

FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an
administrative marker by the William J. Clinton
Presidential Library Staff.**

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records
Subgroup/Office of Origin: Americorps
Series/Staff Member: General Files
Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 24232
FolderID:

Folder Title:
Food Security Act [1]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	66	1	2	3

From: Martha Phipps
To: OCNET.OC-POST.JBERG, SIES1.CMACIAS, USDAHQ.GW.Larr...
Date: 6/21/96 10:34am
Subject: RFP help

I just spoke with Cathy Woteki. She will call Bob Robinson and ask him to assign a few people from CREES to help add some innovation to the RFP. I told her that Joel was heading up this effort and that it needed to happen today. Bob should be in touch with Joel.

I have been trading calls with Grady - he doesn't know about this yet but I will tell him as soon as we connect. He will need to be brought in to the process. I would assume that, unless we make major progress in identifying a project director/location early next week that the 1996 funds will be administered by FCS, since the money is coming from there.

I will be out of the office between 1:30 and 4:00 today. I am available any other time.

CC: EOLSEN, GFRAZIER, CRAWLS, JPOTTS

May 24, 1996

NOTE FOR MIKE FISHMAN
YVETTE JACKSON BONNY O'NEIL
PATTY MORRIS RON VOGEL

FROM: Steven Carlson

SUBJECT: Revised Notice for Community Food Projects

Attached is a revised notice for publication in the Federal Register to solicit applications for the Community Food Projects authorized by the Farm Bill. This revision attempts to respond to all of the comments received from you and your staff.

I have also attached a set of funding issues which will require resolution in the near future. My belief is that we will need to seek an OGC opinion to reach that resolution. Please let me know if you think there are alternatives.

The next step is to forward the draft to others in the Department; this awaits only identification of appropriate recipients.

I have copied ITD and CMB with this note with a request that you look at the draft for both format and content.

Attachment

cc: Kilolo Kijakazi
Ted Macaluso
Art Foley
Jorge Bernado
Sheri Ackerman

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food and Consumer Service

Community Food Projects: Application for Grants

AGENCY: Food and Consumer Service, USDA

ACTION: Notice

SUMMARY: The Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-127) established new authority for a program of Federal grants to support the development of community food projects designed to meet the food needs of low-income people; increase the self-reliance of communities in providing for their own food needs; and promote comprehensive responses to local food, farm, and nutrition issues. Up to \$1 million will be available in fiscal year 1996 for grants to eligible private nonprofit organizations. This notice sets out the objectives for these projects, the eligibility criteria for projects and applicants, and the application procedures. USDA also has legislative authority to provide technical assistance community food projects that seek such assistance. Applications for projects designed to provide training and technical assistance to organizations developing appropriate community food projects are also requested under this notice. This notice contains the entire application package needed to apply for either a project

- make clear how project agency

or technical assistance grant.

DATES: Grant applications must be received by the Food and Consumer Service (FCS) no later than 5:00 pm EST on August XX, 1996. Proposals received after the deadline will be ineligible to receive fiscal year 1996 funding.

ADDRESSES: Send an original and six copies of the grant application to: Jorge Bernardo, Contracting Specialist, Contract Management Branch, Food and Consumer Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 3101 Park Center Drive, Alexandria, VA 22302.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: Jorge Bernardo, (703) 305-2993

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority

The Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-127) amended the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and established new authority for a program of Federal grants to support the development of community food projects. These grants are intended to help eligible private nonprofit entities that need a one-time infusion of Federal assistance to establish and carry out multi-purpose community food projects.

Background

The term "community food project" means a community-based project that requires a one-time infusion of Federal assistance to become self-sustaining and that is designed to:

- (1) meet the food needs of low-income people; *— require poverty states*
- (2) increase the self-reliance of communities in providing for their own food needs; and *— matching, long term goals*
- (3) promote comprehensive responses to local food, farm, and

nutrition issues. - *Create partnerships*

Community food projects are intended to take a comprehensive approach to developing long-term solutions that ensure food security by linking the food sector to community development, economic opportunity, and environmental enhancement.

Comprehensive solutions may include elements such as:

- (1) improved access to high quality, affordable food among low-income households; - *farmers' market, gleanings*
- (2) support for local food systems, from urban gardening to local farms that provide high quality fresh foods, ideally with minimal environmental impact;
- (3) expanded economic resources for community residents through local business or other economic development, improved employment opportunities, job training, and the like. *food prod facilities*

Community food projects are intended to go beyond the models offered by emergency and Federal food assistance programs by creating the capacity for all members of communities to better access affordable food in the marketplace. Ideally these projects will seek solutions over the longer term rather than focusing on short-term food relief. They will seek comprehensive solutions to problems across all levels of the food chain from farmer to consumer.

Eligibility

Applicants must be a private, nonprofit entity. Because the projects must promote comprehensive responses to local food, farm, and nutrition issues, not single-purpose projects, applicants are encouraged to seek and create partnerships among

public, private non-profit, and private for-profit sectors.

