

Health in All Policies Task Force Implementation Plan

***Farm to Fork***

*Endorsed by the SGC on January 24, 2012*

**I. The Health in All Policies Task Force**

The Health in All Policies (HiAP) Task Force is a multi-agency effort to improve state policy and decision-making by encouraging collaborative work towards health and sustainability goals by incorporating health considerations into non-health policy areas. After an in-depth process that included input from health and policy experts, the public, and extensive Task Force discussions, the Strategic Growth Council (SGC) approved eleven priority recommendations and charged the Task Force with developing implementation plans.

The HiAP Task Force is comprised of staff from the following agencies, departments, and offices: Air Resources Board; Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency; Department of Community Services and Development; Department of Education; Department of Finance; Department of Food and Agriculture; Department of Forestry and Fire Protection; Department of Housing and Community Development; Department of Justice; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Social Services; Department of Transportation; Environmental Protection Agency; Governor’s Office of Planning and Research; Health and Human Services Agency; Labor and Workforce Development Agency; Office of Gang and Youth Violence Policy (Funding was abolished in the 2011/12 budget; OGYVP closed on December 31, 2011.); and Office of Traffic Safety. In addition, the Task Force is staffed and facilitated by the California Department of Public Health.

**II. Goals and Objectives**

Goals

*Aspirational Goal:* Every California resident has access to healthy, affordable foods at school, at work, and in their neighborhoods.<sup>1</sup>

The aspirational goal above provided the structure for the development of recommendations to promote access to healthy, affordable food and help achieve other important sustainability goals.

This implementation plan outlines an initial set of activities to advance Recommendation I.E.1, “Encourage and expand the availability of affordable and locally grown produce through ‘farm-to-fork’ policies and programs.”<sup>1</sup> This was one of four recommendations made by the Task Force to advance the goal of improving access to healthy food. For more information on additional HiAP Task Force recommendations related to promoting healthy food, please refer to the *HiAP Task Force Report to the SGC*.<sup>1</sup>

### Objectives

Five objectives will be pursued:

1. Establish an interagency California farm-to-fork office with joint staffing by the California Department of Education (CDE), California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), and California Department of Public Health (CDPH).
2. Strengthen the ability of schools to safely grow, purchase, and serve fresh, locally grown fruits and vegetables.
3. Promote workforce development and increase the amount of fresh, locally grown fruits and vegetables available to child nutrition programs and other institutions through agriculture and food service and culinary arts career technical education programs.
4. Increase the ability of California farmers to sell food to large institutions by supporting the creation of regional food hubs.
5. Promote land use approaches that support increased community access to healthy food.

On August 3, 2011, the SGC endorsed the HiAP Task Force Implementation Plan, *Leveraging Government Spending to Support Healthy Procurement*. There are several areas of overlap between that plan and the actions outlined here. Both plans specifically support increasing access to local, healthy foods. Background research for the food procurement plan will likely uncover similar needs for improved distribution systems, and will likely explore purchasing processes for institutions such as schools. In addition, the development of regional food hubs discussed in this plan could facilitate state agency procurement from local farmers.

### **III. Rationale**

#### **Strategic Growth Council Links**

As set forth in SB 732, the SGC’s sustainability objectives include improving air and water quality, improving the protection of natural resources and agricultural lands, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Addressing farm-to-fork policies and programs through the HiAP Task Force can advance these objectives while supporting healthy and economically viable communities.

Increasing access to fresh, local, and sustainably grown produce in communities and institutions can support a food system that uses less energy, supports the preservation of farmland, contributes fewer greenhouse gases and air pollutants, and is better prepared to adapt to climate change. Agriculture and food systems also play a tremendous role in supporting California’s health and economy. California-grown agricultural products provide a source of economic activity for the state, bringing in

revenue and supporting jobs. Increasing fruit and vegetable consumption would significantly benefit California’s agricultural economy.

