

Regional Food Hubs and School Meals:  
A comprehensive approach to nutrition in Southern California schools

Kelsey Newport

20 April 2011  
Professor Robert Gottlieb  
Senior Comprehensive Project  
Urban and Environmental Policy Department

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>METHODS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>HOW WE GOT HERE: HISTORY OF NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH POLICY .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SCHOOL LUNCH IN LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>FARM TO SCHOOL.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>REGIONAL FOOD HUBS.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA FARM TO SCHOOL MODELS.....</b>	<b>26</b>
RIVERSIDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT .....	26
SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT .....	30
VENTURA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.....	35
<b>BARRIERS IN LAUSD .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>CONNECTING FARM TO SCHOOL AND A REGIONAL FOOD HUB.....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECCOMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>APPENDICIES .....</b>	<b>48</b>
APPENDIX A: MENU CHANGES IN HEALTHY HUNGER-FREE KIDS ACT 2010.....	48
APPENDIX B: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES AND THEIR AFFILIATIONS.....	49
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS .....	50
<b>NOTES .....</b>	<b>52</b>

## **ABSTRACT**

This report will explore the barriers that exist within LAUSD to the implementation of a Farm to School program, and how the development of a Regional Food Hub in Los Angeles could overcome some of those barriers. The report will first examine the history of National School Lunch Policy as well as school meal programs in LAUSD to give the reader a sense of how foods served in the lunchroom today are the product of historical events and legislation that continue to impact meal programs. Through key interviews, this research explores three Farm to School models that already exist in Southern California - Riverside Unified School District, San Diego Unified School District, and Ventura Unified School District - to examine the breadth of programs that exist and the methods those programs have used to overcome their own barriers. The report will then examine the concept of a Regional Food Hub, and how collaboration with a food hub would address the barriers faced by LAUSD.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

*Scaling Up: An Innovative Model for Large-Scale Farm to School Programs* examines the potential for the implementation of a Farm to School program in Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) through the facilitation of a Regional Food Hub (RFH) in the Los Angeles Area. This report outlines the importance of Farm to School in the context of the current national school meal program atmosphere, and the major barriers that prevent schools such as LAUSD from developing such a program. The vision presented is a program that connects a Farm to School program in LAUSD with a RFH in such a way that allows the district to bring in fresh local and regional fruit and vegetables directly through a hub, providing the district with cost effective and efficient access to produce.

Farm to School programs aim to provide healthy meals to schoolchildren while supporting local farms and the community. With the lack of access to fruits and vegetables that plague many of the country's neighborhoods and the rising obesity crisis that our nation's youth are facing, the implementation of these programs is critical to our future. The reality is that many of the nation's children do not understand where their food comes from or how it is produced, and Farm to School programs work to close that gap while providing kids with real, fresh foods. In addition, the number of small and mid sized farms are decreasing throughout the country, while industrial farming is becoming more prevalent – as are the human rights and environmental violations that come with this profit and efficiency driven production.

The goals of this report are to demonstrate the success of three Farm to School programs in school districts in the Southern California region – Riverside Unified, San Diego Unified, and Ventura Unified, and show how the development of a Regional Food Hub that supports small and mid-scaled farms who use sustainable farming practices can help other districts operate Farm to School programs. Farm to School provides access to fresh fruits and vegetables for students, often times to those students who do not have the opportunity to get these items outside of school. It also accompanies this access with education, so that students can make informed decisions about the foods they choose to give their bodies and the external impacts those choices have on their environment. Farm to School also provides business opportunities for the small and mid sized farms, especially through the establishment of a RFH. And lastly, the case studies demonstrate that a Farm to School program can be run at a cost that is lower or comparable to traditional methods of procurement through large companies, and also increase participation and thus revenue from school meal programs.

This report recommends that LAUSD should develop a relationship with the Regional Food Hub Advisory Council to collaboratively develop a RFH in Los Angeles that can serve the needs of the school district and support the farmers that are part of the hub. Evaluation of new procurement processes and a new menu featuring locally-produced, fresh food is also important for the development of a Farm to School program because it will help determine student preferences in meals and measure economical advantages of local food procurement. This report recommends that LAUSD change their policies in regards to their ability to purchase blemished and odd sized produce items that are sold by farmers at a reduced cost, and reform their purchasing policy to include stronger language regarding the preference for local and regional products. As a first step in a transition to local purchasing, LASUD should work with its vendor to compile a list of perishable products that are locally and regionally available to the district. Lastly, this report recommends that further outreach be done to inform and education farmers about the opportunities for participation in a RFH, and the potential market that collaboration with LAUSD may provide.

## INTRODUCTION

The Farm to School Movement originated out of a desire to have fresher, more flavorful fruits and vegetables served in school lunchroom, and to increase the accessibility and familiarity of these items to all school children. Farm to School connections are intended to address several concerns, including rising rates of obesity in school aged children, the increasing prevalence of fast food items in the cafeteria, and the decline of the small family farm. The movement has been adopted by public health champions and community food security advocates, and has become increasingly visible with the support of First Lady Michele Obama and the Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010. Because Farm to School empowers students to make healthy choices throughout their lives, it is viewed as a promising approach to reducing the rate of obesity in school children through increased consumption of fruits and vegetables and important nutrients.

Farm to School at its core is a program that encompasses much more than just human health. It aims to inform students about their entire food system, and about the impacts their food choices have not only on their bodies, but on the world they live in. Farm to School programs introduce the idea that foods come from the ground, they don't magically appear on the other side of a drive through window. Farm to School also connects students with farmers in their community, teaches them to actively interact with the foods that they eat and to make conscious and informed decisions about which foods they choose to feed their bodies with. Farm to School goes far beyond the goal of reducing the number of children who are considered to be overweight in this nation, and aims to make a deeper more systematic change in the way that the next generation thinks about food.

Farm to School is an important part of establishing a healthy community food system, one that provides fresh and healthy food options, supports the small and mid size farmer, and encourages economic growth and green jobs. As mentioned above, increased access to healthy, fresh fruits and vegetables is key to improving the health of our communities and encouraging healthy food choices. In schools, the ability to provide healthy options not only increases the intake of healthier foods, but it also educates students about making healthy food decisions, which they can then take home and share with their families and practice in their communities. Farm to School programs are also a very effective way to support the small and mid size farmer,

an occupation that continues to decline as does the percentage of a dollar that every farmer receives. Large scale industrial farming has played a large role in this trend, as large producers are more focused on global markets and the production of subsidized commodity crops than are small farmers. Additionally, these large scale farms have been at the center of human rights violations, as more farms have been cited for paying extremely low wages, requiring long hours and employing children in the fields.<sup>1</sup> Farm to School programs have the opportunity to become more comprehensive public health programs by choosing to support farms and that use environmentally sound agricultural practices and pay fair wages to farmworkers.

In this research, I set out to determine the opportunities and barriers for the establishment of a Farm to School program in the Los Angeles Unified School District. In LAUSD, produce and other food products comes from all over the country and sometimes outside of it, and the multiple levels of bureaucracy in the district have created an atmosphere that is resistant to developing a Farm to School program. Despite the fact that other large districts around the country, such as New York and Chicago, have established Farm to School programs, food services administrators in LAUSD have a perception that it would be impossible to establish a program within the district, even in its particularly advantageous location of agriculturally rich southern California. My research aimed to explore both the real and perceived barriers to the implementation of a Farm to School program, and subsequently explore the ways in which a Regional Food Hub (RFH) might be able to address and overcome some of those barriers. A RFH is an integrated food system of coordinated production where farms can aggregate and collectively distribute products, making them more available to customers such as LAUSD, while supporting small and mid-sized farm in the Southern California region. While this research provides a basic overview of the most prevalent barriers involved, a more comprehensive feasibility study is necessary before a Farm to School program could be implemented.

This research project developed out of my long held passion for food and gardening, coupled with my commitment to social justice and desire to make a difference in my community. Growing up, I was fortunate enough to be raised in an environment where we had a backyard garden and cooked with fresh, whole foods. I quickly became aware of the intense effort that it took to grow each and every thing we ate, especially in the barren, rocky soil that characterizes the east slopes of Oregon. At the age of nine, I decided to become a vegetarian because I didn't like the idea of eating chickens, which we raised for eggs. Now, I have become much more

aware of the multitude of issues associated with industrial farming, and have remained a vegetarian as a result. As my awareness of this and many other issues that are connected to the foods that I eat and the food system from which they come has grown, I have become very deliberate in the food choices that I make. Through my studies at Occidental college, I was able to engage with the people and organizations of Los Angeles in working for change, and became much more aware of areas where our food system seriously underserved a large portion of the population, and the high numbers of people that don't have the privilege to make such choices about their foods simply because of their low incomes and their location within the city. I was introduced to terminology such as "food desert" and "food justice," which quickly became part of my vocabulary. It was through this process that I have become interested and involved in Farm to School programs and exposing students to whole foods and the many steps involved in the process of growing those.

Farm to School is about much more than just improving the immediate health of our children. It's about advocating for a more socially and economically just food system, where everyone, including students, has access to real, fresh and whole foods. And it's about ensuring the possibility of this access into the future, and creating a food system that is sustainable for the environment, economics and social equity. Farm to School is about changing the model of what school lunch means, and bringing about a new paradigm for the way we think about food, especially the food in our schools. Change is difficult in an environment where serving school food focuses more on a keeping a healthy bottom line of the budget than on serving up a healthy meal to our nation's youth. Our school food system has become deeply dependent on large-scale industrial agricultural practices to provide cheap products, and multi-national corporations as models for speed and profits. Farm to School represents hope with the tremendous success that it's had and its recent inclusion in the newest version of the Child Nutrition Act.

California has been a leader in the establishment of Farm to School programs, and there are over 400 schools in California alone that have some form of a program. The state's role as one of the leading agricultural producers in the national also places it at a special advantage for the establishment of Farm to School programs. In addition to the Farmers' Market Salad Bar program in the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District that was among the first Farm to School program in the country, this report will highlight three other districts in the Southern California region that either have fully implemented Farm to School programs or that are in the

process of integrating them into their Food Services Program. These districts will be compared to Los Angeles Unified School District in terms of their ordering, delivery and service of local food products.

Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) is particularly interesting because of its size and history. LAUSD is the second largest district in the nation, with 670,000 students currently enrolled in K-12 programs district wide, and over 1,000 sites that it serves. There are 32 cities that lie at least partially within the district's boundary, which spans an area of 710 square miles.<sup>2</sup> Every day, LAUSD serves approximately 650,000 meals to all of its school sites, adult schools and other locations.<sup>3</sup> The annual budget for the district's Cafeteria Fund was \$314 million for the 2010-2011 school year. The current menu features items such as pizza and hamburgers, but the Food Services Department, working with a RENEW initiative (Renewing the Environment for Nutrition, Exercise and Wellness), and the Urban & Environmental Policy Institute (UEPI) have updated and reinvented the menu for the coming years. This menu is in concordance with nutrition standards for the Healthy Hunger Free Kids Act 2010, which will go into effect nationwide in 2012. Along with this new menu, LAUSD has also changed the way that it will be purchasing food in the coming years, seeking more bids from vendors rather than using donated federal commodity food products. These changes are important improvement in the LAUSD school meal program, however, no direct farm connections have been initiated within the district, still placing them outside the realm of Farm to School even if they are procuring more produce. This report aims to explore the challenges and barriers that exist to establishing a Farm to School program on a large scale, and how the district might be able to take advantage of its unique location in the Southern California region to establish such a program.

The first section on this paper will explore the history of the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), and the important historical events and legislation that have contributed to the formation of school lunch the way we see it today, both on a national and local scale. This will give an overview of important policies, from the development of the first National School Lunch Act in 1946 to the most recent Child Nutrition Reauthorization: Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, as well as explore some aspects of the most recent movement to privatize school lunches. The next part of this section will look at the history of school meal programs specifically in LAUSD, and the prominent recent initiatives, such as the Soda Ban and newest

vendor bidding procedures that are changing the atmosphere. The report will then explore the history of Farm to School, beginning with the first Farmers' Market Salad Bar in the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District (SMMUSD), and looking at the many different models that the program has since expanded to encompass. Lastly, I will give a definition of a Regional Food Hub and vision for a hub network in California based on the Regional Food Hub Advisory Council's 2010 report.<sup>4</sup>

The second section of the paper will contain my primary research on the potential synergy of a connection between Farm to School programs and regional purchasing. The first component is a comparison of three districts in the southern California region that have already implemented Farm to School programs – Riverside Unified School District, San Diego Unified School District, and Ventura Unified School District. This comparison demonstrates the different scales and scopes of programs that exist in this region, and provides a template of categories for comparing the districts and the programs that they offer. I also examine the differences in the ways that these three districts procure their Farm to School products, and how RFH models are utilized to serve the districts needs. This section will also examine the major barriers to the establishment of a Farm to School Program in LAUSD -- namely the cost of fresh and local food products, distribution of those products, and the difficulty of preparing and serving those products. I will also briefly explore the ways in which the other three districts in this study were able to overcome similar barriers, and how that experience might be applied in LAUSD.