To be eligible for a grant, a private nonprofit applicant must meet three requirements:

(1) have experience in the area of:

(a) community food work, particularly concerning small and medium-sized farms, including the provision of food to people in low-income communities and the development of new markets in low-income communities for agricultural producers; or

(b) job training and business development activities for food-related activities in low-income communities;

(2) demonstrate competency to implement a project, provide fiscal accountability, collect data, and prepare reports and other necessary documentation; and

(3) demonstrate a willingness to share information with researchers, practitioners, and other interested parties.

In selecting among applicants that meet the preceding three requirements, preference shall be given to projects designed to:

(1) develop linkages between two or more sectors of the food system;

(2) support the development of entrepreneurial projects; *Exec RD?*

(3) develop innovative linkages between the for-profit and nonprofit food sectors; or

(4) encourage long-term planning activities and multi-system, interagency approaches.

Funding and Number of Awards

The total amount of funds provided as grants may not exceed \$1 million in fiscal year 1996 and \$2.5 million in each of fiscal

years 1997 through 2002.

The Federal share of the cost of establishing or carrying out a community food project that receives assistance under this program may not exceed 50 percent of the cost of the project during the term of the grant. Grantees may provide for the non-Federal share through a payment in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including facilities, equipment, or services. A grantee may provide for the nonfederal share of the funding through State government, local government, or private sources.

Because the projects funded by this grant authority will be community-based and funded substantially by non-federal sources, the Congress did not expect that any one grant should command a significant portion of the total grant authority. The Congress believed there will be many worthy projects applying for grant awards in each of the next 7 years, and expects USDA to make many awards each year to the most worthwhile of the grant applicants. Based on this guidance, USDA has concluded that no single grant shall exceed \$250,000 in fiscal year 1996. USDA strongly urges that requests for support not fall below \$25,000 in fiscal year 1996.

A community food project may be supported by only a single grant under this program. If multiple applications are received from the same community, USDA will determine in its sole discretion whether they relate, or should relate, to a single community food project. In the event USDA determines that more than one application relates to the same project, FCS will in its sole discretion determine which application best represents the

project; all other applications related to that project will be rejected without discussion.

Length of Grants

The term of each grant may not exceed three years. Projects may be defined in terms of one-year phases (e.g., planning, implementation, self-sufficiency) not to exceed a total of three years where each phase has measurable goals and outcomes. Initial funds will be provided only for the first year of operations. USDA may renew grants for up to two one-year terms - not to exceed three years in total -- if: 1) annual goals are met; 2) quarterly and annual reports, documenting progress and plans, are submitted and accepted by USDA; and 3) the grantee cooperates with an independent evaluation.

Evaluation

P.L. 104-127 requires USDA to provide for an evaluation of the success of community food projects supported under this authority. USDA plans to select an independent evaluator in a separate competition in fiscal year 1997. All grantees shall be expected to cooperate with the evaluation as a condition of the grant by providing selected information on each project and its progress and by making key staff available for interviews or discussions with the independent evaluator. Applicants are also encouraged to plan for their own internal self-assessments and evaluations to measure the effectiveness of each project.

Reporting Requirements

Grantees shall be required to submit quarterly progress reports, annual reports (if it is a multi-year project with

phases), and a final report. The quarterly reports will summarize work on the project, identify major problems or delays encountered and potential resolutions, and describe work planned for the upcoming quarter. In addition, each report will describe progress toward project goals, based on outcome measures established by the grantee in the application as described below. The annual reports (if applicable) will summarize progress towards goals over the course of the year and discuss plans for the next year. The final report will address the extent to which project goals were achieved as well as lessons learned during the life of the project.

Application Procedures and Requirements

The proposal shall be on 8.5 x 11 inch paper, typed or word processed. The proposal shall not exceed 20 pages including cover page, text, and all appendices and attachments. The proposal shall be organized as follows:

Cover page: The cover page shall contain the name of the organization(s) submitting the proposal; its address and telephone number; the names of the author(s) of the proposal; and the name and telephone number of a contact person authorized to contractually bind the organization, if different from the author.

Answers to specific questions: The proposal shall repeat and answer each of the following ten questions:

1. What is the community to be served by this project? Describe the geographic area to be served and any pertinent information about the local food economy or food system,

demographics and income, or other area information relevant to the proposed project.

2. What organizations will be involved in this project and which segments of the local food economy or system do they link? Include a description of the relevant experience of the organizations doing similar work.

3. What is the goal or purpose to be achieved by this community food project?

4. How will the goal or purpose be accomplished?

5. What are the major tasks and/or milestones, by time, that will mark progress towards achieving the goal or purpose?

6. What measurable outcomes will be used to assess whether goals set by the grantee are met?

7. If this is a multi-year project, what measurable outcomes should be used to assess whether project goals for the first year are met and second year funding is warranted? What measurable outcomes should be used to assess whether project goals for the second year are met and third year funding is warranted?

8. What is the budget for the project (in total and by year)? How will funds be used? Describe in detail proposed Federal and proposed non-Federal sources. Identify whether contributions are in cash or in kind. If in-kind, describe the basis for evaluating the value of the in-kind contributions.

9. Identify the staff or positions required for this project. An organizational chart should be provided if available. Who are proposed as key staff on this project and

what is their relevant experience? Include a discussion of the capacity of the individuals and organization(s) to implement and to manage the project.

10. What are plans for achieving self-sustainability? Describe why a one-time infusion of federal funds will be sufficient for the proposed project.

