch of their Detroit location. The team utilized the conference to identify resources for web development and content strategy and developed a "Hype This" training program, including a roll-out special events calendar.

Delridge Produce Cooperative, Seattle, WA
The Seattle-based Delridge Produce Co-op was started by a group of neighborhood residents seeking greater access to fairly priced, locally produced, fresh produce. Its vision is to create a storefront that will carry locally grown, fairly priced produce. The group attended the conference to refine its business plan and to develop a list of action items in preparation for launching a retail store. Team accomplishments include: identification of financing options, development of marketing strategies and operations policies and procedures, a review of organizational capacity, a refinement of membership benefits and a mechanism for community outreach.

Dig Deep Farms & Produce, Alameda, CA
The Alameda County (CA) Deputy Sheriffs' Activities League (DSAL) is a nonprofit affiliated with the Alameda County Sheriff's Department. Its mission is to reduce crime by creating good jobs and providing youth with positive alternative activities. Dig Deep Farms & Produce was launched to employ local people in urban food production and distribution and to sell healthy locally-grown produce back to the community at affordable prices. Dig Deep attended the conference to develop marketing strategies, and left with significant input on its organizational mission and structure in addition to insights on developing a targeted marketing campaign.

Farm to School Hub, Denver, CO
The Denver Farm to School Hub aims to create Farm to School projects that promote transparency and fairness, while offering education and support to school children and small to medium scale farms. The group operates two pilot Farm to School projects in the Denver area and is working to establish models for Farm to School local food hubs that can be replicated across the U.S. At the conference, the team sought assistance with product aggregation and processing strategies, funding, and food safety expertise. By the close of the conference, the team had developed business plans for its pilot projects and identified funding options for further project development.

Mobile Markets: An Urban Food Access Initiative, Alexandria, VA
The Arcadia Center for Sustainable Food & Agriculture is a nonprofit dedicated to growing a sustainable food system in the Washington D.C. area. The group hopes to expand its educational campaign and increase fresh food access to D.C.'s low-income populations by launching a mobile market that connects local farms with low-income, urban communities. The team utilized the conference to initiate the development of a business plan for the mobile market and identify strategies for ensuring that product is affordable to low-income consumers. Some of its strategies for achieving this goal include: 1) increasing accessibility by bringing food to the "eaters", 2) improving affordability by accepting SNAP and WIC benefits through an on-site EBT machine, and 3) fostering desire for fresh food through education about the importance of healthy diet.

Southeast Michigan Food Hub, Detroit, MI
The Southeast Michigan Food Hub plans to build a socially equitable value chains sourced from from small and mid-size Michigan farms. Product aggregated at the hub would then be distributed to Detroit's under-served areas and southeastern Michigan institutions. At the conference, the team built on a recent feasibility study to develop a logic model outlining activities required to launch and maintain the hub. The project also attracted new local partners that are committed to supporting the project.

The Village Marketplace, Los Angeles, CA (1st Place)
The Village Marketplace was launched to improve community access to healthy, local food, create local jobs and internships, and provide a source of revenue to its parent nonprofit Community Services Unlimited. Toward these ends, the Village Marketplace manages several local food distribution operations including two farm stands, a farm fresh produce bag subscription program, several catering and restaurant accounts, and dries and sells packages of culinary and medicinal herbs. The program is poised for expansion. Program staff attended the conference to get outside input on its business plan and proposed infrastructural expansion, and to determine which legal entity (e.g. LLC vs. nonprofit) is most appropriate for its simultaneous social, environmental, and profit missions. By the end of the conference, the team had developed a program development strategy based on 5-year growth projections and produced pro forma financial statements in preparation for meetings with prospective funders.

Addressing Capital & Resource Challenges
The goal of this team was to help increase the capital literacy of conference attendees, identify start up funding gaps and provide technical training for business planning. As such, this team floated among the other projects and responded to questions and needs in live time. It also provided an online forum for conference attendees to pose questions about capital for food-based businesses. By the end of the conference, it compiled a list of best practices related to financing local food efforts and an extensive compilation of financial resources for conference attendees and similar organizations and businesses.

Coordinating Production Planning Tools for Wholesale & Institutional Buyers (2nd Place)
Matching supply and demand can be difficult in the local food market because sales data is often not reported back to growers, limiting their ability to plant according to market demand. The result is price volatility and an inconsistent ability to meet the growing demand for local product by institutional and retail buyers. This team's goal for the conference was to produce a coordinated production planning tool, but diverse input from a variety of supply chain actors resulted in the prototype of an open source database that would track both product availability and sales, enabling farm and sales managers to better align supply and demand. This database was designed to be used in conjunction with existing online local food market places.

Distribution Models Serving Rural Areas
Rural areas face unique food distribution challenges because of their low population densities, high transportation costs, and the (often) limited financial resources of their residents. This team's objective was to draw lessons from successful rural distribution models and to identify ways to build collaboration within and across regions through policy change, improved network development, and/or trans-regional collaborative grant projects. Toward these ends, they developed a decision-tree to guide rural communities and development specialists through the process of developing a rural food distribution strategy appropriate to their region. They also developed an outline for a national webinar to increase information exchange between rural distribution networks throughout the U.S.

Social Justice & Equity in the Food System (1st Place)
Racism and injustice in the food system are evidenced by the inaccessibility of affordable, healthy food in many communities of color. Racism is also apparent in the lack of power-sharing by racially-privileged leaders and decision makers in many organizations active in local food systems work. This team set out to identify priorities and resources to promote and habitualize a social justice orientation at all levels of leadership and throughout funding, agenda-setting, and operational processes within organizations involved in community and regional food system work. At the conference, they produced a draft of a toolkit to guide organizations through a critical reflection process on how race dynamics are expressed and could be improved in their governance, policies and procedures, program development, evaluation and accountability, funding and fiscal strategies, and relations with external partners.

Marketing Fresh, Local Food to Large-Scale Buyers
Storytelling through marketing and branding is critical to helping local farmers capture a premium for their products, especially in high volume markets. Recognizing the difficulty that many producers face in getting the most out of their messaging, this team came to the conference to develop a marketing toolkit comprised of best practices, examples, and resources to make it easier to effectively market and brand local food. The culmination of this team's effort was the working draft of an online and print marketing toolkit titled, *Let's Let'em Know It's Local*. A key theme in the toolkit, particularly for producers, is the importance of leveraging no-cost social media such as Facebook and LinkedIn to increase a farm's web presence and build a stronger sense of farm and product identity.

Food Innovation Districts (3rd Place)
The Food Innovation Districts team was proposed in response to a recommendation made in the 2010 Michigan Good Food Charter to establish "Food Innovation Districts"—a designation given to a geographic area of a city or town to promote food cluster development through the co-location of food production, processing, wholesale, and retail outfits. Its goal was to identify the regulatory and legal structures, economic development incentives, land-use planning tools, and community and agricultural needs pertinent to the formation of a Food Innovation District (FID). At the conference, the team developed a set of "next steps": 1) Develop a model overlay zoning district to help local governments foster Food Innovation Districts; 2) Build a toolbox for planners and policy-makers including examples and information about suitable economic development incentives; 3) Advocate that FIDs be eligible for Tax Increment Financing; and 4) Cultivate media recognition for municipalities that take the lead on FID development.

RESEARCH & POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The research and policy implications of the issues examined at the conference were wide-ranging. The following list of research and policy recommendations is not comprehensive, but it highlights the diversity of challenges and questions faced by food business entrepreneurs, farmers, community activists, residents, nonprofits, planners, policymakers and other practitioners as they work to make community and regional food systems more equitable and resilient. The items listed below emerged in discussions within the thirteen issue and project teams and were documented by facilitators and notetakers.

Research

- Advance quantitative research on the economic impact of rural food distribution for rural communities and mixed methods research on the contribution of rural food distribution to community development and food sovereignty.

- Compile a set of national precedent studies to inform the financing and siting of pilot Food Innovation Districts.

- Continue to investigate the financial viability of regional food values chains and document the unique capital needs of small and mid-scale agricultural and food businesses.

- Research and compile resources on legal entities suited to values-driven community food enterprises to help entrepreneurs identify appropriate business structures.

- Innovate ways to improve access to operating capital for small and mid-scale agriculture and food businesses.

Policy

- Support state and local policy and planning efforts to pilot Food Innovation Districts as a strategy for community-based economic development.

- Develop grant programs, incentives and resources to foster increased participation of underserved farmers in decision-making roles of food distribution networks and other rural economic development initiatives.

- Improve coordination across existing farm credit and grant programs and Extension resources to help improve the economic viability of small and mid-scale farming in low-income rural areas.

- Develop resources to help commercial-scale, commodity farmers who would like to transition to specialty crop production and reconnect with regional markets.

- Promote the development of regular public transit routes between documented food insecure areas and full service grocery retailers.

- Encourage or require that federally funded research projects demonstrate their immediate value to communities being studied by borrowing from the Community Benefits Agreement (CBA) model utilized by planners and developers. Success indicators might include local hiring, skills transfer, leadership and relationship development, and community participation in research design and implementation.

- Require publicly funded grant recipients to complete a social justice training before release of funds and/or project implementation.

- Support urban agriculture by advocating that municipalities be exempt from state-level Right to Farm Laws that prevent them from developing urban agriculture ordinances suited to the needs of their residents and appropriate for the urban environment. Model urban agriculture ordinances acknowledge that not all agricultural activities are compatible with all use districts and typically encourage activities with positive track records, take a precautionary attitude toward activities whose impacts are uncertain, and disallow activities that are known to create environmental problems.

CONCLUSION

Designed for local food business start-ups and others working to increase access to affordable, healthy food, the Making Good Food Work conference created a national forum to develop and hone business plans and examine a variety of issues pertaining to local and regional food distribution. Its unique action-oriented structure offers a new conference model that weds the historically tech-specific start-up weekend with a traditional plenary and workshop model. The result was a conference that attracted individuals with a wide range of personal and professional backgrounds. Further, it successfully harnessed their expertise to vet business ideas, problem-solve issues such as rural food distribution and imbalances in local supply and demand, and identify best practices on topics ranging from local food marketing and branding to organizational strategies for increasing inclusion and eliminating racism in the food system.

The projects and themes highlighted in the proceedings document point to the significant advances we have made in recent years toward developing local and regional food systems that are both more efficient and more equitable. Still, tensions between farmer profitability and product affordability continue to vex those working to build food systems that are fair for all. Further progress will require innovations in small business financing, purchasing practices, subsidy structures, aggregation and distribution logistics, as well as the development of creative partnerships between different scales of operations and across food supply chains.

Conference Structure

Making Good Food Work

April 19-21, 2011 • Detroit, Michigan

CONFERENCE STRUCTURE

● ● ● ● ●

The conference structure took inspiration from tech-oriented Startup Weekends, which are hands-on opportunities for entrepreneurs to fine-tune and vet their business ideas and take them from concept to launch in three days. In a typical Startup Weekend, about 50 percent of the attendees come with a background in business while the other 50 percent have technical (generally engineering) expertise. The event begins with open mic pitches by anyone with an idea for a product. Attendees explain the product concept and describe who is needed on the team to make it a success. Over the following two days teams focus primarily on product and business development. On the final day, teams make a product pitch, demonstrate their prototypes, and receive feedback (and sometimes prizes) from a panel of experts (often times venture capitalists or other local entrepreneurs) who judge each team based on which business they would be most likely to invest in.

The objective of bringing this action-oriented conference model to the local and regional food distribution arena was to leverage food system and business expertise from across the U.S. to help catalyze thirteen local and regional food distribution and marketing initiatives and advance related research and policy agendas. Because the organizers recognized the marked differences between developing an online product or service and developing a food value chain or aggregation facility or mobile market (with many more stakeholders, partners, and physical logistics to consider), the model was adapted substantially to fit our intended goals and audience.