In the conclusion I explore the potential for a Regional Food Hub to work with LAUSD to supply fresh, local and regional products on a consistent basis. This will outline the ways in which a RFH could provide a method of product procurement that contributed to a sustainable community food system, while improving the nutrition and health of students in LAUSD. I then provide recommendations for how LAUSD can evaluate their menu and procurement policy changes, engage in the development of a RFH in Los Angeles, and begin moving towards a Farm to School model in their school meal program.

## METHODS

The majority of this research was done through key informant interviews. In total I conducted 20 interviews with individuals involved in school meal program and regional food hubs, including food service directors, food policy advocates, non-profit employees, farmers and others who have been involved in school food issues. These interviews generally lasted from 15 minutes to an hour, and were done in person or by phone. Some of the interviews were recorded and subsequently transcribed if the subject consented, and notes were simply taken during others. In addition to interviews, I read books, reports and other information to supplement the report. The online research was mainly used to gather background data on school districts and their meal programs, as well as inform the background of the National School Lunch Program. Library catalog and journal research was done to identify books and articles that explain the historical development of the National School Lunch Program and the controversy that has long been a part of its trajectory. I identified *The National School Lunch Program: Background and Development (1973)* by Gordon W. Gunderson as a highly referenced work and it became the basis of my historical analysis. This book focused on the development of school lunch programs, and the legislative history that supported these programs. This was supplemented with Susan Levine's more recent *School Lunch Politics: The Surprising History of America's Favorite Welfare Program (2008)*, which had a more thorough exploration of legislation in the last 30 years, as well as added to Gunderson's strictly policy based approach to the subject.

The subjects were identified with the help of Professor Robert Gottlieb, as well as Sharon Cech at the Urban & Environmental Policy Institute. Subjects were contacted via email and asked if they would participate in the research, and then we worked to schedule a time either by phone or in person. The interviews took place from January to March, 2011. My research questions varied from subject to subject because they were tailored specifically to the work of each interviewee. The questions were generally directed to gain an understanding of the role that the specific subject held, what their interactions with Farm to School were or had been, what the details and logistics of the programs they had or were involved with were, and the main barriers that they encountered establishing or working in these programs. I also asked questions about what the subjects saw as the potential, or in some cases real, benefit from the collaboration between a Farm to School program and a Regional Food Hub. I also had the fortune of attending

a few of the Los Angeles Food Policy Council Meetings, where I was able to identify other contacts, while also gathering information on the state of the entire food system in Los Angeles and various aspects of it.

I examined documents from LAUSD and other school districts that included information about the nature of school lunch programs. These included participation information, free and reduced rates for districts, and budget information within the lunch programs. I also looked more in depth at the budget for LAUSD and the portion of funds for Food Services, as well as a report reflecting the impact of the 2011-2012 budget cuts on the district. I reviewed reports by the National Good Food Network on the successful components of RFHs, and how those components allow RFHs to be competitive in the market setting. I looked at newspaper articles and blog entries reflecting the status of Farm to School and RFH collaboration development. Additionally, I examined the work done by Sharon Cech and the Regional Food Hub Advisory Council in California to get a sense of their vision for the hub, as well as the food systems assessment done by San Diego county in preparation for a hub in San Diego. I had the opportunity to attend “Effective Strategies to Create Healthier Food Service Environments- Building Nutrition into Food Service Contracts,” a food policy forum put on by the Los Angeles County of Public Health. All of these sources shaped the findings presented in this report.

## HOW WE GOT HERE: HISTORY OF NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH POLICY

The history and development of the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) have greatly impacted the foods that are seen in school cafeterias across the United States. School lunch programs began in the early 1900s, following the publication of *Poverty* by Robert Hunter and *The Bitter Cry of the Children* by John Spargo, which brought to light the existence of hunger among children in the United States, and the importance of nutrition in a child's physical and mental development.<sup>5</sup> While there were developments made by privately funded programs before the 1930s, it was not until the Great Depression that federal funding was allocated for meal programs, however it could only be used to fund the labor involved in preparing the meals, not for the actual foods purchased.

In 1936, the Commodity Donation Program was developed as a response to the falling prices of food caused by food surpluses, and the continued existence of hunger among children. Further, this program marked the beginning of the involvement of the Department of Agriculture in school meal programs, and the power of that department to shape the foods and nutritional content that appear on school lunch trays. Congress gave authorization to the Department of Agriculture to purchase and distribute the farm commodities, "effectively [transforming] free commodity distribution into agricultural price support rather than food aid."<sup>6</sup> The Commodity Donation Program significantly increased the number of school lunch programs around the country, and in fact created a dependency on federal assistance and food donations to keep those programs running.

In 1946, the National School Lunch Act (NSLA) was passed by Congress to establish permanent federal funding for the purchasing of foods for school lunch programs. NSLA was established to "safeguard the health and wellbeing of the Nation's children, and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food."<sup>7</sup> The Act also required that the meals served be in accordance with the Food and Nutrition Board (FNB), which set scientific standards for the nutrient needs of school age children. The task of creating a menu was quite challenging because of nutritional requirements, and the considerable influence of the Department of Agriculture and farm interests to ensure that their commodities were not neglected.<sup>8</sup> Recommended Dietary Allowances (RDAs) became the most widely integrated outcome of the nutrition recommendations within school lunch programs. Federal funding would

subsidize meals depending on how they met the RDA guidelines on a weekly basis. In the initial years of the program, there were three types of meals offered to a child – The highest level, a Type A meal, included up to one half of a child’s RDAs plus a cup of milk, the second level, a Type B meal, provided up to one third of a child’s RDAs and a cup of milk, and the lowest level that could qualify for federal subsidy was solely the provision of a cup of milk.<sup>9</sup> The earliest menus contained high levels of fat in order to increase caloric intake, but also included servings of proteins, dry peas or beans, eggs, vegetables or fruits and whole grains. The Type A meal contained  $\frac{3}{4}$  cup of vegetables or fruits in addition to  $\frac{1}{2}$  cup of cooked beans or peas, and a whole grain bread serving.

NSLA had still only reached about half of the Nation’s children by 1960. The funding structure was such that many children did not have access to subsidized meals, and none of the Nation’s largest school districts had made contracts with the Department of Agriculture to receive subsidies.<sup>10</sup> Amendments passed in the 1960s provided federal funding for states based on the participation rate in the school lunch program for a given state, and the assistance need rate for the state.<sup>11</sup> The amendments also created a special cash reimbursement section for meals that were served at free or reduced prices. In 1966, the Child Nutrition Act (CNA) was passed “as a measure to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation’s children, and to encourage the domestic consumption of agricultural and other foods, by assisting States, through grants-in-aid and other means, to meet more effectively the nutritional needs of our children.”<sup>12</sup>

A 1968 report entitled *Their Daily Bread* released by the Committee on School Lunch Participation profiled the lack of participation in school lunch programs, and the discrimination within such programs that had become prevalent. Most recognized was the finding that low-income areas, which often coincided with areas of color, had low participation in their schools’ lunch programs.<sup>13</sup> In light of the *Their Daily Bread* report, and the growing awareness of hunger within the United States, inspired public activism took on the “right to school lunch” as a civil rights issue. It was enough to get the Secretary of Agriculture to put forth a clear set of guidelines for free lunches, essentially setting an eligibility standard that was equivalent to the federal poverty line. In the years after the passage of the Child Nutrition Act, the National School Lunch program was in many ways transformed from an agriculture subsidy program to a poverty relief program – although it remained under the Department of Agriculture and was still closely tied to, if not dependent upon, commodity donations. The program, however, was at this point

not a universal nutrition program; the result of the shift to a poverty relief program was that the focus was less on providing nutritious and complete meals and more on dispensing food to the most people at the lowest possible cost.<sup>14</sup>

The Department of Agriculture modified the guidelines for lunch programs to make it easier for outside food industry players to enter into the programs. Processed foods were meant to simplify lunch services in those schools that did not have full food preparation facilities, defined as “those foods which are so prepared and processed that they: improve nutrition, reduce cost, offer greater convenience in meal preparation, improve acceptability, and improve stability.”<sup>15</sup> Corporations quickly stepped up and became viable vendors for school lunches in a way that was profitable for lunch programs. In 1970 the Department of Agriculture decided that it would only reimburse Type A meals, or full lunch meals, and instead of discouraging the entrance of fast food into cafeterias it actually encouraged it. The easiest route for schools to meet their rising costs was to enter into private contracts with outside food companies, often with corporations such as McDonalds, Pizza Hut and Taco Bell.<sup>16</sup> Schools quickly made the transition from an outlet for commodity donation to a very high value market for corporate food companies.

Schools quickly made the transition from an outlet for commodity donation to a high value market for corporate food companies. The lunchroom was run on a business model, one that focused on budgeting and participation rates rather than nutrition content or quality of meals. Vending machines with other “competitive foods” followed the entrance of corporations into meal programs, and even those schools where competitive foods weren’t available during the lunch hour, they were open to students at almost all other times of the day. In 1979, the legislation was again modified to state the “foods of minimal nutritional value” could be sold to schools.<sup>17</sup> This meant anything with at least five percent of the Recommended Dietary Allowance of any one of eight nutrients. It was easy and cheap enough for the fast food corporations to fortify their products with fiber or vitamin A or C, and the introduction of “junk foods” quickly spread into cafeterias. As a result, schools began construction central kitchen facilities instead of having on site kitchens in every school, and even these facilities were more to freeze and reheat already packaged and processed foods than they were for preparing or any traditional cooking. The school food environment was rapidly assimilated into a culture of industrial farming, large-scale processing and nation wide networks of food distribution.<sup>18</sup>

When President Reagan took office in 1981, his focus was on downsizing government spending, and for the food programs this meant dramatically cutting back programs and making it much harder for families to qualify for free and reduced meals. The size of fruit and milk servings were also reduced in the name of saving money, in addition to the atrocity of ketchup as a vegetable, jam was considered a fruit, eggs in cake considered a protein, and cake, cookies and chips could all count as bread servings. In 1990, the National School Lunch Program ranked as the second largest government food provision program, with the Food Stamp program being only slightly larger. In 1993, there were 24.5 million children that ate school lunch, significantly reduced from the 28.8 million that had been part of the program just 10 years earlier. After 1993, the program began to expand again, and has grown at the rate of about half a million more participants per year until now.<sup>19</sup> The proportion of school lunch participants receiving free and reduced rate meals has also increased, after holding steady near 50% for the ten years from 1981 to 1992, and has risen today to approximately 65.3% nationwide.

