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Alameda County Circular Economy for Food

There are both extreme injustices and opportunities for equalization within Alameda County’s current food system. While there is plenty of food available, too much of it is unhealthy, expensive, inaccessible, or wasted. COVID-19 has revealed even deeper vulnerabilities and inequities. Developing a food system that focuses on equity, sustainability, and health can correct many of these concerns – both during this crisis and beyond – but it requires an intentional, systems-level plan. It requires shifting to a philosophy based on a circular economy for food.

Many components of a circular economy have been built out through the cooperative efforts of ALL IN and the Deputy Sheriff’s Activities League. But now, more than ever, it is clear this system needs to be expanded and unified in order to reap all the benefits of a truly virtuous cycle. This report articulates the costs and benefits of intentionally investing in a circular economy for food to produce healthier food, generate jobs, stimulate local economies, and lower the County’s greenhouse gas emissions – while saving the County millions of dollars. This pandemic is a crisis, but also an opportunity to restructure the food system. It is an invitation to shift to an Alameda County Circular Economy for Food (ACCEF).

Recommendations

1) Decide on a food system name, create branding, and use it consistently .............................................................. 18
2) Form an Alameda County Circular Economy for Food Association (ACCEFA) .......................................................... 18
Food Production

Within the ACCEF, healthy food is made primarily of whole, plant-based ingredients grown sustainably, and for that Alameda County needs a thriving urban agriculture system. DSAL has created Dig Deep Farms (DDF) – a proven model for producing local, regeneratively grown foods within our own region. DDF produce is currently being used to create Food As Medicine (FAM) bags for patients who receive prescriptions for foods that will improve diet-related diseases such as diabetes, obesity, and hypertension. With plans to build out the FAM Farmacy-quality prescription food program to 9-10 clinics in the County, the demand for this produce will increase substantially.

Additionally, there is tremendous opportunity for growth in sales to numerous large anchor institutions such as hospitals and schools. DSAL has identified food contracts DDF could secure if production were sufficient, but the model must be scaled to meet this increased demand. The quick responses of DSAL and ALL IN has infused the ACCEF with sustainably grown produce from local farms to fill the gaps created by weaknesses in the conventional food system during COVID-19. This work could be expanded upon to enrich the food system for the long term with environmentally conscious local produce. Doing so will require investments in farm expansions, including hiring justice-involved individuals as farmers and thoughtful policy changes to support dozens of good-paying jobs. This, in turn, will feed revenue into the local economy and reduce the County’s greenhouse gas emissions.
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[Note: ★ recommendations are top recommendations for the immediate future.]
Food Aggregation

Major anchor institutions are looking to increase their procurement of sustainable, locally sourced, and prepped foods. What’s more, the benefits of having urban agriculture within Alameda County will not be felt unless County residents can access the foods these urban farms generate. Not only is the Food Hub where prepped produce can be processed for sale to institutional clients, it is also a central point within the ACCEF, serving as a place to sort produce and prepared meals before they’re delivered to DDF and FAM clients. The Food Hub is also the location for re-packing rescued food before it is delivered, a space for incubating local food entrepreneurs, and a place for receiving and prepping emergency food aid and MSM meals before sending them out into the community. In the future, the Food Hub may also serve as a retail location for selling DDF produce to the public. Though the Food Hub only opened in early 2020, it is already running beyond capacity, and therefore several steps should be taken to strengthen and expand this component of the ACCEF. Significant investments are required to add additional Farmacist staff and for procuring both emergency (interim) food processing space and long-term expansion of Food Hubs throughout the County. Food Hubs locations and Farmacist operations staff will be required as well.
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Post-COVID-19 Programmatic ............................................................................................................................ 34
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27) Improve transportation to Healthy Corner Stores and Farmers’ Markets .............................................................. 36
Post-COVID-19 Workforce

Implement workforce development recommendations of the ARC Workforce Assessment

[Note: ★ recommendations are top recommendations for the immediate future.]
Food Processing

There are hundreds of creative, talented food entrepreneurs within the County who are looking for ways to grow their businesses and employ more people. Through the rapid response of ALL IN and DSAL, a model for contracting food prep and production to local businesses, was set up and tested in under a month. The prepared meal project put 16 out-of-work food entrepreneurs and their staff to work preparing meals for community members (some using the Food Hub), helping to keep businesses alive, with 150+ additional restaurants ready to aid in growing the program. The program scaled from 0 prepared meals/week to 2,500 meals/week in 2-3 months,¹ with most food producers able to generate greater quantities of meals/week than their original contracts. Moving forward, the program could easily onboard additional restaurants to deliver 166,000+ meals/week now that a system is in place to aid in food distribution during the pandemic. But beyond this crisis, these food entrepreneurs could be re-tasked to produce medically supportive meals for the elderly and those with health conditions such as diabetes, hypertension, and obesity. To support all components within the ACCEF system, both to meet this current crisis and in the years ahead, emergency funds are required to continue delivering prepared-food aid. Updated standards for nutrition and packaging as well as some regulatory changes are also required for ongoing meal processing.

Quotes from Interviews with Food Entrepreneur Who Participated in the Prepared Meal Food Aid Program

“I really enjoyed the satisfaction of helping the community. When I went to deliver I saw the lines of cars and the first thing I did when I came back I told my staff to hold their heads high - a lot of people in the community are benefiting from the work we’re doing. That was the best thing about this. We’re not just seeing a bunch of executives in a corporate meeting.” ~Bryan Roy (Eriksdelicafe.com)

“It gave us exposure to a lot of people that didn’t know about us - another audience and the people are contacting us now for our food.” ~Jose Ramirez (massmeals.co)

¹ “DSAL by the Numbers (Was Attendance & Data Report),” COVID Monthly Report tab.
“It was rewarding because it was a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to help the community. Plus, people personally reached out on social media to thank me and some of them would come into the kiosk.” ~Rene Lontoc (https://www.thankquegrill.com/)

“It was money when we needed it the most - in the beginning before we could turn our business around from catering large gatherings (which were canceled) to change to meal delivery service. That bridge was really helpful. And the idea of feeding people in situations that were difficult also went a long way - getting up every morning with purpose in a crisis is depressing, so having a way to give back and help yourself at the same time was meaningful.” ~Dawn Deardorf (http://www.AuroraCateringBayArea.com)

“Definitely a life saver for me this month.” ~Neeru Brar (http://Countrywaffleshayward.com)

“I don’t have a minimum requirement - every meal counts. It helped immensely to have this contract.” ~Jorge Espinosa (http://ElTaquitoRestaurant.com)

**Recommendations**

**LOCAL PRESERVED FOOD PRODUCTION**

- Post-COVID-19 Policy
  - 29) Pursue a policy for industrially zoned land to be designated for food processing ................................................. 40
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  - 31) Streamline regulatory system for establishing new food businesses ................................................................. 41

- Post-COVID-19 Programmatic
  - 32) Facilitate the establishment of procurement agreements for prepped and preserved food producers ................ 41

**LOCAL PREPARED MEAL PRODUCTION**

- COVID-19 Response (urgent)
  - 36) Fund the continuation and expansion of the meal preparation and distribution program for low-income families 44

- Post-COVID-19 Policy
  - 37) Introduce an ordinance to limit the number of fast food restaurants in low-access, low-income communities ... 44

- Post-COVID-19 Programmatic
  - 38) Facilitate the establishment of procurement agreements for local, small business prepped and preserved food producers ................................................................. 44
  - 39) Develop written ingredient and basic nutrition standards for meal preparers aligned with USDA school nutrition standards ........................................................................................................ 45
  - 40) Develop written food packaging standards for participating ACCEF food entrepreneurs .................................. 45

- Post-COVID-19 Workforce
  - 41) Facilitate ACCEF food preparation jobs training for former criminal justice-involved individuals ..................... 45
  - 42) Work with financial institutions to offer de-risked financial tools for food processors to establish or expand their operations ........................................................................................................ 46
  - 43) Work with the HOPE Collaborative to expand their Healthy Corner Store Chef Challenge ................................ 46

[Note: ★ recommendations are top recommendations for the immediate future.]
No circular economy for food can exist without the ability to transport food between the various stops along the route. A 1400 Jobs Re-Entry Hiring Initiative was established by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors several years ago with the intent of employing individuals with criminal justice system involvement. The jobs created in this pathway forward would provide a plan for seeing this initiative become reality. The Probation Department and Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency (BOSS) is another program designed to connect employment contractors with job-ready formerly justice-involved individuals – the ACCEF jobs in this plan would be both interesting and fulfilling because of the service to the community. DSAL and ALL IN have piloted a project to employ people as drivers and food handlers, which has benefited the County by reducing recidivism and healthcare costs while saving millions of dollars. Since the start of the pandemic, serious, existing food insecurities have been severely intensified, and this pilot project has scaled 408% for food as medicine deliveries, and gone from zero to 5319 people served with rescued meals to meet the challenge. Many residents of Alameda County are housebound, elderly, medically vulnerable, or unable to wait in line at a typical distribution center – challenges which have only been exacerbated during the 2020 pandemic. Through the new DSAL Food Hub, former criminal justice-involved individuals have recovered 9,500+ meals/month (up from 600 per month pre-pandemic) from schools, restaurants, and other local providers and redistributed them to CalFresh and Medicaid recipients.

The Food as Medicine (FAM) program was created to give low-income residents access to local, regeneratively grown, plant-based foods supported by group behavioral programming that helps to decrease rates of obesity, diabetes, hypertension, and depression. Building on these strengths, the ACCEF is looking to expand the Food as Medicine offerings to include medically-tailed meals (MSMs) combined with integrative medicine services proven to reduce negative health indicators by 16%, resulting in millions in healthcare savings for the County and providing significant income streams for local food entrepreneurs. What’s more, a healthier population is a healthier workforce that can contribute more to the community, while keeping additional revenue streams flowing.

2 “DSAL by the Numbers (Was Attendance & Data Report),” COVID Monthly Report tab. Increased from 119 in Jan to 605 in June: 605-119/119 = 408% increase
throughout the County. Additionally, by keeping those who have been justice-involved employed, the County can avoid further incarceration costs and instead reinvest those funds into rehabilitative services based on best practices. The County will not be able to reap the economic benefits without further investments in additional medical experts, food preparation space and support staff, plus new vans and drivers to deliver FAM and MSM.

### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD DISTRIBUTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COVID-19 Response (urgent)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td>Redeployment of 190 County vehicles and hire 190 drivers to support the delivery of emergency prepared meals and school breakfasts and lunches during the COVID-19 pandemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ConSUMPTION OF HEALTHY DISTRIBUTED FOOD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-COVID-19 Programmatic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td>Expand number of FAM clinics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td>Develop ACCEFA medically supportive meal ingredients, nutritional requirements, and labeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td>Market MSM to wider community with diet-related health conditions to support food entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td>Explore a blended model between the ACCEF and Meals on Wheels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td>Set research goals for measuring FAM and MSM health indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td>Select and pilot the preparation of MSM meals through local food entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td>Develop a plan for redirecting the meal prep model to medically-supportive meal prep post-pandemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td>Create a system for FAM practitioners to make house calls and offer services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td>Research Targeted Case Management (TCM) as possible funding source for Deputy referrals into FAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td>Research School-Based Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (SMAA) and County-Based Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (CMAA) programs for possible funding options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td>Research possible use of SNAP-Ed funding or programming for FAM clinic trainings and/or new community-level educational programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td>Research Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program for possible funding options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNOLOGY TOOL FOR DISTRIBUTION COORDINATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td>Support the development of the ACCEF mobile application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td>Create public awareness materials that explain how to access WIC and CalFresh/SNAP benefits to increase demand for FAM and MSM services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note: ★ recommendations are top recommendations for the immediate future.]
Food Recycling

Regenerative farming not only produces healthier foods to be used within the ACCEF, it also has benefits for the County’s climate change efforts. Food rescue is also an extremely effective way for the County to reduce overall greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and redirect costs that might be otherwise incurred through a carbon tax or trade scheme. The County could support individual municipalities’ efforts at reducing GHGs from food waste by offering coordinated services for edible food rescue. The County could do even more by building composting into the ACCEF. What’s more, recovered meals save residents on groceries and recirculate funds within the local economy. Expanding on these efforts will close the loop on the circular economy but will require investments in jobs for the formerly criminal justice-involved, as well as vehicles for food and compost pickup and delivery.

Recommendations

**Food Rescue**

- Post-COVID-19 Policy
  - Develop harmonized food safety standards and procedures for food rescue operations

**Post-COVID-19 Programmatic**

- Increase quantity of food rescued by through enhanced partnership development

**Post-COVID-19 Workforce**

- Use municipalities’ funding for meeting their SB 1383 food waste requirements to employ formerly justice-involved people as recovered food drivers and composters

**Organic Waste Recovery and Composting**

- Post-COVID-19 Programmatic
  - Create an ACCEF compost collection program
  - Create an ACCEF DDF compost coupon program
  - Set up compost bin pick-up for food aid recipients and from partner organic waste collectors

**Post-COVID-19 Workforce**

- Launch a program to provide inmate composting training

[Note: ★ recommendations are top recommendations for the immediate future.]
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Alameda County Circular Economy for Food
Introduction: Circular Instead of Linear

There are both extreme injustices and opportunities for equalization within Alameda County’s current food system. While there is plenty of food available, much of it is unhealthy, expensive, inaccessible, and/or wasted. What’s more, the current system relies on industrial production methods that favor speed and efficiency over well-

FOOD SPEND  

SOCIETAL COSTS RELATED TO 
CONSUMPTION  
PRODUCTION

*Excluding obesity; **Due to diet
Based on Cities and Circular Economy for Food analysis – for details see Technical Appendix.
being, health, equality, and jobs creation, while ignoring growing evidence of the environmental degradation left in its wake. Consider just a few statistics:

- For every $1 spent on purchasing food, there are $2 in external costs: $1 for the consumption costs related to micronutrient deficiency, malnutrition, and obesity, and $1 for production costs related to health, economic, and environmental factors.  
  
- The EU pays USD $150 billion annually to provide health care for farm workers who are exposed to low levels of pesticides which are linked to cancer, depression, asthma, reduced IQ, and elevated rates of ADHD.

- Peri-urban surroundings hold 40% of the world’s cropland. Local sourcing from peri-urban farms increases resilience in food supplies and reconnects people to the food system, which may encourage healthier diet choices.

- Up to 20% of municipal budgets are used for waste management.

The inequalities of our current system have only intensified during the COVID-19 pandemic. For instance, the Alameda County Food Bank has seen a ten-fold increase for free food giveaways since the start of the crisis, and the Berkeley Food Network has seen the highest number of clients since its founding, leaping from 500 households served weekly to 1,400 households served weekly, a 180% increase. At the same time, the Black Lives Matter demonstrations in the wake of George Floyd’s killing have drawn attention to the racial inequities both in food

---

3 “Food and The Circular Economy.”
4 “Cities and Circular Economy for Food,” 16.
7 “Urban Products Systems Summary: Factsheets,” 2.
8 Anthony, “Alameda Food Bank Sees 10x Demand amid COVID-19 Crisis.”
9 Njoroge, “Food Pantries Rally to Help Those Made Food Insecure by COVID-19.”
insecurity and how the pandemic has disproportionately impacted Black people. At baseline, communities of color experience more food insecurity; seven out of 10 individuals living in poverty are people of color.\textsuperscript{10} According to the City of Oakland Racial Disparities Task Force Town Hall, while African Americans make up 10\% of the County’s population, they are seeing 14\% of the cases; Latinx people are only 22\% of Alameda County but are seeing 46\% of the COVID-19 caseload.\textsuperscript{11}

Developing a food system that focuses on equity, sustainability, and health would go a long way to correcting many of these concerns, but it requires just that – an intentional, systems-level plan. It requires a circular economy for food philosophy.

In 2014, on the 50\textsuperscript{th} Anniversary of President Johnson’s War on Poverty, Alameda County Supervisor Wilma Chan launched a New War on Poverty in Alameda County. To date, this initiative has tackled a variety of issues ranging from employment to healthcare, plus housing and services for seniors and people with disabilities. Food insecurity has also been a central issue, and one that has been addressed through the cooperative efforts of ALL IN Alameda County and the Deputy Sheriff’s Activities League (DSAL).

This document explores the many aspects of Alameda County’s current policies and programs that fit a Circular Economy for Food model, built out largely through the work already done by ALL IN and DSAL. It also provides a cost-benefit analysis of the system and makes recommendations for how to fill in some of the gaps and take the programs forward, but most importantly attempts to articulate an intentional vision for thinking about how to approach the challenges of food equity and sustainability in a holistic, unified manner. It is inspired by the Ellen MacArthur Foundation’s Circular Economy for Food project which has three ambitions: “emerge: source food grown regeneratively, and locally where appropriate; make the most of food (use by-products more effectively, prevent waste); design and market healthier food.”\textsuperscript{12} Ideally, Alameda County’s Circular Economy for Food (ACCEF) challenges government leaders, program administrators, and the community to think of the food system not as many individual, one-way journeys from factory to table, but as a unified whole that functions together, each aspect feeding into the next in a continuous loop in ways that either compound problems or find synergies that create uplift within the County’s towns, cities, and unincorporated regions.

In the ACCEF model, there are five foundational stops along the circular economy route: food production, food aggregation, food processing, food distribution, and food waste recycling. In the following pages, we will survey the current food economy landscape in Alameda County suggesting how each component fits within the ACCEF, as well as make recommendations for how to strengthen the connections and plan for the future. We encourage readers to think of each aspect not as a separate standalone element, but as one part of a complex economy that should be seen as a beautiful whole if it is to strengthen all stakeholders within the region.