Additional information: Provide any additional information which supports the need for and usefulness of the project.

Certifications: Provide verification that the applicant is a private nonprofit organization.

The certifications listed below will be required to be completed before award can be made. These certifications do not need to be submitted with the application. Applicants who make it to the final technical review stage will be notified and must submit all required certifications at that time. Applicants who do not promptly submit the required certifications at that time will be dropped from consideration for fiscal year 1996 funding.

Required certifications are:

1. XXXXXXXXXX

2. XXXXXXXX

...

99. XXXXXXXX

How Proposals Will Be Reviewed

A. Initial Technical Review.

The following criteria will be applied in the technical evaluation of applicants' proposals, with each criterion area

having the scoring weight indicated (maximum possible score = 100 points).

1. Applicability and Merit

Reviewers will read the answers to questions 1 through 5 and then score the proposal based on their assessment of the merit of the proposed project in regard to its ability to meet the food needs of low-income people in the proposed community; increase the self-reliance of the proposed community for providing for its own food needs; and promote comprehensive responses to local food, farm, and nutrition issues. **(30 points)**

2. Capacity to become self-sustaining

Reviewers will read the answers to questions 6, 7, 8, and 10 and then score the proposal based on their assessment of the project's ability for continuing to term and becoming self-sufficient once Federal funding ends. **(20 points)**

3. Organizational and staff qualifications and experience.

The offeror must be a private nonprofit organization. Reviewers will read the answers to questions 2, 8, and 9 and the score the proposal based on their assessment of applicant's:

(a) experience in the area of community food work, particularly concerning small and medium-sized farms, including the provision of food to people in low-income communities and the development of new markets in low-income communities for agricultural producers; or job training and business development activities for food-related activities in low-income communities **(15 points)**

(b) competency to implement the proposed project, provide

fiscal accountability, collect data, and prepare reports and other necessary documentation; (10 points)

(c) willingness to share information with researchers, practitioners, and other interested parties (5 points)

4. Preference items

Based on their reading of the entire proposal, reviewers shall score additional points based on their judgement of how well the proposed project:

(a) develops linkages between two or more sectors of the food system; (5 points)

(b) supports the development of entrepreneurial projects; (5 points)

(c) develops innovative linkages between the for-profit and nonprofit food sectors; (5 points)

(d) encourages long-term planning activities and multi-system, interagency approaches (5 points)

Because the award process must be completed by September 30, 1996, USDA will complete its technical review without further discussion with applicants. Scoring will be made solely on the basis of applicants' written proposals; there will be no discussions, negotiations or submissions of "best and final" proposals.

Based on the initial technical review a competitive range shall be established. Proposals that fall in the competitive range shall have a Cost Review and a Final Review by a Board of Awards.

B. Cost Review and Certifications

Proposals that make it into the competitive range will be examined to ensure that budgets include only allowable costs. If questions on allowable costs arise, discussions for clarification may be held with applicant.

C. Final Review

Proposals that fall in the competitive range shall have a final review by a Board of Awards. The Board shall select among the proposals in the competitive range based on such factors as the relative ranking of proposals in light of total funding available, the need to achieve a spread of projects around the nation, balance and diversity among different approaches to community food security, the quality of proposed self-assessments and quantitative outcome measures, and other considerations pertinent to assuring that the total mix of funded projects best serves the public purpose.

Technical Assistance

P.L. 104-127 authorizes USDA to provide technical assistance regarding community food projects, processes, and development to organizations seeking such assistance. Report language accompanying the conference bill indicates that applications for projects designed to provide training and technical assistance to organizations developing community food projects should be considered. USDA, therefore, seeks grant applications from organizations capable of providing this assistance. Applicants for technical assistance grants should clearly demonstrate experience and expertise in all areas of community food security.

Responsibilities for the technical assistance grantee(s) can

include, but are not limited to, 1) helping USDA to determine which project grantees will receive this service and 2) identifying and coordinating technical assistance available from other Federal agencies. Technical assistance may also include helping the project grantees to:

- (1) conduct needs assessments;
- (2) build coalitions;
- (3) develop and conduct project evaluations;
- (4) refine outcome measures and conduct measurements; and
- (5) convert the project to a self-sustaining operation.

Offerors should anticipate that there will be several projects for which they are responsible for providing assistance. These projects may be very different in their design and objectives. Therefore, the technical assistance grantee will need the capability to address a substantial number of community food issues.

The criteria for the selection of a technical assistance grantee are as follows:

1. Understanding of purpose and objectives

The offeror should demonstrate an understanding of the purpose and objectives of the Community Food Project and the role of the technical assistance grantee. (15 points)

2. Approach to Technical Assistance

The offeror should clearly describe their approach to providing technical assistance to both FCS and the project grantees. (30 points)

3. Organizational and staff qualifications and experience

The offeror should describe the organization's experience in the areas of 1) technical assistance; 2) community food work; 3) job training, business development, or economic development; and 4) work with low-income communities. They should also discuss the organization's capacity for conducting the work required and resources committed to the study. The proposed staff should have the training, knowledge, and experience needed to complete this project. (35 points)

4. Management Plans

The proposal should contain plans for project management including the method for devoting resources to several disparate projects, staff responsibilities, the approach to monitoring work, problem resolution, and an organizational chart of the staff to be assigned to this project. (20 points)

WILLIAM E. LUDWIG
Administrator
Food and Consumer Service

DATE

1st level

- Community driven
- or - agency driven (ie. state ISA?)