## **SCHOOL LUNCH IN LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

As in many other cities in the United States, Los Angeles began to develop programs for feeding school children in the early 1900s. By 1921, the Board of Education was funding the program in select schools, and at that time they were already serving lunch to almost 3,000 students on some days.<sup>20</sup> Home Economics Departments or school body associations were in charge of these early programs, and meals were served at cost to those who could afford them, and subsidized for those who couldn't. The majority of meals were served in high schools at this time, as it was more likely that older students would have traveled long distances and would not return home for a mid-day meal. The focus of the meal was less on the nutritional content of the meal and more on just the simple provision of a meal. In the 1940s the school lunch program became further institutionalized through the enactment of the National School Lunch Act.<sup>21</sup> Then, in the 1970s, the Board of Education in Los Angeles made it a goal to serve lunch to all of the students, and built the Newman Nutrition center in 1979 as a central kitchen site initially used to prepare and distribute meals to 8,000 students at 25 sites. At this time, the focus remained on providing a complete meal, defined as the "Type A" meal pattern in the NSLA. Then in the 1980s LAUSD's federal funding was reduced by half due to federal assistance reductions, and subsequently meal program participation began to decline.<sup>22</sup>

In the 1990s, the Los Angeles Times published a series of articles entitled the "Hunger Wars" that sited large populations of hungry children across the southern California region. The articles told stories of children going to school nurses' offices clutching their stomachs in pain or holding their heads in dizziness- out of hunger.<sup>23</sup> As a result of this news coverage, Charlotte Newman obtained funding to do a study in fourteen randomly selected LAUSD schools in low-income areas of the district, to explore how rampant the hunger problem was. Combined with the study was the premise of an intervention follow up to address the results. What the results of the study showed, was that in combination with hunger, a surprisingly high rate of obesity existed among students, 20-25 percent in the schools they surveyed.<sup>24</sup> At that time this was a very surprising finding, as national data was not yet reflecting the growing obesity trend and it wasn't what the study set out to explore. The intervention that was chosen to address the issues of hunger as well as obesity was a replication of the Farmers' Market Salad Bar from Santa Monica. There were three elementary schools chosen as a pilot for the intervention, all of which

had greater than 90 percent free and reduced qualification and had ethnically diverse student bodies. All three sites also had the physical infrastructure to support a salad bar, including a space to set up the salad bar with at least three walls and a roof. Wendy Slusser, an assistant clinical professor at the UCLA School of Public Health and Medical Director of the FIT for Healthy Weight Program, was a key researcher for this pilot and worked closely with the Deputy Director of school food services in LAUSD at the time. Slusser stated that the LAUSD Director was very skeptical of the program at first, but after the researchers took her to see the salad bar in SMMUSD and she saw how children were choosing the salad bar over hot lunch and using it safely, she was willing to try a pilot in LAUSD.<sup>25</sup> Robert Gottlieb was also closely involved in the study because of his involvement in the development of the Santa Monica salad bar program. Two of these salad bars were set up with produce from the schools vendors, and one was a farmers' market salad bar. The goal of the study was to determine if there would be a change in the children's fruit and vegetable consumption with the implementation of the salad bar.<sup>26</sup>

The program was successful, and the study showed a significant increase in fruit and vegetable consumption among the children, as measured by a 24-hour recall interview done with the students. The implementation of the salad bars, however, hit many barriers along the way and ultimately, the farmers' market model was not adopted by the district. Staff members from the Community Food Security Program in the Urban & Environmental Policy Institute worked directly with the cafeteria staff to order and pick up the fruits and vegetables, so the program could not be institutionalized by the district. In the small scale that it was done for this project, it was very time consuming to get the orders from the farmers' market or coordinate orders with multiple farms, and there was not enough staff to make it a successful project. Staff in LAUSD complained that it was difficult to work with the farms. They encountered inconsistency in the quality and availability of products from the farms and challenges in the logistics in having food delivered programs. Cafeteria staff had also not been trained to handle whole, tree-ripened fruits, since they were used to using pre-cut, packaged produce.

While the farmers' market salad bar model was not initially viable for LAUSD, the district acknowledged the positive impact the salad bars had on the fruit and vegetable consumption of students, and has since expanded the number of salad bars in schools. From 1998 when the pilot began to 2010, the district has put in salad bars in 60 of its schools. Slusser says this is slow, but at least it is progress. In 2010, the district said they will work to support

any school that wants to get a salad bar and has the physical structure to support one, which is important not only for preparation, but also for the safety standards to serve the salads. Slusser also stated that while the district is making this effort, there is a significant lack of awareness among the principals and cafeteria managers about the opportunity, which has also contributed to the slow growth of the program.<sup>27</sup>

By the year 2000, LAUSD was contracting a portion of their meal services from brand name fast-food companies, who could provide them with cheap items such as pizza and sub sandwiches. In 2000-2001, the district spent the same amount of their budget on these brand name items as on the all fruits and vegetables purchased by the district.<sup>28</sup> In addition to the incorporation of these brand-name products into the meals, the district also raised revenue through the vending and ala cart sales of typically high fat, high sodium and low nutritional value items, known as “competitive foods”. Because of the increasing prevalence of these items, an initiative to create a Healthy School Food Policy was started. The LAUSD School Board formed A Child Nutrition Advisory Committee (CNAC) to consider changes to meal programs. Parents and community members founded the Healthy School Food Coalition (HSFC) to advocate for healthier school food in LAUSD and to organize youth and parents interested in food quality and food policy.<sup>29</sup>

As part of this initiative, school board member Valerie Fields introduced a motion calling for a nutritional assessment of the food sold in LAUSD schools. WestEd was hired to do the assessment. The research team selected eight high schools and fifteen middle schools, where cafeteria menus were analyzed for their nutritional content, and visual surveys of vending machines and competitive foods were also used. There were also elementary schools in the study who simply submitted a month’s record of food production sheets. The survey found that the schools did offer meals that when complete were consistent with the USDA’s dietary guidelines, but that students’ choices tended to be those high in calories and saturated fats.<sup>30</sup> Students also tended to take lower amount of vegetables and whole grains than what was recommended by the USDA. In WestEd’s observations of vending machines, they discovered that most of the items purchased by students were carbonated beverages, however, water, juice and sports drinks were also sometimes available. Additionally, the study found that the items sold in student stores were typically foods high in added sugars, refined starches and sodium. The availability of these foods certainly contributes to their high levels of consumption, but for many middle and high

school students, peer pressure is also an important factor in food choices. One survey found that while students might admit they are hungry, they didn't want to be seen eating the cafeteria food, especially if they faced the stigma of paying for lunch with free or reduced price tickets, and so they chose to buy unhealthy items from vending machines or student stores instead.<sup>31</sup> This study made apparent the nutritional difference in those foods served as part of the school meal program and the "competitive foods" served outside of it. The low nutritional value of the competitive foods, and the likelihood of the students to consume them, made those options the target of the HSFC and the CNAC.

HSFC's first campaign was addressing the problem of soda sold in vending machines. As the campaign against soda in vending machines began to gain momentum, LAUSD school board members, Genethia Hayes and Marlene Cantor proposed a district wide soda ban as a board policy, the HSFC helped write the motion and lobby the school board to pass it, building upon similar initiatives taking place in the state of California, notably Senate Bill 19, which regulated sales of foods high in fat and sugar, increased state reimbursements, and provided grants for nutrition and exercise programs in elementary schools.<sup>32</sup> This was passed in 2001 with the support of the California Center for Public Health Advocacy and Senator Martha Escutia, with the help of nutrition and community food security advocacy groups. The HSFC was able to build community support for the soda ban proposal, and they fought alongside supporting board members to get the resolution passed. There was significant concern from opposing board members for the possible loss of revenue and funding that would occur as a result of banning soda. However, it is of significance to note that at the time the district earned just a few dollars per student per year from the sales of sodas and other competitive foods, which in the scope of the overall food services budget of over \$300 million is rather insubstantial. The ban was implemented successfully, and was nationally recognized as a landmark model and an important step in improving the school food environment.<sup>33</sup>

Building upon the soda ban, the LAUSD school board continued to work towards a healthier school food environment through the adoption of two subsequent motions, the Obesity Prevention Motion in 2003 and Cafeteria Improvement motion in 2005. These have been able to build upon the soda ban to further reduce the snack foods sold in vending machines and student stores, and increase the fruit and vegetable servings that are offered with school meals in the cafeteria, as well as the whole grains that are available. These motions also aimed to shift the

historically negative perception of cafeteria food, and promote good nutrition and increase participation in the school lunch program.<sup>34</sup> In 2006, a motion was passed to standardize the menu for the entire district, ensuring that every student in the district receives the same food items. This also required every cafeteria to provide a minimum amount of produce, which had previously been under-regulated and managed individually by each cafeteria, which resulted in some students having lower quantities and less variety of fruits and vegetables available to them than others.<sup>35</sup> To correct this issue, the district is currently in the process of updating its technology in the form of a digital Cafeteria Management System (CMS) which will allow the district to electronically track all of its purchases, which sites those products are sold at, and what items are selling the best.

In 2007 LAUSD hired David Binkle as the Deputy Director of Food Services, and since then he has helped moved the district to invest in new technology and the modernization of some school lunch rooms, develop new menu items, and engage students in the nutrition and menu planning process. These changes positively affected the LAUSD school lunchroom atmosphere, but there were still complaints of long lunch lines, the cafeteria running out of menu items, and limited promotion and education about the changes. Additionally, students continued to choose and consume items that were similar to those sold at fast-food restaurants.<sup>36</sup> For the 2011-2012 academic school year, the Food Services Department has reinvented their menu and the way that they procure their food products, including fresh produce items. The new menu that the LAUSD Food Services has developed was created to be in accordance with the recommendations from the Institute of Medicine that have been incorporated into the Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act 2010, and will be implemented nationally in 2012. The menu includes increased portions and variety of vegetables and fruits offered, increased servings of whole grains and further reductions in the fat and sodium content of meals (see appendix A).

Up until 2008, the district had a produce buyer who went directly to the Los Angeles Terminal Market to place orders for fruits and vegetables. In a 2008 audit of the district, this system was found to be inefficient, and the district has since purchased produce through vendor companies. In early 2011, Food Services put out a Request for Proposals (RFPs) to companies that could provide the district with food products. In this process, LAUSD doesn't have exact specifications of the products they want, instead says Binkle, they want to allow the vendor companies to sell what they have. Binkle says that this forces the vendor to think about what

kind of products they can provide that are within the meal pattern regulations, and how that vendor can get it distributed to the schools most efficiently.<sup>37</sup> The district believes that it will have the ability to procure cheaper products using the RFPs, because the vendors will have to compete to provide low cost products, and get those products to the district as efficiently as possible.<sup>38</sup> The contracts that result from this process will be five year contract, in contrast to the typical three, which the district hopes will further reduce the costs of products because companies will have a guarantee that their product will be bought for a longer period. With these contracts, the district is also asking that the suppliers do marketing of their products within the schools, something that LAUSD doesn't have the budget for but would like to do more of to improve the image of the schools meals. In selecting companies, the district must choose those with a reliable history and the capacity to supply and distribute the massive volumes of products that LAUSD needs. They also must meet all of the safety and health code regulations of the district, and have insurance that can cover their products.<sup>39</sup>

The Food Services Department in LAUSD has certainly made important steps forward, including infrastructure and technology upgrades, and the menu that will appear in cafeteria's in the fall of 2011 has been recognized across the nation as a ground-breaking model.<sup>40</sup> The menu changes specifically address the health impacts of school meals, reflected by their tailoring to the Institute of Medicine's recommendations, but the price-focused procurement of the district fails to take into account the external impacts of their decisions. If LAUSD truly wants to become a leader in healthy food, they should feature local and regional products that support their community, and in doing so become a model for students by encouraging choices that are not only healthy for their bodies, but for the environments and communities in which they live.

## FARM TO SCHOOL

Farm to School began almost 15 years ago, when Robert Gottlieb's daughter came home from school complaining about the brown lettuce in the salad bar. As a concerned parent and school board member, not to mention a well-known social justice activist and professor of Urban Planning at UCLA, Gottlieb took his daughter's complaint as a call to action.<sup>41</sup> He approached the Food Services Director of the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District where his daughter attended, and proposed starting a Farmers' Market salad bar with products from the Santa Monica Farmers' Market. Rodney Taylor, the director at the time, at first thought the idea was absurd and that it was just not something that was feasible to do in a school district.<sup>42</sup> Gottlieb continued to pressure Taylor and others in the Food Services Department until they agreed to do a pilot program with preschool students for two weeks during a summer session. This first model of the Farmers' Market Salad Bar was quite successful, and when Taylor came to the lunchroom and saw the students going through the lines, picking out the bite-sized pieces of fresh fruits and vegetables, and saw all of the colors in the salad bar and the excitement of the students, he became completely sold on the model. The next school year Gottlieb approached Taylor once again, this time with grant funding to pilot a salad bar in an elementary school. The pilot project was wildly successful; it increased salad bar participation six fold.<sup>43</sup>

In the next three years, Taylor and the SMMUSD Food Services Department set up a salad bar in each of the other 15 elementary schools in the district. Taylor received a grant to hire a salad bar coordinator, which was a critical step in getting the program up and running. He also was able to get further grant funding to implement salad bars in the first five schools, which were in lower income areas of the district. The PTA funded the remaining two years that it took to install salad bars in the rest of the schools, and by the third year, 2000, the district was no longer receiving grant funds and required very little outside money to keep the salad bars running. When Taylor left the district for a position in Riverside in 2002, the Farmers' Market Salad Bar was fully institutionalized and took no additional outside resources.<sup>44</sup> "So this answers all the questions of whether or not a program like this can be implemented," Taylor says, "whether it could be sustainable, [and whether] you could modify eating behaviors and have a healthy bottom line as well."<sup>45</sup>

The Farmers' Market Salad Bar was one of the first Farm to School programs in the country, and now just 15 years later, the National Farm to School Network estimates that there are over 2,000 programs nationwide involving more than 10,000 schools. More than just about bringing fresh foods into the school lunchrooms, Farm to School also supports a food system that builds local economies, provides living wage jobs, and increases access to local, fresh, affordable and healthy foods. There are many different models of Farm to School across the country, from programs that utilize the Farmers' Market Salad Bar model to those that aim to incorporate just one local/regional item purchased directly from a farm or group of farms each month. The nature of each of these programs depends on the specific context of each school and the resources that are available in the surrounding community. The implementation of almost every Farm to School program involves a challenging path. Farm to School changes the paradigm of what it means to purchase foods for, prepare and serve a school lunch, and there is great resistance to that shift within many school districts.. The initial stages of Farm to School programs often require outside funding or an investment on the part of the food services department. Buying local, fresh produce can be more expensive than purchasing through traditional vendors, and the availability of those foods may be limited by seasonal factors. Additionally, it takes time and funding to train kitchen staff members and update kitchen facilities for the preparation of fresh, whole foods, as well as to advertise the new products and to educate students about their value.