\textsuperscript{10} Brittany, “How COVID-19 Is Affecting Communities of Color.”
\textsuperscript{11} Brittany.
\textsuperscript{12} Ellen MacArthur Foundation, “Cities and Circular Economy for Food.”
1) Decide on a food system name, create branding, and use it consistently

The main thesis of this pathway for growth is that no part of the circular economy for food can be understood in isolation – it is part of a whole without which it may not make economic or practical sense. Likewise, if programming and policy are siloed, no constituent part is likely to reach its full potential within Alameda County. By selecting a name for this circular economy for food system and then consistently communicating and reinforcing it as an interconnected, circular (not linear) whole, all the various actors will feel a shared sense of purpose and vision, and the importance of collaborative planning for policy and budgets will become clearer. Therefore, the County Board of Supervisors is encouraged to:

- Select a name for this entire system. I have suggested something simple: Alameda County Circular Economy of Food (ACCEF which could be pronounced “asseff”), however, if another name would be preferred, you are encouraged to choose it.
- Either use the draft ACCEF logos I have provided, or have a professional create branded images and logos that will provide cohesiveness for the initiative.
- Most importantly, be consistent in using whatever name you select.

2) Form an Alameda County Circular Economy for Food Association (ACCEFA)

In order to ensure that the ACCEF model functions in a truly circular way, the County could consider creating a central brain trust that consists of members from all the elements within the circular economy who can grow the overall vision and design a roadmap for how to make that comprehensive, intentional vision a reality, including core values and central goals. This could take the form of an Alameda County Circular Economy for Food Association (ACCEFA). The ACCEFA would be tasked with collaborating on new County policy initiatives, developing and coordinating standards and policies for each component in the system (farming certifications and standards, food producer nutrition and packaging standards, composting collection and processing procedures, etc.), building programs to develop a talent pipeline (farmers, composters, drivers, food entrepreneurs, food preservers, FAM professionals, etc.), and planning for program expansion. Measurable outcomes should be defined for each aspect of the program.

The ACCEFA should be comprised of stakeholders from around the County and should have several sub-committees which are populated primarily by community-level members. Suggested sub-committee focus areas include:

- Urban farming (farmers, composters, etc.)
- Food entrepreneurship and rescue (restaurant owners, food preservers, Meals on Wheels, Food Bank, food retail, marketing professionals, etc.)
- Workforce development (probation staff, drivers, business development bureau, local chambers of commerce)
- Health services (medical staff, AC Public Health, etc.)
- Beneficiaries (especially for FAM and MSM recipients)
- Food waste (StopWaste, composters, etc.)
- Youth (students, recipients, patients, etc.)

Alternatively, research should be conducted to find representative industry organizations for the above sub-committees which could function as leads for each individual component in the system. For instance, the Alameda County Public Health Department’s current “Healthy Retail” monthly meetings could be expanded to cover the
ACCEFA Food entrepreneurship and rescue sub-committee work. However, for simplicity, the remainder of this report will refer to a centralized committee as ACCEFA.
Chapter 1 Food Production

Foundational to any circular economy for food system are the farms and farmers who grow the food people need to lead healthy lives. Dig Deep Farms (DDF), founded by DSAL, grows healthy vegetables in the Alameda County communities of Ashland, Cherryland, and San Leandro. The program currently has the Mason’s farm, an 8-acre piece of land available for farming, with two small farm parcels in the flatlands and one large parcel in the hills of San Leandro. Additionally, Dig Deep Farms has a 500 fruit-tree orchard at City View Farm in addition to vegetable plantings. DDF integrates community involvement, healthy food access, and job creation to raise the quality of life, individually and collectively, of a community. If DDF is to continue to be central to the ACCEF system, it will need to grow by adding additional production capacity, building a pipeline of urban agriculture farming talent, and developing standards for ensuring consistency and sustainability. Rob Bennaton of UCANR has identified 180 potential urban agriculture sites within the Bay Area, the majority of which are in Alameda County.
There are significant benefits to increasing urban and peri-urban (plots of land on the outskirts of urban centers) farming within a community.

**Economic Benefits**

Increasing the number of peri-urban and urban farms:\textsuperscript{13}

- Lowers County healthcare costs
- Creates jobs and business knowledge
- Lowers food costs for community residents
- Increases home values

\textsuperscript{13} Surls et al., “Gearing up to Support Urban Farming in California,” 4.
Physical Health and Well-Being Benefits

Growing produce within a community improves the health of the residents who live within it. The Modified Retail Food Environment Index (mRFEI) measures the number of healthy (supermarkets, larger grocery stores, supercenters, produce stores) and less healthy (fast food restaurants, small grocery stores, convenience stores) sources of food by census tract. It is calculated as a percentage based on the total number of healthy food retailers divided by all food retailers (both healthy and unhealthy). A food desert lacks access to affordable fruits, vegetables, low-fat/non-fat milk or dairy alternatives, whole grains, and other healthy foods. A food swamp has a large number of energy-dense snack food sources. An mRFEI score of zero indicates a food desert – meaning of 100 food retailers, all 100 were unhealthy. A low mRFEI score such as 10 represents a food swamp, meaning out of 100 food retailers, only 10 are healthy. In Alameda County, the mRFEI scores are particularly low for people of color: 7 for African American communities and 8.7 for Latinx communities.

Research on how retail food environments near schools impact adolescent health show that food swamps (low mRFEI scores) in low-income communities are more likely to increase rates of obesity. Conversely, proximity to urban farms and farmers’ markets have been shown to increase:

- Food security and access
- Food source and nutrition literacy
- Consumption of fruits and vegetables
- Mental and physical health

Social Impact Benefits

Community gardens, community-supported farms, and urban farms provide the following positive social impacts:

- Providing opportunities for employment
- Offering youth education and leadership development opportunities
- Transforming blighted spaces into safe, healthy spaces and generating pride of place
- Fostering cross-generational and cultural integration
- Building social capital and enhancing a sense of community
- Providing access to land and outdoor recreation space (particularly important during the COVID-19 pandemic)

Cost-Benefit Analysis

PRODUCTION STORY: Many opportunities if capacity is increased/demonstrated ability to scale up

Current and future capacity:

DDF: 39,387 lb of produce/year or $37,158 revenue

Masonic: 457,380 lb of produce/year or $432,600 revenue

Ardenwood: 1,411,020 lb of produce/year or $1,314,080 revenue

14 “Overweight & Obesity Reports,” 1.
15 California Pan-Ethnic Health Network, “Modified Retail Food Environment Index (Alameda County, 2009).”
16 Cooksey Stowers, Boehm, and Schwartz, “Draining the (Food) Swamp.”
17 Surls et al., “Gearing up to Support Urban Farming in California,” 4.
18 Surls et al., 3.
19 “Farm Projections,” Farm Revenue Projection-Complex Option. Multiplying 762,300 drips (G22) by 6 lb/drip (cells E7-12 * 6lb/drip and H7-H12)
20 “Farm Projections,” Farm Revenue Projection-Complex Option. Multiplying 762,300 drips (G22) by 6 lb/drip (E22 * 6lb/drip and H22)
21 “Farm Projections,” Farm Revenue Projection-Complex Option. Multiplying 762,300 drips (G25) by 6 lb/drip (E26 * 6lb/drip and H26)
Total projected production of 1,907,787 lb from DDF farms if Masonic and Ardenwood added:
$1,810,418

Significant new contracts/programs available
$83,857/month to DDF to serve 6,100 FAM clients/year\textsuperscript{22}
$41,600/month from Kaiser contract to DDF for one hospital region for unprocessed produce\textsuperscript{21}
$800,000/month from Bay Cities Produce for one contract for produce\textsuperscript{24}

Total monthly revenue from DDF produce sales:
$925,457/month or $10.3M/year

**EMPLOYMENT STORY:** Many jobs if capacity is increased.
- Total potential former criminal justice-involved individuals who need employment
  - 1,258 people released per month\textsuperscript{25}
- DDF produce
  - DDF: 8 farmers currently employed
  - Masonic: 7 farmers
  - Ardenwood Farms: 20 FTE farmers needed\textsuperscript{26}
  - Total: 35 farmers

**CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENVIRONMENT STORY:** Regenerative farming cuts GHG and lowers negative health impacts of conventional farming.
- Current health improvements from regenerative farming through cleaner air, water, and soil: $1,237
- Current GHG avoided: 2 tons or $193 (carbon pricing)
- Current soil degradation prevented: $463
- Potential health improvements from regenerative farming through cleaner air, water, and soil: $18,304
- Potential GHG avoided: 15 tons or $2,857 (carbon pricing)
- Potential soil degradation prevented: $6,852

**INVESTMENT STORY:**
TBD costs for launching Ardenwood and Masonic farms

\textsuperscript{22} Using numbers from calculations done on the “Farm Projections,” Earned Income tab spreadsheet in row 37.
\textsuperscript{23} “FSP Pricing 07-10-2020.” Total calculated based on per-unit “Price-High” and total “Usage Monthly avg” on the Produce tab. This section only includes rows 20-33 – unprocessed produce.
\textsuperscript{24} “Bay Cities Order - Coke Farm.” Total calculated based on per-item price and volume for one week of produce purchased from Coke Farm. Based off of “COKE FARM LISTd 7-9-20” pdf file and calculations done on the “Farm Projections,” Earned Income tab spreadsheet in row 38.
\textsuperscript{25} Board of State and Community Corrections, “Supplemental JPS Reporting Dashboard - Smartsheet.Com.” Email from John Lindsay-Poland: That site reports that 4,665 people were released in the three month period from April 5 through July 4, or 1,555 per month. 1,250 of these releases were reported as “related to COVID-19”.
The number of those booked into SRJ is considerably less than before the pandemic, because police are citing many people before booking. Previous year data indicates that approximately 100 people per day (3,000 a month) were booked into SRJ. ACSO reported a couple months ago that, as a result of more citations, about half as many people are being booked into Santa Rita as before. If 1,500 a month are being booked, that would be consistent with the 1,500 releases a month also.
Of course, a large number of these are for short stays. Consistently, about 15% of the population is pre-sentence.
\textsuperscript{26} “Farm Projections,” Farm Revenue Projection-Complex Option. Staff and COGS tab, Column G, for FTE on Ardenwood, calculate 5 seasonal and 15 all year.
Note: All $ benefits expressed in USD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regenerative agriculture on cropland (baseline)</th>
<th>Health benefits</th>
<th>Economic benefits</th>
<th>Env</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[per ha]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current DDF Land using Regenerative Ag (DDF)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Land using Regenerative Ag (Ardenwood)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibiotic resistance</th>
<th>Waterborne diseases</th>
<th>Air pollution from agriculture</th>
<th>Pesticides exposure</th>
<th>Total health benefits</th>
<th>Waste prevented market value</th>
<th>Waste looped N&amp;P value</th>
<th>GHG emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antibiotic resistance</td>
<td>Waterborne diseases</td>
<td>Air pollution from agriculture</td>
<td>Pesticides exposure</td>
<td>Total health benefits</td>
<td>Waste prevented market value</td>
<td>Waste looped N&amp;P value</td>
<td>GHG emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total health benefits: $611
Total economic benefits: $195
GHG emissions: 2
Total economic benefits: $2857
A 1400 Jobs Re-Entry Hiring Initiative was established by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors several years ago with the intent of employing individuals with criminal justice system involvement. The Probation Department and Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency (BOSS) program is available for supporting jobs for the former criminal justice-involved. So far, the county has only placed a few of these workers. The ACCEF is ideally situated as a way to create more of these jobs, but they will not be able to do so if the program runs out of funds.

**Case Studies**

Toronto has planted fruit trees and other food-bearing plants in peoples’ backyards. In 2019, the city redistributed almost 3,500 pounds of fruits and vegetables as of April. ²⁷

The UCANR Gill Tract Community Farm currently produces approximately 22,000 pounds of food annually on 3.5 acres with volunteer labor. ²⁸

**Recommendations**

*COVID-19 Response (urgent)*

3) Augment DDF produce outputs through contracts with existing farm producers in order to scale up quickly

DDF has done a tremendous job fulfilling the short-term needs of many in the community for fresh produce, but if ACCEF is to scale up quickly to meet demand during the COVID-19 pandemic and following, other farm growers will be needed to meet significantly higher demand for food production. As such, the County should consider partnering with existing farmers to quickly increase supply. Rob Bennaton, working with Simon Ma, has identified regenerative farm producers with whom the County could contract in the short (and long) term, including: Sunol AgPark, Pleasanton Farm Project, CoCo San Sustainable Farm, J.E. Perry Farms, Fertile GroundWorks, and/or First Generation Farmers. It is recommended that the County begin discussions with these providers immediately and move quickly to secure purchase contracts with them.

4) Fund and promote the UCANR/UCCE Civic Urban Farmer Pilot Project

Both short- and long-term, the ACCEF will need many skilled farmers to work on DDF and other urban and peri-urban agricultural sites. UCANR/UCCE has developed the Civic Urban Farmer pilot project (including 14 total classes covering compost management, organic waste matter management, pest management, irrigation, cultural competencies, conflict management, leadership development, advocacy/organizing, fundraising, etc.). It needs additional support to get off the ground and would be valuable for training successive groups of justice-involved individuals as they exit the prison system.

- Consider funding all or a portion of the Civic Urban Farmer Pilot Project, which requires $50,000-$80,000 for start-up and pilot costs.
- Work with the Alameda County Probation Department to identify suitable candidates for the program to begin Fall 2020.
- Consider also partnering with the Black Master Gardeners group as program instructors (Frank McPherson has the group’s details).

---

²⁷ “Community Reduce & Reuse Programs.”

²⁸ As per Rob Bennaton discussion with Maryruth Belsey Priebe, June 24, 2020
5) Approve funding and partnership to deploy Junior Master Gardener teaching program as after-school option during the COVID-19 pandemic

For the urban agriculture system to grow, more individuals with expertise in urban farming will need to be fed into the pipeline. Supporting the launch of existing Junior Master Gardener programming in partnership with UCANR/UCCE, OUSD, and other school districts could allow the creation of out-of-school programming for students on off-days during the COVID-19 pandemic. The DDF space as well as existing school garden sites could be used to educate youth about gardening. This could be especially useful job skills training for those living in regions that already support farming.

- OUSD has shown interest in program development for out-of-school time, especially if students are on a staggered schedule.
- Rob Bennaton of UCANR/UCCE is a good contact for talking about both types of programs and where they could be deployed.
- The Junior Master Gardener program has already been developed and has even launched a virtual version of the program. The organization has teacher training and online curriculum for educating existing teachers on this material.
- Life Lab has an outdoor Pajaro Valley classroom already constructed. A partnership with this organization may streamline the process for students nearby.

Post-COVID-19: Policy

6) Resolve zoning issues in order to procure additional urban and peri-urban sites for food production within the County

In order for the ACCEF to thrive, the County should consider exploring opportunities to preserve more prime farmland for growing local produce for the community. Zoning issues and speculation have prevented communities within the county from making this possible. It is recommended that the County work in partnership with the cities and other municipalities to explore possible legislative or ordinance options for protecting more of these spaces.

- The ACCEFA (Urban farming sub-committee) should identify the most promising pieces of land and the zoning restrictions that have prevented their development, and then make recommendations to the County for how to procure those pieces of land.
- Rob Bennaton and the UCANR/UCCE urban agriculture map could provide much of the information needed to make these decisions.
- The County should consider pursuing comprehensive zoning protection that guards prime farmland within Alameda County from further development.
- The City of Fremont’s Policy 2-6.9A: The Protect Fremont Private Open Space Initiative of 2012 could be used as a model for this initiative.

7) Collaborate with municipal governments to create a fruit tree planting program to generate locally grown, backyard produce

The City of Toronto, Ontario has developed a program to plant fruit and vegetable trees in peoples’ backyards and has distributed almost 3,500 pounds of fruits and vegetables as of April 2019.29 Long Beach, California has recently launched a similar program. The ACCEFA (Urban farming sub-committee) could consider developing a similar program in unincorporated regions as well as on County properties. This initiative would create more green spaces.

---

29 “Community Reduce & Reuse Programs.”
to benefit mental health, provide shade to combat climate change and the urban heat island effect, and provide better soil and water retention in communities.

- Trees should be selected in consultation with Alameda County Sustainability and should be drought-tolerant and require little maintenance.
- Families and businesses would apply to have a tree planted on their property (see Long Beach’s application page).
- Recipients could choose from a variety of trees and would sign a waiver of liability and a maintenance agreement (see Appendix C).
- Justice-involved individuals with Master Gardener training could be employed to plant the trees.

8) Survey and designate County buildings for rooftop agriculture

Growing produce on rooftops is not only a useful way to increase local production but can also provide a cooling benefit to the buildings to lower heating and air conditioning expenses.

- The Alameda County Public Works Agency should conduct a survey of County-owned buildings to determine which are most suitable for rooftop agriculture projects.
- Further, funding and other support could be provided to DDF to establish pilot projects on these sites.

9) Promote California AB 551 Chapter 406 to encourage more property owners to lease their land to urban farmers in exchange for tax incentives

Many parcels of land within the County are not being developed because of speculation and as such represent lost opportunities for supporting the ACCEF. AB 551, The Urban Agriculture Incentive Zones Act, encourages property owners to lease their land to urban farmers for 10-year terms by allowing the owners to pay agricultural tax rates for the site for the duration of the lease.

- It is recommended that the County strategically raise awareness of this bill with property owners who hold particularly promising pieces of land to increase urban agriculture in the region.

10) Work with financial institutions to offer de-risked financial tools for farmers to expand their operations

Some urban farmers within Alameda County may be unwilling to expand their operations because of the increased financial risks. Finding ways to support these farmers to increase production of regenerative farming in the region is important for growing the number of suppliers for the ACCEF.

- The ACCEFA (Urban farming sub-committee) could begin by identifying which farmers are interested in expanding operations but have failed to do so because of financial risk.
- The ACCEFA could identify financial partners interested in increasing urban agriculture and work with them to create new de-risked loan opportunities for the identified farmers.