For example, whereas in tech-based Startup Weekend, teams are chosen and formed on the spot, at MGFW, team leaders were pre-selected and in some cases, team leads contacted individuals with relevant expertise before the start of the conference (the majority of participants joined a team on day one). Also, the organizing team placed more emphasis on recruiting experts and workshop presenters to provide technical assistance to teams than would typically occur at a Startup Weekend. Finally, on the last day rather than a "product demo," each team was required to give a presentation. The structure and form of the final products and presentations were largely left up to the individual teams (e.g. The Village Marketplace team actually developed a pro forma statement whereas the COLORS Detroit team developed a strategic launch marketing plan). Please refer to Appendix A on page XX for a detailed conference program.

Project and Issue Selection

A Request for Proposals was released in December 2010 and distributed via members of the organizing committee to individuals and organizations active in U.S.-based community and regional food work and related research and policy. The RFP was also disseminated more broadly through websites and listserves of organizations such as the Community Food Security Coalition, COMFOOD, Good Food Jobs and others. The RFP consisted of a short application requiring prospective team leads to describe a project or issue they would like to develop at the conference. Project team applications were tailored to attract food distribution start-ups while issue-based applications were designed to engage researchers and organizations addressing specific logistical, social, or policy concerns pertaining to community and regional food distribution. Please refer to Appendix B on page 54 for the team lead application templates.

Team leads were asked to make a commitment to attend the conference pending the selection of their proposals. Financial assistance was available to team leads who were unable to cover the cost of travel and registration. This assistance was particularly important as the conference organizers sought to engage participants from under-served communities to comprise a meaningful range of participants.

The conference planning committee received twenty-four applications. Selection criteria were based on USDA Agricultural Food and Research Initiative (AFRI) grant guidelines and this conference's specific emphasis on food distribution. As follows, proposals were evaluated on 1) the extent to which they would improve access to good food for under-served communities and 2) how well they addressed distribution issues such as aggregation, local market development, and delivery logistics. Other considerations included project location, topic, and leadership. The thirteen projects and issues selected represented business and research efforts underway in eight states, though several projects (e.g. the Access to Capital Resources Team) were inherently broader in scope.

Team Structure

Each team lead was appointed a facilitator to help guide the team through the rigorous three day project development process. A notetaker also accompanied each group to document the process, discussions, and outcomes. Facilitators typically had professional or academic experience broadly relating to the project or issue, while most of the notetakers were undergraduate or graduate students from area universities. Many facilitators and notetakers received registration waivers in exchange for their assistance.

All other conference attendees, approximately 200 in total, self-selected into teams following three minute pitches by team leads on the opening day. Teams ranged in size from eight to twenty people. Several of the larger teams self-organized into smaller working groups. Conference participants spent the majority of the conference in facilitated team time working on their chosen project or issue. Each group had a small work space—chairs arranged around one or more tables—around the perimeter and on the balcony of a large meeting room. Many participants brought personal laptop computers. Free wifi was provided.

Materials

Each team was given a project and notetaking packet designed to serve two functions: 1) to provide conceptual structure and project planning support to the conference teams; and 2) to help track and record conference activities for the conference proceedings. Facilitators and notetakers were required to submit notes and project planning documents via e-mail to the proceedings coordinators on the second and third mornings of the conference. Conference planners developed the packets and required regular submissions to help assure and assess that the teams were progressing. Refer to Appendices C and D for the conference planning and notetaking packet templates. In addition, conference organizers provided each team with flip charts and markers. Some groups also borrowed or brought their own projectors to allow for collaborative computer-based work.

Fishbowls

At the end of conference days one and two, team leads gathered on stage to provide updates and reflections on their team's progress with all conference participants. These five minute presentations kept everyone apprised of the challenges and breakthroughs experienced by other teams. Team leads used this time to request additional expertise, express gratitude, and share realizations. The request for sharing was slightly different on each day and tailored to support and highlight team progress. This short exercise increased information sharing across teams and helped build camaraderie among conference participants.

Case Study: Locally Sourced Conference Food

To model local sourcing and cultivate new supply chain relationships, conference coordinators made special arrangements with head chef Phil Belloli of International Banquets to develop a menu around locally sourced products. This effort brought to light many of the challenges associated with local food distribution including: seasonality, inadequate storage, aggregation and small-mid-scale distribution infrastructure, increased food preparation costs, and mismatched expectations between suppliers and buyers regarding pricing, volume, and invoicing. Conference local food coordinator Michaelle Rehmann showcased challenges and lessons from these procurement efforts during lunch on day one of the conference.

Conference meal planning efforts ultimately pointed to three local food sourcing strategies. In the Do It Yourself model, event planners double as distributors and brokers by working with chefs to design a seasonal menu and negotiating with local suppliers and distributors to procure local ingredients. In the Contract In the Advance model, large-scale conference planners stipulate local and seasonal sourcing requirements in the contract they negotiate with conference venues, transferring a greater share of the responsibility onto the venue. The third model uses existing distribution channels, incorporating and highlighting local products that are readily available within established supply chain partnerships; until season extension and winter storage are improved, local products will likely continue to be difficult to procure through existing channels in the winter and early spring in most northern climates. For a full length analysis and sample local sourcing contracts and menus, please refer to the following case study and analysis at the Making Good Food Work website: *Sourcing Local Food for the Making Good Food Work Conference*.

Office Hours

Specialists in business development, marketing, supply chain management, and other areas were invited to provide office hours to participants on day two of the conference. Conference attendees could register for fifteen minute one-on-one consulting and networking that took place in a separate break-out room simultaneous to one of the team work sessions. In all, more than twenty-one specialists volunteered their time and conference participants signed up for slots in advance. Specialists' expertise ranged from organic certification to food packaging to financing to economic development and land-use planning. Office hours were listed on a large sheet of butcher paper in the registration area and the few remaining slots filled up quickly.

Workshops

Eight skills-based workshops were offered to supplement team work time by providing resources and showcasing information on a variety of topics ranging from marketing and financing to case studies on network development and local food distribution. Workshops were concurrent with team time, and teams were asked to send only a few delegates to each workshop in order to maintain momentum on project development. Following is an annotated list of the workshops offered at the conference with links to related resources.

Access to Capital – Where to Find It & How to Qualify

Presenters: Elizabeth Ü, Founder and Executive Director, Finance for Food; Gary Matteson, VP Young, Beginning, Small Farmer Programs and Outreach, Farm Credit Council; Jim Barham, Economist, Marketing Services Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA

The presenters identified a variety of financing strategies available to food-based businesses, from traditional debt and equity, to alternatives like crowd-funding, revenue sharing, non-voting preferred stock, and more. For more information on which strategies are best for you and how to qualify, please refer to the Capital Access folder at the Making Good Food Work website and to the Capital Cookbook: http://www.capitalcookbook.com.

Planning, Pricing, and Packing to Sell More

Presenter: Kate Seely, Project Manager, FarmsReach

Kate Seely, co-founder of the online pre-market farmer planning tool FarmsReach, coordinated a discussion about the resources needed for smaller farmers to seek local and regional markets. Information about FarmsReach and other online tools can be found in the resource section entitled *Online Market Tools*.

A Primer on Issues that Affect Food Hub Start-ups and Expansions into Challenged Markets

Presenters: Carol Coren, Principal, Cornerstone Ventures; Russ Kremer, Heritage Pork Cooperative & Principal, Farm to Family Naturally

An overview of some existing Food Hub business structures provided the foundation for this workshop. Further discussions centered on the creation of feasibility studies and business plans for food hubs that link family farmers to markets in urban food desserts. Tools for business plan development are available in the resources section of the Proceedings entitled Financing.

Marketing Local and Regional Food; Strategies for Targeting Your Audience

Presenters: Evan Smith, Senior Operating Manager, Cherry Capital Foods; Denis Jennisch, Produce Category Manager, Sysco Food Service–Grand Rapids

Organizations seeking new distribution channels for regional foods must develop strategies that meet the needs of target customers. Leaders from two Michigan-based distributors, Cherry Capital Foods and Sysco Food Service–Grand Rapids, discussed the opportunities and challenges with distributing and marketing local products. Issues around food safety and liability continue to pose challenges to small and mid-scale producers and were discussed at length.

Detroit's Alternative Distribution Systems

Presenters: Dan Carmody, President, Eastern Market Corporation; Ashley Atkinson, Director of Urban Agriculture, The Greening of Detroit; Lisa Johanon, Executive Director, Central Detroit Christian CDC.

Presenters shared lessons learned over the past three years through pilot programs that have been implemented to improve food access for Detroit residents and build markets for local growers. The models showcased included a farmers market supplied by urban farmers, a mobile market, and a food hub serving both wholesale and retail markets.

A Food Business Ecosystem or Industry Cluster Approach to Growing Local and Regional Good Food Businesses

Presenters: Casey Hoy, Professor and Kellogg Endowed Chair, Agroecosystems Management Program, Ohio State University; Steve Bosserman, Principal, Bosserman & Associates, Inc; Stan Ernst, AED Economics, Ohio State University

The development of an alternative food system can arise from a network of locally owned businesses that represent facets of the entire value chain. This workshop offered online tools and models of exemplary business networks and provided strategies for extending these models into participant communities. For more information, please visit: http://www.localfoodsystems.org/

Leading Healthcare Reform Wellness Initiatives with Innovations in Local Food Sourcing

Presenters: Rick Beckler, Director of Hospitality Services, Sacred Heart Hospital; Carol Coren, Principal, Cornerstone Ventures

This workshop offered insights into how hospitals and health care systems can be leaders in taking advantage of the opportunities and removing the barriers to institutional food procurement. Covered in the discussion was a review of Sacred Heart Hospital in Wisconsin. In 2010, Sacred Heart committed 15 percent of its food service budget to sourcing locally produced foods. A review of partners and program details is available here: http://fyi.uwex.edu/aic/files/2010/09/Beckler.pdf.

Creating Networks and a Culture of Collaboration

Presenter: Rich Pirog, Center for Sustainable Food Systems, Senior Associate Director, Michigan State University

Rich Pirog, formerly with the Leopold Center for Sustainable Agriculture, discussed the Value Chain Partnership in Iowa that brings together a diverse group of producers, processors, and private, non-profit, and government organizations. Currently, the organization supports six statewide regional working groups. Additional information about the Leopold Center's work can be found here: http://www.leopold.iastate.edu/research/topics.html.

Keynote Speakers

Deputy Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Kathleen Merrigan, Michigan Senator and Chair of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Debbie Stabenow, and co-founder of Zingerman's Community of Businesses Paul Saginaw gave keynote presentations on the first and second days of the conference. Deputy Secretary Merrigan and Senator Stabenow discussed the challenges and opportunities of scaling up local food systems and expressed their support for the research and development of food hubs and the promotion of agricultural economic development. Paul Saginaw highlighted lessons from his career as a food business entrepreneur that led to a unique lateral and vertical expansion of the Ann Arbor-based Zingerman's Community of Businesses, as differentiated from a more traditional approach to growth through the development of franchises. He emphasized the importance of remaining place-based and giving back to the community. All of the keynotes applauded conference attendees' efforts to address the nuts and bolts issues of equitable local and regional food distribution.

Final Presentations & Awards

On day three of the conference, each team had seven minutes to present their final projects. Most teams used PowerPoint presentations to guide the audience from their initial statement of need and/or concept design through their project development process to their business plan or a prototype of their product (e.g. database, toolkit, decision tree, etc.). Each team was evaluated on the value and relevance, scalability, and organizational and financial viability of their project.

Project teams competed for three monetary awards. First and second place awards were issued by a panel of expert judges: Leslie Schaller, Oran Hesterman, and Susan Smalley. A People's Choice award was voted on by conference attendees. Due to the limited amount of award funding and the guiding assumption that issue-based teams did not necessarily face the same financial challenges as food distribution start-ups, the conference organizing committee decided to restrict monetary awards to only project teams. Further, fewer monetary awards increased the size of individual awards, enabling the funds to have a greater impact on the winning projects. As such, issue-based teams competed for three non-monetary awards and were evaluated by: Alex Dorsey, Michael Hamm, Kate Seely, Haile Johnston, and Casey Hoy. Following is a list of the awardees. For more information about these and other projects, please refer to the Making Good Food Work Case Studies section of the Proceedings.