The success of Farm to School programs across the country demonstrates that it is possible to overcome these barriers. When Rodney Taylor left Santa Monica and moved to Riverside, they at first told him that the Farmers' Market Salad Bar was only successful in Santa Monica because it was an affluent district that could support the program. Today, Riverside Unified has a salad bar in every one of its elementary schools, and the food services department has become a revenue-generating department. Farm to School programs depend as much on the willingness of the food services department to overcome the challenges of starting and program as they do on funding or logistics. A subsequent section of this paper will explore three southern California school districts, Riverside Unified, San Diego Unified, and Ventura Unified, all of which have successful Farm to School programs, and the barriers that they have overcome to become successful programs.

## REGIONAL FOOD HUBS

The California Regional Food Hub Advisory Council defines a food hub as “an integrated food distribution system to coordinate agricultural production and the aggregation, storage, processing, distribution and marketing of locally or regionally-produced food products.”<sup>46</sup> A Regional Food Hub (RFH) is a collaboration of stakeholders, both individuals and organizations, who are part of the food system. This includes producers, distributors, vendors, buyers, consumers and everyone else involved in the process of growing and consuming foods. RFHs work to strengthen the food system by providing healthy, fresh and flavorful food for the local or regional community, while also creating green jobs and turning a profit for the producers that allows the hub to be viable into the future. Many of these hubs are also working towards a model of good food- food that is “healthy, green, fair and affordable” that runs from farm to table.<sup>47</sup> As schools, cities and public health organizations move toward procurement and food service policies that are focused on public health incentives in communities, RFHs are a way to mitigate the negative externalities of increased demand for fresh produce, and help create comprehensive strategies that address the public health of both the consumer and producer.

The Regional Food Hub Advisory Council envisions a RFH Network (RFH-N) in California that supports the existing hubs and is able to expand using lessons from their models. Los Angeles would be part of that expansion, and an urban RFH would be created to serve farms and farmers in California, and be part of a statewide, regionally focused, food system. The RFH-N would be developed with the goals of coordinating regional food supply, provide services and support to individual RFH and the farmers within them and do collective marketing, as well as offer space for new technology and innovation to be developed, research to take place, and for participation in policy advocacy.

The Council’s vision of a RFH in Los Angeles is one that would have a “hybrid hub marketplace,” including a wholesale market, a retail marketplace and a permanent farmers’ market. Such a hub would be able to facilitate the support of currently disadvantaged small and mid-scale growers, wholesalers and customers through the creation of a new food system based on eliminated inefficiencies while promoting sustainability.

A Los Angeles RFH has the potential to support a Farm to School program in LAUSD through the provision of fresh, regional food products at a fair cost to both the growers and the district. The aggregation of products through a RFH would be able to better meet the high demand of the district as a customer for at least some of the food products, and create a single vendor through which the district is able to purchase those products. As seen in the OGO and San Diego Growers examples, the growers have been able to sell their products to school districts at a market price because of their ability to reduce the number of steps from field to table, thus reducing costs along the way. The RFH would also provide multiple outlets for farmers beyond just the school district. For example, the San Diego Growers envision that only 20-30 percent of their total sales through their hub will be to school districts, and the rest will be for high profit margin markets, such as wholesale to restaurants and sales directly to customers through CSA and farmers' markets.

## **SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA FARM TO SCHOOL MODELS**

### ***Riverside Unified School District***

"We're trying to redefine what a school lunch is all about. We're doing it based on positive messages and role models, coupled with farm-fresh food." Rodney Taylor

Rodney Taylor came to Riverside Unified in 2002, when the district was facing a deficit of \$3.1 million, a free and reduced population of 62%, and food services department that was in need of change.<sup>48</sup> Taylor had been the food services director for establishment of the Farmers' Market Salad Bar in the Santa Monica Malibu Unified School District, and had seen the success of the program and positive response of the students. Taylor said that he knew when he went to the district he wanted to put in a Farmers' Market Salad Bar, but it took a couple years to reorganize the department and get others on board. When Taylor initially expressed that he, with the support of Occidental College, wanted to establish a Farmers' Market Salad Bar program in Riverside, there was very little support from principals and cafeteria managers. Taylor moved forward, and the first salad bar was launched in 2005 at Jefferson Elementary School, where 900 students ate lunch every day and the free-and-reduced rate was 98%.<sup>49</sup> After the success of this initial trial program, which served an average of 600 salads the first two weeks and eventually flattened out to serve about 250 salads a day, others in the district acknowledged its potential for success not only in the provision of fresh fruits and vegetables, but also as a business model. In the subsequent year, they brought three more schools into the Farmers' Market Salad Bar Program, and then eight per year every year after than, until all 29 elementary schools had salad bars.<sup>50</sup>

## Riverside School District Profile

Number of Students in District	44,000 <sup>51</sup>
Number of School Sites in District	31 elementary schools 6 middle schools 7 high schools
Average Meals Served per day	32,000 <sup>52</sup> (Lunches only)
Participation Rate in Meal Programs	70% <sup>53</sup>
Free and Reduced Rate of District	57% <sup>54</sup>
Average Household Income Level in District Area	\$57,590 <sup>55</sup>

## Riverside Farm to School Program Profile

Program Model	Farmers' Market Salad Bar, based on the Santa Monica Malibu Salad Bar. This is offered as a complete meal alternative to hot lunch.
How are products purchased?	Ordered directly from growers' collaborative one week before they are to appear in the salad bar. There is one district-wide salad bar coordinator who places the order for all of the salad bars. <sup>56</sup>
Who are the products purchased from?	All products are bought from the Old Grove Orange Growers Collaborative, which consists of 25 farms in the inland empire region.
Delivery	Produce is delivered directly to the schools by the farms <sup>57</sup>
Preparation	All foods arrive at the schools in their whole forms, and the kitchen staff in schools has been trained in the preparation of products. <sup>58</sup>

Region from which the produce is derived	Products are purchased directly from Old Grove Orange, specifically working with four farmers within 50 miles of the schools. RUSD defines this as “local purchasing at its best” <sup>59</sup>
Classroom Component/ Other educational components	Harvest of the Month activities Taste tests School Gardens Field trips to Farms and Farmers’ Markets Farmer visits to classrooms <sup>60</sup>
Staff Training	Training for: produce cleaning, cutting and handling procedures, monitoring the salad bar and ensuring students choose a complete reimbursable meal, ordering procedures, salad bar set-up, utensil use and leftover storage procedures. <sup>61</sup>
Perceived Barriers	Too expensive, Farmers’ Market Salad Bar would only work in an affluent district. The district was too big.

Challenges	<p><b>Overcoming deficit in the food services department.</b> When Taylor was hired, the district was in debt and couldn't make the payments on its newest nutrition center. Taylor had to wait a couple of years to start Farm to School until debt was at a more manageable level.</p> <p><b>Changing the Food Service Mentality.</b> At first, many people thought that it wouldn't be possible, but when they saw the success in the first school, everyone got on board with the program. "You can't change anything until you change your mind" – Quoted by Rodney Taylor</p> <p><b>Initial cost.</b> Each salad bar costs about \$6,000 to get started, so they had to make an initial investment. But after the initial costs, the food services department is making money.</p> <p><b>Raising lunch prices.</b> In order to provide, "better quality, better variety and shorter lines" that parents had asked for, he raised the price of lunch. At first it was quite controversial, but now it has become institutionalized.</p>
------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Riverside Unified and Old Grove Orange

In Riverside, Bob Knight with the Old Grove Orange growers collaborative supplies over 30 school districts with regional products. The Old Grove Orange (OGO) hub began as a CSA (Community Supported Agriculture) program to connect local growers to local eaters, and that developed into a program in which 1200 families are currently involved. Rodney Taylor was instrumental in creating the hub. Taylor approached Knight about working with Riverside on a Farm to School project, and OGO was able to provide the district with products similar to those provided to CSA customers- mandarins, kiwis and oranges. In this case, the school really became the catalyst for the hub, and as more schools started Farm to School programs, more farms were brought into the hub. Knight states, "this is a real practical mechanism for small groves to basically be sustainable." The Old Grove Orange (OGO) hub has currently has 25

farms at sites across the inland empire region. The collaborative has been able to remain competitive with large-scale farmers because they deliver their own products, and are therefore able to sell them at the market price rather than sell them to distribution companies. The advantage to the farmers is that a higher percentage of the price of a given product goes directly back to the farm, who is able to translate that into higher wages for workers and investment into environmentally sound growing practices. OGO also has their own 3000 sq. ft. aggregations facility, where products from their 25 farms are aggregated, graded and hand packed for distribution. 75% of these products are sold under a collective OGO label, and the other 25% of products are sold directly by the individual farms. The ability of the farms to use the aggregation point to pack and label their products adds value to those products, and they are able to keep their costs down through the collective and locally focused distribution of their products.<sup>62</sup> At a Farm to School event in Riverside in March 2011, Knight expressed that what the collaborative farmers are interested in is “maintaining a farming lifestyle for our community”, and the community has been very supportive of the farms. In the 30 school districts it sells to, the OGO products now reach over 1 million students in Riverside, San Bernardino, Orange and L.A. Counties. “Each school district that we recruit,” Knight states, “means additional farmers, additional farms that we can make sustainable.”<sup>63</sup> This speaks to the tremendous impact that RFHs can have in their communities, and the concrete advantages to the farmers that the market outlet of a school district can provide.

### ***San Diego Unified School District***

San Diego’s Farm to School Program is very young, beginning in the Fall of 2010. As part of a CDC grant, Vanessa Zajfen was hired as a Farm to School coordinator for the San Diego Unified School District. In this role, she searches for local farmers and then determines which products to buy based on the ability of the district kitchens to prepare and serve the foods. Their first purchase was in October of 2010, when they bought 40 tons of oranges from a San Diego grower and featured those oranges for their Harvest of the Month program. The Farm to School program has specifications as to what kind of farms their products will be coming from in terms of both range and size. These state the preference will be given to products from farms that are less than 500 acres in size, grow no less than two crops per 250 acres, utilize hand harvesting and packing,

and farms that grow organically and/or in a sustainable manner.<sup>64</sup> To deal with price restrictions, they also choose to buy produce that isn't of the highest grading, but is instead called "fancy fruit" and may be of an odd size or have blemishes. This allows the district to buy products that are still very high in quality and rich in flavor, but ones that farms may not be able to sell to markets like Whole Foods or restaurants. In November of 2010 the district featured apples, and in December it was a spring lettuce mix. For March, they worked specifically with Tierra Miguel Foundation and the San Diego Growers Guild to coordinate a harvest of broccoli. The broccoli was planted on multiple farms in early January, and harvested in March as the featured item. The district tries to incorporate the products in different ways, in entrees, on the salad bar, and if it's appropriate in after school snacks as well.

#### San Diego Unified School District Profile

Number of Students in District	135,792 <sup>65</sup>
Number of School Sites in District	119 elementary schools 24 middle schools 30 high schools <sup>66</sup>
Average Meals Served per day	72,000 Lunches 25,000 Breakfasts <sup>67</sup>
Participation Rate in Meal Programs	53%
Free and Reduced Eligible Rate of District	55% <sup>68</sup>
Average Household Income Level in District Area	\$62,820 <sup>69</sup>

## San Diego Farm to School Program Profile

Program Model	SDUSD features one local product every month, either in their salad bar or in a menu recipe.
How are products purchased?	All products are purchased directly from growers by the Farm to School Coordinator. The farms are identified by the district as ones that are in accordance with their purchasing guidelines.
Who are the products purchased from?	SDUSD works with both individual growers in San Diego county that have farms less than 1,000 acres in size, as well as with Tierra Miguel Foundation and a collective of growers called the San Diego Growers Guild.
Delivery	Products are delivered to the SDUSD distribution company, and then those products are delivered to the central kitchen sites.
Preparation	SDUSD has 19 central kitchen sites where the majority of foods are prepared. <sup>70</sup>
Region from which the produce is derived	Local: Grown/raised within a 150 mile radius from the San Diego Unified Food Services distribution center. San Diego Local: Grown/raised within 25 miles from San Diego County Line Regional: Grown/raised within a 250 mile radius of the San Diego Unified Food Services distribution center. <sup>71</sup>
Classroom Component/ Other educational components	Harvest of the Month Classroom visits by farmers Field Trips to Farms Nourish CA Curriculum, beginning April 2011
Staff Training	When the district knows what product will be coming, they ensure that all of the kitchen staff will be knowledgeable about how to handle and prepare the product.