Grady Foster
former comm (305-2230) phone
(305-1615) phone
fax

May 24, 1996

NOTE FOR MIKE FISHMAN
YVETTE JACKSON
PATTY MORRIS

acting Head
Special Nutrition Program

BONNY O'NEIL
RON VOGEL

State: strategic planning
Directors - heads up new
announcement

FROM: Steven Carlson

SUBJECT: Revised Notice for Community Food Projects

(high school
training project)

Attached is a revised notice for publication in the Federal Register to solicit applications for the Community Food Projects authorized by the Farm Bill. This revision attempts to respond to all of the comments received from you and your staff.

I have also attached a set of funding issues which will require resolution in the near future. My belief is that we will need to seek an OGC opinion to reach that resolution. Please let me know if you think there are alternatives.

The next step is to forward the draft to others in the Department; this awaits only identification of appropriate recipients.

I have copied ITD and CMB with this note with a request that you look at the draft for both format and content.

Attachment

- enthusiasm - E. Fox

cc: Kilolo Kijakazi
Ted Macaluso
Art Foley
Jorge Bernado
Sheri Ackerman

complete package

* - linkage
? - limits - #

2 projects

- water
- food

encourage applications

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food and Consumer Service

Community Food Projects: Application for Grants

AGENCY: Food and Consumer Service, USDA

ACTION: Notice

SUMMARY: The Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-127) established new authority for a program of Federal grants to support the development of community food projects designed to meet the food needs of low-income people; increase the self-reliance of communities in providing for their own food needs; and promote comprehensive responses to local food, farm, and nutrition issues. Up to \$1 million will be available in fiscal year 1996 for grants to eligible private nonprofit organizations. This notice sets out the objectives for these projects, the eligibility criteria for projects and applicants, and the application procedures. ^o USDA also has legislative authority to provide technical assistance community food projects that seek such assistance. ^o Applications for projects designed to provide training and technical assistance to organizations developing appropriate community food projects are also requested under this notice. This notice contains the entire application package needed to apply for either a project



Key examples?

Self definitions: gleaning
example: farmers markets

or technical assistance grant.

DATES: Grant applications must be received by the Food and Consumer Service (FCS) no later than 5:00 pm EST on August XX, 1996. Proposals received after the deadline will be ineligible to receive fiscal year 1996 funding.

ADDRESSES: Send an original and six copies of the grant application to: Jorge Bernardo, Contracting Specialist, Contract Management Branch, Food and Consumer Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 3101 Park Center Drive, Alexandria, VA 22302.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: Jorge Bernardo, (703) 305-2993

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority

The Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-127) amended the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and established new authority for a program of Federal grants to support the development of community food projects. These grants are intended to help eligible private nonprofit entities that need a one-time infusion of Federal assistance to establish and carry out multi-purpose community food projects.

Background

The term "community food project" means a community-based project that requires a one-time infusion of Federal assistance to become self-sustaining and that is designed to:

- (1) meet the food needs of low-income people;
- (2) increase the self-reliance of communities in providing for their own food needs; and
- (3) promote comprehensive responses to local food, farm, and

nutrition issues.

Community food projects are intended to take a comprehensive approach to developing long-term solutions that ensure food security by linking the food sector to community development, economic opportunity, and environmental enhancement.

Comprehensive solutions may include elements such as:

- (1) improved access to high quality, affordable food among low-income households;
- (2) support for local food systems, from urban gardening to local farms that provide high quality fresh foods, ideally with minimal environmental impact;
- (3) expanded economic resources for community residents through local business or other economic development, improved employment opportunities, job training, and the like.

Community food projects are intended to go beyond the models offered by emergency and Federal food assistance programs by creating the capacity for all members of communities to better access affordable food in the marketplace. Ideally these projects will seek solutions over the longer term rather than focusing on short-term food relief. They will seek comprehensive solutions to problems across all levels of the food chain from farmer to consumer.

Eligibility

Applicants must be a private, nonprofit entity. Because the projects must promote comprehensive responses to local food, farm, and nutrition issues, not single-purpose projects, applicants are encouraged to seek and create partnerships among

public, private non-profit, and private for-profit sectors.

To be eligible for a grant, a private nonprofit applicant must meet three requirements:

(1) have experience in the area of:

(a) community food work, particularly concerning small and medium-sized farms, including the provision of food to people in low-income communities and the development of new markets in low-income communities for agricultural producers; or

(b) job training and business development activities for food-related activities in low-income communities;

(2) demonstrate competency to implement a project, provide fiscal accountability, collect data, and prepare reports and other necessary documentation; and

(3) demonstrate a willingness to share information with researchers, practitioners, and other interested parties.

In selecting among applicants that meet the preceding three requirements, preference shall be given to projects designed to:

(1) develop linkages between two or more sectors of the food system;

(2) support the development of entrepreneurial projects;

(3) develop innovative linkages between the for-profit and nonprofit food sectors; or

(4) encourage long-term planning activities and multi-system, interagency approaches.