### **Health Impacts of the Food System**

Food and good nutrition are necessary for health. Eating recommended servings of fruits and vegetables daily can help reduce the risk of obesity, heart disease, stroke, hypertension, and some cancers.<sup>2</sup> California – and the nation – faces unprecedented levels of chronic disease, which now accounts for over 75 percent of all deaths in California<sup>3</sup> and 75 percent of all U.S. health care expenditures.<sup>4</sup> Obesity and overweight, which increase chronic disease risk and contribute to lost productivity, cost California an estimated \$21 billion in 2006.<sup>5</sup>

Access to full-service grocery stores and produce vendors like farmers’ markets is linked to increased consumption of fruits and vegetables.<sup>6,7</sup> Despite the fact that California produces nearly half of the fruit and vegetables grown in the U.S.,<sup>8</sup> consumption by Californians of fruits and vegetables continues to be far below recommended levels.<sup>9</sup> Nearly 1 million Californians live in places categorized as “food deserts,” areas with low access to supermarkets or large grocery stores.<sup>10</sup> Many of these food deserts are in low-income neighborhoods,<sup>11,12</sup> creating an additional barrier to healthy eating behaviors.

### **Definition of Farm-to-Fork and Farm-to-School Policies and Programs**

Farm-to-fork policies and programs are those that support farms in production and delivery to local consumers. There are a number of ways to encourage farm-to-fork programs, including by establishing local distribution systems and supporting those who want to buy locally.<sup>13</sup> The term “locally grown” in this implementation plan refers to agricultural products that are grown in California or geographically proximate to consumers. When feasible, local purchasing is supportive of the SGC’s sustainability objectives.

Farm-to-school approaches are a subset of farm-to-fork efforts which specifically connect schools and local farms “with the objectives of serving healthy meals in school cafeterias, improving student nutrition, providing agriculture, health and nutrition education opportunities, and supporting local and regional farmers.”<sup>14</sup> While this implementation plan addresses the broader issue of farm-to-fork, in many instances, work under this plan will initially focus more narrowly on farm-to-school efforts in order to build upon existing efforts and momentum. Schools are major food purchasers and farm-to-school programs provide important economic benefits by supporting California agricultural businesses. Farm-to-school approaches can be incorporated into curricula, and can improve student willingness to try new vegetables, reduce student food waste, and even improve grades and test scores.<sup>15</sup> According to the National Farm to School Network, there are 40 farm-to-school programs in California, involving 20 school districts and over 400 schools. With over 1,000 school districts and nearly 10,000 public schools in California, there is tremendous opportunity for growth of farm-to-school programs. In addition to kindergarten through high school, farm-to-school programs may involve early childhood programs, as well as before- and after-school programs. In

general, when the term “school” is used in this implementation plan, it is intended to include early childhood programs and before- and after-school programs.

### **Existing Efforts**

A number of existing efforts already encourage farm-to-fork and farm-to-school policies and programs in California. For example, the 2010 *California Agricultural Vision: Strategies for Sustainability* specifically addresses improving access to safe, healthy food for all Californians, promoting robust regional markets for all California producers, and cultivating the next generation of farmers and ranchers.<sup>16</sup> Given the relationship between health and educational achievement, in 2011, State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson launched the *Team California for Healthy Kids* campaign. This effort works to “promote healthy eating and physical activity throughout the day, every day, in schools, before and after school agencies, early childhood programs, and communities,” with one of the two goals for the first two years of the campaign being to increase “access to drinking water and fresh foods, particularly salad bars.”<sup>17</sup>

Since 2005, the California Farm to School Taskforce has been working to promote and expand farm-to-school activities in California.<sup>18</sup> The Taskforce brings together stakeholders including representatives from CDPH, CDE, and CDFA, advocacy organizations, growers’ organizations, school food service directors, school garden promoters, and other organizations working on aspects of farm-to-school policies and programs.

Federal policy also supports farm-to-school efforts. In 2008, the *Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act* was amended to require the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage institutions operating child nutrition programs to purchase unprocessed locally grown and locally raised agricultural products. The *Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010* provides funding for farm-to-school technical assistance and grants, beginning in October 2012.

### **Background**

#### Schools

Healthy eating is an essential component of supporting academic achievement, and because an estimated 19 to 50 percent of calorie intake by children occurs at school,<sup>19</sup> schools can play an important role in influencing healthy eating. Students who eat breakfast experience increased learning and academic achievement, improved attention to academic tasks, reduced visits to the school nurse, and decreased behavioral problems.<sup>20</sup> School meal programs also positively impact academic performance, absenteeism, and tardiness among students.<sup>21,22</sup>

#### *School Gardens*

School gardens provide multi-disciplinary learning opportunities for children, expose and encourage children to eat fruits and vegetables, and provide opportunities for learning about nature and ecological processes.<sup>23</sup> Garden-enhanced nutrition education helps students discover fresh food, make healthier food choices, and be physically active.