Perceived Barriers	<p>Legality of sourcing local food          Not enough food in San Diego County          Local food would be too costly          No kitchen facilities to prepare foods</p>
Challenges	<p><b>Price</b> is the number one issue, but has not prevented the program from being successful. As mentioned in the introduction, the district has come up with creative ways to meet the price point, and farms have been willing to work with the district on this.</p> <p><b>Time.</b> Most of their preparation cooking is done in the central kitchens, and then the items are sent out in a heat and serve model, because there is not enough time or kitchen capability at each school site to prepare items there. In addition, students only have a 20 minute period to eat, which also limits the foods that can be served.</p> <p><b>Distribution.</b> SDUSD has to have the foods dropped off at the 19 kitchens in enough time to prepare the foods for lunch.</p> <p><b>Access.</b> SDUSD wants to ensure that other, small districts in the region have access to fresh products as well. If they wanted, SDUSD could buy all of the products grown by small and mid sized farmers in the county, and we want to make sure that other people and schools have access to those products too.</p> <p><b>Coordination.</b> It's relatively easy for the F2S Coordinator to contact just one farm and have them provide us with a product. But it's much harder to have multiple farms growing a product, and be able to coordinate the harvest and delivery of those products.</p>

## San Diego Unified and the San Diego Growers

The San Diego Growers are part of an emerging RFH in San Diego, that is being developed out of the San Diego Food System Working Group Assessment of San Diego County. The assessment aimed to explore the connections between the production, distribution, consumption and waste disposal of foods and the impacts of each of those processes on the environment and human health. The assessment aims to create a plan for a sustainable food system that integrates the stewardship of environmental resources in San Diego County with economic growth and jobs through building the local food system, and better health and well-being of residents resulting from increased access to affordable fresh produce items. The San Diego Growers are a group that are working to achieve this vision for a new food economy by building farm capacity, developing local distribution infrastructure and contributing to healthy school food environments.<sup>72</sup> Tierra Miguel Foundation Farm has been a large part of the development of the RFH, which Foundation Director Jonathan Reinbold says is “more of a system, not a [physical] place,” and in this sense the hub is already fully functioning. In the future, however, the collaborative would like to get a physical location where they are able to lightly process their products.

In San Diego, the SDUSD Farm to School Coordinator began working with Tierra Miguel Foundation in the fall of 2010 to identify farmers who could provide products for the school district. In January of 2011, the Tierra Miguel growers coordinated to plant broccoli for the school district, which was featured as the Harvest of the Month item in March. They are integrated to both coordinate agricultural production, and then aggregate those products together and distribute them collectively. Reinbold estimates that schools will become about 20-30% of the sales for the hub in the coming years, but for the food hub to continue its success the other portion of the sales have to have higher profit margin markets, such as farmers’ markets and restaurant sales. They also explain their success with the project so far as due in part to the support of the San Diego Unified School District and the community. Farmers, the district and other partners meet every month to talk about procurement in the school district and give the growers an opportunity to talk about what they are doing. Reinbold and another member of Tierra Miguel, Ashley Colpaart, both believe that a RFH project like theirs will only thrive if the partners share the same values, which are to increase local consumption of foods grown within San Diego County, and work together to institutionalize this through policy.<sup>73</sup>

In addition to helping establish the hub, SDUSD is also working with their traditional produce vendor to source more of the products locally, because the vendor knows more of the commodity growers that can provide large quantities of products. These are products that are still grown within the boundaries of local and regional as defined above, but are at a low enough cost that they can be served in the menu daily. This combination of strategies to incorporate more regional products into San Diego has been very successful, and they are now working to implement the Nourish curriculum for students that focuses on the larger concepts associated with the food options that they choose.

### ***Ventura Unified School District***

The Ventura Unified School District set up their first salad bar 10 years ago, as a pilot project through the collaboration of a parent and a farmer. As the school nutrition director, Sandy Curwood's mission was to feed children healthy foods. She took this salad bar model and institutionalized it, bringing up five schools a year until all of the schools in the district had salad bars in their cafeteria. They purchase the majority of their produce through a single vendor, who provides them a list of which farms the products they can purchase come from, and they try to purchase as many local and regional products as they can. This year, they have also created a partnership with a farm just outside of Ventura who agreed to grow 10 acres of carrots specifically for VUSD. This has been very successful, and they are hoping to build this relationship in the future so that more products can be grown specifically for the district. In addition to the inclusion of the Farmers' Market Salad Bar, VUSD has also transitioned to a scratch cooking model, and almost all of the items on their menus are now prepared from scratch by their kitchen staff. This took an initial investment in the training of the staff, but they have ultimately been able to save money by buying bulk products and by using their labor force more efficiently.

## Ventura Unified School District Profile

Number of Students in District	17,506 <sup>74</sup>
Number of School Sites in District	25 <sup>75</sup>
Average Meals Served per day	7,000 lunches <sup>76</sup>
Participation Rate in Meal Programs	N/A
Free and Reduced Rate of District	47% <sup>77</sup>
Average Household Income Level in District Area	\$76,190 <sup>78</sup>

## VUSD Farm to School Program Profile

Program Model	VUSD has a farmers' market salad bar that is a side option for all lunches.
How are products purchased?	The majority of products are purchased through their main produce vendor, Berry Man, who provides a list of where the products are sourced. They focus on buying products as locally as they can. <sup>79</sup>
Delivery	Products are delivered to the VUSD through the vendor. They are delivered as whole products.
Preparation	VUSD has transitioned to scratch cooking, and all staff have been trained to use knives and prepare the whole produce for meals. <sup>80</sup>

Region from which the produce is derived	Extremely Local: in Ventura County, mainly from Oxnard and Ventura. Regional: Tri-Valley region Statewide: State of California <sup>81</sup>
Safety Certifications	No additional safety or health code certifications were required. <sup>82</sup>
Liability of Farm to School Products	Did not encounter additional liability in the purchase of farm products. <sup>83</sup>
Classroom Component/ Other educational components	Classroom nutrition education Garden based nutrition education Harvest of the Month program Farmer visits to schools
Staff Training	All kitchen staff members were sent to the Longevity Institute in Westlake to be trained in scratch preparation of all of the items on the menu, as well as in the preparation of whole produce. <sup>84</sup>
Perceived Barriers	Local produce would be too expensive Scratch preparation would be too expensive Scratch preparation would require too much labor <sup>85</sup>

Challenges	<p><b>Training Staff.</b> VUSD had to make an initial investment to train all of our staff. But now they have been able to save money because haven't had to add additional labor and can buy more bulk products.</p> <p><b>Buy in.</b> Getting the staff and the district to buy into and support the program was an initial challenge, but with the programs success they have been able to get more staff members, district level employees and school board members to support the program.</p> <p><b>Distribution.</b> The district does not have the resources to pick up the products directly from farms, so they have to find other ways to connect the farms and farmers with the schools.</p> <p><b>Cost.</b> It costs the district more to buy healthy food, but they have been able to keep those costs down with the efficient use of labor and scratch cooking, and were able to reform the system by investing in it up front. And, the Nutrition Department firmly believes that feeding kids healthy foods is critically important, and they are willing to spend extra money to do that.<sup>86</sup></p>
------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Ventura Unified Procurement Practices

When the salad bar first began at VUSD, the district worked directly with the California Alliance for Family Farms (CAFF), who coordinated with the farmers and delivered products directly to the schools. The salad bar program was able to develop under this model; however the district was dependent on CAFF to facilitate the program. When the relationship with CAFF ended abruptly due to CAFF's decision to focus more exclusively on Northern and Central California where their headquarters is located, the VUSD had to figure out how to keep the program running. This was the biggest challenge that they encountered, but the program was able to continue developing through that challenge and it remains a successful model today. Instead of working through a farm or RFH, VUSD has worked with its produce vendor to create a list of "extremely local" and "regional" farms from which they can buy specific products and are able to track where those products come from.<sup>87</sup>

Ventura is an important case for several reasons. Their dedication to the salad bar program even after their initial supplier was unable to facilitate the program demonstrates the commitment of the district to changing the philosophy behind providing school meals. This has also been proven by their commitment to go beyond the salad bar, and retrain their staff in scratch cooking, which has helped them use staff members more efficiently and saved the district money. The VUSD Farm to School program is an example of working within the existing structure of their food procurement vendors to facilitate a program, which benefits the district and encourages the vendor to work directly with smaller, more local farms. While this procurement system differs slightly from the other models, it shows the district's changing attitudes towards procurement and the willingness of VUSD to pressure vendors to supply products from local and regional farms.

## **BARRIERS IN LAUSD**

Changing engrained models of the way in which a school meal is delivered, prepared and served is a challenging process. As seen in the examples above, there are many barriers that are encountered along the way, and it takes time, resources and will power to move through those barriers and get a program started. The current budget crisis in California will increase barriers to innovative food reforms. In the coming fiscal year, class sizes in LAUSD will again increase as more than 7,000 employees are given leave, and elective programs are reduced to almost nonexistent. It is in this climate that we have to emphasize the importance of healthy eating supporting a community food systems approach that looks at the long-term sustainability of school lunch programs and the students they feed, while ensuring the health and economic vitality of all community members.

For a school district such as LAUSD, the massive size makes it that much more difficult to instigate changes. Out of the near 1000 sites that LAUSD meal programs serve, 400 do not have kitchens and many schools don't have cafeterias either, or have three to five times the number of students that the cafeterias were meant to hold. This results in long waiting lines, and little time to eat for those at the end of the line. The logistics of menus are the most important aspect of meal planning according to food services. Menus are developed to comply with nutritional standards, but to a large degree foods are chosen based on the ability of staff to prepare them in the time allotted, low cost, and availability. These are three of the key barriers in the implementation of any Farm to School program, especially one in a district where 650,000 meals are prepared and served every day. The following section will outline these and other barriers that LAUSD would face in an attempt to establish any form of a Farm to School program.

### Distribution

All of the foods that end up on the school lunch or breakfast tray must by some way or another make it into each of the schools and on to those trays. Distribution of food products is one of the major barriers to the incorporation of more produce into the cafeteria. Currently, perishable products are delivered to the central warehouse, and then subsequently distributed to central kitchens for preparation or to school sites. For many produce items, salad greens for

example, there is a short life from field to table in order to retain freshness. The items must be transported and delivered to each of the over 1,000 sites on a daily basis, or at minimum twice weekly. For a Farm to School program to be implemented, there would either need to be a secondary distribution system for the produce, or it would need to be integrated in with distribution network of other goods that already occurs in LAUSD.

### Scale

The sheer quantity of products used on a daily basis in LAUSD is a barrier to a Farm to School program. Many other small school districts have the ability to source products from just one local farm, or work with a specific farmer to provide a product for an extended period of time. With a district as large as LAUSD, industrial scale farms and food distribution channels have been the default because of their ability to provide the district with enough product. The ability of a vendor, or a farm, to work with the district is dependent on their ability to provide the quantities of products required by the district.

### Current Preparation Practices

The current method of preparing foods in LAUSD is such that relatively few meals actually get prepared in kitchens at the school or other sites.<sup>88</sup> The majority of preparation is either done in central kitchens, or happens before the district even acquires the products. Many of the produce items come already washed and chopped, and items like burritos and wraps are bought already prepared. When these items are bought already prepared, there becomes reduced opportunities for the incorporation of Farm to School products within menu items. This means that school site kitchens and central kitchens in some cases are not physically equipped and don't have staff trained in working with whole products, which is a barrier for getting farm fresh products into school meals.