Funding and Number of Awards

The total amount of funds provided as grants may not exceed \$1 million in fiscal year 1996 and \$2.5 million in each of fiscal

years 1997 through 2002.

The Federal share of the cost of establishing or carrying out a community food project that receives assistance under this program may not exceed 50 percent of the cost of the project during the term of the grant. Grantees may provide for the non-Federal share through a payment in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including facilities, equipment, or services. A grantee may provide for the nonfederal share of the funding through State government, local government, or private sources.

Because the projects funded by this grant authority will be community-based and funded substantially by non-federal sources, the Congress did not expect that any one grant should command a significant portion of the total grant authority. The Congress believed there will be many worthy projects applying for grant awards in each of the next 7 years, and expects USDA to make many awards each year to the most worthwhile of the grant applicants. Based on this guidance, USDA has concluded that no single grant shall exceed \$250,000 in fiscal year 1996. USDA strongly urges that requests for support not fall below \$25,000 in fiscal year 1996.

A community food project may be supported by only a single grant under this program. If multiple applications are received from the same community, USDA will determine in its sole discretion whether they relate, or should relate, to a single community food project. In the event USDA determines that more than one application relates to the same project, FCS will in its sole discretion determine which application best represents the

project; all other applications related to that project will be rejected without discussion.

Length of Grants

The term of each grant may not exceed three years. Projects may be defined in terms of one-year phases (e.g., planning, implementation, self-sufficiency) not to exceed a total of three years where each phase has measurable goals and outcomes. Initial funds will be provided only for the first year of operations. USDA may renew grants for up to two one-year terms - not to exceed three years in total -- if: 1) annual goals are met; 2) quarterly and annual reports, documenting progress and plans, are submitted and accepted by USDA; and 3) the grantee cooperates with an independent evaluation.

Evaluation

P.L. 104-127 requires USDA to provide for an evaluation of the success of community food projects supported under this authority. USDA plans to select an independent evaluator in a separate competition in fiscal year 1997. All grantees shall be expected to cooperate with the evaluation as a condition of the grant by providing selected information on each project and its progress and by making key staff available for interviews or discussions with the independent evaluator. Applicants are also encouraged to plan for their own internal self-assessments and evaluations to measure the effectiveness of each project.

Reporting Requirements

Grantees shall be required to submit quarterly progress reports, annual reports (if it is a multi-year project with

phases), and a final report. The quarterly reports will summarize work on the project, identify major problems or delays encountered and potential resolutions, and describe work planned for the upcoming quarter. In addition, each report will describe progress toward project goals, based on outcome measures established by the grantee in the application as described below. The annual reports (if applicable) will summarize progress towards goals over the course of the year and discuss plans for the next year. The final report will address the extent to which project goals were achieved as well as lessons learned during the life of the project.

Application Procedures and Requirements

The proposal shall be on 8.5 x 11 inch paper, typed or word processed. The proposal shall not exceed 20 pages including cover page, text, and all appendices and attachments. The proposal shall be organized as follows:

Cover page: The cover page shall contain the name of the organization(s) submitting the proposal; its address and telephone number; the names of the author(s) of the proposal; and the name and telephone number of a contact person authorized to contractually bind the organization, if different from the author.

Answers to specific questions: The proposal shall repeat and answer each of the following ten questions:

1. What is the community to be served by this project? Describe the geographic area to be served and any pertinent information about the local food economy or food system,

demographics and income, or other area information relevant to the proposed project.

2. What organizations will be involved in this project and which segments of the local food economy or system do they link? Include a description of the relevant experience of the organizations doing similar work.

3. What is the goal or purpose to be achieved by this community food project?

4. How will the goal or purpose be accomplished?

5. What are the major tasks and/or milestones, by time, that will mark progress towards achieving the goal or purpose?

6. What measurable outcomes will be used to assess whether goals set by the grantee are met?

7. If this is a multi-year project, what measurable outcomes should be used to assess whether project goals for the first year are met and second year funding is warranted? What measurable outcomes should be used to assess whether project goals for the second year are met and third year funding is warranted?

8. What is the budget for the project (in total and by year)? How will funds be used? Describe in detail proposed Federal and proposed non-Federal sources. Identify whether contributions are in cash or in kind. If in-kind, describe the basis for evaluating the value of the in-kind contributions.

9. Identify the staff or positions required for this project. An organizational chart should be provided if available. Who are proposed as key staff on this project and

what is their relevant experience? Include a discussion of the capacity of the individuals and organization(s) to implement and to manage the project.

10. What are plans for achieving self-sustainability? Describe why a one-time infusion of federal funds will be sufficient for the proposed project.

Additional information: Provide any additional information which supports the need for and usefulness of the project.

Certifications: Provide verification that the applicant is a private nonprofit organization.

The certifications listed below will be required to be completed before award can be made. These certifications do not need to be submitted with the application. Applicants who make it to the final technical review stage will be notified and must submit all required certifications at that time. Applicants who do not promptly submit the required certifications at that time will be dropped from consideration for fiscal year 1996 funding.