Project Awards
- The Village Market Place – 1st Place
- COLORS of Detroit – 2nd Place, People's Choice Award

Issue Team Awards
- Food Distribution, Social Justice, and Equity - First Place
- Coordinated Marketing Tool - Second Place
- Food Innovation Districts - Third Place

Key Themes & Findings

Making Good Food Work

April 19-21, 2011 • Detroit, Michigan

KEY THEMES & FINDINGS

● ● ● ● ●

The Making Good Food Work conference brought together a diverse group of participants from across the nation. Attendees included nonprofit leaders, food business entrepreneurs, local and state policymakers, business experts, extension agents, students, community members, university researchers, and others. The question at the heart of the conference was: "How can we provide local and sustainably produced food to a greater number of consumers, especially those with inadequate access to healthy food, while creating new markets and ensuring fair returns for underrepresented producers?" Scaling up a food system is complex and requires commitment and partnerships across all elements of the food chain, from farm to consumer. The Making Good Food Work conference fostered the development of these partnerships and provided a forum for sharing best practices and resources. This section highlights the major themes and findings from the conference.

Business models designed to help producers retain a larger percent of the retail food dollar typically operate at price points that make their products unaffordable to low-income markets. Conversely, business models such as mobile markets and corner store programs that are designed to improve access to and the affordability of fresh produce generally source from terminal markets from (inter)national suppliers in order to keep retail costs low. A number of the start-ups at the conference hoped to develop enterprises that served both small and mid-scale local producers and increase food access to underserved populations. Efforts to resolve this fundamental tension between farmer profitability and consumer access will require innovations in small business financing, purchasing practices, subsidy structures, tax incentives, aggregation and distribution logistics, as well as the development of creative partnerships between different scales of operations and across food supply chains.

Many food business start-ups are looking for holistic ways to define and measure success as evidenced by conference participants' enthusiasm for developing more equitable supply chain relationships, triple-bottom line accounting, and new ways of financing and structuring business entities. Nearly all conference participants are engaged in food distribution as a means of addressing broader social, environmental, and economic concerns rather than pursuing profit alone. As such, while discussing projects, participants often defined success in terms of integrating social and environmental responsibility with profitability. Conference teams struggled with how to maintain financial sustainability for their organizations while offering fair prices (higher) for farmers and fair prices (lower) for low-income consumers. Because these goals can often work at odds, conference participants' saw promise in hybrid business models that combined for-profit and nonprofit missions and in alternative financing strategies (e.g., crowd-funding) that allow for greater community participation and flexibility.

Limited financial literacy and business acumen among food business start-ups and food security organizations points to a need for greater financial and technical assistance for food business start-ups with social and environmental missions. An increasing number of nonprofits and community based organizations are launching for-profit programs to reduce their dependence on grant funding. As a result, their staff needs to acquire new business and financial management skills. Similarly, many new entrepreneurs have limited knowledge of business planning and financial resources. The conference structure allowed attendees to identify resources for strengthening these deficits leading to increased financial viability and improving the fundability of their projects. However, these efforts need to be ongoing and wider reaching if sustainable food businesses and enterprises enhancing food access are going to gain real traction.

Asset-based and collaborative approaches to food-oriented community and economic development are favored in today's challenging economic climate. "Job creation" and "economic development" emerged as frequently used terms at the conference. Some team leads even suggested reframing local food projects in business terms rather than describing them as part of a movement. Finding ways to leverage city and state economic development resources (as exemplified by the Michigan Food Enterprise Districts in Traverse City, MI) can create access to new financial resources, generate new partnerships, and improve the long-term sustainability of local food projects. Similarly, because building new infrastructure can be costly, time-intensive, and fiscally risky for new businesses, several groups proposed a phased launch approach for their businesses. For example, one team proposed launching a buying club as a way to build market demand and refine operational logistics prior to launching a full service store or stand.

"Food hubs" show promise as a strategy for improving time and cost efficiencies in the aggregation and distribution of local and regional food. The concept of "food hubs" was also at the forefront of the conference. Deputy Secretary of Agriculture, Kathleen Merrigan spoke to the importance of developing projects that provide aggregation opportunities, address supply chain logistics, and develop distribution infrastructure. Some groups discussed the cost advantage of purchasing as a consortium, a practice that is only feasible with adequate storage and redistribution infrastructure. Food hubs could serve this function for consortia of school districts and corner stores that would like to purchase in volume but currently lack the aggregation and distribution infrastructure to do so. The USDA Agricultural Marketing Service recently launched a study and overview of food hubs throughout the country. Links to this report can be found in the resources section of this report.

Enhanced communication within local food systems and across local food supply chains could result in more efficient use of resources, better and more equitable supply chain management, and valuable network development and knowledge transfer. During the final team presentations, conference facilitator Joseph McIntyre referenced organizational behavior expert Meg Wheatley's quote, "To create better health in a living system, connect it to more of itself," noting that many of the issue teams' outcomes revealed a desire to improve food systems through stronger networking, communication, and improved feedback loops. For example, one team developed an open-source database to improvement management across local food supply chains as a strategy for increasing farmer profitability and better aligning supply and demand. This collaborative spirit was also evident in participants' interest in building network capacity through the formation of regional and topical working groups or "Communities of Practice" and in the development of low-budget, user-friendly communication tools such as webinars, decision trees and How-To toolkits.

Programs designed to increase consumers' healthy food purchasing power can be beneficial to both low-income households and local food producers. Most of the start-ups that attended the conference plan to accept SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program) and WIC (Women Infants and Children) benefits through on-site Electronic Benefits Transfer machines. Programs such as Michigan's Double Up Food Bucks provides private matching funds that increase SNAP and WIC recipients' purchasing power when they buy produce from local growers. These programs help mitigate financial barriers while also increasing healthy food access and building market opportunities for local producers.

Lessons Learned

Making Good Food Work

April 19-21, 2011 • Detroit, Michigan

LESSONS LEARNED

● ● ● ● ●

Since this was the first time the conference organizers attempted to apply the start-up weekend model to a food system conference, organizers learned a number of lessons throughout the planning and execution of the conference. Following are some of these lessons:

Travel and registration scholarships are crucial to attracting conference attendees with a diverse set of skills and backgrounds. Approximately 25 percent of conference attendees received a travel and/or registration scholarship. Many of these individuals contributed to the conference in-kind by assisting with conference logistics, facilitation, and other tasks. The conference would not have been able to assemble the same diversity of experience and expertise and it likely would have lacked the emphasis on serving under-served communities if scholarships had not been possible.

Take the time to familiarize facilitators and notetakers with the project planning materials. The lead facilitator (Joseph McIntyre) and volunteer coordinator (Winona Bynum) hosted orientation conference calls the week prior to the conference to familiarize facilitators and notetakers with project planning materials, roles, and expectations. Teams whose facilitators and notetakers attended the orientation were able to make better use of the materials and produced better overall documentation of their teams' process and results.

Engage local expertise and utilize local suppliers whenever possible. Detroit is becoming a national leader in urban agricultural production and is a hot bed of innovation for improving community food security. By sourcing from area farmers, showcasing local agricultural and distribution projects, and actively engaging local partners such as the Detroit Food Policy Council, Wayne State University students, and community-based organizations, the conference participants were able to learn from and in a small way give back to the host community.

Strong facilitation is critical to a team's success. Some facilitators had multiple responsibilities at the conference (e.g. served as both facilitator and workshop presenter or had to attend to other professional commitments), which distracted from their facilitation role. Teams that had facilitators who could stay engaged throughout the process and were experienced with facilitation and/or the team's topic benefited from the continuity and focus. In addition to the facilitation provided at the team level, the overall conference design and operation drew very heavily on the input from our very experienced conference facilitator and on the collective facilitation experience of conference planners. Extensive planning, regular check-ins to monitor progress and climate, and repeated focus on the conference goals were a few important aspects of this facilitation.

Concurrent team time and workshops limit participants' opportunities. Conference attendees devoted extensive time and attention to their teams over the course of the conference. As a result, some attendees were frustrated that team time and workshops were concurrent and that teams were discouraged from sending more than a few delegates to each workshop. Time permitting, a better structure might open concurrent workshops to all attendees and make team time optional during this period. On the other hand, when teams were forced to decide who would go to the workshop and who would continue the teamwork, all team members experienced and practiced setting priorities, compromising, making decisions, and relying on co-workers to get important information.

Teams at different stages of business plan and organizational development reap different benefits from this conference model. Project teams with strong organizational leadership and high levels of internal communication and financial literacy were able to use this conference to fine-tune their business plans, develop pro forma financials, and prepare to meet with lenders. By comparison, projects in the concept design phase and those experiencing organizational and financial challenges ultimately focused more on structural issues. The mix of developmental stages allowed for a wider range of issues to be explored at the conference. However, if conference planners sought a more uniform level of preparedness across project teams, project selection criteria might more intentionally assess projects based on factors such as organizational leadership and level of concept and business plan development.

Notify all team lead applicants of award structure in advance. Due to limited funding and an emphasis on fostering the development of community food enterprises, only project teams were eligible to win the financial awards issued at the end of the conference. The top three issue-based teams received non-monetary recognition for their achievements. Yet, because many of the issue-based teams developed toolkits and other resources whose further development will require additional funding, some participants were disappointed that the issued-based teams were excluded from receiving financial awards. Knowledge of the award structure may have affected how some team leads structured their proposals and could have been remedied by better articulating the award structure in the RFP.

The physical environment is extremely important. Initially, planners believed that it might be problematic to have all the teams working in one large room rather than each having their own room. But teams' relative proximity facilitated questions and exchanges between teams. Also, the ballroom was on the 8th floor and featured windows on two sides. The natural light and relative isolation from hotel lobby traffic made it a good place for the teams to work.

An unusual conference format may attract some types of participants while it does not appeal to others. There was considerable enthusiasm for the conference and its format from community-based organizations. It was, however, less a draw for academics, public sector employees and professionals from businesses supporting food businesses. Conference organizers had hoped that the opportunity for academics to interact with community-based organizations that could become research and outreach partners would be attractive. But budget and staff reductions have made it extremely difficult for academics to travel—especially if they would miss teaching responsibilities. In addition, this conference provided few opportunities for academics to make presentations or give papers that would be reflected in their vitae.

Participant Feedback

The start-up weekend conference model was viewed as a success by participants. Comment cards completed at the end of the conference offer the following insights:

"Working on real live projects is so much more engaging than theoretical exercises and for the usual 'talking heads' conference model."

"Conference model provides great model."

"A good process can bring people together in amazing ways that will inspire you."

"[The] ideas/plans/ reports that come out of conferences can actually be put to use on the ground."

"I'm going home with a plan/tool that I can start using in my town next week. It's not just theory and talk."

The cards also reflected interest in maintaining momentum. Given the limited budgets, time constraints, and the regional focus of conference attendees, finding a way to share information, and exchange ideas proves challenging. It is hoped that the following summaries and references combined with conference website (https://sites.google.com/site/mgfwpublic/conference-resources?pli=1) will facilitate continued learning and dialogue. Conference attendees expressed enthusiasm in making the Making Good Food Work conference an annual or biannual event and noted that similarly structured regional conferences could benefit the ongoing development of vibrant and inclusive regional food systems throughout North America.

Project Profiles

Making Good Food Work

April 19-21, 2011 • Detroit, Michigan

PROJECT PROFILES

● ● ● ● ●

Thirteen project and issue-based teams formed the core of the Making Good Food Work conference. Project teams typically focused on specific place-based food distribution start-ups while issue-based teams enabled researchers and organizations to co-explore specific logistical, social, or policy concerns pertaining to community and regional food distribution. The separation between project and issue teams was sometimes blurred as issue teams often developed tool kits and reports that helped further project team work. The synopsis that follows attempts to capture the essence of each team's objectives, processes, and outcomes.