11) Pass a County Good Food Purchasing ordinance that supports the sourcing of circular food products/supplies through incentives and other inducements

In addition to increasing the production of regeneratively-grown produce in the region, a thriving ACCEF requires bigger markets for these urban agriculture goods. The Anchors in Action Alliance, for instance, has brought together 850 hospitals, 7,800 schools, 100 colleges and universities, and 28 public institutions from 14 cities that have a combined food purchasing power in the hundreds of millions of dollars. Through their Center for Good Food
Purchasing, developed in part with Healthcare Without Harm (HWH) and the Real Food Challenge, they are working together to develop sustainable and equitable purchasing policies. HWH is working on a similar initiative in the Bay Area through their Anchors in Resilient Communities program. The ACCEFA (Urban farming sub-committee) should focus on several initiatives for developing procurement streams for urban farm products. The first would be a County purchasing ordinance for all County buildings and operations, as well as all ACCEF partners.

- As per Aileen Suzara’s report, it is recommended that the County adopt and implement a Good Food Purchasing Plan ordinance based on recommendations from The Good Food Purchasing Program, which uses a metric-based, flexible framework to encourage large institutions to prioritize purchases from DDF and other local food producers, and direct buying power to support “transparent and equitable food systems.”
- This Good Food Purchasing Plan should apply to County-wide operations (all locations in which food is prepared or served (e.g. congregant feeding (Seniors), Jails/Prisons, etc.)) as well as to food and meal preparers for the food distribution system.
- The ordinance should define standards that must be met by urban farmers in order to be considered one of the ACCEF partners, and should cover local economy, sustainability, health, labor practices, nutrition, and animal welfare, as well as specific criteria for vendors/farmers. See Simon Ma’s report which outlines a scoring system that could be used.
- The ordinance would define minimum percentages of food to be purchased from DDFs and other urban farm partners (as certified by the sustainability standard chosen by the ACCEFA), with percentages increasing over time until a significant percentage is sourced from local regenerative urban agriculture sites.
- Use the Sustainable Food Purchasing Policy (Appendix B) and the Good Food Purchasing Plan models as guides.
- Work with Healthcare Without Harm (see their Value Chain Assessment report for details on possible partnership).

12) Work with the ACCEF to lobby the USDA for increased reimbursement rates for school meals using the Good Food Purchasing Plan as a guide

A key challenge for the ACCEF Good Food Purchasing Plan is the budget provided by USDA for institutional procurement of food, which is extremely small and insufficient to support regenerative agriculture and good paying jobs for farmers and drivers. In order to support the Good Food Purchasing ordinance in County schools, budgets will need to be increased.

- The Board is encouraged to work with the ACCEF to lobby the USDA for increased reimbursement rates for school meals in particular.

Post-COVID-19: Programmatic

13) Direct staff to do the research and identify most promising parcels of land and budgets required to prepare them for urban agriculture production

The DSAL model for expansion of DDF urban agriculture production is to find the most promising parcels of land that can be acquired at no cost and then remediate and equip them as necessary. However, research is required to make these determinations, as well as coordination between various departments within the County.

---

30 “Anchors in Action.”
It is recommended that the Board direct the County Treasurer, County Assessor, and General Services Agency, as appropriate, to 1) research potential parcels of land (in particular tax-defaulted properties), and 2) develop a procurement plan for each parcel of land.

ACCEFA (Urban farming sub-committee) to work with DDF to determine costs for remediation and equipment, plus create a timeline for implementation for each parcel.

14) Develop a strategic plan for increasing the availability of locally-grown, regenerative agriculture produce

There are many potential sites within Alameda County that could be used to grow more produce for the ACCEF. Several obstacles stand in the way of this being possible: zoning issues and funding for site purchase or lease. The ACCEFA Urban farming sub-committee should create a 10-year plan for increasing the County’s ability to grow produce in urban and peri-urban settings with the following elements:

- This work should be done by or in close consultation with Rob Bennaton, UCANR/UCCE
- Set a goal for total tonnage of food to be produced in urban and peri-urban agriculture.
- Set a goal for the number of Dig Deep Farms to be established to meet the food tonnage goal.
- Consult with UCANR/UCCE to identify the top site possibilities that are both safe (non-contaminated) and that have the greatest tractability in terms of zoning issues for urban and peri-urban areas. Rob Bennaton has developed a map that identifies the sites with food-producing capabilities.
- Resolve zoning issues for these sites and/or secure purchase or long-term lease agreements.
- Create a timeline for procuring and converting the land into agriculture production.
- Secure the funding and permissions to develop these agricultural plots.
- As per Aileen Suzara’s recommendations, identify small, preferred pools of growers or working with aggregator.
- Seek partnerships with adjoining counties – namely Contra Costa and San Joaquin – for purchasing food grown in their regions where irrigation is less of a limiting factor.

15) Create a Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) program to build off FAM bag delivery success

With the infrastructure already set up to take FAM orders and deliver food bags to participants, creating a CSA structure for anyone in the public to benefit from receiving regeneratively-grown produce would improve program returns with little extra effort.

- ACCEFA (Urban farming sub-committee) should work with DDF personnel to develop this program.
- The ACCEF mobile app should also include functionality for people to purchase FAM food bags.

16) Formalize and set a standard for urban farmers to be used on all Dig Deep Farms and other partner urban farms

There are many sustainability standards and certifications available for these farms. The ACCEFA (Urban farming sub-committee) should select one and move forward with it to streamline the County’s ability to identify which existing farms can be participants in the program and to begin encouraging existing farms to convert to the chosen standard. The following are some options:

- UCANR’s Community Food Production (CFP) Self-Certification Checklist (see Appendix A): The ACCEFA finds this useful for micro urban farms that would like to supply produce to the Food Hub or the Food Bank and should be considered a stepping stone to more stringent standards should the farm grow larger.
- Regenerative Organic Certificate (as identified in ALL IN’s Priority Tiers 1.27.20 doc): Developed by the Regenerative Organic Alliance, this standard calls for high thresholds with regards to soil health, animal
welfare, and social fairness and could be considered for all larger DDF and partner urban and peri-urban farms.

- More research could be done on other possible certification or standards systems.

17) Implement expanded and improved urban farming recommendations of the ARC Value Chain Assessment

The ARC team has offered their expertise and learning to aid in the development of a regional food system. The organization has laid out these recommendations in their “Anchors in Resilient Communities - Regional Food System Project Value Chain Assessment” report. Within that report, they have identified several next steps which could be incorporated into the ACCEFA (Urban farming sub-committee) planning:

- Implementing cost-saving measures at urban farms, such as how to reduce food waste and use all parts and pieces; how to seek markets for ‘seconds’ products; how to communicate local purchasing efforts and impacts to the consumer; and smoothing out supply chain logistics.
- Using logistics technology and third-party logistics providers, including backhauling.
- Adopting GroupGAP audit programs and other farmer collaboration strategies.
- The ARC team has suggested several ways the ACCEF could use their research and education and partnership coordination expertise, including on the development of policies and processes, procurement strategies, distributor and aggregator capacity building, and strategies for farmer and/or distributor and aggregator capacity building.

Post-COVID-19: Workforce

18) Launch an ACCEF jobs training initiative within the County jail system

Building the pipeline of individuals ready to take on work within the circular food economy will be important to supporting the local food system and for channeling individuals into employment once they leave the system. The ACCEFA (Workforce development sub-committee) should therefore build on the 1400 Jobs Re-Entry Hiring Initiative established by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors to create a plan for implementing and promoting new training programs for individuals in the Santa Rita jail to prepare them for exit. Potential programs could include the following:

- Work with Rob Bennaton and the American Horticultural Therapy Association to develop agriculture skills (this therapy-focused program could also inform the former criminal justice-involved Master Gardener training program). Additionally, UCANR’s Civic Urban Farmer and Master Food Preserver programming could be adapted for use within the jail system for incarcerated individuals to learn farming skills before release from jail.
- Partner with Inmates to Entrepreneurs to use their Virtual Training course to provide inmates with entrepreneurial skills.

19) Support the provision of multi-language Civic Urban Farmer teaching materials and instructors

For many within the low-income or former criminal justice-involved sectors of the community, English is not a native language. In fact, 46.4% of Alameda County residents speak a non-English language, with 30.6% identifying as Asian (non-Hispanic) and 11.9% Hispanic. The County of Alameda benefits greatly from the services of those who are fluent in languages other than English, including those who are formerly justice-involved and looking for opportunities in farming, composting, or food preparation. To support the growth of urban farmers in the region, it

---

31 Anthony, “Alameda Food Bank Sees 10x Demand amid COVID-19 Crisis.”
is recommended that the County fund the translation of Civic Urban Farmer and Master Preservationist teaching materials into other languages and hire multi-lingual instructors to lead the program.

Post-COVID-19: Funding

20) Work with the City of Oakland on their Measure W to appropriate for job training

Measure W imposes a vacant property tax beginning July 2, 2020 and is expected to generate between $6.5 and $10.5 million revenue annually.32 Some of these funds have been designated for “Job training, apprenticeship, pre-apprenticeship, drug treatment, and job readiness assistance programs” for “homeless people or those at risk of becoming homeless.”33 Consider working with the City of Oakland to use some of those funds for training former criminal justice-involved as Master Gardeners or Master Preservers.

32 “OAK Measure W - Vacant Property Tax.”
33 City of Oakland Measure W: City Attorney’s Ballot Title and Summary of Measure W, OMW 8.
Chapter 2 Food Aggregation

The benefits of having urban agriculture within Alameda County will not be felt unless County residents can access the foods these urban farms generate. The Food Hub is a central point within the ACCEF, serving as a place to sort produce before it’s delivered to DDF and FAM clients, the location for re-packing rescued food before it is delivered, a space for incubating local food entrepreneurs, and a place for receiving and prepping prepared meals before sending them out into the community. Though the Food Hub only opened in early 2020, it is already running beyond capacity. More space and staff are needed to build upon the early successes of this program, and therefore it is recommended that several steps be taken to strengthen and expand this component of the ACCEF, which will not only create more local jobs, but also employ food entrepreneurs, farmers, and more within this circular economy.
Cost-Benefit Analysis

FOOD HUB PREPPED FOOD STORY: Institutional partners have been identified and contract discussions have begun but additional farm production capacity and staffing are needed.
Total current revenue from prepped produce:
$0

Revenue generated through new contracts
$4,885/month ($58,620/year) revenue for Kaiser processed foods contract

EMPLOYMENT STORY: The first Food Hub is supporting 7 jobs, but is at full capacity both in terms of space and staffing. Additional Food Hubs and Farmacists are needed to meet food insecurity demands and future institutional partner contract requirements.
- Total potential former criminal justice-involved individuals who need employment
  - 1,258 people released per month
- Food Hub Farmacists
  - 7 Farmacists/clinic for supporting prepped produce, DDF produce, FAM/MSM/prepared meal coordination or 119 for all 10 clinics
- 3 incubated businesses/Food Hub or 51 for all 17 municipalities

INVESTMENT STORY: An investment in hiring formerly justice-involved individuals accrues many benefits to the county, but also provide crucial administrative support to helping grow the ACCEF through increased Food Hub capacity.
- $59,800/Farmacists ($23/hour + 24% benefits) or $418,600/Food Hub or $4.19M for all Food Hubs (1 per clinic)
- $3M/clinic to build new or $51M for all 17 Food Hubs
- $12,000/refrigerated container + purchase/lease of new Food Hub space

Recommendations

COVID-19 Response (urgent)

21) Research and fund the (short-term) expansion of the Food Hub to one in each municipality

Perhaps the biggest limiting factor for distributing all the available food (produce grown, food products produced, restaurant meals created) within the ACCEF at the time of this writing is the storage space needed and the administrative staff to run the expansion of the program. The DDF Food Hub is functioning at full capacity in terms

34 “FSP Pricing 07-10-2020.” Total calculated based on per-unit “Price-High” and total “Usage Monthly avg” on the Produce tab. This section only includes rows 2-11 – processed produce.
35 Board of State and Community Corrections, “Supplemental JPS Reporting Dashboard - Smartsheet.Com.” Email from John Lindsay-Poland: That site reports that 4,665 people were released in the three-month period from April 5 through July 4, or 1,555 per month. 1,250 of these releases were reported as “related to COVID-19.”

The number of those booked into SRJ is considerably less than before the pandemic, because police are citing many people before booking. Previous year data indicates that approximately 100 people per day (3,000 a month) were booked into SRJ. ACSO reported a couple months ago that, as a result of more citations, about half as many people are being booked into Santa Rita as before. If 1,500 a month are being booked, that would be consistent with the 1,500 releases a month also.

Of course, a large number of these are for short stays. Consistently, about 15% of the population is pre-sentence.

Sheriff confirmed 1258 released per month who will require re-entry services.
36 “DSALfoodhubProforma HOT COPY,” Kitchen&Event Income tab. See row 170 for “Farmacists Needed/food hub” numbers
37 “DSALfoodhubProforma HOT COPY,” Kitchen&Event Income tab. See row 170 for “Farmacists Needed/food hub” numbers
of storage and sorting space, which has resulted in lower quantities of food rescued or meals and produce delivered. Additionally, more administrative support is needed to ramp up processing of more food through the system – more staff is required for processing, sorting, re-packaging, storing, and tracking of the various types of food, and operations personnel with Lean and Six Sigma skills are needed to develop efficient routes and processes for the intake and distribution of the various streams of food coming in and out of the Food Hubs. As such, in the short term, the ALL IN and DSAL need additional support from the county for finding interim space and personnel.

- The ACCEFA (Urban farming sub-committee) should form a partnership with the GSA to conduct research for the purchases of finding new space (potentially space that is currently unutilized because of COVID-19) in which the ACCEF programming can take place in the short term.
- Site selection should be based on rates of unemployment as well as food and transportation insecurity.
- Funds should be made available for renting or leasing selected, underutilized space. Revenue leveraged from the recovery and delivery contracts could be used to offset the costs of renting or leasing space. Alternatively, the county should consider supporting the establishment of new Food Hubs through below-market rental rate agreements.
- Funds are also required to hire additional administrative personnel to manage the processes within the Food Hub.

Post-COVID-19 Programmatic

22) Assess current county and community assets that could be repurposed or collaboratively schedule for meal product in each municipality

Residents are in urgent need of food aid – both raw produce from farms like DDF and prepared meals from our local food entrepreneurs. However, additional food preparation and sorting space is required to make this possible in response to the COVID-19 increased food insecurity.

- It is recommended that the Board direct appropriate County personnel to do a rapid assessment of underutilized kitchen assets that could be repurposed during the pandemic for food preparation and storage.
- The Board should consider also directing County personnel to research kitchen spaces that are currently used only during some hours of the day and work with other stakeholders to develop a schedule to maximize use of such properties. This kind of arrangement is something that could potentially continue after the pandemic crisis has passed as a way to permanently expand Food Hubs throughout the County.

23) Develop and fund a plan for increasing the number of Food Hubs throughout the County

The Food Hub has already proven to be an invaluable place for coordinating many aspects of the ACCEF’s food distribution, but it is already beyond capacity. There is significantly more food that could be recovered if Food Hubs were available in all municipalities. Additionally, FAM and MSM programs will require additional space in order to meet the goals of expanding the FAM clinics to 9-10 in the next three years. Plus, many more jobs for the former criminal justice-involved could be created in each of these Food Hubs.

- The ACCEF (Food entrepreneurship and rescue sub-committee) should create a plan for how many new Food Hubs will be developed over what time period.
- Site selections for future Food Hubs should be based on rates of unemployment as well as food and transportation insecurity.
- The Board should fund the expansion of this program to take advantage of all the food distribution opportunities throughout the county.
24) Facilitate the employment of former criminal justice-involved individuals as Food Hub support staff

Many people are released from the justice system every day – approximately 100 per day at the time of this writing. There were 4,665 people released in the three-month period from April 5 through July 4, 2020 or 1,555 per month, with 1,250 of these releases reported as “related to COVID-19.” While many of those released were on short stays in the jail system, many are not. Regardless, a large percentage of those released are in need of employment. Likewise, additional support staff are required in the Food Hub to handle the larger volumes of food being processed through the facility. It is recommended that the County therefore facilitate the hiring of more probated individuals.

- Goal for 7 Farmacists in each of 17 Food Hubs (one in each municipality and unincorporated region) for a total of 119 Farmacists

Investments in vans and drivers should be conducted in a phased manner, with resources being allocated to areas where the immediate need is greatest and most tractable.

25) Work with healthcare anchor institutions to provide health insurance for all staff within ACCEF

Building a virtuous cycle that improves the health of people living within Alameda County should consider also including programs that support the health of all the workers within the ACCEF. Healthcare Without Harm (HWH) has been consulting with several healthcare systems in the regions and has developed some thinking around this concept. They could lead in this initiative in conjunction with the ACCEFA Workforce sub-committee.

26) Develop a program for expanding the Healthy Corner Store model through Food Hubs to make regeneratively-grown produce available to the community

Healthy corner store initiatives are under way throughout the country. In Philadelphia, for instance, The Food Trust is working with 350 participating healthy corner stores, with 60 stores currently providing not only more nutritious foods, but also in-store nutrition counseling. The HOPE Collaborative’s Healthy Corner Store and a similar project through Mandela Partners have been developed (now merged into one program managed by Jenny Wang in Alameda County Public Health) to create more healthy corner stores. The Three Amigos Deli in Oakland received $10,000 in funding through the HOPE Collaborative to conduct renovations that would enable the selling of healthy sandwiches and salads. These programs should be expanded through existing and future Food Hubs to 1) create more retail outlets for locally-grown DDF and urban agriculture partner produce, and 2) increase the accessibility of healthy foods (both raw produce from DDFs and prepared meals) in food desert communities, possibly by providing retail space within existing and new Food Hubs. This program could include the following elements:

- Facilitated contracts between local prepared meal producers and store owners (including the FAM nutritional labeling in Recommendation #

- Each Food Hub or healthy corner store should apply for its own FNS number in order to accept CalFresh benefits.
- Incentives such as seed grants or low-interest loans for converting existing small grocers or establishing Healthy Corner Stores. Incentives may cover tenant improvement funds, small grants, and tax breaks.
- Connections with low-interest financing for purchasing necessary equipment to store and display healthier foods.
- Consulting and technical assistance to store owners to increase visibility and attractiveness of healthy food displays, improve marketing, and develop business plans.