Children who plant and harvest their own fruits and vegetables are more likely to eat them.<sup>24</sup> As of 2002, there were approximately 2,400 gardens in California schools,<sup>23</sup> and food from school gardens is often eaten in after-school programs, classrooms, and cafeterias.

School gardens pose a potential risk for food-borne illness, so proper garden and food handling techniques are essential. State agency conversations and HiAP Task Force public workshops indicate that many local jurisdictions lack clarity regarding state regulations for approved food sources for school campuses. Many local health departments issue their own guidelines regarding school gardens, and many school districts and local health departments have chosen to prohibit the on-campus consumption of produce grown in school gardens due to food safety concerns.<sup>25</sup> In addition to concerns regarding growing practices, there are additional concerns related to food preparation and handling at schools. Because many schools lack adequate kitchen facilities, they also lack staff trained in food preparation and safe food handling, making the preparation of fresh fruits and vegetables difficult or impossible. Lastly, school staff may lack the in-depth gardening knowledge and skills necessary to ensure food safety, necessitating education and training on water and soil quality, proper use of compost and fertilizer, food handling, and other gardening and food safety issues.

#### *Farm-to-Fork Coordination and State Agencies*

Some schools, districts, and state agencies have created dedicated farm-to-school coordinator positions to help develop and sustain farm-to-school programs. A Pennsylvania study found that farm-to-school coordinators improve efficiency by providing technical assistance to build local capacity and create connections between farms and schools.<sup>26</sup> This study also reported that Oregon and Maryland passed legislation to hire farm-to-school coordinators to be housed in the Departments of Education, in order to work in concert with a coordinator at the Department of Agriculture. Oklahoma and Connecticut also have farm-to-school coordinators. These examples provide a framework to expand farm-to-school efforts to additional institutions such as hospitals, prisons, and universities (i.e., farm-to-fork).

#### *Workforce Development*

California’s agricultural economy depends upon having a robust workforce, but between 1992 and 2002, California saw a 43 percent decline in the number of farmers under the age of 35.<sup>16</sup> While the typical path to farming is through family farm businesses, ease of entry into farming, access to capital, education and information, and understanding the regulatory environment can impact decisions to enter farming and ability to sustain these businesses. Supporting a new generation of farmers through career technical education is an important opportunity to support California’s agricultural economy while pursuing other educational and job-readiness goals.

CDE currently has agricultural career technical education programs that integrate technical agriculture training with a strong academic foundation. These programs can prepare students for college or entrance into agricultural careers. In addition, as farming processes advance technologically, higher skills are required, increasing

demand for farmers with these skills. Career technical education programs can expose youth to farming systems and careers through school and community gardens, farms, and greenhouses. These programs prepare future producers in healthful and sustainable production, processing, and marketing techniques. Growing and serving produce on school campuses benefits healthy eating in schools by demonstrating the full farm-to-fork effort not only to those engaged in production, but also to fellow students who will soon be consumers. These programs also support farm-to-fork principles by training future food service and culinary workers to prepare fresh ingredients.

### Regional Food Hubs

While farmers may want to sell their produce to local institutions such as schools, universities, and hospitals, they face a variety of barriers in doing so. For example, because many schools lack adequate kitchen facilities, they often must buy food that is already washed, chopped, frozen, and ready-to-eat. Such preparation requires processing facilities that may not be affordable for smaller farm operators. Storage, processing, and distribution infrastructure is costly, and many individual small- and mid-sized farms lack such infrastructure. Institutions may lack the staffing to negotiate with a wide variety of farmers, or may lack storage and refrigeration facilities themselves. Because institutions need guaranteed supply, they may be reluctant to negotiate with local farmers whose supply may fluctuate over time. Regional food hubs can provide a combination of centrally located facilities with necessary business management structures to facilitate the aggregation, storage, processing, distribution, and marketing of local produce. Such hubs can provide farmers with much-needed infrastructure, while supporting institutions interested in procuring local products.

### Land Use

While farmers' markets and fruit and vegetable carts and stands can provide greater access to produce, zoning regulations may restrict produce vendors from locating in food deserts. However, local communities have begun to change their zoning language in order to support produce vending. For example, in 2008, after collaboration between health, agriculture, and planning groups, the Fresno City Council approved revised zoning language to permit farmers' markets as an approved use.<sup>27</sup> Schools and other public properties (e.g., parks and city streets) can also provide sites for farmers' markets. Fresno and La Jolla currently operate school-based farmers' markets through joint use agreements.