Required certifications are:

1. XXXXXXXXXX
2. XXXXXXXX
- ...
99. XXXXXXXX

How Proposals Will Be Reviewed

A. Initial Technical Review.

The following criteria will be applied in the technical evaluation of applicants' proposals, with each criterion area

having the scoring weight indicated (maximum possible score = 100 points).

1. Applicability and Merit

Reviewers will read the answers to questions 1 through 5 and then score the proposal based on their assessment of the merit of the proposed project in regard to its ability to meet the food needs of low-income people in the proposed community; increase the self-reliance of the proposed community for providing for its own food needs; and promote comprehensive responses to local food, farm, and nutrition issues. (30 points)

2. Capacity to become self-sustaining

Reviewers will read the answers to questions 6, 7, 8, and 10 and then score the proposal based on their assessment of the project's ability for continuing to term and becoming self-sufficient once Federal funding ends. (20 points)

3. Organizational and staff qualifications and experience.

~~The offeror must be a private nonprofit organization.~~

Reviewers will read the answers to questions 2, 8, and 9 and the score the proposal based on their assessment of applicant's:

(a) experience in the area of community food work, particularly concerning small and medium-sized farms, including the provision of food to people in low-income communities and the development of new markets in low-income communities for agricultural producers; or job training and business development activities for food-related activities in low-income communities (15 points)

(b) competency to implement the proposed project, provide

fiscal accountability, collect data, and prepare reports and other necessary documentation; (10 points)

(c) willingness to share information with researchers, practitioners, and other interested parties (5 points)

4. Preference items

Based on their reading of the entire proposal, reviewers shall score additional points based on their judgement of how well the proposed project:

(a) develops linkages between two or more sectors of the food system; (5 points)

(b) supports the development of entrepreneurial projects; (5 points)

(c) develops innovative linkages between the for-profit and nonprofit food sectors; (5 points)

(d) encourages long-term planning activities and multi-system, interagency approaches (5 points)

Because the award process must be completed by September 30, 1996, USDA will complete its technical review without further discussion with applicants. Scoring will be made solely on the basis of applicants' written proposals; there will be no discussions, negotiations or submissions of "best and final" proposals.

Based on the initial technical review a competitive range shall be established. Proposals that fall in the competitive range shall have a Cost Review and a Final Review by a Board of Awards.

B. Cost Review and Certifications

Proposals that make it into the competitive range will be examined to ensure that budgets include only allowable costs. If questions on allowable costs arise, discussions for clarification may be held with applicant.

C. Final Review

Proposals that fall in the competitive range shall have a final review by a Board of Awards. The Board shall select among the proposals in the competitive range based on such factors as the relative ranking of proposals in light of total funding available, the need to achieve a spread of projects around the nation, balance and diversity among different approaches to community food security, the quality of proposed self-assessments and quantitative outcome measures, and other considerations pertinent to assuring that the total mix of funded projects best serves the public purpose.

Technical Assistance

7. P.L. 104-127 authorizes USDA to provide technical assistance regarding community food projects, processes, and development to organizations seeking such assistance. Report language accompanying the conference bill indicates that applications for projects designed to provide training and technical assistance to organizations developing community food projects should be considered. USDA, therefore, seeks grant applications from organizations capable of providing this assistance. Applicants for technical assistance grants should clearly demonstrate experience and expertise in all areas of community food security.

Responsibilities for the technical assistance grantee(s) can

include, but are not limited to, 1) helping USDA to determine which project grantees will receive this service and 2) identifying and coordinating technical assistance available from other Federal agencies. Technical assistance may also include helping the project grantees to:

- (1) conduct needs assessments;
- (2) build coalitions;
- (3) develop and conduct project evaluations;
- (4) refine outcome measures and conduct measurements; and
- (5) convert the project to a self-sustaining operation.

Offerors should anticipate that there will be several projects for which they are responsible for providing assistance. These projects may be very different in their design and objectives. Therefore, the technical assistance grantee will need the capability to address a substantial number of community food issues.

The criteria for the selection of a technical assistance grantee are as follows:

1. Understanding of purpose and objectives

The offeror should demonstrate an understanding of the purpose and objectives of the Community Food Project and the role of the technical assistance grantee. (15 points)

2. Approach to Technical Assistance

The offeror should clearly describe their approach to providing technical assistance to both FCS and the project grantees. (30 points)

3. Organizational and staff qualifications and experience

The offeror should describe the organization's experience in the areas of 1) technical assistance; 2) community food work; 3) job training, business development, or economic development; and 4) work with low-income communities. They should also discuss the organization's capacity for conducting the work required and resources committed to the study. The proposed staff should have the training, knowledge, and experience needed to complete this project. (35 points)

4. Management Plans

The proposal should contain plans for project management including the method for devoting resources to several disparate projects, staff responsibilities, the approach to monitoring work, problem resolution, and an organizational chart of the staff to be assigned to this project. (20 points)

WILLIAM E. LUDWIG
Administrator
Food and Consumer Service

DATE

June 26, 1996

To: Joel Berg, Director of National Service

From: Jim Jacobs, EZ/EC Office

RE: COMMUNITY FOOD SECURITY ACT R.F.P.