38 Board of State and Community Corrections, “Supplemental JPS Reporting Dashboard - Smartsheet.Com.”
39 “Healthy Corner Store Initiative, Pennsylvania and New Jersey.”
40 “Healthy Corner Store Project.”
• Incentives to small grocers for receiving residential compost materials in exchange for Dig Deep Farms coupons which can be used for future FAM purchases (see Recommendation #Error! Reference source not found.).
• All program elements could also be applied to establish innovative retail food vendors such as mobile vendors, farmers’ markets, community-supported agriculture, vending machines, and co-operatives.
• Any non-Food Hub healthy corner stores should abide by the Good Food Purchasing Policy created by the ACCEFA (see Recommendation #11).

27) Improve transportation to Healthy Corner Stores and Farmers’ Markets

Having healthy produce available in former food deserts is important, but if the grocers are not conveniently located to enough residents, it will be difficult to increase the consumption of healthy foods in the community. To overcome this challenge, it’s important to ensure public transit routes connect neighborhoods to these healthy food sources.

• It is recommended that Housing and Community Development work with local transportation and public transportation authorities to analyze current routes to health retail and build in new connections if necessary.

Post-COVID-19 Workforce

28) Implement workforce development recommendations of the ARC Workforce Assessment

The ARC team has offered their expertise and learning to aid in the development of a regional food system. The organization has laid out these recommendations in their “Anchors in Resilient Communities Regional Food System Project Workforce Assessment” report. Within that report, they have identified several next steps which could be incorporated into the ACCEFA (Workforce development sub-committee) planning:

• Support connectivity between workforce, food business, and transportation decisionmakers to attract investment in infrastructure that will catalyze workers’ access to quality jobs, as well as business profitability.
• Document the entry points that offer workers pathways to higher-wage, secure careers in the food sector and share that information with K-12 schools, community colleges, technical training programs, and business incubators in the East Bay.
• Identify organizations that provide training for food sector workforce, document employers’ needs, and match employers with training resources.
• Raise and/or leverage funds to support the expansion of training programs to help food sector employers onboard and retain workers hired from the communities of Oakland and Richmond.
• Support the development of quality jobs in the food chain by encouraging institutional buyers to prioritize labor standards in their purchasing policies and internal practices.
• Support the development of an outreach campaign to increase awareness of job opportunities with high-road employers in the food processing and institutional food service sectors.
• Identify job and career opportunities currently unfulfilled within Anchor partners (i.e. food workers in universities or healthcare facilities).
• Use the report’s recommendations for working with East Bay Anchor Institutions in setting an example, ACCEF procurement policies, and workforce investments.

Additional ways the ARC team could play a role in the ACCEF workforce through research and education as well as stakeholder coordination:
• Highlight exemplary employers with values-aligned labor practices to drive others in the industry to improve job quality, especially for front-line workers.
• Analyze and map the career pathways that exist in the food processing and institutional food service sectors, particularly in the East Bay, to highlight ways that workers can enter career-pathway jobs in food more effectively and/or move to such positions from restaurant food service jobs.
• Document and connect the network of support organizations that is poised to support, educate, and train the workforce to enter and progress through career-pathway jobs in the food system.
• Identify barriers to unionization in the food sector and coordinate action to protect existing unions.
• Document best practices from national and statewide case studies of groups fostering improved workforce opportunities in the food system, especially in institutional food service and food processing.

See the full brief for details.
Chapter 3 Food Processing

Major anchor institutions are looking to increase locally-sourced, sustainable prepped foods. The Food Hub is an ideal space in which to convert DDF produce into chopped, sliced, and diced prepped foods for use in hospitals, schools, and other local institutions. This could be a valuable way to support the growth of local urban agriculture as well as jobs for the former criminal justice-involved through the 1400 Jobs Re-Entry Hiring Initiative established by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors.

Additionally, many residents of Alameda County are elderly, medically vulnerable, or unable to wait in line at a typical distribution center – challenges which have only been exacerbated during the 2020 pandemic. Through the new DSAL Food Hub and ALL IN, a prepared meal project was launched in under a month to put 16 out-of-work food entrepreneurs and their staff to work preparing meals for community members (some using the Food Hub), helping to keep businesses alive, with 150+ additional restaurants ready to aid in growing the program. DSAL and ALL IN also have a vision for keeping and expanding this kind of program beyond the pandemic to include medically-supportive meals (MSMs) that would improve the health of thousands of Alameda County residents (see Chapter on Food Distribution). To support all these ACCEF efforts, additional food processing space plus new vans and drivers are urgently needed.
Cost-Benefit Analysis

EMERGENCY FOOD AID REDIRECTED GROCERY SPENDING STORY: Both recipients and County save monthly

Monthly savings per family receiving 5 meals monthly:
People served and savings (personal and County):
2258[^41] families who received ~5 meals/bag served with prepared meals or 11,290 total meals in July 2020

Personal savings:
$16.50/5 meals avoided grocery costs recirculated within the community ($3.30/meal)^[42]
$33,000/10,000 meals/month avoided grocery costs recirculated

County savings:
$1.53/5 meals – sales tax revenue (state, county, municipality) on redistribution of grocery spending to consumer goods^[43]
$3,052.50/10,000 meals/month – sales tax revenue (state, county, municipality) on redistribution of grocery spending to consumer goods

Total current personal & County savings:
$36,052.50/month

Total current revenue from prepared meals:
$150,000/month (10,000 meals/month @ $15 each)

EMERGENCY PREPARED MEAL & MSM REDIRECTED GROCERY SPENDING STORY: Food insecure families receive much-needed free, healthy prepared meals produced by local food entrepreneurs during the COVID-19 pandemic. These same food entrepreneurs are redirected to producing medically-supportive meals (MSMs, see Recommendation #48) paid for by EBT funds after the pandemic.

People served and savings (personal and County):
38,386[^44] families served with 191,930 emergency meals if scaled to all 17 municipalities & unincorporated regions
$633,369 – avoided grocery costs recirculated within the community ($3.30/meal)^[45]
$58,587 – sales tax revenue (state, county, municipality) on redistribution of grocery spending to consumer goods^[46]
$691,956 combined grocery savings and tax revenue

Revenue generated through renewed emergency meal aid contracts
$2,878,950/month generated business to 166 food entrepreneurs from scaling emergency food aid to all 17 municipalities (191,930 @ $15/meal)

Capacity/performance (Jan to June scaling up):

[^41]: “DSAL by the Numbers (Was Attendance & Data Report),” COVID Monthly Report tab. 2258 families received prepared meals with 5 meals/bag or 11,290 total meals in July, 2020 = 38,386 families served with 191,930 meals
[https://www.acgov.org/about/cities.htm & http://www.acgov.org/uninc/](https://www.acgov.org/about/cities.htm & http://www.acgov.org/uninc/) Assuming similar volumes can be processed in all 17 Municipalities and Unincorporated regions of Alameda, including: Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Newark, Oakland, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, Union City, West County, Castro Valley, Eden, Fairview.
[^42]: “The Cost of Living in California.” Article notes an average food cost in California of $3573 annually; this was divided by 12 months to get a monthly cost of $297.75 or $3.30/meal and then multiplied by 10 meals/month = $33.
[^43]: “Consumer Expenditures for the San Francisco Area.” Calculated using a 9.25% sales combined tax rate.
[^44]: “DSAL by the Numbers (Was Attendance & Data Report),” COVID Monthly Report tab. 2258 families received prepared meals with 5 meals/bag or 11,290 total meals in July, 2020 = 38,386 families served with 191,930 meals
[^45]: “The Cost of Living in California.” Article notes an average food cost in California of $3573 annually; this was divided by 12 months to get a monthly cost of $297.75 or $3.30/meal and then multiplied by 343,637 total meals recovered to get total for County.
[^46]: “Consumer Expenditures for the San Francisco Area.” Calculated using a 9.25% sales combined tax rate – multiplied by the grocery savings.
- Emergency food aid meal deliveries increased from 0 meals prepared/month in March to 9,000 meals/month in July
- 166 food entrepreneurs signed up to provide emergency meals but only 16 could be contracted

Revenue generated through new MSM contracts
$288,860/month generated of business to 166 food entrepreneurs from 25% of 6,100 patients/year MSM patients (1,875 patients from all 10 clinics purchasing 37,500 meals/month combined) each purchasing 20 meals/month ($300/month/patient @ $15 each) circulating within the County

EMPLOYMENT STORY: Providing prepared meal contracts to local food entrepreneurs during COVID-19 keeps businesses open and people employed.

- 192 food entrepreneurs + 1 employee each contracted during shelter-in-place to deliver 191,930 meals/month to food-insecure folks
- 37 food entrepreneurs + 1 employee each based on 37,500 MSM meals/month

INVESTMENT STORY: Funding is being sought from philanthropic funders to extend the emergency prepared meal initiative in Alameda County, but additional funding is required to prevent the program from ending.

- Some portion of $15/meal for 191,930 meals each month

Local preserved food production

Transforming locally-grown fruits and vegetables into shelf-stable products for the community is another aspect of ACCEF’s system. For many crops, more food is created in a season than can be consumed in a short timeframe, making food preservation through canning, freezing, and jarring an important way to keep the circular economy supplied over the entire year. Additionally, food production is already a strong industry in many of the unincorporated regions of Alameda County, proving interest and capability in this sector. As a great source for jobs, the County should consider looking for ways to support the expansion of the preserved food production businesses through a variety of policies and programs.

Recommendations

Post-COVID-19 Policy

29) Pursue a policy for industrially zoned land to be designated for food processing

Increasing the quantity of preserved foods sourced from local farms will require space and business support for new food entrepreneurial ventures. The County should consider supporting the designation of industrially zoned land to be used for food processing (including packing and wholesaling facilities). Policy should include plans for infrastructure upgrades to increase productivity and innovation.

30) Develop a cooperatively owned food processing facility for creating whole, preserved or packaged foods

Ideally, locally-grown produce could be sold to consumers in an unprocessed form, but converting some of it into shelf-stable options would support the food production in larger facilities and residential homes. The ACCEF should

---

47 “DSAL by the Numbers (Was Attendance & Data Report),” COVID Monthly Report tab. See “# Prepared Meals Delivered” row
48 A DSAL report states, “In addition to employing eight people directly, the program also helps participating food vendors keep their staff employed during the COVID crisis, with approximately 50 jobs preserved to date as a direct result of these grants.” I estimated one food entrepreneur and one employee to service one contract.
include facilities that take the whole foods grown on local regenerative farms and turn them into canned, frozen, jarred, or bagged foods for sale at the Health Corner Stores and sold to anchor institutions such as hospitals and schools (see ARC Technical Assistance Advisors).

31) Streamline regulatory system for establishing new food businesses

The ACCEF will need new food processing businesses to be established in the near term to support the growth in urban agriculture. Therefore the County should consider developing a policy for streamlining food production, processing, and distribution business development by improving the permitting, location, and expansion of these facilities.

Post-COVID-19 Programmatic

32) Facilitate the establishment of procurement agreements for prepped and preserved food producers

To ensure food preservers (especially those working at scale in the cooperatively owned food processing facility (see Recommendation #30) to turn regeneratively-grown produce into canned, jarred, or frozen prepped foods) have markets for their products, the ACCEF (Food entrepreneurship and rescue sub-committee) should work with County operations as well as partners identified by the Anchors in Resilient Communities Food System Project to secure purchase agreements for the products produced by food preservers (see Recommendation #11). However, there is tremendous potential to sell prepped DDF produce to Alameda County institutional partners identified by Healthcare Without Harm. DSAL is already cultivating several promising contracts that would support current DDF production and allow for rapid expansion of prepped foods from local, regenerative agriculture. In particular, a contract with only one Kaiser region could offer ~$45,000/month revenue, scaling up FAM deliveries to full capacity could generate $256,000/month, and a single Bay Cities Produce contract ~$1.5 million/month revenue. These are only a small portion of the available sustainable food contracts. According to a Healthcare Without Harm report analyzing the overall purchasing budget for sustainable food in the East Bay from hospitals (five in all), two K-12 school districts, and the UC Campuses, the total was $19,015,708 in 2013-14.

- Board members are encouraged to use their influence to help establish long-term contracts with institutional clients. The Food Systems Map created by Anchors in Resilient Communities provides a listing of the anchor institutions which could be included in a procurement strategy (see ARC Food System Maps and ARC Potential Institutional Vendors as resources and the Healthcare Without Harm Value Chain Assessment report for ways HWH could assist with this process).

Post-COVID-19 Workforce

33) Support ACCEF jobs training initiative with Master Preservationist training within the County jail and for the former criminal justice-involved

As with the Civic Urban Farmer training and in conjunction with the 1400 Jobs Re-Entry Hiring Initiative established by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors, Master Preservationist training could be provided to inmates as a way to build the pipeline of individuals ready to take on work within the circular food economy once they leave the system. The ACCEF (Workforce development sub-committee) should therefore create a plan for implementing and promoting new training programs for individuals in the Santa Rita jail to prepare them for exit. Potential programs could include the following:

- Provide funding for former criminal justice-involved individuals to take the Master Preservationist training through UCANR/UCCE.

---

49 Healthcare Without Harm, “Leveraging Institutional Purchasing Power to Support Sustainable Food Systems and Healthy Communities.”
• Provide funding for former criminal justice-involved individuals to take the Food Entrepreneurial Training Academy training.
• Adaptation of the Master Preservationist training materials for use in the jail system.
• Partner with Inmates to Entrepreneurs to use their Virtual Training course to provide inmates with entrepreneurial skills.

34) Support the provision of multi-language Master Preservationist teaching materials and instructors

Many within the low-income or former criminal justice-involved sectors of the community do not have English as their native language. To support the growth of food preservation in the region, it is recommended that the County fund the translation of Master Preservationist teaching materials into other languages and hire multilingual instructors to lead the program.

35) Approve funding and partnership to deploy Master Preservationist teaching programs as after-school options (potential for COVID-19 programming)

Supporting the launch and adaptation for youth of the Master Preservationist programming in partnership with UCANR/UCCE, OUSD, and other school districts could allow the creation of out-of-school programming (potential to also adapt this for students during COVID-19 pandemic staggered schedules for students). The DDF Food Hub could be used for educating students on the preservation of foods. This could be especially useful job skills training for those living in regions that already support food production and may also be useful for after-school programming during the COVID-19 pandemic.

• Adapt UCANR/UCCE has a UC Master Food Preserver program.
• OUSD has shown interest in program development for out-of-school time.
• Rob Bennaton of UCANR/UCCE is a good contact for talking about this program.

Local prepared meal production

Since March of 2020, when the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic drastically increased food insecurity throughout the community, especially for the medically vulnerable, Dig Deep Farms was able to secure $500,000 in grants to provide emergency pickups and deliveries of prepared meals (over 13,300 meals have been delivered since March 2020), produce and food staples (over 13,800 bags delivered or picked up since March) and over 1100 Food as RX prescription produce bags to Alameda County residents. The program supported 14 food businesses run by entrepreneurs of color to stay afloat during the pandemic by contracting with them to provide these emergency prepared meals at the Food Hub. This has helped to preserve approximately 50 jobs in the local food economy.

Interviews were conducted (full transcripts and summary here) with several of these food businesses to evaluate the prepared meal program and develop recommendations for moving forward. The following are the key takeaways from those interviews:

• The prepared meal contracts have been a significant source of revenue for many of the food entrepreneurs and in many cases have meant the difference between some keeping staff and putting all staff on furlough.
  o Nevertheless, most have had to furlough some of their staff members, and many are concerned about rental costs (some have had to pay only partial rent, thereby accruing rental debt to landlords).
  o All interviewees would be happy to receive additional contracts and none required minimums, though most suggested that more than 1,000 meals/month per contract would be appreciated. Many stated they could handle much more.
All interviewees were open to adapting meal offerings to fit within specific nutritional guidelines such as those required for medically-supportive meals (MSMs).

Some interviewees requested ample time from contract award to delivery in order to properly prepare food stocks, staff, and scheduling.

- The word-of-mouth advertising these food entrepreneurs have received as a result of labeling applied to prepared meals has helped them see substantial increase in support from community members in terms of orders and words of encouragement.
- Meal ordering systems such as GrubHub and DoorDash have become a necessity for most but allow no room for profit.
  - Some have developed their own online order systems.
  - Some have been conducting deliveries on their own using personal or company vehicles.
- These food entrepreneurs are creative and have worked hard to adapt their business models to work within County shelter-in-place restrictions, including how to structure in-person meal service, health and safety procedures in their kitchens, as well as the types of services offered.
- Nearly 100% of all food entrepreneurs interviewed have taken advantage of federal PPP funding which has now been exhausted.
- Several of the interviewees made use of the Food Hub for preparing their meals or for storing the finished meals, which was essential to the successful delivery of their contract.