Another approach to expanding produce access is to employ creative land uses for growing fruits and vegetables. These creative sites could include utility right-of-ways, leased park lands, and other publicly owned lands, such as schools. In exploring these new approaches to land use, it will be important to consider food and worker safety concerns, including soil, water and air quality, liability, and maintenance. Joint use policies are an important tool for supporting creative land uses, and many models exist for how to use land and facilities for multiple purposes.

#### **IV. Resources**

Many of the actions in this implementation plan will require staff time or other resources. The activities outlined in this plan will be supported by contributed time from HiAP staff and staff in Task Force member agencies. There are no direct funds to support this project. Several action steps specifically involve exploring potential funding streams, including federal grants, agricultural industry investments, and additional commitments of in-kind support from involved departments, agencies, and offices. It may be possible to leverage graduate student research support for a number of items in this plan. Finally, if the proposed objective to create a state farm-to-fork office is fulfilled, that office may take responsibility for carrying out a number of the action steps outlined here.

#### **V. Workplan Narrative**

##### **Objective 1: Establish an interagency California farm-to-fork office with joint staffing by CDE, CDFA, and CDPH.**

*Action Step 1.1: Research how other states and counties have funded and structured farm-to-fork offices or positions, focusing first on farm-to-school.*

The California Farm to School Taskforce has researched how other states and counties have funded and designed their farm-to-fork and farm-to-school work, as well as the priorities and functions of designated offices or positions, and will share its findings with the HiAP Task Force. HiAP staff will conduct additional research into farm-to-fork offices.

*Action Step 1.2: Explore funding and other logistics for an interagency California farm-to-fork office.*

CDPH, CDFA, and CDE will explore funding for this shared office and will collaborate to determine details such as office location, staffing, and general functions.

*Action Step 1.3: Determine key priorities for an interagency California farm-to-fork office.*

Initial priorities for the new farm-to-fork office will be determined by CDE, CDFA, and CDPH with input from the Farm to School Taskforce, the HiAP Task Force, and relevant stakeholders. The farm-to-fork office will focus initially on farm-to-school programs and policies. This may include support for the national *Let's Move!* Salad Bars to School campaign and CDE's *Team California for Healthy Kids* campaign, which encourages schools to increase access to fresh fruits and vegetables through the use of salad bars. The farm-to-fork office will aim to expand its scope as it becomes more established and additional funds become available.

##### **Objective 2: Strengthen the ability of schools to safely grow, purchase, and serve fresh, locally grown fruits and vegetables.**

*Implementation Plan for Recommendation 1.E1., Encourage and expand the availability of affordable and locally grown produce through “farm-to-fork” policies and programs.*

*Action Step 2.1: Explore approaches to increase the availability of locally grown fruits and vegetables in schools while ensuring food safety in production and preparation.*

Due to confusion about food safety requirements for school gardens and use of other fresh produce in schools, some schools are missing important opportunities to promote healthy eating. CDFA, CDE, CDPH, and other relevant stakeholders, such as the California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association (CACASA), the California Conference of Directors of Environmental Health (CCDEH), and the Farm to School Taskforce, will explore approaches to encourage schools to increase availability of locally grown fruits and vegetables, including those grown in school gardens, orchards, and greenhouses, while addressing food safety and environmental health concerns related to food production, preparation, handling, and storage. These agencies will work to ensure that any suggested safety procedures are feasible and manageable while also ensuring that necessary safety precautions are taken and liability concerns are addressed.

As these conversations progress, consideration will be given to whether the developed approach might also be applicable to community garden settings. The Department of Community Services and Development (CSD) collaborates with local Community Action Agencies (CAAs) that work in several community settings.

*Action Step 2.2: Disseminate information about how to ensure food safety while increasing the availability of locally grown fruits and vegetables in schools.*

Upon completion of Action Step 2.1, CDFA, CDPH, and CDE will develop a dissemination plan for sharing information about approaches to increase availability of locally grown fruits and vegetables in schools while promoting safe growing and food handling practices. This dissemination plan may include, but is not limited to, working with the Farm to School Taskforce, the California Conference of Local Health Officers, CCDEH, California Conference of Local Health Department Nutritionists, school food service directors, and after-school program networks. If conversations under Action Step 2.1 discuss non-school settings, CSD can disseminate materials to relevant CAAs.