### Training

The fact that most items come to the district already in an edible form means that kitchen staff members are not trained to work with fresh, whole products. Other districts who have implemented Farm to School programs have done such things as send their kitchen staff member to outside training locations, or done private trainings with the staff. This requires an investment

on the part of the district, and it is that investment in the workforce that represents a barrier, especially with the large number of staff members that are part of the LAUSD Food Services Department. Additionally, specific training can be required depending on what kind of Farm to School program is implemented, for example a Farmers' Market salad bar requires training of staff to help students safely use the salad bar and comply with meal standards. The buy-in and support of cafeteria staff is also critical to the success of a Farm to School program, and training can help empower staff to adopt the philosophy of the program, and motivate them to take on the increased workload in order to provide a better quality meal for students

### District Policy

There are two district policies that significantly affect the ability of the district to purchase local products. In making their decision to provide every student with a standardized meal, they also decided that all of the produce items that they serve should also be standardized. Every fruit must be “even looking” so that it has no irregular bumps or coloration. This makes it difficult for the district to buy farm fresh products that may not be “even,” and impossible to buy “fancy fruit,” or second grade products that have blemishes or are not of a standard size. Additionally, the LAUSD has a waiver from the federal government allowing them to purchase products from outside the United States border to provide more variety to students at a cheaper price. While this may provide that variety, it also encourages the relaxed environmental and labor regulations that exist in many other produce growing countries, and without policy that encourages them to buy native products, reduces the willingness of the district to buy regional or local products.<sup>89</sup>

### Cost

Cost is one of the most significant perceived barriers to starting a Farm to School program. Because of the very tight budget that the Food Services Department operates on, it is very difficult to think about purchasing alternative products. Currently, LAUSD spends only \$0.77 on food in every meal.<sup>90</sup> In addition to the cost of purchasing food products, Farm to School programs can have initial start up costs, such as salad bar equipment, staff training, and promotion and marketing of the program. However, in looking at the case studies listed above all three were able to overcome the barrier of cost and purchase local and regional products at

prices equal to those of traditional vendors and large scale competitors. The large scale orders of the district also give it an advantage because it is more cost effective for a farmer to sell to one large institutional customer instead of incurring transaction costs from multiple small orders. Additionally, participation has increased at two out of three of the districts, increasing the revenue generating ability of the food services departments.

### Support

As Rodney Taylor, Food Services Director in Riverside, quoted to me, “you can’t change anything until you change your mind.” For Taylor, it took seeing preschool students eating from the salad bar to get him excited about the idea and win his support. Without support from the top, there is no way that a Farm to School program will get started. It takes a lot of time, effort, dedication, and above all passion, to implement any kind of Farm to School program.<sup>91</sup> For a Farm to School program to be successful, the Food Services Department must be willing to support the program and do whatever it takes to get it started. The school board can also be an important source of support, as are cafeteria managers and staff, teachers and principals. Without these multiple levels of support, or support in the school board to pass a policy that requires the district to do direct, local purchasing, starting a Farm to School program is impossible.

LAUSD must overcome these barriers to develop of a Farm to School program. As demonstrated by the other, successful districts, it is possible to overcome challenges with the support of the district, the local community and through collaboration with regional farmers. The recent updates to the infrastructure, technology, procurement procedures and menu in the food services department in LAUSD put it in a favorable position to at least begin looking into the incorporation of a Farm to School program. The following section will explore how the development of a Regional Food Hub in Los Angeles would help overcome some of the barriers listed above and aid in the development of a Farm to School program.

## **CONNECTING FARM TO SCHOOL AND A REGIONAL FOOD HUB**

A Regional Food Hub could facilitate the development of a Farm to School program in LAUSD through the collaborative effort of farmers and the coordination of growing and purchasing practices that are able to provide the district with fresh fruits and vegetables at a price the district can afford. In doing so, LAUSD would become part of a market for small and mid scale farmers that builds the economy with green jobs and promotes sustainable agricultural practices, while using the Farm to School model to educate young students in schools about the importance of knowing where their food comes from and the impact their food choices have on their communities. Improving the school menu to comply with nutritional standards that have been developed in a response to the concern of public health institutions about obesity and lack of access to fresh fruits and vegetables among low-income persons must take into account the “public health” of the communities that are affected by the increased demand for fresh fruits and vegetables. A RFH has the potential to support sustainable growers who provide an alternative to the industrial agricultural practices that negatively impact the health of the environment and of farm workers.

The three case studies highlighted above demonstrate the ways in which a RFH can be an asset in the development of a Farm to School program, and how the Farm to School program can support a RFH. As is occurring in San Diego, the collaborative development of a Farm to School program and a hub can be an effective part of developing a comprehensive sustainable food system which benefits the school district, farmers, and the surrounding community. The Los Angeles Food Hub is just in the beginning of development, creating a perfect opportunity for collaboration with dominant stakeholders in the Los Angeles area, including LAUSD.

A RFH has several advantages to the school district over a traditional vendor. First, the hub has the potential to provide fresher products by reducing the time that a product travels from field to table. This allows for higher quality products to be brought into the district because they are allowed to reach their peak in the fields, rather than being picked early in preparation for long transports. In reducing time, the RFH also reduces the steps that an item takes from the field to the cafeteria, and as shown in Riverside this can reduce the cost of the products. LAUSD’s new RFP procurement system would allow the hub to submit a collective proposal to the district to

supply its produce, and in doing so allow the small and mid scale farmers that are part of the RFH to compete with the larger industrial growers.

In interviews with farms that have worked with Farm to School programs in the past, they expressed that a RFH could also make schools a viable outlet for their products. School districts are challenging customers for small and mid-sized farms, because the tight food service department budgets don't leave room for a premium on products. In some previous relationships, farmers have only been able sell goods to school districts at or below the cost of production, which is not sustainable for the farm. A RFH can help support the farmer through the development of multiple outlets of sale through the hub, some that have a higher profit margin for the farmers. The hub also has the potential to provide access to resources, such as training for farm workers and storage facilities, and also reduce costs to farmers through collective distribution and marketing.

For these reasons, a collaborative relationship between a Farm to School program in LAUSD and a RFH in the Los Angeles area has the potential to be a successful and beneficial relationship on many levels. The hub has the potential to provide high quality, fresh, local and regional products to LAUSD in a way that meets the demand of the district and supports the farmers. The examples of successful relationships studied in this report show that it is possible to develop such a relationship, and that such a relationship can in fact reduce the cost of fresh fruits and vegetables to the school district.

## **CONCLUSIONS and RECCOMENDATIONS**

An effective collaboration between Los Angeles Unified School District and a Regional Food Hub has the potential to meet the goals of providing fresh local and regional fruits and vegetables to students in the district, increasing educational awareness about where foods come from and how they are grow, supporting small and mid-scale sustainable farms, and could be cost effective for the district. This innovative model of a Farm to School program serves both the needs of LAUSD, the farmers and the surrounding community, while participating in the creation of a more socially and economically just food system for the entire Southern California region.

Farm to School comprehensively addresses many of the top public health, environmental and economical issues that we are facing in the United States. These including rising rates of obesity among children and adults, exposure to pesticides, and the lack of access to fresh produce that occurs in many urban areas. It also supports the shrinking numbers of small and mid sized farm, and promotes those farms that pay fair wages and have good labor standards, as well as sound environmental practices though increased profit margins by cutting out the middle man. Farm to School is important because it exposes students to fresh, whole foods, and in doing so educates those students about the external impacts of their food choices. Farm to School isn't just about foods served in school meals; it's a broader program that seeks to redefine what school meals are, and create a new paradigm for the way that our students think about the foods they eat.

A RFH is an emerging concept, and the network of stakeholders in Los Angeles is just beginning to take shape. LAUSD has the opportunity to be at the forefront of developing a large-scale Farm to School model through the collaboration with a RFH and the farmers within that hub. My first recommendation is that LAUSD enter into the discussion with the Regional Food Hub Advisory Council pertaining to the development of a hub in Los Angeles, and help facilitate the development of the RFH and RFH-N in a way that would enable the hub to serve the needs of the school district.

After the new menu is put into effect in the fall of 2011, it will be necessary to evaluate the menu and determine its success among students. The menu should be an important topic of

discussions for the development of the RFH, because it determines the demand of products from the district. An assessment of the perishable menu items is also needed, as this will determine the amount of time that an item can retain its quality and freshness as it moves from field to cafeteria. Additionally, the LAUSD should conduct an evaluation of the Request for Proposal process, and determine what, if any, economic advantages the RFP provides.

LAUSD should also change their policy that requires fruits and vegetables to be of an even grade, free of blemishes and standard in size, to allow for lower cost, “fancy fruit” to be purchased by the district. This would allow LAUSD to buy products from farmers that are not of the highest possible grade, but are still very high quality and fresh products that are sold at reduced prices. San Diego Unified has been able to incorporate these products at a comparatively reduced cost to the district. LAUSD should shift their RFP policy to definitively focus on local and regional products, especially in a transition away from products purchased from outside the United States. In transitioning their procurement, LAUSD should also work with their bid winner from the RFP put out in 2011 to identify local and regional farms that can supply the district with some of the perishable products as Ventura Unified has done, and work to incorporate these items into the school meal programs.

On the side of the RFH, more outreach must be done to identify farms and farmers that are interested in being part of the hub, and education regarding the benefits of a hub. Because of the tough market, many of the small and mid scale farmers have found a niche in the market that they are serving, and expanding their products to serve schools is something that is desired but is fiscally challenging. Educating these farmers about the opportunities that a RFH provides for collaboration with a school district in terms of long-term contracts, and price and customer guarantees for their products.

These are the first steps in the implementation of a Farm to School program as a collaboration with a Regional Food Hub. The inclusion of Farm to School and the updated menu guidelines in the Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 demonstrate national level support for these programs, and the recognition that change is necessary for an environmentally and economically sustainable future that promotes ‘justice for all.’ The development of a Farm to School program in LAUSD with the facilitation of a RFH have the potential to positively impact the health of the next generation of students, conserve environmental resources, and promote worker justice in agriculture.

**APPENDICIES**

*Appendix A: Menu Changes in Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act 2010*

**Changes in Minimum Amounts and Types of Food: Lunch**

	Current requirement	Proposed requirement
Fruit and Vegetables .....	½–1 cup of fruit and vegetables combined per day	¾–1 cup of vegetables plus ½–1 cup of fruit per day.
Vegetables .....	No specifications as to type of vegetable .....	Weekly requirement for dark green and orange vegetables and legumes and limits on starchy vegetables.
Meat/Meat Alternate .....	1.5–3 oz equivalents (daily average over 5-day week).	1.6–2.4 oz equivalents (daily average over 5-day week).
Grains .....	1.8–3 oz equivalents (daily average over 5-day week).	1.8–2.6 oz equivalents (daily average over 5-day week).
Whole Grains .....	Encouraged .....	At least half of the grains to be whole grain-rich.
Milk .....	1 cup .....	1 cup, fat content of milk to be 1% or less.

Source: Department of Agriculture, Food And Nutrition Services, Nutrition Standards in the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs. Federal Register: Volume 76, No. 9. January 13, 2011.

**LAUSD’s Proposed Secondary Schools Lunch Menu for Compliance with these Guidelines**

SECONDARY LUNCH		USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.						LAUSD	I.O.M.	MEET	
WEEK #1	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY						
ENTRÉE CHOICE #1	Mesquite Chicken (2 oz) with Veggies (1/2 c D.G.V.) & Brown Rice (1 c)	Tandori Chicken (2 oz) with Veggies (1/2 c O.V.) & Whole Wheat Naan (1.8 oz)	Beef Soft Taco (2 oz M/MA) (Mexicali Corn (1/4 c S.V.) & Whole Wheat Tortilla (1.8 oz)	Smoked Turkey Burger (2 oz) on Clabatta Roll (1.8 oz) & Potato "Smiles" (1/2 c S.V.)	Orange Chicken (2 oz M/MA) Bowl (1 c) with Veggies (1/4 C OTH V.) & Walnuts (1/2 oz)	Meat/Meat Alt - 19 oz				Meat/Meat Alt - 10 oz to 12 oz	Yes
	2 M/MA, 2 G, 1/2 D.G.V.	2 M/MA, 2 G, 1/2 C O.V.	2 M/MA, 2 G, 1/4 C S.V.	2 M/MA, 2 G, 1/2 C S.V.	3 M/MA, 2 G, 1/4 C OTH V.)						
ENTRÉE CHOICE #2 - V	Black Eyed Pea & Veggie Salad (1/2 c L)	Vegetable Curry (1/4 c S.V.) (1/4 c O.V.) & Whole Wheat Naan (1.8 oz)	Vegetable (1/2 c OTH V.) Tamale (2.2 oz)	Quinoa (1/2 c) & Veggie (1/2 c OTH V.) Salad	Asian Pad Thai (Assorted Veggies (1/2 c OTH V.) & Noodle (1 c) with Spice Peanut Sauce)	Vegetable - 7 Cups				Vegetable - 5 Cups	
	1/2 C L	2 G, 1/4 C S.V., 1/4 C O.V.	2 G, 1/2 C OTH V.	1 G, 1/2 C OTH V.	2 G, 1/2 C OTH V.	1 cup Dark Green Veg, 3/4 cup Orange Veg, 1 cup Legumes, 1 1/2 cup Starchy Veg, 2 3/4 cup Other Veg				1/2 cup Dark Green Veg, 1/2 cup Orange Veg, 1/2 cup Legumes, 1 cup Starchy Veg, 2 1/2 cups Other Veg	Yes
ENTRÉE CHOICE #3	Baja Tacos (Shrimp (2 oz), Cabbage (1/2 c OTH V.), Whole Wheat Tortillas (1.8 oz)	Israeli Couscous (1 c) & Veggie (1/2 c L) Salad	Slow Roasted Pork (2 oz) & Veggies (1/2 c S.V.) with Whole Wheat Tortillas (1.8 oz)	Chef Salad (Turkey, Egg, (2 oz) Veggies & Mixed Green (1/2 c D.G.V.))	Chicken (2 oz) & Vegetable (1/2 c OTH V.) Bao (1.8 oz)	Grains - 25				Grains - 12 to 13	Yes
	2 G, 2 M/MA, 1/2 C OTH V.	2 G, 1/2 C L	2 G, 2 M/MA, 1/2 C S.V.	2 M/MA, 1/2 C D.G.V.	2 G, 2 M/MA, 1/2 C OTH V.						
SIDE #1	FRESH FRUIT (1 CUP)	FRESH FRUIT (1 CUP)	FRESH FRUIT (1 CUP)	FRESH FRUIT (1 CUP)	FRESH FRUIT (1 CUP)	Fruit - 5 Cups				Fruit - 5 Cups	Yes
SIDE #2	CHOICE OF MILK (8 OZ)	CHOICE OF MILK (8 OZ)	CHOICE OF MILK (8 OZ)	CHOICE OF MILK (8 OZ)	CHOICE OF MILK (8 OZ)	Milk - 5 Cups				Milk - 5 Cups	Yes