Following are some quotes from the food entrepreneur interviewees:

“I really enjoyed the satisfaction of helping the community. When I went to deliver I saw the lines of cars and the first thing I did when I came back I told my staff to hold their heads high - a lot of people in the community are benefiting from the work we’re doing. That was the best thing about this. We’re not just seeing a bunch of executives in a corporate meeting.” ~Bryan Roy (Eriksdelicafe.com)

“It gave us exposure to a lot of people that didn’t know about us - another audience and the people are contacting us now for our food.” ~Jose Ramirez (massmeals.co)

“It was rewarding because it was a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to help the community. Plus, people personally reached out on social media to thank me and some of them would come into the kiosk.” ~Rene Lontoc (https://www.thankquegrill.com/)

“It was money when we needed it the most - in the beginning before we could turn our business around from catering large gatherings (which were canceled) to change to meal delivery service. That bridge was really helpful. And the idea of feeding people in situations that were difficult also went a long way - getting up every morning with purpose in a crisis is depressing, so having a way to give back and help yourself at the same time was meaningful.” ~Dawn Deardorf (http://www.AuroraCateringBayArea.com)

“Definitely a life saver for me this month.” ~Neeru Brar (http://Countrywaffleshayward.com)

“I don’t have a minimum requirement - every meal counts. It helped immensely to have this contract.” ~Jorge Espinosa (http://ElTaquitoRestaurant.com)
**Recommendations**

**COVID-19 Response (urgent)**

36) Fund the continuation and expansion of the meal preparation and distribution program for low-income families

As already mentioned (see Recommendation #44), the COVID-19 crisis and shelter-in-place orders are creating severe economic stress and making it more challenging than ever for economically disadvantaged communities to access healthy, affordable food. Many food entrepreneurs have seen significant dips in sales and need new contracts to keep their businesses alive through the crisis. While DSAL and ALL IN had procured philanthropic funds to launch this program, funds will run out at the end of July 2020, so the system is not sustainable over time. Additional support and funding is required to keep businesses operational.

- The program has been funded to this point by philanthropic monies, and additional donations are being requested from organizations like the Stupski Foundation.
- Along with other philanthropic partners, the Board should consider funding the continuation of this program. Specifically, funding is required to purchase prepared meals from local food vendors at a rate of 3,000 meals/week at a cost of $15/meal ($180,000/month).

**Post-COVID-19 Policy**

37) Introduce an ordinance to limit the number of fast food restaurants in low-access, low-income communities

In order to support the expansion of healthy food options within Alameda County communities, the balance between healthy and unhealthy food businesses in the region needs to favor those that offer plant-based, nutritionally dense meals. It is recommended that the County consider the following:

- Introduce an ordinance to limit the number of fast food restaurants in low-access, low-income unincorporated communities to achieve a higher mRFEI score (better balance between healthy and unhealthy food sources – see Chapter 0).\(^50\)
- Require fast food menu labeling in unincorporated communities for nutrition purposes – indicate those foods with high fat or high calories.\(^51\)

**Post-COVID-19 Programmatic**

38) Facilitate the establishment of procurement agreements for local, small business prepped and preserved food producers

To ensure the development of markets for DDF prepped foods, the ACCEFA (Food entrepreneurship and rescue sub-committee) should work with County operations as well as partners identified by the Anchors in Resilient Communities Food System Project to secure purchase agreements for the products produced in the Food Hub. The Food Systems Map created by Healthcare Without Harm (HWH) Anchors in Resilient Communities report provides a listing of the anchor institutions which could be included in a procurement strategy (see [ARC Food System Maps](#) as a resource and the Healthcare Without Harm [Value Chain Assessment](#) report for ways HWH could assist with this process).

\(^{50}\) Babey and Diamant, “Designed for Disease: The Link Between Local Food Environments and Obesity and Diabetes.”
39) Develop written ingredient and basic nutrition standards for meal preparers aligned with USDA school nutrition standards

The values of the circular economy in Alameda County should be instilled in all food partners, including the emphasis on nutritionally dense meals, produce sourced from regenerative DDF farms and other regenerative urban agriculture producers, and seasonality of ingredients. To ensure these ACCEF philosophies are encouraged with all program participants, the ACCEFA (Health services sub-committee) should develop written standards for basic nutritional requirements for all meals prepared within the ACCEF.

- Nutrition standards should be aligned with USDA school nutrition standards to simplify and make it possible for program expansion to a variety of audiences.
- All food entrepreneurs who provide prepared meals should adhere to the Good Food Purchasing standards (see Recommendation #11).
- Working with the Alameda Public Health Department and All IN’s team lead by Dr. Chen, the ACCEFA (Health services sub-committee) should create minimum nutrition standards for every meal to ensure they are balanced and limit negative ingredients and preparation methods. These standards should be accompanied by training and tools for measuring finished meal nutritional composition.
- The ACCEFA (Food entrepreneurship and rescue sub-committee) should set standards for plant-based meals, with increasing percentages required for all prepared meals over time.
- The ACCEFA should also set recommendations for using seasonal ingredients appropriate for Alameda County to encourage the use of locally-grown, sustainable produce.

40) Develop written food packaging standards for participating ACCEF food entrepreneurs

A healthy ACCEF is one that not only protects human health, but also environmental health. Food packaged in disposable containers will detract from the health gains made in other parts of the ACCEF and should be avoided through an ACCEFA (Food waste sub-committee) program that sets standards for the types of packaging required for all prepared meals.

- Work with StopWaste to develop a set of standards for preferred packaging types. See Appendix D: Sample Zero Waste Agreement for Food Entrepreneurs for a model set of standards.
- Set minimum requirements for meal preparers with increasing percentages of preferred packaging used over time.
- Work with packaging vendors to secure preferred pricing for the types of packaging required for the ACCEF system.

Post-COVID-19 Workforce

41) Facilitate ACCEF food preparation jobs training for former criminal justice-involved individuals

Building the pipeline of individuals (through the 1400 Jobs Re-Entry Hiring Initiative established by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors and the Probation Department and Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency (BOSS) program) who have the food preparation and entrepreneurial skills to work within the ACCEF will be important to expanding the system. The ACCEFA (Workforce development sub-committee) should therefore create a plan for implementing and promoting new training programs for individuals in the Santa Rita jail to prepare them for exit and work within the Food Hub and as food entrepreneurs.

- Partner with or create a program modeled after existing chef and food safety programs to train inmates on best practices for working in the DDF Food Hub and as food entrepreneurs within the ACCEF. A potential program partner or model is Bridges of America which provides 1,000 hours of culinary training
over six months as well as Serv-Safe® Food Handler training (see also ARC Food Safety Compliance Resources).

- Adapt the Food Entrepreneurial Training Academy training for incarcerated individuals.
- Partner with Inmates to Entrepreneurs to use their Virtual Training course to provide inmates with entrepreneurial skills.

42) Work with financial institutions to offer de-risked financial tools for food processors to establish or expand their operations

New food processing businesses – especially ones that can produce processed foods at the scales necessary for institutional partners – must overcome significant financial hurdles to become established or to expand. Finding ways to support these entrepreneurs to increase production of canned, jarred, or frozen foods in the region is important for growing the number of suppliers for the ACCEF.

- The ACCEFA (Food entrepreneurship and rescue sub-committee) could begin by identifying which food processors are interested in establishing or expanding operations but have failed to do so because of financial risk.
- The ACCEFA could identify financial partners interested in increasing locally produced foods and work with them to create new de-risked loan opportunities for the identified farmers.

43) Work with the HOPE Collaborative to expand their Healthy Corner Store Chef Challenge.52

HOPE Collaborative’s Healthy Corner Store Chef Challenge could be expanded to spur interest in locally produced foods and identify promising food entrepreneurs who could make use of the Food Hub for becoming meal preparation partners.

---

52 “Healthy Corner Store Chef Challenge.”
Chapter 4 Food Distribution & Consumption

It’s one thing to create the beneficial foods that people need to live healthy lives, but if those with food insecurities and diet-related health challenges cannot get the good food they need, neither the County nor its residents will benefit from the work already being done by DSAL and ALL IN. The distribution component of the ACCEF will enable that Alameda County residents can actually consume and benefit from the foods created by DDFs and local food entrepreneurs.

Cost-Benefit Analysis

JUSTICE COSTS REDIRECTED STORY: The County could reduce expenditures and recidivism through intentionally creating workforce opportunities for formerly CJ-involved populations. Annual County savings for employing one former criminal justice-involved individual and preventing their recidivism:
$103,072 – total incarceration costs per inmate (average 1,800 inmates at any given time)$53
$418.10 – sales tax revenue on earned wages (state, county, municipality)$54
$729 cost per domestic violence 911 (deputy) call (domestic violence rates are up to 10x higher by former criminal justice-involved men and their partners than general population)$55
Total potential county savings for full employment: $104,219.10 per full-year employed individual or $21,469,114 if all 206 people employed full time for a year

Annual personal savings: $886.70 – excess doctor and pharmaceutical expenses avoided$56

Total savings County & Personal: $105,105.80

EMPLOYMENT STORY: There are more people released from jail than we have jobs – more positions are needed. This is especially true during COVID where non-violent offenders are experiencing early release in an effort to reduce the spread of COVID. The food system is in dire need of human capital to ensure it runs efficiently and effectively to meet high demand due to the economic impact of COVID.

# employed
- Total potential former criminal justice-involved individuals who need employment
  - 1,258 people released per month$57
- Food rescue, DDF food bags, prepared meals
  - 6 drivers per Food Hub for Food rescue, MSM meals, FAM CSA bags$58 = 102 drivers all municipalities$59
  - 11 FAM bag drivers to cover all 10 clinics
  - TOTAL: 113 drivers for full capacity

---

$53 Email received from Dave Brown July 14, 2020 with numbers from sheriff and undersheriff: “$103,072. That’s because the $228/day is based on 2300 inmates. We’re down to 1857 so it’s $282/day. According to the Undersheriff, there would need to be a much bigger drop in the number of inmates to achieve some sort of economy of scale for savings.”

$54 “Consumer Expenditures for the San Francisco Area.” Calculated total 11.3% distribution of average annual expenditures for sales taxable items for San Francisco metropolitan area residents by adding Alcoholic beverages (1%), Apparel and services (2.6%), Entertainment (4.1%), Personal care products and services (1.2%), Reading (0.2%), Tobacco products and smoking supplies (0.1%), and Miscellaneous (2.1%) from Table 1. Total annual sales tax revenue calculated based on $40,000 wages working as a Dig Deep driver at a 9.25% sales tax rate.

$55 “DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IN ALAMEDA COUNTY: Community Assessment Planning and Evaluation Unit (CAPE),” 28. Since 2014, there have been ~6,000 domestic violence related 911 calls in Alameda County annually, or 500 per month. In 2020, the S&E B cost per deputy for FY 20-21 is $243,000 (information from Sheriff’s office; with 60 deputies on patrol responding to calls, the deputy-related cost for all call types for the County is $1,215,000/month. One-third of all deputy calls are related to domestic violence, or $364,500/month in deputy-related costs. If divided by 500 DV-related calls/month, that means it costs the County $729 per DV call.

$56 Linn, Sandifer, and Stein, “Effects of Unemployment on Mental and Physical Health.,” 504. From Table 3: Calculated 4.7 excess doctor visits and 1.7 additional instances of medication use. Fay, “How Much A Doctor Visit Will Costs You - Blue Book Prices.” Averaged the cost of a ‘Office Visit, New Patient, Level 1’ cost of $68 with ‘Office Visit, Established Patient, Level 5’ cost of $234 to get $151 per doctor visit. Using this cost with the 4.7 excess doctor visits from Linn, Sandifer, and Stein article, calculated $709.70 per unemployed person. “Prescription Drugs.” Average drug expenditures for all adults is $177 annually.

$57 Board of State and Community Corrections, “Supplemental JPS Reporting Dashboard - Smartsheet.Com.” Email from John Lindsay-Poland: That site reports that 4,665 people were released in the three-month period from April 5 through July 4, or 1,555 per month. 1,250 of these releases were reported as “related to COVID-19.” The number of those booked into SRI is considerably less than before the pandemic, because police are citing many people before booking. Previous year data indicates that approximately 100 people per day (3,000 a month) were booked into SRI. ACSO reported a couple months ago that, as a result of more citations, about half as many people are being booked into Santa Rita as before. If 1,500 a month are being booked, that would be consistent with the 1,500 releases a month also.

Of course, a large number of these are for short stays. Consistently, about 15% of the population is pre-sentence.

Sheriff confirmed 1258 released per month who will require re-entry services.

$58 “DSAlfoodhubProforma HOT COPY,” Kitchen&Event Income tab. See row 168, various columns

$59 https://www.acgov.org/about/cities.htm & http://www.acgov.org/uninc/

Assuming similar volumes can be processed in all 17 Municipalities and Unincorporated regions of Alameda, including: Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Newark, Oakland, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, Union City, West County, Castro Valley, Eden, Fairview
- DDF institutional clients
  - 3 drivers
- School meals
  - 186 drivers needed for delivering 1,932,200 meals/month served to 48,305 students or 96,610 meals/day
- Total driver positions: 206

Capacity/performance (Jan to June scaling up):
- FAM prescription deliveries increased 408% to 605 recipients/month
- Rescued food deliveries increased 2655% to 5319 people served/month

HEALTHCARE SPENDING REDIRECTED STORY: ??
Healthcare savings for 16% improvement in every recipient of Medically-Supported Foods intervention:
- $2,168 – diabetes (Medicaid)
- $4,000 - behavioral health expenditures (annual Medicaid; $1,462,400,000 for the County)
- $25 – obesity (Alameda County allocated spending)
- $7 – disease-associated malnutrition (state-level direct medical costs)
Subtotal: $6200

Disease-related annual productivity losses recouped by every recipient of Medically-Supportive Meals intervention:
- $2,632 - diabetes

---

60 “DSALfoodhubProforma HOT COPY,” Kitchen&Event Income tab. See row 168, E column
62 “DSALfoodhubProforma HOT COPY,” Kitchen&Event Income tab. See cell C161 & C165 for calculations of lb/van for school deliveries
63 “DSAL by the Numbers (Was Attendance & Data Report),” COVID Monthly Report tab. Increased from 119 in Jan to 605 in June: 605-119/119 = 408% increase
64 Includes group medical visits which improve consistency and adherence, while building connectivity and reducing social isolation
65 California Food is Medicine Coalition (CalFIMC), “Medi-Cal Medically Tailored Meals (MTM) Pilot Program Fact Sheet.” Assuming a 16% cost reduction in average annual healthcare expenses per person for all following calculations due to medically-tailored meal intervention.
66 Ng, “Medical Expenditures Associated With Diabetes Among Adult Medicaid Enrollees in Eight States,” Table 2: Estimated Per Capita Mean and Excess Annual Total Medical Expenditures Among Adult Medicaid Enrollees Aged 19–64 Years by Disability-Based Eligibility and Diabetes Status, 8 States, 2012.
67 Conduit Healthy Communities Institute, “Healthy Alameda County.” Site notes that 13.8% of Alameda County Medicare Population were treated for depression in 2017.
68 Chawla, Cox, and Coffin, “Medi-Cal Enrollment Trends,” 3, 9. Presentation notes that there are 13.1 million Medi-Cal enrollees in California (page 3) and 365,600 enrollees in Alameda County (page 9). If 13.8% of the population is treated for depression, that equals 50,453 people.
69 “Behavioral Health in the Medicaid Program—People, Use, and Expenditures,” 111. Report notes that individuals on Medicaid with a behavioral health diagnosis had $4,000 more annual total expenditures compared to those without a behavioral health diagnosis; the increased expenditure is much higher for dually enrolled Medicaid/Medi-Cal recipients. At the $4,000/year rate for 365,600 enrollees in Alameda County, that’s an annual expense of $1,462,400,000.
70 “U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts.” Page notes 1,671,329 population in Alameda County, 20.3% of whom are under 18 years of age or 339,280 individuals and 79.7% over 18 years of age or 1,332,049 people.
71 “The Health and Economic Impacts of Obesity in Alameda County,” 2. Article notes a $134.7 million cost for obesity-related healthcare, and $2.04 billion in lost productivity. 54.6% of AC 1,332,049 adults are obese or 727,299 adults; 34.7% of 339,280 AC children are obese or 117,730 children
72 Goates et al., “Economic Burden of Disease-Associated Malnutrition at the State Level,” Table 1 for California. Estimated state level burden of direct medical spending on disease-associated malnutrition in California is $44 on average ($397 for people 65+ years). This was used to calculate 16% savings through medically-tailored meals.
73 “The Cost of Diabetes | ADA.” Page notes $90 billion in reduced productivity in the US.
74 “Statistics About Diabetes | ADA.” Page notes that 34.2 million Americans have diabetes – a number used in combination with $90 billion in lost productivity to calculate a cost of $2632 in lost productivity per person in the US.
$1,531 – obesity
Subtotal: $4,163

Total potential county savings for medically-supportive meal distribution:
6100 of 42,950 Alameda County residents who receive CalFresh and are diabetic
$37,820,000 County healthcare-related savings if all recipients saw a 16% improvement (6100*6200)
$25,394,300 productivity losses recouped if all recipients saw a 16% improvement (6100*4163)
$63,214,300 total savings reinvested

Total savings (healthcare-related and productivity)
$445,090,850 if all recipients saw a 16% improvement

INVESTMENT STORY: very little to deliver a lot of food to many people
Clinic expansion
$80,000/clinic/year for OSW * 10 clinics = $800,000/year
Drivers
$10,384,872 for 206 drivers required (wages/benefits)

Food Distribution

Every food program within the ACCEF – FAM food bags, rescued meals, and MSM prepared meals – should have a delivery component added to it in order to serve those who are unable to come to a Food Hub to pick up food. This is especially important for many residents of Alameda County who are elderly, medically vulnerable, or unable to wait in line at a typical distribution site, and will be a huge source of jobs for the former criminal justice-involved. Additionally, several programs should be put in place to respond to the tremendous need for food during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The challenge of finding employment for the justice-involved is a significant one around the country:

- 600,000 people released annually; 60-75% of former criminal justice-involved remain unemployed for up to a year after they are released in America.
- Only 12.5% of employers are willing to hire the formerly criminal justice-involved according to the Bureau of Justice.
- 5 million former criminal justice-involved in the US; unemployment rate for former criminal justice-involved is 27% compared to the national rate of 5.8% in 2007.