*Action Step 2.3: Research options for ensuring uniform and consistent school food safety inspections that meet federal requirements.*

California schools report significant challenges in meeting the federal requirement of the National School Lunch Program for two annual food safety inspections due to a lack of inspectors within local health departments. CDE, CDPH, and other relevant stakeholders, such as CACASA, CCDEH, the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), and the Farm to School Taskforce, will discuss food facility inspections and how the state can assist schools in meeting federal requirements. These agencies will develop a summary of findings and develop a state agency action plan to address this issue.

*Implementation Plan for Recommendation I.E1., Encourage and expand the availability of affordable and locally grown produce through “farm-to-fork” policies and programs.*

**Objective 3: Promote workforce development and increase the amount of fresh, locally grown fruits and vegetables available to child nutrition programs and other institutions through agriculture and food service and culinary arts career technical education programs.**

*Action Step 3.1: Compile a list of schools that have career technical education programs to support development of agricultural and food service and culinary workers.*

CDE will develop a document outlining all of the school vocational programs in California that support development of agricultural and food service and culinary workers.

*Action Step 3.2: Explore collaboration with additional partners to support and expand the agricultural and food service and culinary workforces.*

CDFA and CDE will meet with potential partners to explore their interest in supporting the development of agricultural and food service and culinary workers. These potential partners may include the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, the Department of Social Services, the Governor’s Office of Business and Economic Development, and the University of California Cooperative Extension.

*Action Step 3.3: Explore best practices and opportunities to expand and support agriculture and food service and culinary arts career technical education programs in California.*

CDFA, CDE, and interested partners reached through Action Step 3.2 will explore best practices and opportunities for supporting food service and culinary arts and agriculture career technical education. These agencies will develop a summary of findings and a state agency action plan to advance identified programmatic efforts. This will include exploring possible funding sources for this work.

**Objective 4: Increase the ability of California farmers to sell food to large institutions by supporting the creation of regional food hubs.**

*Action Step 4.1: Assess and document how large institutions such as schools, hospitals, universities, food banks, and prisons currently purchase produce from local farms, and identify barriers to such purchasing arrangements.*

CDFA and CDPH will complete a gap analysis to determine what state support is needed to facilitate the creation of regional food hubs, from both the purchasing and supply perspectives. The analysis will explore whether there are institutions that have particular interest and/or face particular barriers in contracting with local farmers and vice-versa. Barriers to explore include availability, cost, distribution networks, and access to storage and production facilities.

*Implementation Plan for Recommendation I.E1., Encourage and expand the availability of affordable and locally grown produce through “farm-to-fork” policies and programs.*

***Action Step 4.2:*** *Consult with stakeholders to identify opportunities for the State to support the creation of regional food hubs.*

Throughout the state, local and regional entities are already making progress on developing regional food hubs in ways that meet specific local needs. In order to support these efforts rather than duplicate existing work, the Task Force will consult with stakeholders to identify opportunities to address state-level barriers to the creation of regional food hubs. Stakeholders can be engaged through existing groups, with additional contacts as needed, and include representatives of large, medium, and small farms, produce distributors, schools, hospitals, universities, food banks, other large institutions, relevant state agencies, local health departments, and sustainability experts. Discussions will include concerns about air quality and transportation as they relate to the siting of regional food hubs. Based on discussions with stakeholders and among state agencies, a state agency action plan will be developed to address prioritized barriers.

**Objective 5:** **Promote land use approaches that support increased community access to healthy food.**

***Action Step 5.1:*** *Identify opportunities arising from the results of the 2011 OPR Annual Planning Survey to expand healthy food access and local food production.*

OPR included questions related to food accessibility and local food production on its 2011 Annual Planning Survey. When survey results become available in January 2012, CDPH and OPR will work together to complete a preliminary analysis of the results. Once this analysis is complete, CDPH will convene a meeting of interested agencies (including, but not limited to, OPR and CDFA) to identify additional steps that could be taken to promote farm-to-fork practices in California.

***Action Step 5.2:*** *Identify zoning barriers to farmers’ markets, produce stands, and other sources of fruits and vegetables in residential areas, and recommend solutions.*

OPR and CDPH will work to identify common zoning barriers to produce access and develop recommendations for potential solutions, particularly for neighborhoods identified as food deserts.