EZ/EC COMPONENT

What the Initiative Is: "The EZ/EC Initiative is designed to afford poor and economically distressed communities real opportunities for growth and revitalization. The framework of the program is embodied in four key principles: Economic Opportunity, Sustainable Community Development, Community-Based Partnerships, and Strategic Vision for Change. Empowerment Zones, Enterprise Communities, and Champion Communities all represent, by definition, communities with poverty rates well above the national average."

The following are examples of the types of activities EZ/ECs could engage in:

* Revolving loan funds or grants targeted to food-related activities, such as: 1) Crop Specific: Funds targeted to area farmers or their cooperatives to encourage more local production of produce and other perishables. These funds could support efforts to find alternatives to crops adversely affected by changing demand or Farm Bill provisions. 2) Enterprise Specific: Funds targeted to size and type of farm, such as small and low-income farmers, and first-time farmers. 3) Function Specific: Funds targeted to food-related activities. Examples might include transporting, storing, and further processing of gleaned or rescued food products. Others would be facilities for processing and preserving locally-produced crops that would be made available to low-income residents. Others would include supermarkets, stores and other food-delivery systems, wholesale and terminal markets, farmers' markets, value-added processing, home canning and preserving projects, and nutrition and education programs.

* Buying or purchasing cooperatives that empower local citizens to join together for more economical and efficient purchasing of foodstuffs. Members could trade labor in the cooperative for food. As the owners, low-income residents would have more say in what food is made available to them. As a cooperative, service-at-cost operation helps to ensure food is more affordable.

* Agricultural cooperatives that empower local farmers, especially low-income, to receive a better return by participating more in the value-added portion of the food system. Operating a processing facility or farmers' markets are just two of a range of value-added activities. With a cooperative, more dollars spent on food stays in the community, and can be a building-block for increasing participation of area farmers in the activities of their local communities.

JOEL: NOTES THAT SOME OF
MEMO IS TAKEN FROM; SOURCE
OF MORE VERBAGE.

COMMUNITY FOOD SECURITY ACT R.F.P.
EZ/EC-ORIENTED ACTIVITIES

I. A WORD ON EZ/EC ACTIVITIES IDENTIFIED IN THE BENCHMARKS

Nearly all EZ/EC communities would be eligible entities under Sec (c)(1)(B) of the Act, "job training and business development for food-related activities in low-income communities."

Some have identified explicit projects that would fall under the above mentioned section, and Sec (c)(1)(A): "community food work..small farms..development of new markets," and so on.

East Central, Arkansas EC: Develop Delta Ag Technology Center to promote and assist promising on-farm and value-added processing.

Beadle-Spink, South Dakota EC: Revolving loan fund for agriculture producers. They are also developing and adult education curriculum for farm and business management.

Scott McCreary, Tennessee EC: Farmers market.

Northeast Delta, Louisiana EC: Farmers market.

Kentucky Highlands EZ: Development financing and working capital for area cooperative members and other farmer-suppliers.

Lower Yakima, Washington EC: Promote expansion of area's value-added agriculture industry.

II. POTENTIAL PROJECTS FOR RURAL EZ/EC COMMUNITIES

Many communities identify priorities in job growth and business development, entrepreneurial and local-business development, job training, low-income and elderly resident health and well being, new public-private partnerships, and overall quality of life without mentioning a specific type of project, businesses or industry as a vehicle. Community food security and related agricultural development is likely of greater general interest to these communities than their plans let on.

Example
A. Targeted Revolving Loan Funds

1. Crop Specific: Funds would be loaned to area farmers to encourage greater production of produce and other perishables. In some instances, this would support efforts by farmers seeking alternative to crops such as tobacco or cotton that are negatively impacted by changes in demand or Farm Bill provisions. Payments could have some risk-sharing mechanism reflecting local intra-annual conditions.

2. Enterprise Specific: Funds would be targeted to specific types and sizes of agricultural-production units, such as small farmers, first-time farmers, or low-income farmers.

- * Local farmer and school-system partnerships that encourage greater use of locally-grown fruits and vegetables in school menus. Projects could fit within more comprehensive strategies to improve child nutrition and support area farmers.
- * Projects that help lower the costs of transporting and storing food. These might include transportation and distribution facilities, the manufacturing of food packaging and storage materials, improving infrastructures and facilities directly involved in food-related activities, and increasing backhaul opportunities.
- * Activities that address the impediments to food stores locating in low-income areas, such as reducing crime and improving safety, and enhancing neighborhood appearance.
- * Food-related job training and education programs in the schools. Programs would offer technical food and agricultural-production education. Hands-on experience could be gained in nutrition and meal planning, and procuring, processing, and distributing food. Special consideration would be given to gleaning and food rescue activities, which could involve school youth groups.

3. **Function Specific:** Funds would be targeted to types of activities. Examples would be transporting, storing, and further processing of gleaned or rescued food products. Another would be facilities for processing and preserving locally-produced crops. Special consideration would be given for those hiring low-income residents.

The EZ/ECs could directly provide the project match, or provide a part in partnership with State, local, or private sources.