COLORS of Detroit, *Detroit, MI*

Awarded second Place among Project Teams & Recipient of the People's Choice Award
Team Lead: Minsu Longiaru, Restaurant Opportunities Center; Facilitator: Cheryl Danley, C.S.
Mott Group for Sustainable Food Systems at Michigan State University.

Background
Restaurant Opportunities Center (ROC) of Michigan is a worker-owned cooperative dedicated to food quality, service excellence, and employee and worker-owner well-being in downtown Detroit. As a member of the national Restaurant Opportunities Center, the group is part of a strong, nationwide network of restaurant and workers' rights advocates. After the tragedies of 9/11/01 in New York City, restaurant operators banded together through ROC to help people in the restaurant industry. A variety of efforts to support restaurant workers take place across Michigan; one of the primary current projects in Detroit centers around the launch of a worker-owned restaurant called COLORS.

This restaurant aims to provide living wage jobs for restaurant workers while developing a menu centered on products sourced from Detroit's urban farms and the surrounding region in an effort to build a movement for change. To date, the team has secured a restaurant space in Detroit's Harmonie Park area, is in the process of recruiting an executive chef, is working to design the menu and facility space, and has established a wide range of supporters.

Objectives & Process
The team came to the MGFW conference seeking marketing assistance. Specifically, the team sought help in determining how to tell the story of ROC Detroit and the COLORS restaurant through a low cost, primarily viral, marketing campaign that could serve as a model for other cities. They sought team members with experience in identifying and targeting diverse markets and communicating complex social value propositions in a compelling way.

The conference provided Detroit ROC with a ten-person team interested in furthering this work. A visit to the proposed COLORS restaurant location site brought the concept and the opportunities and challenges to life for the team members. The restaurant will be located on the first floor in an area near many office buildings and other restaurants. This site offered lower cost rent still within relatively close proximity to potential customers.

A site visit to the restaurant location combined with several of the team members' extensive personal knowledge of Detroit enabled the team to quickly specify target audiences for the restaurant.

Conference Outcomes
The team identified three potential targets for the restaurant: professionals working in the 48226 Zip code; Wayne State faculty and staff; and younger Wayne State students and locals who are interested in local food. The team developed a "Hype This" training program, including a roll-out special events calendar.

Locally owned and operated catering company Detroit Evolution Catering has offered to provide ongoing support and mentorship to ROC COLORS and is willing to share information about its established customer base and proven online advertising tactics. The team also identified other local resources for developing its web content and communications strategy. With a large body of supporters and the "People's Choice" award in hand, the ROC Colors team is off to a strong start.

Delridge Produce Cooperative, *Seattle, WA*

Team Lead: Ariana Rose Taylor-Stanley, Delridge Produce Coop: Facilitator: Kate Seely, Program Manager, FarmsReach.

Background

Delridge Produce Co-op was started by a group of Delridge residents who were interested in greater access to fairly-priced, locally-produced, fresh produce. Located in southwest Seattle, the community of Delridge is an area where residents have limited access to fresh fruits and vegetables within their own community. The area has a diverse population including many people of color and people in poverty. Many residents have limited access to transportation.

Objectives & Process

In recent months, the Delridge Produce Co-op has honed its vision to create a storefront that will create locally-grown, fairly-priced produce. Prior to the conference, the Co-op began developing a business plan to create a cooperatively run storefront in Delridge. During the conference, the group hoped to secure assistance in refining the business plan and to develop a list of action items on how to best launch a retail grocery store.

Throughout the team discussions, and upon review of the business plan financials, it became clear that providing low-cost high quality food while offering fair prices to farmers is a challenge. In order to achieve both objectives, further planning, a shift in strategy, and further fundraising would be necessary. This realization led the team to revise the conference goals from focusing on the launch of the retail storefront to developing a fundraising strategy and launch plan for a buyers club.

Buyers clubs take many forms, but most provide a way for farmers to sell products to consumers through a pre-order process with customer pick up at a set time and location. Often a third party nonprofit, such as the Delridge Produce Co-op, handles the matchmaking and the product transfer between buyer and seller.

This shift in strategy from storefront to buyers club was proposed to the Delridge steering committee via phone and was met with mixed response. Despite some hesitation, the steering committee agreed to the new direction. The conference team provided Delridge with an outside perspective, offering strategic advice that helped shape the group's direction toward a more manageable, phased approach taking them from the buying club to the launch of a produce stand and then ultimately to a full service co-op grocery.

The team's success was largely due to several of its members' first hand experience establishing and operating similar grocery retail cooperatives. A thorough review a variety of other cooperative and affordable food distribution models also proved beneficial. For instance, the Kansas City Food Circle Buying Club provided a helpful foundation for developing policies and procedures.

Conference Outcomes

Team accomplishments include: the identification of financing options, the development of marketing strategies, the creation of overall policies and procedures, a review of organizational capacity, a refinement of membership benefits and a mechanism for community outreach.

Dig Deep Farms & Produce, Alameda County Deputy, *Alameda, CA*

Team Lead: Hank Herrera, Alameda County Deputy Sheriffs' Activities League; Facilitator: Carol Coren, Cornerstone Ventures.

Background

The Alameda County Deputy Sheriffs' Activities League (DSAL) is an independent nonprofit that operates closely with the Alameda County Sheriff's Department. Every year, 9,000 convicted offenders are released from the area's Santa Rita County Jail into the blighted community of 35,000 that offers few prospects for enduring health, employment or opportunities. The organization's mission is to change the community by creating good jobs through DSAL's crime prevention mission.

DSAL recently identified urban agriculture as a way for the organization to raise money while concurrently achieving its mission of creating jobs. As such, the urban agriculture farm, Dig Deep Farms & Produce was launched, a project manager was hired and began farming on 2.5 acres in April 2010. The main goal of Dig Deep Farms & Produce is to create and operate a values-based local food enterprise for the production, distribution and sale of its own food products while aggregating a limited number of food products produced by other area farmers.

Objectives & Process

Upon arriving at the conference, the Dig Deep Farms & Produce team sought to identify better marketing strategies for reaching members of the community. With the development of a stronger marketing plan, the group hoped to be on path toward economic self-sufficiency and offer a way to create jobs and greater hope for community members.

Through the counsel and advice of the conference team members, Dig Deep Farms was encouraged to alter these conference objectives. After hearing more about the organization, the team found that some core management issues were a hindrance to forward progress for the farm. Future growth was at risk if fundamentals such as board management and organizational structure/culture were not addressed. The conference team actively worked to help build a plan for Dig Deep Farms & Produce to address these challenges.

The team leader, Hank Herrara spoke to his partners in Alameda about the change in direction. At the fishbowl on day two, after this call, Hank gave an emotional presentation that made clear that the issues facing the organization were significant and the conference team catalyzed a necessary dialogue with his partners and employers. The conference gave him the strength, team backing and concrete examples he needed for initiating these considerable changes.

Conference Outcomes

The Dig Deep team took home several key lessons from the conference: 1) Sound Board structure and policies coupled with supportive management are important to overall organizational success; 2) An organization with many areas of focus creates a robust support network of members with sometimes conflicting goals; 3) Leaders who can address conflict and change head on are critical for ensuring success in entrepreneurial and social justice food models.

By the end of the conference, the team provided Dig Deep Farms & Produce with a plan for addressing concerns with management and Board of Directors, for more fully engaging the Board of Directors, for establishing the farm as a social enterprise, and for implementing a future marketing and community engagement campaign. While the goals for this project were significantly altered, it is clear that the team leader is going back to his organization with clear direction and a positive strategy for moving forward.

Farm to School Hub, *Denver, CO*
Team Leads: Andrew Novak, Slow Food Denver and Julia Erlbaum, Real Food Colorado; Facilitator: Colleen Matts, CS Mott Group for Sustainable Food Systems at Michigan State University.

Background
The Denver Farm to School Hub team currently operates two pilot Farm to School projects in the Denver region. The group aims to create Farm to School projects that promote transparency and fairness, while offering education and support to school children and small to medium sized farms.

Objectives & Process
Through these pilot programs, the team is working to establish models for local Farm to School food hubs that can be extended throughout Colorado and the nation. To this end, the team is seeking to use existing distribution infrastructure to engage small, medium and large farmers in an aggregation model, develop a minimal processing unit both for immediate use and for long term storage, and to promote these farm products to schools, hospitals and colleges in the Denver area. The team requested assistance with product aggregation and processing strategies, fund seeking, and food safety expertise. The team incorporated these findings in working business plans for the two pilot projects and identified funding options for furthering project development.

Peppered throughout the conference team discussions were the universal issues faced by Farm to School efforts: food safety, confusing and differing school procurement policies, and limited school budgets. Food safety requirements for schools are challenging given newly forming GHP and GAP certification requirements. Certifications sometimes add costs to the already challenging, low cost school pricing structure. Using existing distributors offers a simplified method for farmers but given the complexities of working with multiple farmers, distributors are slow to integrate the Farm to School framework into their business.

Procurement strategies and requirements vary by school district, making it challenging to create a universal Farm to School model. For example, school procurement policies that require a competitive, sealed bid process are not conducive to hub development, which is based on cultivating relationships and finding greater value (i.e., education, stronger community) beyond the food price.

Conference Outcomes
Through the conference discussion, the Denver Food Hub team received invaluable information on operational needs and identified key variables for creating food hub models. The group walked away from the conference with a business plan model to use for their Denver food hub. The collaborative work that has begun at the conference will continue as several conference attendees have agreed to form an informal advisory panel to provide ongoing support. Following are some of the key lessons learned by the Farm to School hub group over the course of the conference: 1) Variation in school food procurement practices and policies make creating one universal Farm to School model difficult; 2) Not all schools have the kitchen equipment and labor necessary to implement a Farm to School program; 3) Inviting primary stakeholders (state/legal/food system advocates) to a roundtable discussion to clarify the goals of food hubs may foster interest, support and excitement in the community; 4) A staged approach may be best case for developing a Farm to School Hub where elements (Distribution, Processing, and Aggregation) can be added or combined to build-up to a full-scale program.

Mobile Markets: An Urban Food Access Initiative, *Alexandria, VA*
Team Lead: Ibti Vincent, Arcadia Center for Sustainable Food & Agriculture; Facilitator: Megan Shoenfelt, Ohio State University.

Background
The Arcadia Center for Sustainable Food & Agriculture is a nonprofit dedicated to growing a sustainable food system in the Washington D.C. area. With a 3-acre educational garden as its core, Arcadia creates a dynamic, experiential learning destination for schools and youth organizations. The group hopes to expand its educational campaign and increase fresh food access to D.C.'s low-income populations by launching a mobile market.

Objective & Process
Ibti Vincent, Arcadia's Mobile Market manager, came to the conference "with a dream and a second hand bus." The organization plans to retrofit their old school bus as a means to bring fresh, local foods and recipe ideas to market stops and schools, with a particular emphasis on connecting local farms with low-income, urban communities.

The mobile market manager is an educator by trade and a passionate local food advocate with no business or market management experience. Through her experience at the conference she hoped to develop a strong logistics and daily operations plan, create a financial sustainability plan, and identify the best locations for her mobile market stops.

The conference team worked diligently to begin the development of a business plan for the mobile market. There was much discussion around how other mobile markets have struggled financially. Arcadia will need to raise additional funds to support the market's operations until the model has been perfected and financial sustainability can be sought. Given tight financials, operations will be strained initially and will be reliant on volunteer or student interns to serve as truck drivers. Selecting routes and site locations will be critical for keeping costs down while optimizing the sales potential at each stop. Fortunately, Arcadia has strong interest from an area housing developer who will bring strength to the initial project launch.

As with other businesses seeking to connect low-income populations with locally produced food, the financial viability of the Arcadia model is uncertain in the current financing and market environment. Nevertheless, Arcadia is committed to providing a mobile market that: 1) increases accessibility by bringing food to "eaters", 2) improves the affordability of local food products by accepting food stamps, EBT and WIC, and 3) fosters desire for fresh food through experiential learning.