***Action Step 5.3:*** *Research creative land uses for community gardens and orchards, consider potential safety concerns, and disseminate promising practices.*

There are many opportunities to use edible plants in landscaping where ornamental plants are commonly used and communities throughout California are employing creative land use methods for community gardens and orchards. OPR and CDPH, in consultation with CDFA and CAL FIRE, will research these methods in California and nationwide and develop a list of promising practices. Possible examples include, but are not limited to, use of utility right-of-ways, leasing of park lands, and use of other publicly owned lands, such as schools. Potential safety concerns will be addressed,

*Implementation Plan for Recommendation I.E1., Encourage and expand the availability of affordable and locally grown produce through “farm-to-fork” policies and programs.*

such as soil and water quality and liability. Additionally, public entities may face challenges such as the cost of cleaning up unused fruit, increased maintenance costs, liability for health problems associated with uncollected fruit spoilage, and trip and fall incidents. These challenges can often be addressed, but require dissemination of promising practices.

Once a list of promising practices has been created, Task Force members will work together to disseminate this information. Possible avenues for dissemination include the OPR Local Government Roundtables, CAL FIRE’s Regional Urban Foresters, and partnering with organizations serving cities and counties (e.g., Institute for Local Government) or organizations committed to expanding community agriculture (e.g., California Urban Forests Council, California ReLeaf), and CSD’s CAAs.

Implementation Plan for Recommendation I.E1., Encourage and expand the availability of affordable and locally grown produce through “farm-to-fork” policies and programs.

## VI. Workplan Summary

Duration: Two years

Resources: As there are no direct funds to support the action steps in this implementation plan, completion of the outlined action steps will be dependent on the availability of resources within member agencies.

Aspirational Goal: Every California resident has access to healthy, affordable foods at school, at work, and in their neighborhoods.				
Recommendation: Encourage and expand the availability of affordable and locally grown produce through “farm-to-fork” policies and programs.				
Action Step		Participating Agency(ies)	Deliverable	Timeline
Objective 1: Establish an interagency California farm-to-fork office with joint staffing by CDE, CDFA, and CDPH.				
1.1	Research how other states and counties have funded and structured farm-to-fork offices or positions, focusing first on farm-to-school	F2S Taskforce, CDPH	Written summary of research findings	January – October 2012
1.2	Explore funding and other logistics for an interagency California farm-to-fork office.	CDFA, CDE, CDPH, F2S Taskforce	Funding plan, grant applications (if applicable), Farm-to-Fork Office Charter	January – October 2012
1.3	Determine key priorities for an interagency California farm-to-fork office.	CDPH, CDFA, CDE, F2S Taskforce	Document outlining near-term priorities	January – October 2012
Objective 2: Strengthen the ability of schools to safely grow, purchase, and serve fresh, locally grown fruits and vegetables.				
2.1	Explore approaches to increase the availability of locally grown fruits and vegetables while ensuring food safety in production and preparation.	CDPH, CDE, CDFA, F2S Taskforce, CSD	Interagency meeting notes, guidance document	January – September 2012
2.2	Disseminate information about how to ensure food safety while increasing the	CDFA, CDE, F2S Taskforce	Dissemination plan	October 2012 – July 2013

Implementation Plan for Recommendation I.E1., Encourage and expand the availability of affordable and locally grown produce through “farm-to-fork” policies and programs.

Aspirational Goal: Every California resident has access to healthy, affordable foods at school, at work, and in their neighborhoods.				
Recommendation: Encourage and expand the availability of affordable and locally grown produce through “farm-to-fork” policies and programs.				
Action Step		Participating Agency(ies)	Deliverable	Timeline
	availability of locally grown fruits and vegetables in schools.			
2.3	Research options for ensuring uniform and consistent school food safety inspections that meet federal requirements.	CDE, CDPH	Written summary of findings, state agency action plan	February – June 2012
Objective 3: Promote workforce development and increase the amount of fresh, locally grown fruits and vegetables available to child nutrition programs and other institutions through agriculture and food service and culinary arts career technical education programs.				
3.1	Compile a list of schools that have career technical education programs to support development of agricultural and food service and culinary workers.	CDE, CDFA,	Schools list	February – June 2012
3.2	Explore collaboration with additional partners to support and expand the agricultural and food service and culinary workforces.	CDPH, CDFA, CDE	Partners contacted	June – December 2012
3.3	Explore best practices and opportunities to expand and support agriculture and food service and culinary arts career technical education programs in California.	CDFA, CDE	State agency action plan	June – December 2012
Objective 4: Increase the ability of California farmers to sell food to large institutions by supporting the creation of regional food hubs.				
4.1	Assess and document how large institutions such as schools, hospitals, universities, food banks, and prisons	CDFA, CDPH	Summary document	July – December 2012

Implementation Plan for Recommendation I.E1., Encourage and expand the availability of affordable and locally grown produce through “farm-to-fork” policies and programs.