75 “U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts.” Page notes 1,671,329 population in Alameda County, 20.3% of whom are under 18 years of age or 339,280 individuals and 79.7% over 18 years of age or 1,332,049 people.
76 “The Health and Economic Impacts of Obesity in Alameda County,” 2. Article notes a $134.7 million cost for obesity-related healthcare, and $2.04 billion in lost productivity. 54.6% of AC 1,332,049 adults are obese or 727,299 adults; 34.7% of 339,280 AC children are obese or 117,730 children.
77 “CalFresh Data Dashboard,” Filtered for Alameda County, May 2020 Quick Facts. In May 2020, the total persons receiving CalFresh in Alameda was 134,219.
78 Nicholas, “Can Food Stamps Help to Reduce Medicare Spending on Diabetes?” This article indicates that 32% of Food Stamp recipients are diabetic (2006). Using that percentage and the number of CalFresh persons in Alameda County (134,219), I calculated 42,950 persons who are both food insecure and diabetic.
79 “Food as Rx Budget Spreadsheet,” Brute Force Food Calculations Farmacy tab. “Total Unduplicated Patients Served cell = 6098 people
80 “DSALfoodhubProforma HOT COPY,” Kitchen&Event Income tab. See row 168, various columns
81 “Reentry and Employment for the Former criminal justice-involved and the Role of American Trades Unions.”
82 “The Challenges of Prisoner Re-Entry Into Society - Blog.”
83 “Out of Prison & Out of Work.”
There are also thousands of justice-involved individuals within the County, many of whom have a hard time finding work. Unemployment rates among the former criminal justice-involved are high, and when that’s the case, there are tremendous knock-on costs for the County. Recidivism is the largest expense to the county that grows out of unemployment in this segment of the population, but there are many other costs for these individuals:

Personal costs of unemployment:
- Loss of earning
- Increased debt
- Rise in relative poverty level
- Potential homelessness
- Loss of skills and poorer future employment prospects
- Erosion of mental health
- Increase in stress and stress-related health issues, leading to 5x more trips to doctor and 2x more medication use, which costs the individual $709.70 more for doctor visits and an additional $177 for medications annually

County costs of unemployment:
- Increased borrowing because of fallen tax revenue
- Lower GDP
- Increased social problems (crime, vandalism)
- Political instability

Finally, the social costs of unemployment extend to the family members of those with justice involvement – women in particular experience higher levels of domestic violence when unemployment rates are high. During the Great Recession, when unemployment rates increased by 50%, the prevalence of intimate-partner violence increased 10-12%. Rates of intimate-partner violence are often 10-fold greater in former criminal justice-involved men and their partners than the general population.

Yet the financial gains the County could achieve from keeping more justice-involved individuals employed is significant:
- Former criminal justice-involved employees have higher retention rates which can save companies (county?) $4000 per person because of lower turnover and potential higher levels of effort (due to poor employment prospects). May see turnover rates between 12-14% lower than otherwise.
- People are twice as likely to avoid recidivism two years after release if they are employed.

---

84 Linn, Sandifer, and Stein, "Effects of Unemployment on Mental and Physical Health.,” 504. From Table 3: Calculated 4.7 excess doctor visits and 1.7 additional instances of medication use.
85 Fay, “How Much A Doctor Visit Will Costs You - Blue Book Prices.” Averaged the cost of a ‘Office Visit, New Patient, Level 1’ cost of $68 with ‘Office Visit, Established Patient, Level 5’ cost of $234 to get $151 per doctor visit. Using this cost with the 4.7 excess doctor visits from Linn, Sandifer, and Stein article, calculated $709.70 per unemployed person.
86 “Prescription Drugs.”
87 Pettinger, “Economic Costs of Unemployment."
88 Schneider, Harknett, and McLanahan, “Intimate Partner Violence in the Great Recession."
89 Williams et al., “Partner Violence after Reentry from Prison,” 1.
91 Trone and Kim, 8.
92 “Full Article: Reentry and the Ties That Bind: An Examination of Social Ties, Employment, and Recidivism.”
• Reduces homelessness through employment – reduces taxpayer costs for shelters and social services. Those who were homeless prior to incarceration are five times more likely to be homeless after release than those who were not.93
• DC Central Kitchen hires ex-offenders to deliver 6,000 meals to shelters, transitional homes, senior centers, after-school programs, and halfway houses. They receive training, with 100 graduates entering the hospitality industry every year when complete. The program has saved Washington, D.C. $2.4 million in incarceration costs every year.94

There are several ways the ACCEF can create jobs, some of which have already been discussed (see Recommendations 4), 18), 33), 35), 28), 41)), and all of which will see the same gains discussed in this cost-benefit analysis. But the distribution side of the ACCEF holds the greatest potential for job creation.

Case Studies

• Massachusetts estimates they lose $20 million in tax revenue every year because of barriers to employment faced by those with criminal histories.95
• A study of Philadelphia’s prison system showed that if just 100 fewer individuals avoided recidivism, it would save the city $2,045,000 annually in correctional costs. Researchers recommended they focus on education for these individuals and connect them into occupations most likely to hire people with their skills and histories.96
• The Pew Research Center found that if recidivism was reduced by 10% in 41 states, it would result in $635 million annual savings as well in reductions in crime. Researchers recommended that states begin preparing for release at time of prison admission in part through tailored programming.97

Recommendations

COVID-19 Response (urgent)

The COVID-19 crisis and shelter-in-place orders are also creating severe economic stress and making it more challenging than ever for economically disadvantaged communities to access healthy, affordable food. Thousands of people have lost their jobs, and schools that provide kids with at least one healthy meal a day are no longer in session, making access to food a daunting societal challenge. DSAL and ALL IN have been working with a network of partners and funders to put a system into place through the Food Hub that has delivered food to over 2,000 families every week. Partnering with East Bay Paratransit, the program has employed drivers who could otherwise be unemployed to transport bags of fresh produce, food bank food, and meals prepared by restaurants and caterers who would otherwise be shuttered.

While this is an important accomplishment, it only addresses short-term needs for a limited number of beneficiaries, and funds will run out at the end of July 2020, so the system is not sustainable over time. Additional support and funding is required to keep businesses operational, drivers working, and people fed. Several initiatives will support the continuation of this work.

---

93 Metraux and Culhane, “Homeless Shelter Use and Reincarceration Following Prison Release.”
94 Krell, “Criminal Background.”
44) Redeployment of 190 County vehicles and hire 190 drivers to support the delivery of emergency prepared meals and school breakfasts and lunches during the COVID-19 pandemic

Currently there is more food available within the ACCEF than there are vans and drivers that can pick up and redistribute it. According to DSAL staff, the two vans currently owned by the County for food recovery and delivery spend most of every day making home deliveries of food, leaving much of the recovered food that could be rescued to waste. As a result, the program now has to limit delivery to any given family to two weeks out of three, on a rotating basis. Each week, about 300 of the 974 families on the delivery list are asked to come pick up their food instead.

Additionally, DSAL drivers could potentially be hired to deliver 1,932,200 meals/month to four local unified school districts to fulfill the promise of the 1400 Jobs Re-Entry Hiring Initiative established by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors. However, DSAL cannot bid on these contracts without the vans and drivers needed to deliver the food to clients. Given the intensification of food insecurity during the COVID-19 pandemic, the County should consider supporting the ability for increased redistribution capacity by purchasing new vans and hiring new drivers.

- The County should consider directing the County General Services Agency (GSA) to assess County vehicle assets to determine which 190 underutilized vehicles could be repurposed during the COVID-19 crisis as delivery vehicles for food aid, and work with DDF and ALL IN to make those vehicles available.

- Drivers will need to be hired to handle deliveries, and for this it is recommended that the County work with DSAL and the BOSS program to hire formerly justice-involved individuals as drivers, with a goal to hire 190 drivers at a cost of $4201/month per driver.

Post-COVID-19 Workforce

45) Purchase or repurpose 206 vans and hire 206 drivers to support the expansion of food rescue, FAM food bag deliveries, and MSM prepared meals delivery

A robust and intentional hiring program for the former criminal justice-involved is a proven way to prevent recidivism and keep people living more stable, healthier lives.

The long-term success of many components of the ACCEF depends on having drivers who can distribute food throughout the County. The Board should therefore consider accessing funds from the 1400 Jobs Re-Entry Hiring Initiative established previously to do the following:

- Set medium and longer-term goals for expansion of both vans and drivers each year to meet expected demand increase.
- Goal for 206 vans redirected or purchased at a cost of approximately $56,000 per van.
- Goal to hire 206 drivers at a cost of $50,412/year per driver.

46) Expand Ban the Box Law to all businesses in Alameda County

When Minneapolis banned the box, 50% of job seekers with criminal convictions were hired for public employment in the first year. Alameda County has passed a Ban the Box Law that prohibits any agency of the County from asking job candidates about their criminal histories until the last step of the interview process. It is recommended that the Board expand this ordinance to cover all businesses in order to encourage additional hiring of former criminal justice-involved individuals.

---

98 "DSALfoodhubProforma HOT COPY," Kitchen&Event Income tab. Numbers based on driver totals from columns B and G.
100 "California – Alameda County Ban the Box Law | Cornell Project for Records Assistance.”
Consumption of Healthy Distributed Food

The modern food system is not serving our communities well – healthy food is expensive, and affordable food creates health burdens that increase medical expenses for those with the least to spend on them. In a Canadian study of 2,731 5th-grade students, researchers calculated the actual difference in cost for foods of various qualities. Using the Harvard Youth Adolescent Food Frequency Questionnaire, they examined the correlation between diet quality and food costs to determine each child’s Diet Quality Index-International (DQI). Comparing costs of 147 food items, they showed that for every one-unit increase in DQI, the costs of a diet cost increased by $0.07 per day. In other words, to afford diets that meet healthy quantities of fruits, vegetables, meats, and protein alternatives, families must spend $1.92 more per day compared to diets that do not meet recommendations for healthy foods.101 Multiply this by several other individuals in the family for an entire month, and the costs for healthy food increase substantially.

Resultantly, when money is scarce, families often opt for less nutritious foods. This is evident in the research: More than 50% of all SNAP subsidies are used for foods high in saturated fats, sugars, and sodium, and only 23.9% goes to fruits, vegetables, nuts, seeds, grains, and spices.102 Not surprisingly, as Figure 2 shows, those with Medi-Cal coverage experience higher rates of avoidable hospitalizations when compared to the uninsured or those with employer-based or private plans,103 adding a lot to the County’s budget. For a circular economy for food to be truly beneficial for those living within its sphere, the healthy foods must be both affordable and accessible.

Optimizing the food distribution system is therefore imperative, and two programs developed by ALL IN Alameda County – Food As Medicine and Medically-Supportive Meals – are already making this possible, but they need expansion for others in the County to feel the benefits as well.

---

102 “Make Food Stamps Healthy.”
Food As Medicine

The ACCEF has tremendous benefits for community health, and ALL IN and DSAL have done tremendous work on developing the Food As Medicine (FAM) program. This 16-week program, which is ‘prescribed’ by doctors to those with risk factors such as diabetes, hypertension, or obesity, combines bundles of fresh, whole produce grown regeneratively at DDF with group medical visits that include nutrition training, cooking lessons and guidance, plus community-building and behavioral support. As Figure 3 shows, these types of programs are already seeing results, with lower hospital admissions, emergency department (ED) visits, and primary care physician (PCP) visits.

Medically-Supportive Meals (MSM)

Medically-supportive meals, an expansion of ALL IN’s Food As Medicine intervention, is in development, and will center on prepared meals made accordingly to unique nutritional needs based on health diagnoses. Research shows that MSM improve health outcomes, increase patient satisfaction, and lower the costs of healthcare. According to a New England Journal of Medicine report, when low-income diabetic patients receive weekly healthy food and 15 diabetes management classes, they saw a decrease in medical costs and a 40% reduction in the risk of death or serious complications, as well as lower A1c levels compared to patients who received only medication interventions.104

ALL IN has plans to expand the FAM model by also offering MSM as part of the FAM prescription program. AB 3118 – “Medically supportive food” had an Assembly Committee on Appropriations hearing scheduled for June 2, 2020, and was a request for three-year funding to evaluate the MSM pilot with 250 program participants and make recommendations for expansion (AB 3118 supporting documents). The Bill specifically outlines a program for approving MSM meals as a covered benefit, which can be paid for by EBT funds - food assistance that is placed on an EBT card (similar to a bank card) and may be used to purchase allowable food items at participating retailers. Applicants apply through counties, and eligible households can receive up to $194 a month per household member on an EBT card. In order to be eligible, households must generally earn less than 200 percent of the FPL. If approved, this will make it much easier for low-income Alameda County residents with diet-related health conditions to purchase meals that improve their health with EBT funds. The recommendations that follow support this effort, though Dr. Chen’s team (in coordination with the ACCEFA Health services sub-committee) will have much more detailed program expansion information.

Recommendations

Post-COVID-19 Programmatic

47) Expand number of FAM clinics

The Food As Medicine program has already been piloted at two clinics, and the team plans to expand the program to 9-10 clinics over the next three years. The FAM programs are a key component of the ACCEF and so the ACCEFA should make it a priority to support the expansion of the FAM clinics according to ALL IN’S expansion plan.

- Dr. Chen’s program, through the ACCEFA (Health services sub-committee) should be fully involved in the program and ensure that all FAM clinic publications harmonize with the ACCEFA branding and messaging in order for the community to see the benefits of the system as a whole.
- FAM recipients should be involved in the expansion program in order to ensure cultural appropriateness in each community.
- Since it is not as simple as making healthy food accessible, the Board should consider making funding available to support all aspects of the program, including (especially) the behavioral modification aspects to aid in accountability and adherence to the program.

48) Develop ACCEFA medically supportive meal ingredients, nutritional requirements, and labeling

Working with the Alameda County Public Health Department and Dr. Chen’s team, the ACCEFA (Health services sub-committee) should develop nutritional requirements for MSM meals. This will facilitate the contracting of MSM meal preparation to local food entrepreneurs within set nutritional guidelines (see Recommendation #48).

- Nutritional requirements may need to be differentiated by disease type (obesity, hypertension, diabetes, etc.).
- MSM requirements should adhere to the Good Food Purchasing Plan standards (see Recommendation #11) and ingredients including plant-based minimums (see Recommendation #38).
- MSM food preparers should be given the tools and training needed to accurately calculate the nutrition of their finished meals.
- A system for periodic testing of meals should be developed to ensure adherence to nutritional requirements.

49) Market MSM to wider community with diet-related health conditions to support food entrepreneurs

Once a system is in place for standardized nutritional requirements tailored to each condition for prepared meals, the ACCEF could market the MSM as doctor-approved options for anyone with a diet-related condition. This could significantly increase revenue for local food entrepreneurs and would improve the health of many thousands more within the County.

- The ACCEFA (Food entrepreneurship and rescue sub-committee) should develop a strategic marketing campaign to advertise MSM meals, particularly in the anchor institutions identified by Healthcare Without Harm (see Recommendation 38).
- The mobile app (see Recommendation 59) should be available for use by the public, with conventional payment options (not just using EBT funds).

50) Explore a blended model between the ACCEF and Meals on Wheels

Meals on Wheels is already delivering food aid to low-income seniors, with nutrition standards that may be in alignment with those the ACCEF would adopt. There may be overlaps in people receiving food aid from both Meals on Wheels and the DSAL/ALL IN emergency food delivery system. Long-term, there may also be overlaps between
Meals on Wheels recipients and FAM or MSM recipients. Working with Meals on Wheels, the ACCEFA (Health services sub-committee) should be able to develop a blended model to provide the most efficient services to those in the community who fall into both service areas.

- DSAL/ALL IN should begin discussions with Meals on Wheels to determine where there may be opportunities for collaboration.
- DSAL could also work with Meals on Wheels to potentially provide drivers for their regular clients.

51) Set research goals for measuring FAM and MSM health indicators

The Alameda County Food Bank and Dr. Chen’s team have developed several research projects to test the efficacy of FAM and other nutritional interventions for diet-related diseases. The ACCEFA (Health services sub-committee) should work with these teams to develop research goals for FAM and MSM health indicators along with a plan for reaching those goals.

**Post-COVID-19 Workforce**

52) Select and pilot the preparation of MSM meals through local food entrepreneurs

The ACCEF has already proven its ability to provide prepared meal distribution through the emergency food distribution program developed in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. As the prepared meal distribution arm of the ACCEF expands, the ACCEFA (Health services sub-committee) can draw on the growing pool of food entrepreneurs experienced in meal preparation to prepare MSM.

- Select several vendors for the pilot program from the existing prepared meal pool based on their focus on healthy meals, adherence to the Good Food Purchasing Policy (see Recommendation #11), and the ACCEF food packaging standards (see Recommendation #40).
- Use the ACCEF MSM nutritional requirements and labeling standards for all prepared meals (see Recommendation #48).

53) Develop a plan for redirecting the meal prep model to medically-supportive meal prep post-pandemic

In a very short period of time, ALL IN and DSAL were able to stand up a meal preparation program for food distribution to low-income families during the COVID-19 pandemic using the talents of local food entrepreneurs. Strict criteria were used to select program participants. Vendors in the meal preparation program are ranked based on:

- Nutritional value/fresh ingredients;
- Quantity of meals they can produce per week;
- Ability to transport meals to Food Hub;
- Ability to produce individually wrapped meals that can be flash frozen;
- Level of impact from COVID (ie. completely closed, somewhat operational, fully operational);
- Possession of a Food Handlers Certificate.

Highest ranking vendor applicants were chosen based on the variety/ethnic appropriateness of their food, their geographic proximity to the unincorporated area, and their standing with the Alameda County Environmental Health Department. DSAL worked with the Eden Area Chamber of Commerce to rank and select vendors, adding additional vendors as funding became available. Additionally, steps were taken to source the ingredients from local agricultural partners who were chosen based on their commitment to local production, fair wages, and clean, regenerative agricultural practices that produce nutrient-dense medical-grade greens and produce.
Most of these vendors already have a focus on health and provided meals to the agreed-upon standards. When asked if they could adhere to strict nutritional standards as might be required in medically-supportive meal (MSM) preparation, most suggested enthusiastically that they would be very interested in continuing in such a program, citing the emotional benefits of assisting those with health problems as a significant motivator for participation.