***Appendix B: List of Interviewees and Their Affiliations***

Laura Benevidez, Food Services Operations, LAUSD  
David Binkle, Food Services Menu/Compliance, LAUSD  
Megan Bomba, Urban & Environmental Policy Institute  
Sharon Cech, Urban & Environmental Policy Institute  
Grant Clinton, Manager of Newman Nutrition Center, LAUSD  
Ashley Colpaart, Tierra Miguel Foundation Farm  
Sandy Curwood, Director of Food and Nutrition Services, VUSD  
Robert Gottlieb, Urban & Environmental Policy Institute  
Orlando Griego, Director of Food and Nutrition Services, SMMUSD  
Phil McGrath, McGrath Family Farms  
Kara Muniz, Assistant Director of Food and Nutrition Services, VUSD  
Jonathan Reinbold, Tierra Miguel Foundation Farm, San Diego Growers  
Dona Richwine, Nutrition Specialist, SMMUSD  
Matthew Sharp, California Food Policy Advocates  
Wendy Slusser, UCLA School of Public Health  
Rodney Taylor, Director of Food Services, RUSD  
Alex Weiser, Weiser Family Farms  
Yelena Zeltser, Urban & Environmental Policy Institute  
Vanessa Zjafen, Farm to School Coordinator, SDUSD

***Appendix C: Interview Questions***

Can you tell me about the Farm to School that currently exists in \_\_\_\_\_ District?

Are the Farm to School products only used on the salad bar or are they also incorporated into menu recipes? What percentage of items on the salad bar are purchased directly from farms? Is there a salad bar in every cafeteria?

Do students choose the salad bar in addition to or in lieu of a hot lunch?

How many meals do you serve per day?

What is the participation rate in meal programs? Has that increased or decreased since you started the salad bars?

What was your main motivation in starting your Farm to School?

Can you tell me about how that project started? Was there an outside organization involved? Was the inclusion of an outside organization beneficial to getting the Farm to School program started or did it make it more complicated?

What kind of barriers did you face in the initial phases of the program? Were there any perceived barriers by you or others in the district that did not end up being issues?

Do you work directly with farms or is there another route that you go through?

How are farm products delivered to the schools?

How are these products prepared when they are delivered? Do you buy products that are already lightly processed or whole foods?

How is the salad bar coordinated? Who purchases the products? Is there one district wide coordinator or one coordinator at each cafeteria site?

Did you have to do any additional training with your staff to educate them in the handling and preparation of the products? How did you train the cafeteria managers to set up and facilitate the salad bars?

What is the region from which the products are derived? Do you have specifications for this region in your procurement policy? Is that something that you would like to work towards?

Did you have to get any special health code or safety certifications to have a farmers' market salad bar?

Is there any additional liability that you incur with the purchase of farm products? (in comparison with purchases from a large vendor)

Do you now, or did you when you started have any previous contractual obligations with other vendors that made purchasing local farm products more difficult?

What are the biggest challenges that you face in doing the FM salad bars on a daily or weekly basis? Do you think it is going to be a sustainable program?

Do you have any ideas as to how those challenges might be addressed? Or how to make to program more successful?

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> Robert Gottlieb and Anupama Joshi, *Food Justice* (The MIT Press, 2010).

<sup>2</sup> LAUSD, “Los Angeles Unified School District Fingertip Facts 2010-2011”, n.d., [http://notebook.lausd.net/portal/page?\\_pageid=33,48254&\\_dad=ptl&\\_schema=PTL\\_EP](http://notebook.lausd.net/portal/page?_pageid=33,48254&_dad=ptl&_schema=PTL_EP).

<sup>3</sup> LAUSDFood Services Division, “Overview of LAUSD’s Nutrition Programs”, August 18, 2010, 10.

<sup>4</sup> Regional Food Hub Advisory Council, “California Network of Regional Food Hubs: A Vision Statement and Strategic Implementation Plan”, September 2010.

<sup>5</sup> Gordon W. Gunderson, *The National School Lunch Program: Background and Development* (Nova Publishers, 2003), 10.

<sup>6</sup> Susan Levine, *School Lunch Politics: The Surprising History of America’s Favorite Welfare Program* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 46.

<sup>7</sup> Gunderson, *The national school lunch program*, 30.

<sup>8</sup> Levine, *School Lunch Politics*, 63.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 66.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 101.

<sup>11</sup> Assistance need rate was defined as the “product of five and the quotient obtained by dividing the average annual per capita income for such State, except that such product may not exceed nine for any such state.” Five is the rate for any State that is equal to or greater than the per capita income level for all the states. Gunderson, *The national school lunch program*, 35.

<sup>12</sup> As written in the Child Nutrition Act, quoted from *Ibid.*, 39.

<sup>13</sup> Levine, *School Lunch Politics*, 132.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 152.

<sup>15</sup> Gunderson, *The national school lunch program*, 55.

<sup>16</sup> Levine, *School Lunch Politics*, 163.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 164.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 165.

<sup>19</sup> Food and Nutrition Services United States Department of Agriculture, “National School Lunch Program: Participation and Lunches Served”, March 2, 2011, <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/slmain.htm>.

<sup>20</sup> Gunderson, *The national school lunch program*, 15.

<sup>21</sup> LAUSDFood Services Division, “Overview of LAUSD’s Nutrition Programs,” 3.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>23</sup> Sonia Nazario, “COLUMN ONE : Going to School Hungry : As poverty spreads, teachers often see students who have not eaten for days. Malnutrition hinders learning, but resistance to breakfast programs raises question of how far districts should go to help. - Los Angeles Times”, November 20, 1994, [http://articles.latimes.com/1994-11-20/news/mn-65221\\_1\\_school-breakfast-programs](http://articles.latimes.com/1994-11-20/news/mn-65221_1_school-breakfast-programs).

<sup>24</sup> Wendy Slusser, “Interview on early salad bar pilot program in LAUSD”, March 25, 2011.

<sup>25</sup> Michelle Mascarenhas, “Farmers’ Market Salad Bars and Nutrition Policy Advocacy in LAUSD” (Center for Food and Justice, Urban and Environmental Policy Institute, July 2002), 5; Wendy Slusser, “Interview on early salad bar pilot program in LAUSD.”

- 
- <sup>26</sup> Wendelin M Slusser et al., “A School Salad Bar Increases Frequency of Fruit and Vegetable Consumption Among Children Living in Low-Income Households,” *Public Health Nutrition* 10, no. 12 (2007): 1490-1496.
- <sup>27</sup> Wendy Slusser, “Interview on early salad bar pilot program in LAUSD.”
- <sup>28</sup> Center for Food and Justice, “Challenging the Soda Companies: The Los Angeles Unified School District Soda Ban” (Urban and Environmental Policy Institute, October 2002), 4-5.
- <sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.
- <sup>30</sup> WestEd, “Nutritional Assessment of Foods Sold in Los Angeles Unified (LAUSD) Schools” (California Food Policy Advocates, n.d.), 10.
- <sup>31</sup> Robert Gottlieb and Anupama Joshi, *Food Justice* (The MIT Press, 2010), 213.
- <sup>32</sup> Center for Food and Justice, “Challenging the Soda Companies: The Los Angeles Unified School District Soda Ban,” 8.
- <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.
- <sup>34</sup> Nicola Edwards and Matthew Sharp, “The State of the Plate: What’s Left on Trays: A Survey of Student Consumption Practices in Nine Los Angeles Unified School District Middle and High Schools”, April 2009.
- <sup>35</sup> Matt Sharp, “Interview on Farm to School in LA”, February 14, 2011.
- <sup>36</sup> Edwards and Sharp, “The State of the Plate: What’s Left on Trays: A Survey of Student Consumption Practices in Nine Los Angeles Unified School District Middle and High Schools,” 8.
- <sup>37</sup> “Effective Strategies to Create Healthier Food Service Environments- Building Nutrition into Food Service Contracts”, April 15, 2011.
- <sup>38</sup> Matt Sharp, “Interview on Farm to School in LA.”
- <sup>39</sup> Megan Bomba, “Interview on New Menu and Procurement in LAUSD”, April 1, 2001.
- <sup>40</sup> David Binkle and Laura Benavidez, “Interview on Food Services in LAUSD”, February 16, 2011.
- <sup>41</sup> Robert Gottlieb, “Interview on History of Farm to School”, January 12, 2011.
- <sup>42</sup> Rodney Taylor, “Interview on Farm to School in RUSD”, February 8, 2011.
- <sup>43</sup> Robert Gottlieb and Michelle Mascarenhas, “The Farmers’ Market Salad Bar: Assessing the First Three Years of the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District Program” (Urban & Environmental Policy Institute, October 2000), 10.
- <sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>45</sup> Rodney Taylor, “Interview on Farm to School in RUSD.”
- <sup>46</sup> “Network of Regional Food Hubs” Regional Food Hub Advisory Council
- <sup>47</sup> “Overview — National Good Food Network”, n.d., <http://ngfn.org/about/history>.
- <sup>48</sup> Interview with Rodney Taylor, “Interview on Farm to School in RUSD.”
- <sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>50</sup> There are officially 31 elementary schools in the district. One of the schools without a salad bar does not have a kitchen, and the other is for special needs children and the salad bar was not an option.
- <sup>51</sup> Riverside Unified School District, “District Profile”, n.d., <http://www.rusd.k12.ca.us/services/ServiceIntro.aspx?sub=a&cl=1030&pid=162>.
- <sup>52</sup> Healthy Communities Network, “Innovations in School Food”, October 5, 2009, 9, [foodsystms.msu.edu/docs/AASA\\_combined\\_ppt\\_FINAL\\_9-30.pdf](http://foodsystms.msu.edu/docs/AASA_combined_ppt_FINAL_9-30.pdf).
- <sup>53</sup> Rodney Taylor, “Interview on Farm to School in RUSD.”