Aspirational Goal: Every California resident has access to healthy, affordable foods at school, at work, and in their neighborhoods.				
Recommendation: Encourage and expand the availability of affordable and locally grown produce through “farm-to-fork” policies and programs.				
Action Step		Participating Agency(ies)	Deliverable	Timeline
	currently purchase produce from local farms, and identify barriers to such purchasing arrangements.			
4.2	Consult with stakeholders to identify opportunities for the State to support the creation of regional food hubs.	CDFA	Meeting notes, state agency action plan	July – December 2012
Objective 5. Promote land use approaches that support increased community access to healthy food.				
5.1	Identify opportunities arising from the results of the 2011 OPR Annual Planning Survey to expand healthy food access and local food production.	CDPH, OPR, HiAP Task Force	Written survey analysis, meeting notes	January – May 2012
5.2	Identify zoning barriers to farmers’ markets, produce stands, and other sources of fruits and vegetables in residential areas, particularly in food deserts, and recommend solutions.	OPR, CDPH, CDFA	Policy memo	June – December 2013
5.3	Research creative land uses for community gardens and orchards, consider potential safety concerns, and disseminate promising practices.	CDPH, CDFA, OPR, CAL FIRE, CSD	Promising practices document, dissemination plan	June – December 2013

CAL FIRE: California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection; CDE: California Department of Education; CDFA: California Department of Food and Agriculture; CDPH: California Department of Public Health; F2S Taskforce: Farm to School Taskforce; OPR: Governor’s Office of Planning and Research

## **VII. Cross Cutting Themes**

### *A. Interagency Collaboration*

The actions outlined in this implementation plan are highly collaborative and engage Task Force agencies in working together on a number of projects. This implementation plan would also institutionalize interagency collaboration through the development of a farm-to-fork office. This office will involve staff from multiple agencies working together to increase the availability of fresh, local produce in schools and other institutions.

### *B. Equity*

Residents of low-income communities and communities of color have greater difficulty accessing local, healthy food. Work to reduce the barriers mentioned throughout this plan could be particularly important for these highly impacted communities. It will be especially important to consider barriers to healthy food access that particularly affect these communities.

### *C. Community Engagement*

A number of action steps involve working with external stakeholders. In addition, several action steps include coordination with the Farm to School Taskforce, which represents a wide range of stakeholders.

### *D. Data*

Many of the proposed action steps include gathering, interpreting, and disseminating best practices and guidance, which will serve to enhance statewide data on farm-to-fork programs.

## **VIII. Evaluation**

Given limited resources for this project, evaluation will be limited to ensuring timely completion of deliverables.

## **IX. Contact**

To learn more about the Health in All Policies Task Force, visit [www.sgc.ca.gov/hiap/](http://www.sgc.ca.gov/hiap/) or e-mail [HiAP@cdph.ca.gov](mailto:HiAP@cdph.ca.gov).

---

<sup>1</sup> Health in All Policies Task Force. (2010). *Health in All Policies Task Force Report to the Strategic Growth Council, December 3, 2010*. Available at [http://www.sgc.ca.gov/hiap/docs/publications/HiAP\\_Task\\_Force\\_Report.pdf](http://www.sgc.ca.gov/hiap/docs/publications/HiAP_Task_Force_Report.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> D. Hyson. *The health benefits of fruits and vegetables, a scientific overview for health professionals*. Wilmington, DE: Produce for Better Health Foundation, 2001.

<sup>3</sup> State of California, Department of Public Health. (July 2007). *Death Records. State of California, Department of Finance, Race and Ethnic Population with Age and Sex Detail, 2000-2050*.

<sup>4</sup> R. DeVol & A. Bedroussian. (2007). *An Unhealthy America: The Economic Burden of Chronic Disease Charting a New Course to Save Lives and Increase Productivity and Economic Growth*. Milken Institute Available at [http://www.milkeninstitute.org/pdf/ES\\_ResearchFindings.pdf](http://www.milkeninstitute.org/pdf/ES_ResearchFindings.pdf).

<sup>5</sup> California Center for Public Health Advocacy (2006). *The Economic Costs of Overweight, Obesity and Physical Inactivity Among California Adults*.