As such, this presents a tremendous opportunity to capitalize on the organization and talent already cultivated to start up a medically-supportive prepared-meal service to augment the existing work being done by FAM clinics.

- The ACCEFA (Health services sub-committee), led by All IN and Dr. Chen, should fast-track the development of nutritional standards for MSM (see Recommendation 48). The Board of Supervisors should consider supporting the work to complete the nutritional standard research with research staff and other funding.
- The ACCEFA should develop an implementation plan to roll out the MSM program to the FAM clinics. The Board should also consider planning to fund this program.

54) Create a system for FAM practitioners to make house calls and offer services

To date, there has been some program development for providing complementary health services within the FAM clinics, including acupuncturists and nutrition counselors. Dr. Chen’s team would like to expand the program offerings to support those with FAM prescriptions through other health modalities, which would improve patient outcomes and employ health practitioners within the community. These health practitioners could be deployed in conjunction with food distribution or make house calls separately as determined by each individual physician. The ACCEFA (Health services sub-committee) should work with Dr. Chen’s team to set out goals for the following:

- Adding additional modalities to the ACCEFA health system.
- Planning for the mobile deployment of these practitioners to recipients of FAM and MSM food deliveries.
- All advertising for practitioners working with the ACCEF system should coordinate with the ACCEF branding and messaging in order to raise awareness of the total program within the community.

Post-COVID-19 Funding

55) Research Targeted Case Management (TCM) as possible funding source for Deputy referrals into FAM

The TCM program may providing funding for the administrative work of Sheriff’s Deputies referring people into the FAM program. More research required (Alex Briscoe may also be a source of information for this initiative).

56) Research School-Based Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (SMAA) and County-Based Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (CMAA) programs for possible funding options

Alex Briscoe has indicated that the CMAA and SMAA programs could also potentially be used to cover Sheriff’s Deputies’ referrals into the FAM program. More research required.

57) Research possible use of SNAP-Ed funding or programming for FAM clinic trainings and/or new community-level educational programming

SNAP Education (SNAP-Ed) is available for teaching people how to shop for and cook healthy meals. The program could be a source of tools and funding for augmenting the FAM educational programming. More research required (Alex Briscoe may also be a source of information for this initiative).
58) Research Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program for possible funding options

The SSA’s [SSI program](#) may offer additional sources of revenue that could be used for FAM clinics and meal delivery. More research required (Alex Briscoe may also be a source of information for this initiative).

**Technology Tool for Distribution Coordination**

Not only does the ACCEF need an efficient distribution system with sufficient vehicles, drivers, and aggregation spaces, it also requires technology to aid in the work of the many team members who will be managing the work. It is recommended that the Board provide support for the development of an app through funding and coordination as necessary.

**Recommendations**

*Post-COVID-19 Programmatic*

59) Support the development of the ACCEF mobile application

Dr. Chen and his team have begun the work to design and create an application that would facilitate the connection between community members and all other features of the ACCEF. The County should consider working with Dr. Chen and his team to complete this mobile application in a timely fashion. In particular, the app will need to leverage DSAL’s capacity as an approved EBT (Electronic Benefits Transfer for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP))/CalFresh retailer to allow residents to pay for meals and produce on an ongoing basis through the app. DSAL has an existing EBT account and accepts EBT payments; however, most small food businesses in the community are not approved EBT retailers because of barriers in the application process or their reluctance to participate in the program. App functionality may go a long way to solving this challenge.

- At this time, the plan is for the app to be developed pro bono by a colleague of Dr. Chen’s.
- The mobile app should provide functionality for all aspects of the ACCEF, including food producers and preservers, meal preparers (both conventional and MSM), drivers, Food Hub staff, FAM practitioners, and customers.
- The mobile app should include mapping of resources for residents to find free sources of food – could expand upon existing services such as [SSA resources map](#) and [Range](#).
- The mobile app should be developed with ACCEF messaging and branding in mind and include educational tools for connecting all members to one another.
- The Board is encouraged to direct ITD staff to support the deployment and maintenance of this application after it has been developed.

60) Create public awareness materials that explain how to access WIC and CalFresh/SNAP benefits to increase demand for FAM and MSM services.

Growing the pool of participants for FAM and medically-supportive meal services is critical for achieving the greatest benefits within the circular economy system. The following are some suggestions for building awareness of the programs, but a widescale public awareness campaign should be designed and implemented to encourage momentum and growth.

- Marketing materials should cover A) cost savings from health improvements and grocery money saved, B) the various prepared meal and produce delivery services available and how to sign up for them, C) how to
access CalFresh/SNAP, WIC, etc. funding and where to get help, and D) how to use the EBT system to pay for delivered meals or produce.

- Include marketing materials in all Healthy Corner Stores, Farmers’ Markets, FAM clinics, and with all food deliveries, food bags, and so on.
- Increase awareness of all program aspects by cross-marketing with other community services.
Chapter 5 Food Recycling

The FAO estimates that one-third of all food is wasted – worth $1 trillion in the US of lost nutrients and a major cost to regions like Alameda County. Designing food waste out of the ACCEF is as important as all of the other steps within this circular economy as it closes the loop and ensures the County can reap both the health and economic benefits from what would otherwise go to the landfill. In September 2016, Governor Brown signed SB 1383 (Lara, Chapter 395, Statutes of 2016), which establishes methane emissions reduction targets in a statewide effort to reduce emissions of short-lived climate pollutants (SLCP) such as from food waste. As it pertains to CalRecycle, SB 1383 establishes targets to achieve a 50% reduction in the level of the statewide disposal of organic waste from the 2014 level by 2020 and a 75% reduction by 2025. The law grants CalRecycle the regulatory authority required to achieve the organic waste disposal reduction targets and establishes an additional target that not less than 20% of currently disposed edible food is recovered for human consumption by January 1, 2022. CalRecycle’s regulations to meet the organic waste reduction targets for 2020 and 2025 and to achieve the 2025 edible food recovery goal take effect and are enforceable on this date. Alameda County has done some work to meet the standards of SB 1383 which requires that organic waste be reduced significantly, including food waste. However, there remains many opportunities to improve this part of the system, especially as it relates to edible

food rescue and redistribution. Turning inedible food waste into compost is an area that needs to be explored in more depth and is perhaps the least developed aspect of the ACCEF model to date. Likewise, there are more opportunities for increasing recycling of on-farm organic waste. The following are recommendations for rescuing food waste that can be reused, as well as recommendations for how to handle inedible food waste by making use of it as compost within County.

Cost-Benefit Analysis

**REDIRECTED GROCERY SPENDING STORY:** Both recipients and County benefit monthly through ACCEF programs for redistributing food through health improvement savings, grocery cost reductions, and more.

Current recovered meal work:

5,319 families – rescued meal recipients (83,063 lb of food)

*Monthly savings per recipient of 10 meals monthly:*

**Personal savings:**

$33 – avoided grocery costs recirculated within the community ($3.30/meal)

**County savings:**

$3.05 – sales tax revenue (state, county, municipality) on redistribution of grocery spending to consumer goods

People served and savings (personal and County):

- 417,273 additional meals/month served with rescued meals or 41,727 recipients/month (10 meals/month)
- $1,377,001 – avoided grocery costs recirculated within the community ($3.30/meal)
- $1,504,374 combined grocery savings and tax revenue

Capacity/performance (Jan to June scaling up):

- Recovered meal deliveries increased 2,656% to 45,307 meals or 5319 recipients/month

**CLIMATE IMPACT STORY:** The County will reduce greenhouse gas emissions, save water and topsoil, reduce pesticides, and improve air quality (see table below).

**INVESTMENT STORY:** Climate change impacts are what should drive investments in the food recycling aspect of the ACCEF, especially as greenhouse gas emissions requirements come online.

**Composting**

## Master composters and drivers @ $50,412/yr (salary+benefits)

---

106 “DSAL by the Numbers (Was Attendance & Data Report),” COVID Monthly Report tab. See column E, used Jun 1-Jul 1 as a rough estimate of most recent volumes

107 “The Cost of Living in California.” Article notes an average food cost in California of $3573 annually; this was divided by 12 months to get a monthly cost of $297.75 or $3.30/meal and then multiplied by 10 meals/month = $33.

108 “Consumer Expenditures for the San Francisco Area.” Calculated using a 9.25% sales combined tax rate.

109 “DSAL by the Numbers (Was Attendance & Data Report),” COVID Monthly Report tab. Increased to 83063 lb/month: 83063/5.5 lbs per day/person = 15106 days of meals multiplied by 3 = for 45,307 total meals

110 “The Cost of Living in California.” Article notes an average food cost in California of $3573 annually; this was divided by 12 months to get a monthly cost of $297.75 or $3.30/meal and then multiplied by 343,637 total meals recovered to get total for County.

111 “Consumer Expenditures for the San Francisco Area.” Calculated using a 9.25% sales combined tax rate – multiplied by the grocery savings.

112 “DSAL by the Numbers (Was Attendance & Data Report),” COVID Monthly Report tab. Increased to 83063 lb/month: 83063/5.5 lbs per day/person = 15106 days of meals multiplied by 3 = for 45,307 total meals

113 “DSAL by the Numbers (Was Attendance & Data Report),” COVID Monthly Report tab. Increased from 193 in Jan to 5319 in June: 5319-193/193 = 2656% increase

---

Alameda County Circular Economy for Food
## Trucks

## Collection buckets, etc.
Note: All $ benefits expressed in USD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health benefits</th>
<th>Economic benefits</th>
<th>Environmental benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antibiotic resistance</td>
<td>Waste prevented market value</td>
<td>CO2e emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterborne diseases</td>
<td>Waste looped N&amp;P value</td>
<td>GHG emissions [m3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air pollution from agriculture</td>
<td>Compacted value</td>
<td>Water use [m3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticides exposure</td>
<td>Total economic benefits</td>
<td>Social costs of water use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food-borne diseases (excl. pesticides)</td>
<td>Total health benefits</td>
<td>Soil Water retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total health benefits</td>
<td>Total health benefits</td>
<td>Soil degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste prevented market value</td>
<td>Total health benefits</td>
<td>Soil degradation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Edible food waste prevention (baseline) [per tonne] | 21 | 22 | 25 | 160 | 227 | 742 | 742 | 2 | 171 | 193 | 111 | 31 | 178 |
| Edible food waste prevention (current) | 166114 | 59118 | 0 | 0 | 225233 | 0 | 0 | 583 | 64114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Edible food waste prevention (potential) | 85763 | 90343 | 105331 | 664041 | 945478 | 3087478 | 3087478 | 6245 | 709837 | 803094 | 460457 | 130727 | 741061 |
Food Rescue

DSAL and ALL IN had already begun collecting food waste and redistributing it through the Food Hub; however, the COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated the scale-up of this program substantially. Since March 2020, the pick-up volumes have gone from 9,000 pounds per quarter and 60,000 pounds per quarter, with most food rescued from schools and received from Daily Bowl (a food rescue nonprofit), a total that is equivalent to approximately 18-121 people fed daily each quarter. However, the food rescue is taking place within only a small region of the County – taking advantage of the lowest hanging fruit opportunities. If food rescue efforts were to be scaled up to every municipality and distributed to Alameda County residents with food insecurity, the grocery savings for these families would be significant, many jobs would be created, and the County will have helped these cities and towns go a long way to reaching their SB 1383 food waste requirements.

Case Studies

Porto, Portugal

The municipality wastes 14,000 tons of food annually. Through programs called Refood and Fruta Feia (Ugly Fruit), they are redistributing food to food banks, essentially avoiding 13% of the food that would have been wasted. If Porto increased food rescue to 50%, these annual benefits would result: USD $15.85 million in health care savings, more than USD $100 million in economic savings from avoiding food waste, and CO2 reductions of 104,800 tons.

Recommendations

Post-COVID-19 Policy

61) Develop harmonized food safety standards and procedures for food rescue operations

One of the biggest barriers to the rescue and redistribution of edible food waste in the County is the lack of harmonized standards for safe handling of these products. This has complicated efforts to recover food and process it effectively. Alexandra Boskovich and Kat Larrowe of the Alameda County Food Bank have pointed to this as one of the biggest limiting factors to growing food rescue.

- The ACCEFA (Food waste sub-committee), working with the Alameda County Food Bank and the Alameda County Public Health Department, may wish to develop a single standard for the safe handling of all types of food rescued, taking SB 1383 and SB 2178 into consideration.
- Training for these new food safety standards would be provided to all food rescue handlers in the community.

Post-COVID-19 Programmatic

62) Increase quantity of food rescued by through enhanced partnership development

Partnering with Daily Bowl and the Alameda County Food Bank, the ACCEFA (Food waste sub-committee) should create a plan for expanding the food rescue program. This plan should include:

---

114 “Food Hub Project Mgmt (Was Food Recovery Launch) - Google Sheets,” FR Recipients&Producers Tracking tab.
115 “The Average American Ate (Literally) A Ton This Year.” Article notes the average American eats approximately 1,996 pounds of food annually, equaling approximately 5.5 pounds per day or 495 pounds per quarter. This figure was used to convert 9,000-60,000 pounds of food recovered quarterly into people fed daily per quarter.
- Goals for how much food is rescued and redistributed.
- Coordination of efforts among all stakeholders working in this space to increase efficiencies.
- Shared standards for processing food waste (see Recommendation #61).

Some partner organizations that may be able to help with this expansion include:

- **Hunger at Home**: This organization is a conduit between the business and nonprofit communities to channel excess food and surplus goods to homeless and hungry individuals and families. Hunger at Home partners with convention centers, hotels, resorts, stadiums, and entertainment venues to donate food and surplus to soup kitchens and other charities to feed those in need.
- **Chefs to End Hunger**: In partnership with our founder and primary logistical partner, Vesta Foodservice, this organization supplies packaging, transportation and logistics to recover prepared food from food service operators, as well as whole product from our regional warehouses and vendor partners. Their program currently operates within the business network of Vesta Foodservice, which covers all of CA. In 2018 they recovered over 3.2 million pounds of prepared food and whole product and hit their 2019 target of 4 million lbs of food recovered!
- **Olio**: This is an app that works with both businesses and in homes to reduce food waste by building communities through sharing surplus and it's all free for anyone to use and request. They have 1.7 million users worldwide and shared over 3 million portions of food.
- **Copia**: This company has created the world’s first end-to-end mobile app to reduce waste for businesses, while solving for hunger and scarcity in communities across the nation. Restaurant chains, commercial kitchens, and food retailers use Copia’s mobile app and analytics to track and reduce surplus, while automatically connecting kitchens with on-demand drivers and nonprofit recipients to maximize financial, social and environmental impact from commercial waste reduction programs across the US and Canada.

**Post-COVID-19 Workforce**

63) Use municipalities’ funding for meeting their SB 1383 food waste requirements to employ formerly justice-involved people as recovered food drivers and composters

Every municipality in the County will require services for redistributing edible food waste within their borders. DDF has already developed a model of employing formerly justice-involved individuals in the ACCEF. This model could be expanded to employ these individuals as drivers for picking up food waste and delivering it to a local Food Hub for processing – either for redistribution as food aid, or as food waste for composting.

- The ACCEFA (Food waste sub-committee) should develop a proposal for employing formerly justice-involved individuals as drivers for the system.
- This proposal should be offered to every municipality, showing the added value of employing local at-risk individuals.
- Funding for employment would be provided by each municipality as part of their budgets for addressing SB 1383 requirements.

**Organic Waste Recovery and Composting**

Within a circular economy, nothing should be considered waste. Food that is inedible is a resource that, if properly processed and composted, can be used to improve soils, increase soil water retention, reduce topsoil loss, and feed beneficial microorganisms and nutrients into a healthy food production system, bringing discarded food full circle into the food production aspect of the ACCEF. To meet SB 1383 food waste recycling efforts, all municipalities within the County will be required to develop systems for collecting and composting excess edible
food. Reclaiming edible food fits perfectly with the ACCEF model and is an opportunity to support jobs and reduce County greenhouse gas emissions, while closing the loop within the circular economy for food.

Additionally, encouraging urban and peri-urban farmers to use compost and fertilizers created from food by-products is also an important piece of the puzzle, and currently is the missing piece from the ACCEF. This is also a tremendous growth opportunity. According to StopWaste’s 2017-2018 Waste Characterization Study, Alameda County’s residential composting rate has fallen from 34.1% in 1995 to 15.2% in 2015. In fact, the CalRecycle food scraps recycling average for the state of California was 21%, whereas Alameda County’s rate was only 14.6%, leaving a lot of room for growth in this area.

Recommendations

Post-COVID-19 Programmatic

64) Create an ACCEF compost collection program

To streamline the collection of organic waste from residents, the ACCEFA (Food waste sub-committee) should create a compost collection program. Tri-Ced, a recycling program created by Supervisor Valle to provide employment for justice-involved youth, has been a huge success in terms of the employment opportunities generated and the business model used. The ACCEF food waste composting program could be modeled after this program – and perhaps even become a partner with it. To enable the recommendations that follow (for collecting compost materials from residents and food entrepreneurs), the ACCEF will need to build out its composting capacity. To support this effort, several elements will be required:

- ACCEFA (Food waste sub-committee) should develop a strategic plan for all elements of the composting program, including staff, composting space, vehicle requirements, demand for food waste processing from all components within the ACCEF, marketing, logistics, coupon program, packaging and labeling of composting pails, and so on.
- The Board is encouraged to direct GSA to examine which vehicles in the County fleet might be used for this program.
- Work with the Sheriff’s BOSS program and the County’s 1400 Jobs Re-Entry Hiring Initiative to plan for hiring formerly justice-involved individuals as drivers for food waste pick-up and delivery to the composting facility.
- Collaborate with StopWaste to create compost containers and ACCEF container labeling for the containers made available for free to residents. The labeling should explain the composting program and how residents can return compostable meal packaging and food scraps for composting in exchange for coupons for DDF purchases (see Recommendation #65).
- The ACCEFA should develop plans for increasing collection every year in line with SB 1383 requirements.
- The finished compost should be used directly on DDF farms to close the circle of the food system.
- ACCEFA should explore the opportunity to partner with Tri-Ced. This program already provides recycling of yard waste, so perhaps their composting operations could be expanded to process food waste collected by the ACCEF.
- Contracted Waste Management services within the county may pose competition for this kind of program, so conflicts in this space should be explored. However, the ACCEF provides greater value for pick-up and composting of food waste given its ability to 1) provide employment for formerly justice-involved individuals and 2) make direct use of composted materials on DDF farms. This program should therefore be given priority specifically for food waste within the ACCEF.