Southeast Michigan Food Hub, *Detroit, MI*
Team Lead: Susan Fancy, Grass Lake Sanctuary; Facilitator: Casey Hoy, Ohio State University.

Background
The nonprofit Southeast Michigan Food Hub plans to build a socially equitable value chain to aggregate produce from small and mid-size Michigan farms. Product aggregated at the hub would then be distributed to Detroit's under-served areas and southeastern Michigan institutions. At its core, the hub will embody strong social values such as providing fair prices for farmers, offering transparency to consumers and delivering high quality foods to Detroit's underserved communities. Through a feasibility study, the group is exploring distribution models such as mobile markets and CSA box models.

Objectives & Process
During the conference the Southeast Michigan Food Hub team set out to vet a recently completed feasibility study and develop action plans to launch in 2012. Given that the conference was held in Detroit, the project leader asked for help from area supporters who were interested in finalizing the project's strategic direction and outlining a launch plan.

The conference team members were primarily from Southeast Michigan, which allowed for a short round of introductions and a seamless shift into action. Due to the team's large size, they decided to break off into three subgroups to work on: 1) clearly defining the hub and launch goals, 2) identifying the core values for the hub, and 3) conducting a review of daily operations including legal issues.

Given the diversity of perspectives represented both at the conference and by the stakeholders involved on the ground, it was difficult to define the hub's core values and prioritize specific functions and market segments. For example, targeting consumers in urban Detroit requires a very different strategy than targeting an institutional or rural customer base.

Conference Outcomes
Despite the struggle to integrate diverse interests, the group left the conference with concrete next steps. Specifically, the team developed a logic model outlining activities and decision required to launch and maintain the hub. These activities included further engagement with community members to learn more about what is needed from the hub. Most team members have committed to supporting the project beyond the conference.

The Village Marketplace, *Los Angeles, CA*
Awarded First place among the Project Teams
Team Lead: Neelam Sharma; Facilitator: John Fisk.

Background
Community Services Unlimited Inc. (CSU) is a nonprofit that aims "to foster the creation of communities actively working to address the inequalities and systemic barriers that make sustainable communities and self-reliant life-styles unattainable." A program of CSU, the Village Marketplace was launched to improve community access to healthy, local food, create local jobs and internships, and provide a source of revenue to CSU, thus reducing its dependency on foundation funding.

Objectives & Process
The Village Marketplace manages several local food distribution operations including two farm stands, a farm fresh produce bag subscription program, several catering and restaurant accounts, and dries and sells packages of culinary and medicinal herbs. The program is poised for expansion and sent staff to the Making Good Food Work Conference to refine its business plan, assess the feasibility of infrastructural expansion, and determine which legal entity (e.g. LLC vs. nonprofit) is most appropriate for its various social, environmental, and profit missions.

This team grappled extensively with how to balance their profit and social objectives. Despite the program's past successes, staff knew that infrastructural expansion is typically costly and can be financially damaging if not based on reliable growth projections. With the assistance of a high power team of business development specialists, academics, and foundation staff, the Village Marketplace was able to determine its infrastructural and staff expansion needs and capacity based on clearly defined operating costs and projected revenues. The conference also brought a number of other resources and best practices to the team lead's attention including equipment leasing options, the usefulness of Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) machines when serving low-income household consumers, and the importance of population density when assessing place-based market potential.

Conference Outcomes
By the end of the conference, the team had developed a program development strategy based on 5-year growth projections and produced pro forma financial statements in preparation for meetings with prospective funders.

Addressing Capital and Resource Challenges

Team Leads: Elizabeth Ü, Finance for Food; Gary Matteson, Farm Credit Corporation; Jim Barham USDA-AMS; Facilitators: Leslie Schaller, ACE Net & Rick Beckler, Sacred Heart Hospital.

Background & Objective
The Addressing Capital and Resource Challenges team had a unique structure that allowed its members to float among the teams to provide support and assistance to those with questions about financing. The goal of this team was to help increase the capital literacy of conference attendees, identify start up funding gaps and provide technical training for business planning.

Process
During the conference, team leader Elizabeth Ü provided an online forum for conference attendees to pose and answer questions about capital for food-based businesses. This forum was an extension of Ms. Ü's forthcoming *Finance for Food: a Capital Cookbook*, which will serve as a guide to financing options that sustainable food system entrepreneurs can use to support their food-based businesses (http://foodlab11.capitalcookbook.com).

The majority of participants at the conference had limited experience with for-profit capital resources. While grant and foundation support were familiar sources of capital, most participants had less experience with community-supported and/or crowd-funding opportunities that were likely good fits for their projects. Furthermore, it is difficult for people to keep up with the new options and models that continue to surface. This points to the need for resources that outline the various types of capital available, along with guidelines for choosing which are most appropriate given the intentions and values of project founders and their teams.

Conference participants were also hesitant to seek help related to financing, despite invitations to ask the finance team directly, or to ask anonymously via the online forum. When approached by the finance team, however, it was clear that each team did in fact have several questions related to financing. Meanwhile, the representatives sent to the financing & capital workshop were frequently the people that already had the most experience in these areas.

Conference Outcomes
The finance team was able to use its experience working with conference participants to identify some clear financial resource needs:

1. Ms. Ü noted that a "basic training in financial literacy (including topics such as budgeting, cash management, financial statements, basic financing terms, and how to approach prospective financiers) would likely be enormously helpful to support food system entrepreneurs in their efforts to raise capital."

2. Ms. Ü also pointed to the fact that many teams had questions about choosing an appropriate entity structure, particularly in light of new cooperative and for-benefit models (e.g. L3Cs). As a result, she suggested that a white paper or FAQ that included all current options would be helpful, as most existing resources do not cover the latest innovative models.

3. Given that a variety of financing models may be appropriate for one project, many teams had questions about how to identify and when to use which financing models for which types of would-be investors. This could be covered by more advanced finance and capital trainings.

4. Finally, there were many questions related to pricing specific aspects of a project. Business plan models for common types of projects would be very helpful in assisting with business planning as different communities replicate models that have been successful elsewhere.

By the end of the conference the group compiled a list of best practices related to financing local food efforts. An extensive compilation of financial resources such as a business plan worksheet, a report on assessing triple bottom line projects, a list of potential funding sources, and suggested ways for leveraging USDA programs can be found on the conference website: (https://sites.google.com/site/mgfwpublic/conference-resources/addressing-capital-and-resource-challenges).

Coordinated Production Planning Tools for Wholesale & Institutional Buyers

Awarded 2nd place among the Issue Teams
Team Leads: Jonathan Reinbold, Tierra Miguel and Sharon Cech, Urban Environmental Policy Institute Facilitator: Steve Bosserman, Bosserman & Associates.

Background & Objectives

Matching supply and demand can be difficult in the local food market. As one team member noted, "[In wholesale and institutional transactions], information about what is being sold is not getting back to local producers, so they're not producing according to demand." As a result, buyers are often unable to meet the consumer demand for local product even when it is in season. While team lead Jonathan Reinbold's initial goal for the conference was to produce a coordinated production planning tool, input from a professionally diverse project team steered the project toward the development of a tool that more comprehensively addresses supply and demand issues across the supply chain.

Process

By day two of the conference, the team had broadened its goal to build an open-source value chain management system that could match supply and demand by offering a common language to producers and buyer and maximizing the sale of local product. While there are already a number of web-based direct and wholesale local food market places, team members noted that these programs tend to focus either on producers or buyers. Further, they primarily serve an information-sharing function rather than an alignment function. For example, they report what product is available or desired at a given time, but they don't provide feedback loops to help producers know how much to plant in advance of the season or to what extent the demand for a given product is actually being met. Wary of duplicating previous efforts, the team collectively reviewed nearly a dozen existing online local food market places to document what services they provide to ensure that their tool would augment rather than recreate existing resources.

The team used its diverse range of professional expertise to establish a list of functions that its tool would need to include to address the distinct concerns of different supply chain actors. The result was a detailed concept design for two interfacing databases. The first database, the "Item Master", would list products. Each item would be identified by an item number, an item sub-code (i.e. for carrots, the sub-codes might distinguish organic from conventional), a UPC code, and include year-to-date information on sales with space for additional notes. Database managers could override the arbitrary item numbers to align with SKUs and/or UPC codes as desired. The second database would detail current and anticipated supply and demand. Item identification would correspond with data in the Item Master and track the availability, purchases, and desired quantities of every item.

Together, these databases would enable managers to run reports to assess the compatibility of supply and demand. If anticipated demand exceeds anticipated availability, buyers and production managers can ask producers to increase production or find new growers to mentor into the system. If anticipated production exceeds anticipated demand, corrections can be made to avoid price collapses by seeking new markets or scaling back production early in the season. The nature of the actual sales transaction will depend on a given market platform. At the end of the year everyone (buyers and producers) will be able to evaluate what worked and what didn't so as to make targeted interventions the following season.

Conference Outcomes

The team plans to put together a funding strategy to finance the database software development by July 2011. Once the program is written, it will be open for anyone to use in conjunction with existing online marketplaces such as Food Hub and Local Dirt. The team has already been in communication with at least one of the existing web-based local food markets to discuss possible collaboration.

Distribution Models Serving Rural Areas

Team Leads: Erin Meier, University of MN SE Regional Sustainable Development Partnership and Sarah Hackney, Gorge Grown Food Network; Facilitator: Rich Pirog, C.S. Mott Group for Sustainable Food Systems at Michigan State University.

Background & Objective

Rural areas face unique food distribution challenges because of their low population densities, high transportation costs, and the (often) limited financial resources [of their residents. Co-led by individuals working on rural distribution issues in the Pacific Northwest and Upper Midwest, this team aimed to develop scalable resources for rural producers, distributors, and rural development specialists. Specifically, the team's objective was to draw lessons from successful rural distribution models from across the U.S. and produce a detailed account of the cost, supply chain structure, infrastructure requirements, and community support critical to the function of each operation. Secondarily, the team sought to identify "next steps" for collaboration within and across regions through policy change, improved network development, and/or trans-regional collaborative grant projects.

Process

The rural distribution team was one of the largest teams at the conference with twenty-one members representing at least ten different states. The team began its project development with a discussion about what "rural" meant to the various team members and how each person thought improved rural food distribution could contribute to the regions where they live and work. The team also considered "what distinguishes rural food system work from other food system planning."

While individual characterizations of "rural" varied, the team generated a clear vision of sustainable, community economic development as indicated by improved rural livelihoods for farmers and other residents, higher rates of rural wealth retention, increased availability of accessible, affordable, healthy food in rural grocery outlets, higher levels of participation of farmers of color in local decision-making, and greater community self-sufficiency.

Rural economies depend on a variety of sectors, each with distinct land use and social implications. Some of the important industries in the rural areas represented by members of the rural distribution team included: tourism, manufacturing, extractive industries such as mining and logging, and a range of agriculture. Consequently, the team was tasked with developing a resource that was specific enough to be actionable yet flexible enough to be useful to rural food distribution projects operating in an array of rural settings. To make the task and team size manageable, the team divided into two sub-groups. The first group focused on applied technology while the second group zeroed in on research issues. The result was a two-pronged plan to 1) develop a national network of rural distribution initiatives and practitioners and 2) to provide concrete resources for organizations or communities working to establish rural distribution enterprises.

Conference Outcomes

Leveraging the relationships made and strengthened at the conference, the research sub-group decided to create a fertile space for examining rural distribution issues and identifying research needs by increasing network connectivity, thus redefining itself as the Capacity-Building sub-group. Toward this end, they developed an outline for a national webinar. Targeted at a mixed audience of community leaders, regional and economic development planners, agricultural producers, potential funders, and others involved in rural and regional food systems work, the webinar would feature four panelists representing a range of rural settings and distribution business operations. Each panelist would provide a description of their distribution network based on a set of standard questions, briefly highlight key challenges and lessons, and identify several questions that would encourage emergent food distribution start-ups to ask of themselves. The webinar (slated for Spring 2012) would serve as a jumping off point for continued inter-regional rural food distribution network development. Subsequent phases might include the formation of regional working groups, resource sharing through regional and online platforms, and continued exploration of research concerns regarding profitability, rural food sovereignty, urban-rural market dynamics and other issues.