*Implementation Plan for Recommendation I.E1., Encourage and expand the availability of affordable and locally grown produce through “farm-to-fork” policies and programs.*

- 
- <sup>6</sup> K.S. Morland, A. Wing, A.D. Roux, C. Poole. (2001). Neighborhood characteristics associated with location of food stores and food service places. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 22(1), 23-29.
- <sup>7</sup> R.P. Lopez. (2007). Neighborhood risk factors for obesity. *Obesity*. 15(8), 2111–2119.
- <sup>8</sup> California Department of Food and Agriculture. (2009). *California Agricultural Resource Directory 2008-2009*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Food and Agriculture, Office of Public Affairs.
- <sup>9</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2010) State-Specific Trends in Fruit and Vegetable Consumption Among Adults — United States, 2000–2009. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 59, 1125-1130.
- <sup>10</sup> J. Lin. Nearly 1 million Californians living in 'food deserts'. *California Watch*. Available at <http://californiawatch.org/dailyreport/nearly-1-million-californians-living-food-deserts-10122>.
- <sup>11</sup> PolicyLink. (2007). *Why Place Matters: Building a Movement for Healthy Communities*. Available at [http://www.policylink.org/atf/cf/%7B97c6d565-bb43-406d-a6d5-eca3bbf35af0%7D/WHYPLACEMATTERS\\_FINAL.PDF](http://www.policylink.org/atf/cf/%7B97c6d565-bb43-406d-a6d5-eca3bbf35af0%7D/WHYPLACEMATTERS_FINAL.PDF).
- <sup>12</sup> California Center for Public Health Advocacy, PolicyLink, and the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research. (2008). *Designed for disease: the link between local food environments and obesity and diabetes*. Regents of the University of California, PolicyLink and the California Center for Health Policy Research.
- <sup>13</sup> J. Curtis, et. al. (April 2010). *From Farm to Fork: A Guide to Building North Carolina’s Sustainable Local Food Economy*. Raleigh, N.C.: Center for Environmental Farming Systems.
- <sup>14</sup> National Farm to School Network. Available at <http://www.farmtoschool.org>.
- <sup>15</sup> D. Shapiro. (February 5 2007) *School Garden Plus Nutrition Lessons Equal Science Literacy*. National Science Teachers Association, WebNews Digest. Available at <http://www.nsta.org/publications/news/story.aspx?id=53348>.
- <sup>16</sup> American Farmland Trust. (2010). *California Agricultural Vision: Strategies for Sustainability*.
- <sup>17</sup> California Department of Education. Team California for Healthy Kids. Available at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/tchk.asp>.
- <sup>18</sup> The California Farm To School Taskforce. Available at <http://www.cafarmtoschool.org/taskforce-about.php>.
- <sup>19</sup> The Los Angeles Food Policy Task Force. (July 2010). *The Good Food for All Agenda*. Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles Food Policy Task Force.
- <sup>20</sup> K. Chandran. (September 2007). *Running on Empty: A Report on the School Breakfast Program in California*. California Food Policy Advocates.
- <sup>21</sup> R.E. Kleinman, S. Hall, H. Green, D. Korzec-Ramirez, et al. (2002). Diet, breakfast, and academic performance in children. *Annals of Nutrition & Metabolism*. 46, 24-30.
- <sup>22</sup> M.D. Florence, M. Asbridge, P.J. Veugelers. (2008). Diet quality and academic performance. *Journal of School Health*. 78, 209-215.
- <sup>23</sup> California Department of Education. (2002). *A Child’s Garden of Standards: Linking School Gardens to California Education Standards*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education. Available at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/nu/he/documents/childsgarden.pdf>.
- <sup>24</sup> California Department of Education (March 2007). *School Garden Overview. A Healthy Nutrition Environment: Linking Education, Activity, and Food through School Gardens*. Nutrition Services Division.
- <sup>25</sup> K. Hampton. (July 10, 2011). School-Grown Food for Lunch: Against the Law? *HealthyCal* Available at <http://www.healthycal.org/archives/4951>.
- <sup>26</sup> C. Hinrichs and K. Schafft. (2008). *Farm to School Programs in Pennsylvania*. The Center for Rural Pennsylvania. Available at [http://www.rural.palegislature.us/farm\\_school\\_report08.pdf](http://www.rural.palegislature.us/farm_school_report08.pdf).
- <sup>27</sup> City of Fresno. (June 3, 2008). *City Council Meeting Minutes*. Available at <http://www.fresno.gov/NR/rdonlyres/016CA9F2-A334-479D-85ED-00515891A605/0/June32008CouncilMinutes.pdf>.