118 StopWaste, 31.
• StopWaste can provide Technical Assistance to small grocers on how to collect and store composted materials.
• Work with small grocers and farmers’ markets to receive residential compost material. They would distribute DDF coupons and in exchange would be given further DDF produce discounts for sale in their stores.

65) Create an ACCEF DDF compost coupon program

To incentivize residents, restaurants, and food preparers to compost their organics, the ACCEFA (Food waste sub-committee) could create a coupon program.

• Residents who provide their organic matter for composting could receive DDF coupons which they can use to make future purchases of DDF produce or prepared meals.
• ACCEF food preparers could receive discounts on DDF produce in exchange for their organic material.

66) Set up compost bin pick-up for food aid recipients and from partner organic waste collectors

In order to support a system for collecting the organic waste from restaurants, food entrepreneurs, and Health Corner Stores, a pick-up system will need to be developed. Additionally, a pick-up service could be provided for those residents who cannot return compost to a local healthy retail store or farmers market. The ACCEFA (Food waste sub-committee) should develop a pick-up program that includes these features:

• StopWaste could provide training for drivers on safe handling of organic matter.
• Additional vans and funding for driver positions will need to be secured.

Post-COVID-19 Workforce

67) Launch a program to provide inmate composting training

As with the other inmate workforce training programs, the ACCEFA (Workforce development sub-committee) should create a plan in conjunction (using the 1400 Jobs Re-Entry Hiring Initiative established by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors and the Probation Department and Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency (BOSS) program) for implementing and promoting new training programs for individuals in the Santa Rita jail to prepare them for exit with commercial composting skills. Potential programs could include the following:

• Work with StopWaste’s technical assistance program to build a training program for composting – skills that can be used on DDF or any other urban farms in the County. Kelly Schoonmaker at StopWaste or one of her colleagues may have information regarding workforce training for waste sorting, including the processing of organic matter for composting.
• Partner with Inmates to Entrepreneurs to use their Virtual Training course to provide inmates with entrepreneurial skills.
Chapter 6 Resources

Food Entrepreneur Interview Transcripts and Take-Aways

Find the full document here.
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Appendices

Appendix A UCCE Community Food Production Self-Certification Checklist

ALAMEDA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

COMMUNITY FOOD PRODUCTION (CFP)
SELF CERTIFICATION CHECKLIST

The following requirements are outlined in the Community Food Production and Safety Act (AB 1990) and are provided as minimum standards of health and safety for community gardens, personal gardens, school gardens, and culinary gardens per California Retail Food Code (Cal Code).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFP Business Name:</th>
<th>CFP Producer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFP Physical Address:</th>
<th>CFP City:</th>
<th>CFP ZIP:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone:</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above bold boxes for office use only.

**CFP Growing Area Requirements:**

1. I will grow my CFP produce (vegetables, fruit, unshelled nuts) in accordance with the "California Small Farm Food Safety Guidelines published by the Department of Food and Agriculture. The guideline can be found at [http://www.cdfa.ca.gov/sf/ & c/pdfs/SFFGbooklet-QuickPrintEnglish.pdf](http://www.cdfa.ca.gov/sf/ & c/pdfs/SFFGbooklet-QuickPrintEnglish.pdf)

2. I will plan the harvest time to avoid problems with harvesting and storing the produce.

3. The CFP Growing area is located at the private dwelling where I as the CFP Producer currently reside.

4. I will have control over the CFP Growing area at all times.

5. I am not aware of any past usages of the CFP growing area or adjacent areas that might have resulted in contamination to the CFP growing area soil.

6. I will use raised beds if soil contamination is suspected.

7. I will only use raised beds.

8. I will only use garden beds, containers, stakes and trellises that are constructed of nontoxic, non-leaching materials (no pressure treated wood or used tires).

9. I will locate my CFP growing area away from all sources of contamination (manure, compost, machinery, garbage, chemicals, standing water, over or within ten feet of a septic system or leech field and any other source of contamination).

10. I will minimize vegetation at the edge of the CFP vegetable growing areas.

11. I will provide a buffer or fence of the CFP growing area to exclude pets and wild animals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B Sample Sustainable Food Policy for Procurement

Full sample can be found here.

**SET GOALS**

Where are you going? How fast do you think you can get there? Defining clear goals will help you to track and report success.

Goals for percentage of total purchases may be assigned for categories such as fresh produce, dairy products, meat products, dry goods or processed foods — or even for single products (such as ground beef, wheat flour, milk in pint cartons, or fresh strawberries). For example, Portland State University set the following goals for local purchasing:

Maintain minimum annual levels of local foods procurement. Local to be defined as products grown and processed in the Northwest (Oregon, Washington, Idaho and Northern California) with an emphasis on Oregon and Washington grown and processed products with a 150 mile radius of the campus. We strive to exceed these minimums to the fullest extent economically possible:

I. 30% annual average of total cost of sales, increasing at 2% per year
II. 30% annual average of fruits and vegetables purchased, increasing at 2% per year
III. 100% milk and dairy products
IV. 100% eggs
V. 50% flour purchased, increasing when economically viable
VI. 50% beef purchased, increasing when economically viable
VII. 15% poultry purchased, increasing when economically viable
VIII. 30% pork purchased, increasing when economically viable
IX. 100% salmon and tuna procured in accordance with the Monterey Bay Aquarium’s “Seafood Watch” sustainable fisheries guide.

Goals can also be tiered according to product characteristics, with purchasing preferences listed from most to least favored. For example, Yale University has established a hierarchy of preferences addressing geography, farm ownership and practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH Desirability</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Farm Ownership</th>
<th>Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Connecticut</td>
<td>- Independent</td>
<td>- Organic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Region</td>
<td>- Cooperative</td>
<td>- Integrated Pest Management (IPM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- United States</td>
<td>- Corporate</td>
<td>- Conventional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yale’s purchasing preferences are further specified to help purchasers make decisions across categories.

**First Tier** (ranked in order of preference)
- Connecticut organic
- Connecticut IPM
- Regional Organic
- Connecticut conventional – small scale operation
- Regional conventional – small scale operation
- Connecticut conventional medium scale operation

**Second Tier** (ranked in order of preference)
- Regional conventional – medium scale operation
- US organic – small/medium scale operation
- US IPM – small/medium scale operation
- Connecticut conventional – large scale operation
- US organic – large scale operation
- US IPM – Large scale operation
- International organic
- US Conventional

Think through whether there is any hierarchy to your goals and how they intersect.

Break out your goals to the degree possible in order to be able to measure performance on each goal separately (i.e. percentage of milk that is rBST-free, percentage of milk from local dairies, and percentage of milk from dairies that are Certified Humane). Avoid compound goals (i.e. percentage of rBST-free milk from local dairies that are Certified Humane), which can complicate verification, limit progress on individual measures, and make year-to-year comparisons and comparisons between categories and products difficult.
To further facilitate comparisons, goals are most effectively stated by percentage of dollars spent rather than by weight or other measures.

Try to identify some goals that will make progress more immediately apparent and provide opportunities for celebration. Be certain to review the “buy lists” currently in use to find “low-hanging fruit” where dramatic progress can be made cost-effectively on a short timeline.

If the institution or its contractors can make an easy substitution for one or more products – for example, buying 100% of strawberries fresh in-season from a local grower or 100% Fair Trade certified coffee – it’s a victory worth claiming. Use these victories, small and large, as a means to educate and inspire the institution’s constituents, and to build leverage for greater change.

Create an Action Plan

Your action plan should establish clear expectations for the institution and its staff, as well as for service providers and wholesale vendors. Be clear about what the institution plans to accomplish independently and what it hopes to accomplish working with food service providers, wholesale vendors or GPOs. Be specific about who will do what when to ensure that the institution meets or exceeds its targets.

Some questions to consider:
- How will the institution communicate its intent to staff and external partners?
- How will the institution demonstrate its commitment to the new policy?
- What resources will be committed to develop and manage new policy initiatives?
- How will staff be educated and motivated?
- How will needs and expectations be conveyed to existing suppliers?
- Who will develop and approve food service and vendor RFPs?
- Who will negotiate and manage the contracts?
- How will social and environmental performance be weighted against price or quality concerns?
- Will there be any performance bonuses or penalties associated with contracts?
- If necessary, how will new suppliers or service providers be identified and recruited?

In a competitive bid situation, where social and/or environmental performance is clearly assigned weight in bid evaluation, there is a chance for food service and wholesale contractors to propose targets beyond the institution’s minimum requirements. This should be encouraged and, if possible, supported with financial or other incentives (eg. longer contract terms).

Given the complexity of issues in the agricultural and food arenas, purchasers must have clear direction for product priorities and specifications, any preferences or requirements related to selection of suppliers, and any negotiable or fixed terms for contracts. Whatever the organization’s goals, purchasers must also be given leeway and appropriate budgetary discretion to make strategic decisions in service of the organization’s goals. Ideally, incentive programs should be put in place to reward staff who find creative ways to improve the institution’s social and environmental performance within budget limits.

Create an Evaluation Plan

A good sustainable food purchasing policy will also specify means and a process for evaluating its effectiveness. Be sure to consider both internal benefits for the institution and, to the degree this can be measured, external benefits for farmers, farm laborers, farm animals and the environment.

You should already have identified some key measures of success. What are they?
- Percentage of employees receiving education or training relevant to the new policy?
- Percentages of purchases of specified products or categories that meet certain criteria?
- Improvements in the nutritional value of meal and snack offerings?
- Reductions in food miles?
- Dollars directed to the local economy?

Think carefully about expectations for monitoring and evaluation. Don’t underestimate the work that may be involved, particularly work for service providers or suppliers that may be involved in collecting and analyzing the data.

A Guide to Developing a Sustainable Food Purchasing Policy • www.SustainableFoodPolicy.org
Appendix C Long Beach Tree Planting Program Documents

Original documents found [here](#).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Size Options</th>
<th>Harvest Season</th>
<th>Mature Height</th>
<th>Minimum Space Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peach</td>
<td>Semi-dwarf or Full size</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Semi-dwarf: 10 - 12 ft. Full size: 20 - 25 ft.</td>
<td>Semi-dwarf: 10 ft. from other trees and 6 ft. from pavement and structures. Full size: 15 ft. from other trees and 12 ft. from pavement and structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avocado</td>
<td>Semi-dwarf or Full size</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Semi-dwarf: 10 - 12 ft. Full size: 30 - 40 ft.</td>
<td>Semi-dwarf: 10 ft. from other trees and 6 ft. from pavement and structures. Full size: 30 ft. from other trees and 15 ft. from pavement and structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomegranate</td>
<td>Semi-dwarf or Full size</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>10 - 12 ft.</td>
<td>10 ft. from other trees and 6 ft. from pavement and structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>Full size</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>12 - 18 ft.</td>
<td>12 ft. from other trees and 18 ft. from pavement and structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig</td>
<td>Full size</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>8 - 10 ft.</td>
<td>10 ft. from other trees and 6 ft. from pavement and structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pear</td>
<td>Full size</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>12 - 18 ft.</td>
<td>12 ft. from other trees and 18 ft. from pavement and structures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For any questions, please contact Kristyn Payne at Kristyn.Payne@longbeach.gov or 562.570.5831.
CITY OF LONG BEACH FRUIT TREE PROGRAM
CONSENT AND WAIVER OF LIABILITY FORM

Statement of the Property Owner:

1. I, the undersigned ("Property Owner"), hereby agree to voluntarily participate in the City of Long
   Beach Fruit Tree Planting Program (the "Program"). I hereby attest that I am the record owner
   of the property described below (the "Property").

2. I understand that as part of my participation in the Program, I may receive a fruit tree to be
   planted on my Property pursuant to the availability of Program funding.

3. By signing below, I grant access and consent for a Program tree to be planted on the Property by
   the City of Long Beach (the "City") and its representatives, agents, subcontractors and
   consultants of all tiers. Planting of the Program tree may take place at a time convenient to the
   City.

4. I understand that the City may provide recommended changes to the Property after a site
   assessment; that said recommendations shall be completed at my own cost and expense; and
   that failure to make the recommended changes, if any, could result in the disqualification of my
   Property from the Program and result in me not receiving a tree.

5. I acknowledge that the City shall make the final decision on the placement of the Program tree,
   and that any expressed owner preferences are non-binding and will only serve to guide fruit tree
   placement.

6. The City is only responsible for the digging of the planting hole. The Property Owner will be
   responsible for any and all other changes necessary to their property, including but not be
   limited to the alteration of landscape, alteration to existing irrigation systems, or other
   necessary alterations as required by the City at its sole discretion.

7. I accept that the date and time of the tree planting may change, my Property may be deselected
   or otherwise withdrawn from the Program, or the Program may be cancelled with or without
   notice, at the City’s sole discretion.

8. I understand that the Program is funded by the CalFire Urban Forestry grant, and the City
   reserves the right to enter and access the Property at any time with or without notice to inspect
   the completed work and conduct periodic inspections of the Program tree’s location, growth,
   and health during the grant period (September 30, 2018 to June 30, 2021).

9. Each owner will be provided with a fruit tree ‘Care Guide.’ I acknowledge that upon change of
   ownership or occupancy, the ‘Care Guide’ must remain with the property and I must inform
   the new owner or tenant.

10. I hereby consent and grant permission to the City to capture my Property image and likeness in
    photographs, videotapes, motion pictures, recordings, or any other media (collectively
    “Images”). I acknowledge that City will own such Images and further grant the City permission
    to copyright, display, publish, distribute, use, modify, print and reprint such Images in any manner
    whatsoever. I further waive any right to inspect or approve the use of the Image by the City prior
    to its use. I forever release and hold the City harmless from any and all liability arising out of the
    use of the Images in any manner or media whatsoever, and waive any and all claims and causes
    of action relating to use of the Images, including without limitation, claims for invasion of privacy
    rights or publicity.
FRUIT TREE MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING CAREFULLY BEFORE SIGNING THIS DOCUMENT

In order to participate in the City of Long Beach Fruit Tree Planting Program (“Program”), each property owner agrees to the following:

- All trees planted under the Program are the sole responsibility of the property owner, and the City of Long Beach will assume no responsibility for any maintenance, repair or replacement.
- The property owner accepts all responsibility for the tree’s maintenance and survival.
- The property owner agrees to all maintenance responsibilities, including but not limited to the following: watering and fertilizing the planted tree following the provided Care Guide instructions specific to the tree received; pruning to ensure the tree does not cause any traffic sight visibility hazards; and that pedestrians have clear access to any walking/sidewalk area, and maintaining the stakes and ties until the time at which they should be removed, normally about 2 years after planting.
- If a tree appears to be failing or is not following normal seasonal growth patterns, the property owner must notify the City immediately at 562-570-5831. However, the property owner acknowledges that the City will not be responsible for any tree repair or replacement.

I HAVE READ THIS DOCUMENT BEFORE SIGNING IT, FULLY UNDERSTAND, AND VOLUNTARILY AGREE TO ITS TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

By signing this document, I also give the City of Long Beach permission to access my property in order to plant and/or inspect the tree and agree to hold harmless the City of Long Beach, its Boards, Commissions, and their officials, employees and agents, from any and all damage claims that arise from or are related to the Program.

Property Owner Name: ________________________________

Property Owner Address: ______________________________

Signature: ____________________________  Date: ___________

For more information about the City of Long Beach Fruit Tree Planting Program, contact:

Kristyn Payne
562-570-5831
Kristyn.Payne@longbeach.gov
Appendix D Sample Zero Waste Agreement for Food Entrepreneurs

Full sample can be found here.

Sample Vendor Contract for Zero Waste Events

Dear Vendor:

Thank you for your interest in participating at ________________ in ______________!
We are proud to announce that with the help of Eco-Cycle, this event will once again be a Zero Waste event!

The goal at a Zero Waste event is to plan ahead and distribute only materials that are recyclable or compostable (not any materials that will be landfilled). There will be no trash cans at the event. Instead, Zero Waste Stations for recycling and composting collection will be available to participants at several locations. Zero Waste events are a great way to not only show our commitment to the environment, but to create a living model of Zero Waste for event participants and the community. As a food vendor handing out products at this event, you are the key to the success of our Zero Waste goal.

Food vendors attending ________________ are required to hand out only recyclable or compostable materials to the public. We have included local recycling and composting guidelines with this contract so you can know which types of containers and packaging will be accepted at the Zero Waste stations. We’ve also provided you with a distributor list that you can use to purchase the correct materials. Remember, if an item is not recyclable locally, we cannot recycle it, even if your supplier has told you it can be recycled. If you have any questions as to whether your items are considered recyclable or compostable, please call Eco-Cycle at 303-444-6634. Our Events Coordinator is available to answer your questions and help you understand your important role in this Zero Waste event.

Our Zero Waste goal is simple to attain if you plan ahead of time for the types of materials you will be providing to the public at the event.

Acceptable Containers and Service Ware
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