The Applied Technology sub-group developed a decision tree to guide communities and allied organizations and rural development specialists through the process of developing a rural food distribution strategy appropriate to the resources and constraints of their region. Rather than dictating a set of action steps, the decision tree asks users strategic questions about local production and markets, infrastructure, community social, political, and financial assets and other factors relevant to the establishment of a local/regional food distribution network. To inspire users and create context, the decision tree would also include examples of best practices, identify critical junctures in organization growth and infrastructural investment, and offer insightful anecdotes from other rural distribution networks. The group envisioned developing both print and online versions of the tool and proposed hosting a design contest to make the decision tree more visual and accessible to audiences with different language backgrounds and literacy levels. Lastly, the group would like to ground-truth the decision tree and seeks organizations that would like to pilot it.

Other potential follow-up projects include: the development of Communities of Practice networks, virtual tours of different rural distribution operations (10-15 minutes of each business), creation of online social networks with in-person meeting opportunities, the development of a series of case studies highlighting success and failure stories, and the formation of a national Good Food Rural Leadership Fellow program funded by foundations and industry partners, in which participants learn how to use research and work in partnership with universities and other research institutions.

Social Justice & Equity in the Food System

Awarded First place among the Issue Teams
Team Lead: Alfonso Morales, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Facilitator: Michaela Tarr, C.S. Mott Group for Sustainable Food Systems at Michigan State University.

Background & Objective

This topic was proposed with the goal of identifying a set of shared policy priorities and resources to promote and institutionalize a social justice orientation at all levels of leadership and throughout funding, agenda-setting, and operational processes within organizations and agencies involved in community and regional food systems work in order to address the inaccessibility of affordable, healthy food in many communities of color, and the lack of power-sharing by racially privileged leaders and decision-makers in many organizations active in local food systems work.

Process

The team initiated its discussion by identifying reasons for the under-representation of social and racial justice in local and regional food systems. The causes identified ranged from conscious and unconscious individual and interpersonal prejudice as expressed by unwelcoming treatment of certain patrons at grocery retailers to institutional and ideological racism manifested in public policy and land use planning (e.g. inadequate public transit access to full service grocery retailers and patterns of disinvestment in low-income neighborhoods and neighborhoods). The team also noted that different experiences and different ways of knowing the world mean people assign different meanings to actions and words, augmenting the challenge of cross-cultural communication. After taking stock of many of the causes of injustice in the food system, the team decided to develop a toolkit designed to walk individuals and organizations through a series of questions that facilitate personal reflection and organizational self-assessment.

Conference outcomes

The resulting toolkit is divided into the following subsections: Governance, Policies and Procedures, Program Development, Evaluation and Accountability, Funding and Fiscal Strategies. A second section focuses on external factors and raises questions about building community-based partnerships and confronting injustices perpetrated by outside organizations. The toolkit also highlights the importance of metrics in assessing needs and benchmarking progress. Several existing self-assessment resources and data sources were identified in the toolkit to assist organizations in their efforts to reflect on and improve their capacity to holistically promote justice in the food system.

Marketing Fresh, Local Food to Large-Scale Buyers

Team Lead: Bob Corshen, Community Alliance with Family Farmers (CAFF); Facilitator: Evan Smith, Cherry Capital Food.

Background & Objective
Story telling through marketing and branding is critical to helping local farmers capture a premium for their products, especially in high volume markets. Recognizing the difficulty that many producers face in getting the most out of their messaging, this team proposed the development of a marketing toolkit comprised of best practices, examples, and resources to make it easier to effectively market and brand local food.

Process
The team began by mapping its knowledge of the demand for local food and the strengths and weaknesses of existing local food marketing practices. Team members came to the conclusion that they would need to develop a multi-faceted toolkit to address the distinct marketing needs of different segments of local food supply chains. As one team member commented, "each stage of the local food supply chain needs to market to the next… It's not just about getting the message to the end consumer—sometimes it's actually more difficult to market local product to broadline distributors like Sysco."

To develop appropriate marketing tools for each phase of the supply chain, they produced distinct resources packets for the following four audiences: farmers, distributors, retailers (large-scale retail buyers and bodegas), and food service operators. The remainder of the conference was devoted to small group working sessions where team members focused on developing marketing tools for each phase of the local food supply chain.

Conference Outcomes
The culmination of this team's effort was the working draft of an online and print marketing toolkit titled, *Let's Let'em Know It's Local*. A key theme in the toolkit, particularly for producers, is the importance of leveraging no-cost social media such as Facebook and LinkedIn to increase a farm's web presence and build a stronger sense of farm and product identity. Following are highlights from each section of the toolkit.

Marketing for Farmers: This section features instructions on how to create a website, logo and online profile and includes no-cost and fee-for-service brand development resources. This section also offers a one-page template of prompts to help farmers tell their story and highlight important characteristics about their products and production practices. Once completed, the template can be used to help them populate any marketing or merchandising material to communicate about the products origins and identity.

Marketing for Distributors: This section features resources highlighted in the farm marketing section but also includes examples and how-tos on developing other critical components of a local food sales and marketing portfolio, such as product lists, sell sheets, and seasonal availability charts. It also encourages distributors to highlight the economic and social impacts of local products whenever possible, and it promotes the use of more interactive promotional strategies such as farm tours and trade shows.

Marketing for Small & Large Retailers: This section addresses two distinct scales of retail outlets: mainstream supermarkets and corner stores. It consolidates existing educational materials on good produce handling practices to help smaller markets improve the quality and shelf-life of their fresh products. It also offers examples of local food branding campaigns, ongoing promotions, creative marketing ideas including in-store farmer profiles, cooking demonstration and local product displays, as well as information on how to better use outdoor space to showcase local product.

Marketing for Food Service Operators: This section addresses the unique marketing needs of white table cloth and mid-range restaurants, cafeterias, K-12 meal programs, and caterers. The integrated marketing strategies profiled range from tray tents (i.e. information on locally featured products that is located on cafeteria tables or hospital trays) and farmer days to increasing the availability of nutritional information and featuring a harvest of the month program.

Food Innovation Districts

Awarded Third place among the Issue Teams
Team Lead: Patty Cantrell, Regional Food Solutions; Facilitator: Kathryn Colasanti, C.S. Mott Group for Sustainable Food Systems at Michigan State University.

Background & Objectives

In recent years, consumer interest in local food has grown, compelling food service operators to increase their local food offerings. Although it is a major agricultural producer, Michigan has missed multiple opportunities to keep food processing business in state even as demand for local and Michigan-grown product grows. For example, when Sysco partnered with the University of Michigan to procure local lettuce, it had to ship it to Ohio to be shredded. Similarly, the Detroit Public School system worked hard to serve its students local produce only to find out it needed to send the produce to Indiana to be packaged in school size servings. These processing opportunities could be recaptured through appropriate agricultural and food business incentives and re-localization efforts.

The Food Innovation Districts team was proposed in response to a recommendation made in the 2010 Michigan Good Food Charter to establish "Food Innovation Districts"— a designation given to a geographic area of a city or town to promote food cluster development through the co-location of food production, processing, wholesale, and retail outfits. Its goal was to identify the regulatory and legal structures, economic development incentives, land-use planning tools, and community and agricultural needs pertinent to the formation of a food innovation district, and subsequently develop an implementation strategy.

Process

Toward these ends, the team examined the opportunities and constraints associated with existing economic and land use planning models including Business Improvement Districts (BIDs), Commercial Rehabilitation Districts (CRDs), Agricultural Processing Renaissance Zones, and the Michigan Main Street Program. To build on preexisting zoning codes, the team determined that a Food Innovation Districts (FID) would function best as a zoning overlay district.

Overlay zoning is a regulatory tool that superimposes a special zoning district over the existing zoning code(s), which identifies provisions supplemental to those in the underlying use district. The overlay district can share boundaries with the base zone or cut across base zoning boundaries. Typically, regulations and/or incentives are attached to the overlay district to protect a specific resource or guide development within a special area. A Food Innovation District overlay designation would mean that approved food production and processing activities would become permitted land uses within the existing zoning code in areas where the Food Innovation District overlay was applied. Zoning overlay districts have already started to be used to permit urban agriculture in existing land use plans in cities such as Madison, Wisconsin.

Conference Outcomes

The team identified the following action steps to promote and establish Food Innovation Districts: 1) Develop a model overlay zoning district to help local governments establish and encourage food innovation districts; 2) Build an FID toolbox for planners and policy-makers comprised of examples of related districts and information about appropriate economic development incentives; 3) Advocate that Food Innovation Districts be eligible for Tax Increment Financing and other development incentives; and 4) Cultivate state-level and media recognition for municipalities that lead the way in the development of Food Innovation Districts.

Resources

The team developed a preliminary list of resources and models and left the conference with the goal of assembling a toolkit to help communities know what ordinances, incentives, and benefits are available or inherent in the food business districts.

- Initiative for a Competitive Inner City: business cluster research (http://www.icic.org/)

- RFP for study of local food clusters in Boston and Detroit (http://www.planning.org/consultants/viewrequest.htm?RequestID=6383)

- Agricultural and Food Industry Clusters in the Northeast U.S.: Technical Report (http://nercrd.psu.edu/publications/rdppapers/rdp26.pdf)

- Business Improvement Districts (http://web.mit.edu/dusp/dusp_extension_unsec/people/faculty/lhoyt/Hoyt_Gopal-Agge_GECO.pdf)

- Ohio's Food Systems – Farms At The Heart Of It All (http://www.crcworks.org/ohfood.pdf)

- Toronto Food Cluster (http://www.toronto.ca/invest-in-toronto/food.htm)

- Business cluster, Wikipedia. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Business_cluster)

- RFP for study of local food clusters in Boston and Detroit (http://www.planning.org/consultants/viewrequest.htm?RequestID=6383)

- Local clusters for rural prosperity (http://small-mart.org/local-clusters-for-rural-prosperity)

- Regional Food Clusters and Government Support For Clustering (http://ideas.repec.org/p/pra/mprapa/26251.html)

Research and Policy Implications

Making Good Food Work

April 19-21, 2011 • Detroit, Michigan

RESEARCH AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

● ● ● ● ●

The research and policy implications of the issues examined at the conference were wide-ranging. The following list of research and policy recommendations is not comprehensive, but it highlights the diversity of challenges and questions faced by food business entrepreneurs, farmers, community activists, residents, nonprofits, planners, policy-makers and other practitioners as they work to make community and regional food systems more equitable and resilient. The items listed below emerged in discussions within the thirteen issue and project teams and were documented by facilitators and notetakers.

Research

- Advance quantitative research on the economic impact of rural food distribution for rural communities and mixed methods research on the contribution of rural food distribution to community development and food sovereignty.

- Compile a set of national precedent studies to inform the financing and siting of pilot Food Innovation Districts.

- Continue to investigate the financial viability of regional food values chains and document the unique capital needs of small and mid-scale agricultural and food businesses.

- Research and compile resources on legal entities suited to values-driven community food enterprises to help entrepreneurs identify appropriate business structures.

Policy

- Innovate ways to improve access to operating capital for small and mid-scale agriculture and food businesses.

- Support state and local policy and planning efforts to pilot Food Innovation Districts as a strategy for community-based economic development.

- Develop grant programs, incentives and resources to foster increased participation of underserved farmers in decision-making roles of food distribution networks and other rural economic development initiatives.

- Improve coordination across existing farm credit and grant programs and Extension resources to help improve the economic viability of small and mid-scale farming in low-income rural areas.

- Develop resources to help large-scale, commodity farmers who would like to transition to specialty crop production and reconnect with regional markets.