- 
- <sup>54</sup> Healthy Communities Network, “Innovations in School Food,” 9.
- <sup>55</sup> US Census Bureau, “Riverside County QuickFacts from the US Census Bureau”, n.d., <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06065.html>.
- <sup>56</sup> Rodney Taylor, “Interview on Farm to School in RUSD.”; Rodney Taylor, “Clarification on Farm to School”, March 28, 2011.
- <sup>57</sup> Taylor, “Clarification on Farm to School.”
- <sup>58</sup> Rodney Taylor, “Interview on Farm to School in RUSD.”
- <sup>59</sup> Taylor, “Clarification on Farm to School.”
- <sup>60</sup> Nutrition Services Department RUSD, “Riverside Unified School District Farmers’ Market Salad Bar”, n.d.
- <sup>61</sup> Healthy Communities Network, “Innovations in School Food.”
- <sup>62</sup> Regional Food Hub Advisory Council, “California Network of Regional Food Hubs: A Vision Statement and Strategic Implementation Plan,” 16.
- <sup>63</sup> Loma Linda School of Public Health, *Growcology - “The Origins and Future of Farm to School”*, 2011, <http://vimeo.com/21445745>.
- <sup>64</sup> “San Diego Unified School District | Food Services”, n.d., <http://www.sandi.net/20451072011452577/Blog/browse.asp?a=398&BMDRN=2000&BCOB=0&c=68623&20451072011452577Nav=|175|&NodeID=5240>.
- <sup>65</sup> San Diego Unified School District, “San Diego Unified School District: Fact Sheet ‘San Diego Unified School District at a Glance, 2008-2009’”, November 25, 2008.
- <sup>66</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>67</sup> San Diego Unified School District, “San Diego Unified School District: Fact Sheet ‘Food Services’”, n.d.
- <sup>68</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>69</sup> “San Diego County QuickFacts from the US Census Bureau”, n.d., <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06073.html>.
- <sup>70</sup> Vanessa Zajfen, “Phone Interview on Farm to School in SDUSD”, February 2, 2011.
- <sup>71</sup> “San Diego Unified School District | Food Services.”
- <sup>72</sup> “TIERRA MIGUEL FOUNDATION: San Diego Growers’ Project”, n.d., <http://www.tierramiguelfarm.org/education-growersproject.htm>.
- <sup>73</sup> Jonathan Reinbold and Ashley Colpaart, “Phone Interview on Teirra Miguel Foundation”, February 10, 2011.
- <sup>74</sup> “District and School Enrollment by Ethnicity - Enrollment by Ethnicity for 2009-10”, n.d., <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/Enrollment/EthnicEnr.aspx?cYear=2009-10&cGender=B&cType=ALL&cChoice=DistEnrEt2&cSelect=5672652,Ventura%20Unified>.
- <sup>75</sup> Kara Muniz and Sandy Curwood, “Interview on Ventura Farmers’ Market Salad Bar program”, March 30, 2011.
- <sup>76</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>77</sup> “Ed-Data Website: Ventura Unified School District Students Tab”, n.d., <http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/Navigation/fsTwoPanel.asp?bottom=%2Fprofile%2Easp%3Flevel%3D06%26reportNumber%3D16>.
- <sup>78</sup> “Ventura County QuickFacts from the US Census Bureau”, n.d., <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06111.html>.
- <sup>79</sup> Kara Muniz and Sandy Curwood, “Interview on Ventura Farmers’ Market Salad Bar program.”

<sup>80</sup> Ibid.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

<sup>88</sup> Matt Sharp, “Interview on Farm to School in LA.”

<sup>89</sup> Ibid.

<sup>90</sup> David Binkle and Laura Benavidez, “Interview on Food Services in LAUSD.”

<sup>91</sup> Rodney Taylor, “Interview on Farm to School in RUSD.”

## Bibliography

- Binkle, David and Laura Benavidez. "Interview on Food Services in LAUSD", February 16, 2011.
- Bomba, Megan. "Interview on New Menu and Procurement in LAUSD." April 1, 2001.
- Center for Food and Justice. "Challenging the Soda Companies: The Los Angeles Unified School District Soda Ban". Urban and Environmental Policy Institute, October 2002.
- Cech, Sharon and Yelena Zeltser. "Interview with Urban and Environmental Policy Institute." February 3, 2011.
- Clinton, Grant. "Interview on Newman Nutrition Center." February 16, 2011.
- County of Los Angeles Public Health and RENEW Los Angeles County. "Effective Strategies to Create Healthier Food Service Environments- Building Nutrition into Food Service Contracts", April 15, 2011.
- "District and School Enrollment by Ethnicity - Enrollment by Ethnicity for 2009-10", <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/Enrollment/EthnicEnr.aspx?cYear=2009-10&cGender=B&cType=ALL&cChoice=DistEnrEt2&cSelect=5672652,Ventura%20Unified>.
- "Ed-Data Website: Ventura Unified School District Students Tab." <http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/Navigation/fsTwoPanel.asp?bottom=%2Fprofile%2Easp%3Flevel%3D06%26reportNumber%3D16>.
- Edwards, Nicola, and Matthew Sharp. "The State of the Plate: What's Left on Trays: A Survey of Student Consumption Practices in Nine Los Angeles Unified School District Middle and High Schools", April 2009.
- "FarmToSchool.org Home Page" <http://www.farmtoschool.org/index.php>.
- Food and Nutrition Services: United States Department of Agriculture. "National School Lunch Program: Participation and Lunches Served." <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/slmain.htm>.
- Gottlieb, Robert. "Interview on History of Farm to School." January 12, 2011.
- Gottlieb, Robert, and Anupama Joshi. *Food Justice*. The MIT Press, 2010.
- Gottlieb, Robert, and Michelle Mascarenhas. "The Farmers' Market Salad Bar: Assessing the First Three Years of the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District Program". Urban & Environmental Policy Institute, October 2000.
- Griego, Orlando and Dona Richwine. "Interview on History of Farm to School in Santa Monica-Malibu School District." February 1, 2011.

Gunderson, Gordon W. *The National School Lunch Program: Background and Development*. Nova Publishers, 2003.

Healthy Communities Network. "Innovations in School Food", October 5, 2009.  
[foodsystems.msu.edu/docs/AASA\\_combined\\_ppt\\_FINAL\\_9-30.pdf](http://foodsystems.msu.edu/docs/AASA_combined_ppt_FINAL_9-30.pdf).

"Healthy Schools Project." <http://www.venturausd.org/childnutrition/thehealthyschoolsproject/>.

"Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act Wrap-Up - inform. innovate. inspire. - FoodService Director."  
<http://www.fsdmag.com/operations-feature-stories/healthy-hunger-free-kids-act-wrap-up.html?Itemid=0>.

Hoffman, A. C. "Agricultural Surplus Programs." *The Journal of Marketing* 6, no. 4 (April 1, 1942): 174-176.

"Hunger In America - Courant.com." <http://www.courant.com/news/opinion/hc-campbell-hungry-kid-0327-20110327,0,4544896.column>.

"Kids like healthy food; so let's give it to them." Local Views, Southern California News: News for Inland Southern California."  
[http://www.pe.com/localnews/opinion/localviews/stories/PE\\_OpEd\\_Opinion\\_D\\_op\\_food\\_loc\\_17.15ea7f0.html](http://www.pe.com/localnews/opinion/localviews/stories/PE_OpEd_Opinion_D_op_food_loc_17.15ea7f0.html).

"LAUSD Budget Realities." <http://budgetrealities.lausd.net/>.

LAUSD Budget Services Division. "2010-11 & 2011-12 Fiscal Stabilization Plan." March, 2010.

LAUSD. "Los Angeles Unified School District Fingertip Facts 2010-2011."  
[http://notebook.lausd.net/portal/page?\\_pageid=33,48254&\\_dad=ptl&\\_schema=PTL\\_EP](http://notebook.lausd.net/portal/page?_pageid=33,48254&_dad=ptl&_schema=PTL_EP).

LAUSD Food Services Division. "Overview of LAUSD's Nutrition Programs." August 18, 2010.

Levine, Susan. *School Lunch Politics: The Surprising History of America's Favorite Welfare Program*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Loma Linda School of Public Health. *Growcology - "The Origins and Future of Farm to School."* 2011. <http://vimeo.com/21445745>.

Los Angeles Unified School District Budget Services and Financial Planning Department. "Superintendent's 2010-2011 Final Budget." June 22, 2010.

Mascarenhas, Michelle. "Farmers' Market Salad Bars and Nutrition Policy Advocacy in LAUSD."  
 Center for Food and Justice, Urban and Environmental Policy Institute, July 2002.

McGrath, Phil. "Interview on Farms and Food Hubs." March 8, 2011.

Morrison, Patt. "Patt Morrison Asks/ Jamie Oliver: Food fighter." *Los Angeles Times*, February 26, 2011.

Muniz, Kara and Sandy Curwood. "Interview on Ventura Farmers' Market Salad Bar program", March 30, 2011.

"National Good Food Network Regional Lead Teams — Wallace Center."  
<http://www.wallacecenter.org/our-work/current-initiatives/national-good-food-network-1/national-good-food-network-regional-lead-teams/>.

Nazario, Sonia. "COLUMN ONE : Going to School Hungry : As poverty spreads, teachers often see students who have not eaten for days. Malnutrition hinders learning, but resistance to breakfast programs raises question of how far districts should go to help." *Los Angeles Times*, November 20, 1994. [http://articles.latimes.com/1994-11-20/news/mn-65221\\_1\\_school-breakfast-programs](http://articles.latimes.com/1994-11-20/news/mn-65221_1_school-breakfast-programs).

Paulson, Amanda. "Next on the feds' menu? Overhauling school lunches." *The Christian Science Monitor*, June 4, 2010.

Price, Charlene, and Betsey Kuhn. "Public and Private Efforts for the National School Lunch Program." *Food Review* May-August 1996 (1996).  
[www.ers.usda.gov/publications/foodreview/may1996/may96i.pdf](http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/foodreview/may1996/may96i.pdf).

Ralston, Katherine; Constance Newman, Annette Clauson, Joanne Guthrie, and Jean Buzby. "The National School Lunch Program: Background, Trends and Issues." U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Economic Research Report. Number 61, July 2008.

Regional Food Hub Advisory Council. "California Network of Regional Food Hubs: A Vision Statement and Strategic Implementation Plan." September 2010.

Reinbold, Jonathan and Ashley Colpaart. "Phone Interview on Teirra Miguel Foundation", February 10, 2011.

Riverside Unified School District. "District Profile."  
<http://www.rusd.k12.ca.us/services/ServiceIntro.aspx?sub=a&cl=1030&pid=162>.

RUSD Nutrition Services Department. "Riverside Unified School District Farmers' Market Salad Bar."

"San Diego County QuickFacts from the US Census Bureau."  
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06073.html>.

"San Diego Unified School District: Food Services."  
<http://www.sandi.net/20451072011452577/Blog/browse.asp?a=398&BMDRN=2000&BCOB=0&c=68623&20451072011452577Nav=|175|&NodeID=5240>.

San Diego Unified School District. "San Diego Unified School District: Fact Sheet 'Food Services'"

———. "San Diego Unified School District: Fact Sheet 'San Diego Unified School District at a Glance, 2008-2009.'" November 25, 2008.

"Schools cut lunch options for kids who can't pay - Health - Diet and nutrition." Msnbc.com  
[http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/41631002/ns/health-diet\\_and\\_nutrition/](http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/41631002/ns/health-diet_and_nutrition/).

"Schools learning to cook from scratch : Ventura County Star."  
<http://www.thelighthousenews.com/news/2010/jul/16/schools-learning-to-cook-from-scratch/?print=1>.

Sharp, Matthew. "Interview on Farm to School in LA." February 14, 2011.

Slusser, Wendelin. "Interview on early salad bar pilot program in LAUSD", March 25, 2011.

Slusser, Wendelin M, William G Cumberland, Ben L Browdy, Linda Lange, and Charlotte Neumann. "A School Salad Bar Increases Frequency of Fruit and Vegetable Consumption Among Children Living in Low-Income Households." *Public Health Nutrition* 10, no. 12 (2007): 1490-1496.

Taylor, Rodney. E-mail communication. "Clarification on Farm to School." March 28, 2011.

Taylor, Rodney. "Interview on Farm to School in RUSD." February 8, 2011.

"The Big Squeeze - inform. innovate. inspire. - FoodService Director."  
<http://www.fsdmag.com/operations-feature-stories/the-big-squeeze.html>.

"TIERRA MIGUEL FOUNDATION: San Diego Growers' Project."  
<http://www.tierramiguelfarm.org/education-growersproject.htm>.

United States. *Beyond Federal School Meal Programs Reforming Nutrition for Kids in Schools: Hearing Before the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, United States Senate, One Hundred Eleventh Congress, First Session, March 31, 2009*. Washington: U.S. G.P.O, 2010.

———. *Challenges and Opportunities for Improving School Nutrition: Hearing Before the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, One Hundred Tenth Congress, Second Session, Hearing Held in Washington, DC, March 4, 2008*. Washington: U.S. G.P.O, 2008.

———. *Food Buying Guide for Child Nutrition Programs*. 2001st ed. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, 2001.

US Census Bureau. "Riverside County QuickFacts from the US Census Bureau."  
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06065.html>.

“Ventura County QuickFacts from the US Census Bureau.”  
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06111.html>.

Waters, Alice and Katrina Heron. “No Lunch Left Behind.” *New York Times*, February 20, 2009.

Weiser, Alex. “Interview on Farms and Food Hubs”, March 8, 2011.

Zajfen, Vanessa. “Phone Interview on Farm to School in SDUSD”, February 2, 2011.