- Promote the development of regular public transit routes between documented food insecure areas and full service grocery retailers.

- Encourage or require that federally funded research projects demonstrate their immediate value to communities being studied by borrowing from the Community Benefits Agreement (CBA) model utilized by planners and developers. Success indicators might include local hiring, skills transfer, leadership and relationship development, and community participation in research design and implementation.

- Build on existing resources to develop a social justice training for recipients of publicly funded grants to be completed before release of funds and/or project implementation. Trainings would examine a variety of forms of discrimination and identify strategies for eliminating them in research and institutional settings specifically.

- Support urban agriculture by advocating that municipalities be exempt from state-level Right to Farm Laws that prevent them from developing urban agriculture ordinances suited to the needs of their residents and appropriate for the urban environment. Model urban agriculture ordinances acknowledge that not all agricultural activities are compatible with all use districts and typically encourage activities with positive track records, take a precautionary attitude toward activities whose impacts are uncertain, and disallow activities that are known to create environmental problems.

Resources

Making Good Food Work

April 19-21, 2011 • Detroit, Michigan

Appendix A: Conference Program

Drawing upon the diverse and strong backgrounds of the conference attendees, numerous resources were identified. Given the conference structure, most resources were identified in relation to a specific project or issue. While not a complete list, the section below aims to capture some of the resources and models discussed during the conference. These and other resources will continue to be available on the Making Good Food Work conference website: http://www.makinggoodfoodwork.com.

Financing

- Finance for Food's online forum is the foundation for the upcoming Capital Cookbook. This book will serve as a guide to financing options that support sustainable food systems. (http://capitalcookbook.com/17-2/)

- The finance section on conference website includes several lists of funding sources including USDA grant programs. (https://sites.google.com/site/mgfwpublic/conference-resources/addressing-capital-and-resource-challenges)

- Kickstarter offers crowd sourcing funding tool. (http://www.kickstarter.com/)

Business Models

- The finance section on conference website includes reports on the pros and cons of business and non-profit structuring. (https://sites.google.com/site/mgfwpublic/conference-resources/addressing-capital-and-resource-challenges)

- Several groups discussed great potential with the new L3c hybrid business/non-profit model (L3c) available in some states. Legislation started in Vermont, statute available here: http://www.sec.state.vt.us/corps/dobiz/llc/llc_l3c.htm.

Mobile Markets & Buying Club Models

- Rural Resources: Greeneville, TN (http://ruralresources.net/)

- Oklahoma Food Coop: Oklahoma City, OK (http://www.oklahomafood.coop/)

- Citizen's Coop: Gainesville, FL (http://www.citizensco-op.com/about.html)

- Local Roots: Wooster, OH (http://www.localrootswooster.com/)

- People's Grocery: Oakland, CA (http://www.peoplesgrocery.org)

Food Hub Models

- Regional Food Hubs: Understanding the scope and scale of food hub operations (http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSv1.0/getfile?dDocName=STELPRDC5090409)

- Wallace Center at Winrock International: http://www.foodhub.info

- USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service Food Hub Portal: http://www.ams.usda.gov/foodhubs

Food Security/Low-Income

- Community Food Security Coalition: http://www.foodsecurity.org/

- Food Desert Locator: http://www.ers.usda.gov/data/fooddesert/about.html

- The Growing Food and Justice for All Initiative: http://www.growingfoodandjustice.org

Online Market Tools

- Ecotrust's FoodHub: http://www.food-hub.org

- Local Dirt: http://www.localdirt.com

- Local Orbit: http://localorbit.it/lo2/

- MarketMaker: http://national.marketmaker.uiuc.edu/

- Om Organics: http://www.omorganics.org

- Real Time Farms: http://www.realtimefarms.com

Distribution & Food Safety

- Cherry Capital Foods: http://cherrycapitalfoodsllc.blogspot.com/

- Sysco's Journey from Supply Chain to Value Chain: 2008-2009 final report. (http://ngfn.org/resources/ngfn-database/knowledge/Sysco%20Case%20Study%202009.pdf)

- Good Agricultural Practices and Good Handling Practices (GAP&GHP). (http://www.ams.usda.govGAPGHPAuditVerificationProgram)

Appendix B: Team Lead Cover Letter & Application Templates

December 9, 2010

We are excited to invite you to submit a team project for the "Making Good Food Work" conference.

This coming April 19-21, more than 200 entrepreneurs, food industry professionals, non-profit practitioners, researchers, and policymakers will convene in Detroit to build strategies for more effective and equitable distribution of local and regional food. The conference will be supported by the USDA's Agriculture and Food Research Initiative and additional sponsors. Over 20 organizations from across the U.S. have indicated their support for and intent to participate in the conference.

The event will center around development of real-world projects led by participants from around the country. Over the course of three days, participants will form and work in entrepreneurial teams to develop actual businesses, programs, and research projects that strengthen local food systems by tackling challenges of food distribution logistics, infrastructure, and transportation in their community.

Possible projects could include but are not limited to:
- Researching and outlining a business plan, including start-up costs, for a mobile grocery unit;
- Developing a strategic plan to increase sales from urban farmers to local restaurants;
- Laying the groundwork for a multi-state food distribution research proposal;
- Writing a proposal for a feasibility study for a regional aggregation facility; or
- Developing food distribution plans for an area identified as a "food desert."

In addition to ten to fifteen "entrepreneurial" teams working to develop projects, we will also invite five to ten "issue-based" teams that are not tied to a specific project or business, but will draw together experts and practitioners to discuss the overarching policy issues and boundary conditions associated with specific topics in alternative distribution which could include food hub development, processing and aggregation, mobile grocery stores, or specific challenges for rural distribution.

Teams will have the opportunity to draw on the experience and skills of team members from across the nation as well as experts in subjects like transportation, supply chain management, training and education for producers, marketing, business development, and alternative finance. On Day Three, teams will present on their progress and receive feedback from other attendees. Some awards may be given for continuing work on top projects.

We are soliciting applications from individuals and organizations to lead teams and hope you will consider submitting your new or existing project or issue idea.

To be considered, please decide whether you would like to lead an issue-based team or a project-based team, then complete and return an electronic copy of the appropriate form to Jess Daniel by February 4, 2011. If you have questions or need more information, please don't hesitate to contact Jess Daniel at 714-388-4489 or by e-mail at jessd@msu.edu.

Sincerely,
The Making Good Food Work Organizing Team

Making Good Food Work
National Conference on Local and Regional Food Distribution
April 19-21, 2011 ● Detroit, MI

Team Leader Application – Project-based Teams

Project-based teams will work to develop actual businesses, programs, and research projects that address food distribution challenges in their community or region.

Please return an electronic copy of the application form in .doc or .pdf format to Jess Daniel by February 4, 2011. If you have questions or need more information, please don't hesitate to contact Jess at 714-388-4489 or by e-mail at jessd@msu.edu.

Project/Team Name:

URL (if applicable):   E-mail address:

Full name: Organization:

City: State:

Project is initiated by:

☐ Researcher/academic   ☐ Third party entrepreneur

☐ Non-profit/government   ☐ Wholesaler/distributor

☐ Retail   ☐ Other, please describe: _____

Primary markets you plan to serve (check all that apply):

☐ N/A Research project   ☐ Restaurants   ☐ Areas with inadequate food access

☐ Farm-to-school   ☐ Wholesale distributors   ☐ Direct-to-consumer

☐ Farm-to-hospital   ☐ Supermarket   ☐ Other, please describe: _____

☐ Farm-to-institution   ☐ Alternative retail

Services you plan to supply (check all that apply):

- ☐ N/A not sure
- ☐ Pricing
- ☐ Storage
- ☐ Production support
- ☐ Billing
- ☐ Distribution
- ☐ GAP/HACCP training
- ☐ Aggregation
- ☐ Marketing
- ☐ Season extension training
- ☐ Processing
- ☐ Wholesale marketing
- ☐ Quality/packing requirements training
- ☐ Washing
- ☐ Direct-to-consumer marketing
- ☐ Logistics
- ☐ Packing
- ☐ Branding
- ☐ Quality control
- ☐ Repacking
- ☐ Other

Please address the following questions in two pages or less. Please be as specific as possible.

1. What are the goals of your project?
2. What stage of development is your project or business in?
3. Who are the key stakeholders? Which stakeholders will attend the conference?
4. What are the key opportunities and challenges your project addresses?
5. What type of resources or expert assistance do you need? How do you feel this conference will help move your project forward?
6. How will your project impact underserved communities? *Examples might be targeting under-represented populations of producers, or focusing on distribution to areas with low-access to fruits and vegetables.*

Making Good Food Work
National Conference on Local and Regional Food Distribution
April 19-21, 2011 ● Detroit, MI

Team Leader Application – Issue-based Teams

Issue-based teams will draw together practitioners, researchers, and policy-makers interested in discussing a particular alternative distribution model. The team may work to determine a set of common best practices, challenges, boundary conditions, and policy and research needs.

Please return an electronic copy of the application form in .doc or .pdf format to Jess Daniel by February 4, 2011. If you have questions or need more information, please don't hesitate to contact Jess at 714-388-4489 or by e-mail at jessd@msu.edu.

Full name: E-mail address:

City: Organization:

State:

Examples of issues that an "issue-team" include, but are not limited to:

- Food hub infrastructure
- Green carts and mobile vending
- Aggregation in the urban context
- Retail models for rural areas
- Fruit and vegetable processing
- Volunteer-based aggregation and distribution
- Local/regional buying by large-scale distributors

Please address the following questions in two pages or less. Please be as specific as possible.

1. What issue do you plan to address in your group?
2. What outcome or outcomes do you expect from the team process? This could include identifying a set of shared policy priorities, creating a set of planning guidelines, or developing questions for future research.
3. How will these outcomes move the conversation forward on your issue?
4. What type of input will you need to achieve these outcomes? What kind of participants do you hope to attract to your group?
5. How will your project impact underserved communities? Examples might be targeting under-represented populations of producers, or focusing on distribution to areas with low-access to fruits and vegetables.

Frequently Asked Questions

1. **Does this project need to be a new idea?**
No, we encourage you to submit existing business or project ideas. For existing projects, the conference will be a chance to consider new strategies or directions, get a fresh perspective on the program's efficacy, or get access to specific expertise that will help improve existing operations.

2. **How will teams be formed?**
For the most part, teams will form organically at the conference based on participants' interests and expertise. We will post a summary of the selected projects on-line pre-conference. At the start of the event, pre-selected team leads will give a brief 3 minute "pitch" to all attendees explaining the nature of the project, their goals, and their needs. Afterwards, attendees will have time to self-organize. If you plan to lead a team around an existing project, we encourage you to invite other stakeholders and contributors to attend the conference and join your team.

3. **How many people will be on each team?**
We expect around 8-10 people on each team. Each team may end up larger or smaller depending on the interest of participants.

4. **What will each team deliver at the end of the three days?**
Deliverables will depend on the team and its goals. Teams might end up with a rough business plan, a funding proposal, or a strategic plan or they may simply come up with follow-up questions and a list of stakeholders to engage.

   Every team will give a short presentation on Day Three, outlining their progress over the weekend. Teams will also be expected to fill out and turn in a few short "check-in" worksheets through the course of the event, which will be posted online and will be available for participants and non-attendees after the conference.

5. **What expertise will be available to assist the teams?**
We anticipate conference participation by researchers, educators, distributors, and policy-makers who are interested in food distribution issues. Once the projects have been selected, we will recruit experts who have particular interest in the topics.

6. **What, besides time for teams to work, will be included in the conference?**
There will be interactive conference sessions focused on some of the key opportunities and challenges in food distribution as identified by conference planners.

7. **What are the overall goals of the conference?**
   - Academics, policy makers, entrepreneurs and entrepreneurs learn from experts and from one another to **develop plans for action**, a better sense of how their interests and work fit into the national context, and ideas of actions needed for developing regional and local food distribution that better serves disadvantaged communities.

   - Proceedings **inform policy-makers, funders, and advocates** especially in the fields of public health, economic development, agriculture, and planning on avenues for **supporting development of regional food distribution, especially serving disadvantaged communities**, through training and education, infrastructure investment, or policy change.

   - Conferees will come away with **a plan to recreate the conference in their region** in order to extend the impact of this conference towards the previous goals and to recognize the significance of regional differences.

8. **What is the cost?**
Conference registration costs $150 for early registration and $200 for late registration and covers participation, workshops and keynote speakers, some meals, and an optional field trip.

Facilitator & Team Lead

Project Team Packet

Team Name: _____

Team Leader: _____

Facilitator: _____

Dear Making Good Food Work Facilitator,

We are excited to have you at Making Good Food Work and appreciate the time you have taken to be here. Please take a few minutes to familiarize yourself with this packet and consider how you might incorporate it into your team facilitation and notetaking.

What is this packet for?

This packet is designed to serve two purposes:

1. to provide conceptual structure and project planning support to the conference teams; and
2. to help track and record conference activities for the conference proceedings.

How to use this packet:

We ask that as a facilitator you work with your team lead and notetaker to ensure that this packet is completed by the end of the conference. It may be helpful to transfer some of the packet content on to larger paper during working sessions so that you can collectively engage some of these questions and exercises.

How to turn in this packet once completed:

Following is a list of packet components and when they are due. All submissions are due by 10am the day after they are recorded (e.g. e-mail notes from Day One, April 19th by 10am on Day Two, April 20th). Please send submissions to: ldfarnsworth@wisc.edu.

Turn in by 10am Day 2
Team Roster
Conference work plan
Action Planning Tool

Turn in by 10am Day 3
Unanswered Questions
Policy Barriers
Conference Learnings, Achievements & Strategies
Next Steps

Please put your team name and the date the notes were recorded in the subject line. For example: "Greencarts Notes 4/19/2011".

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact the proceedings coordinators:
Lindsey Day Farnsworth (617) 272-0287 or Amy Bruner Zimmerman (608) 358-6228.

Team Roster – Work Session 1

Project Name:										
Skills & Resources *(Identify the skills and resources each team member brings to the conference.)*										
Team Members / **E-mail Address**										

Conference Work Plan – Work Session 1

Building on your strategic challenges, questions, and conference objectives, identify information and/or deliverables (ex. Power Point presentations, fact sheets, etc.) that each team member will be responsible for gathering or developing at the conference.

Challenges, Opportunities, & Questions	Conference Outcomes		Team Member	Action
	Knowledge	Deliverables		

Action Planning Tool – Work Session 1

Please use this template (modifying as needed) to lay out the steps you will need to complete to accomplish your goal. Please reflect the following considerations as you complete this form.

- Evidence of Success (How will you know that you are making progress? What are your benchmarks?)
- Evaluation Process (How will you determine that your goal has been reached? What are your measures?)

Action Steps *What Will Be Done?*	Responsibilities *Who Will Do It?*	Timeline *By When? (Day/Month)*	Resources *A. Resources Available* *B. Resources Needed (financial, human, political & other)*	Communications Plan *Who is involved? What methods? How often?*
Step 1:			A. B.	
Step 2:			A. B.	
Step 3:			A. B.	
Step 4:			A. B.	
Step 5:			A. B.	
Step 6:			A. B.	

Unanswered Questions – Work Session 2 or 3

The grid below is organized into five topical categories. Please use this framework to organize questions that have arisen for your team and/or could affect the advance the development of your project.

Supply chain *Issue description*	Policy *Issue description*	Business management *Issue description*	Food security *Issue description*	Other *Issue description*

Policy Barriers – Work Session 2 or 3

The grid below organizes policy into four different scales. Please use this framework to identify policy issues that may affect the implementation or effectiveness of your project.

Local *Issue description*	State *Issue description*	Regional *Issue description*	Federal *Issue description*	Other *Issue description*

Conference Achievements – Work Session 4

Key Conference Learnings

Please describe or list key learnings that have emerged for your team over the course of the conference. Include emerging research questions here as well.

Achievements

Please describe three achievements your team accomplished over the course of the conference. If Power Point presentations, business plans, proposals, and/or other documents were developed, please include as attachments.

Strategies for Moving Forward

Please identify three possible strategies/solutions for addressing the challenges and/or policy barriers your group has identified.

Post-Conference Next Steps – Work Session 4

In the space below please identify tasks, deliverables, and deadlines for each of your team members to advance the project outcomes identified in your conference workplan.

Team Member	Task	Deliverable/Outcome	Target Deadline

Facilitator & Team Lead

Issue Team Packet

Team Name: _____

Team Leader: _____

Facilitator: _____

Dear Making Good Food Work Facilitator,

We are excited to have you at Making Good Food Work and appreciate the time you have taken to be here. Please take a few minutes to familiarize yourself with this packet and consider how you might incorporate it into your team facilitation and notetaking.

What is this packet for?
This packet is designed to serve two purposes:

1. to provide conceptual structure and project planning support to the conference teams; and
2. to help track and record conference activities for the conference proceedings.

How to use this packet:
We ask that as a facilitator you work with your team lead and notetaker to ensure that this packet is completed by the end of the conference. It may be helpful to transfer some of the packet content on to larger paper during working sessions so that you can collectively engage some of these questions and exercises.

How to turn in this packet once completed:
Following is a list of packet components and when they are due. All submissions are due by 10am the day after they are recorded (e.g. e-mail notes from Day One, April 19th by 10am on Day Two, April 20th). Please send submissions to: ldfarnsworth@wisc.edu.

Turn in by 10am Day 2
Team Roster
What We Know & Don't Know
Challenges & Opportunities
Conference work plan
Action Planning Tool (Adapt this tool as appropriate for issue teams)

Turn in by 10am Day 3
Unanswered Questions
Policy Barriers
Conference Learnings, Achievements & Strategies
Next Steps

Please put your team name and the date the notes were recorded in the subject line. For example: "Greencarts Notes 4/19/2011".

If you have any questions, don't hesitate to contact the proceedings coordinators: Lindsey Day Farnsworth (617) 272-0287 or Amy Bruner Zimmerman (608) 358-6228.

Team Roster – Work Session 1

Issue:										
Skills & Resources (Identify the skills and resources each team member brings to the conference.)										
E-mail Address										
Team Members										

Work Session 1

Issue:

Team Leader: **Facilitator:**

What We Know

Description: *(3-5 sentences about what we already know about this issue.)*

What We Don't Know

Description: *(3-5 sentences about what we don't know about this issue.)*

What is Contested or Controversial?

Description: *(3-5 sentences about what we know to be controversial about this issue.)*

Work Session 1

Issue:

Team Leader: **Facilitator:**

Please use your assessment of your topic to identify three high leverage challenges and/ or opportunities to examine at this conference. Keep in mind challenges/opportunities that might catalyze new research or policy initiatives or could directly inform or support local food business development and improved food security.

Challenge/Opportunity #1

3-5 sentence description:

Challenge/Opportunity #2

3-5 sentence description:

Challenge/Opportunity #3

3-5 sentence description:

Conference Work Plan – Work Session 1

How can your team best utilize this conference to advance to develop or improve understanding of your issue? Building on the questions, challenges, opportunities you have identified, please develop conference objectives in the space below. Identify information and/or deliverables (ex. proposal abstracts, fact sheets, etc.) that each team member will be responsible for gathering or drafting at the conference.

Challenges, Opportunities, & Questions	Conference Outcomes		Team Member	Action
	Knowledge	Deliverables		

Action Planning Tool – Work Session 1

Please use this template (modifying as needed) to lay out the steps you will need to complete to accomplish your goal. Please reflect on? the following considerations as you complete this form.

- Evidence of Success (How will you know that you are making progress? What are your benchmarks?)
- Evaluation Process (How will you determine that your goal has been reached? What are your measures?)

Action Steps *What Will Be Done?*	Responsibilities *Who Will Do It?*	Timeline *By When? (Day/Month)*	Resources A. *Resources Available* B. *Resources Needed (financial, human, political & other)*	Communications Plan *Who is involved? What methods? How often?*
Step 1:			A. B.	
Step 2:			A. B.	
Step 3:			A. B.	
Step 4:			A. B.	
Step 5:			A. B.	
Step 6:			A. B.	

Unanswered Questions – Work Session 2 or 3

The grid below is organized into five topical categories. Please use this framework to organize questions that have arisen for your team and/or could affect the advance the development or improve understanding of your team issue.

Supply chain *Issue description*	
Policy *Issue description*	
Business management *Issue description*	
Food security *Issue description*	
Other *Issue description*	

Policy Barriers – Work Session 2 or 3

The grid below organizes policy into four different scales. Please use this framework to identify policy issues that may affect the development or understanding of your issue.

Local *Issue description*	
State *Issue description*	
Regional *Issue description*	
Federal *Issue description*	
Other *Issue description*	

Conference Achievements – Work Session 4

Key Conference Learnings

Please describe or list key learnings that have emerged for your team over the course of the conference. Include emerging research questions here as well.

Achievements

Please describe three achievements your team accomplished over the course of the conference. If Power Point presentations, business plans, proposals, and/or other documents were developed, please include as attachments.

Strategies for Moving Forward

Please identify three possible strategies/solutions for addressing the challenges and/or policy barriers your group has identified.

Next Steps – Work Session 4

In the space below please identify tasks, deliverables, and deadlines for each of your team members to advance the development or understanding of the issue your team has focused on.

Team Member	Task	Deliverable/Outcome	Target Deadline

Volunteer

Notetaking Packet

Team Name: _____

Notetaker: _____

Dear Making Good Food Work Volunteer,

We are excited to have you at Making Good Food Work and appreciate the time you have taken to be here. As a volunteer, we ask that you support your team lead and team facilitator. This may mean taking notes on a flip chart while the team discusses, finding materials, doing background research, or acting as a liaison between the team and conference organizers.

We are also asking you to play an important role as a notetaker to capture the important work that happens at the conference. These notes will be used both in the evaluation of the conference and also to write up proceedings to share what we learn with other good food advocates and entrepreneurs who are not able to attend.

Notetaking guidelines

We ask that you take detailed bulleted notes of the discussions and conversations that happen within your team. This won't necessarily be simple or straightforward: your team may break into subgroups or move quickly from discussion to research and back to discussion, but we're counting on you to capture what you can.

If you would like to attend a workshop during team time and your team continues to work, we ask that you find a substitute notetaker among your team members to take over your role.

At the end of each day, we ask that you summarize the notes from that day into no more than 2 pages of key themes and takeaways.

We ask that you e-mail these notes (both the full-length bulleted notes and the 1-2 page summary) to volunteer@makinggoodfoodwork.com by no later than 10am the next day (e.g. e-mail notes from Day One, April 19th by 10am on Day Two, April 20th).

Please put your team name and the date the notes were recorded in the subject line. For example: "Greencarts Notes 4/19/2011".

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to get in touch with the volunteer coordinator, Winona Bynum (313-330-5320) or Jess Daniel (714-388-4489).

Team Title: _____

Team Lead: _____

Facilitator: _____

Notetaker: _____

Instructions: Please use this template for your 1-2 page summary of each day's working sessions. Please also include your team title, team lead's name, and your name with your full-length notes.

I. **Summary of issues discussed**
Please summarize the session and highlight the major plans and issues that emerged in your team's sessions today.

II. **Barriers and opportunities**
Please list and briefly describe the barriers and opportunities discussed by your team.

III. **Unanswered questions**
Please list and briefly describe the questions and uncertainties discussed by your team.

IV. **Key themes**
Please identify emerging themes. Themes may include issues that keep resurfacing in your conversation but are tangential to the core focus of your group, such as recurring concerns about community food security or under-representation of certain stakeholder groups.

Submit your notes no later than 10am the next day to: volunteer@makinggoodfoodwork.com. Please put your team name and the date the notes were recorded in the subject line: "Greencarts 4/19/2011".