B. Cooperatives

1. **Buying or Purchasing:** Builds on the EZ/EC principal of empowering local residents. Non-profit entities could organize local residents into the necessary "critical mass" needed for food purchasing cooperatives. Partnerships would then be sought with local producers, food wholesalers, and processors for supply arrangements. The foodstuffs would be purchased. Start-up costs for the store and warehouse could be met jointly by CFS and EZ/EC funds. As cooperatives are a "service-at-cost" organization, they in theory can operate at lower margins and lower prices than for-profit firms. Often the primary impediment are the start-up costs and a sufficient working capital base.

2. **Agricultural Cooperatives:** Empowers local farmers to extend into more value-added operations and keep more of the profits in the local area.

C. Cost of Transporting Food and Operating Supermarkets

1. **Neighborhood Safety and Crime:** Part of comprehensive program to directly identify and address impediments to stores locating in low-income areas.

2. **Infrastructure**

3. **Backhaul and Other Factors Affecting Transportation Costs**

D. School-System Linkages

1. **Technical food and ag production programs with hands-on experience:** Could directly assist in the procurement, preserving, and distribution of gleaned and rescued food. Students could directly assist in assisting residents in nutrition, meal planning, and food preservation.

2. **Local Producer-School System Partnerships:** Encourage more use of local production by community schools. A comprehensive approach is needed, given the budget constraints of the schools--mainly price-driven purchasing.

Ron Hill - R

920-691 0

Thomas



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Food and
Consumer
Service

3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302

SUBJECT: Community Food Projects

TO: Martha Phipps
Deputy Chief of Staff

Victor Vasquez, Director
Rural Empowerment Zone and Enterprise Community Program

Barbara A. Meister, Confidential Assistant
Research, Education, and Economics

Joel Berg, Director
Americorps National Services

Cheryl Macias
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional Affairs

Veronica De La Garza, Director
Intergovernmental Affairs

Lon Hatamiya, Administrator
Agriculture Marketing Service

DATE: June 17, 1996

To expedite cross-clearance, please find attached a copy of the Community Food Projects Request for Applications that has been sent to the Office of General Council for their review and comment. If you have any additional comments or questions, please call Steven Carlson at (202) 305-2134 by Wednesday, June 19, 1996.

From: Martha Phipps
To: OCNET.OC-POST.JBERG, SIES1.CMACIAS, USDAHQ.GW.Larr...
Date: 6/21/96 10:34am
Subject: RFP help

I just spoke with Cathy Woteki. She will call Bob Robinson and ask him to assign a few people from CREES to help add some innovation to the RFP. I told her that Joel was heading up this effort and that it needed to happen today. Bob should be in touch with Joel.

I have been trading calls with Grady - he doesn't know about this yet but I will tell him as soon as we connect. He will need to be brought in to the process. I would assume that, unless we make major progress in identifying a project director/location early next week that the 1996 funds will be administered by FCS, since the money is coming from there.

I will be out of the office between 1:30 and 4:00 today. I am available any other time.

CC: EOLSEN, GFRAZIER, CRAWLS, JPOTTS

To: Martha Phipps, Cheryl Macias, Barbara Meister

From: Joel Berg

JB

Some advocates of the Community Food Security Act around the nation have started an organized campaign to oppose the Secretary's decision to have the Act administered by CREES.

They have contacted Congressional offices, including those of Senator Leahy and Congressman de la Garza. They have also faxed the attached "urgent action alert" to anti-hunger groups throughout the country. The alert contains many inaccuracies.

Tom Amontree asked me to prepare talking points for him in case he gets any media calls on the topic. Please review the draft talking points immediately and call me at 720-5746 with any comments.

cc: Tom Amontree

back to mail
Joseph Wall 401-834
Community Food
and Nutrition 19345
Program
Nation Office of Economic Opportunity

06/27/1996 16:52 3108225410

COMMFOODSECURITYCLTN

PAGE 01

COMMUNITY

Post-It* Fax Note	7671	Date	6/27	# of pages	2
To	LIZ RILEY	From	Andy Rile		
Co/Dept		Co			
Phone #		Phone #			
Fax #		Fax #			

NICE, CA 90294

1

URGENT ACTION ALERT!
COMMUNITY FOOD SECURITY ACT
IMPLEMENTATION IN JEOPARDY
CONTACT USDA SECRETARY GLICKMAN AND YOUR
CONGRESSMAN TODAY.

Wednesday, June 26, 1996

WHAT'S HAPPENING:

The USDA has just shifted responsibility for administering the Assistance for Community Food Projects program (the Community Food Security Act), threatening the viability and integrity of the entire program.

The program was being coordinated through the Office of Analysis and Evaluation (OAE) of Food and Consumer Services. OAE had developed an RFP (Request for Proposals) which was set to be released next week. This week, Secretary Glickman removed the program from the oversight of OAE and turned it over to Research, Education and Extension's Cooperative State Research and Extension Services (CSRES).

Under this new action, CSRES has been assigned to rewrite the RFP (new guidelines unknown) within the next four days. In addition, provisions for grants for outside groups to conduct training and technical assistance may be dropped, and USDA will try to do it themselves, despite their admitted lack of knowledge on community food security.

WHY THIS STINKS:

- This jeopardizes the issuance of the RFP for FY 1996. With so little time left for USDA to issue an RFP, allow time for proposals to be written, review proposals, make awards, and obligate funds by Sept. 30th, any glitch that holds up the process could kill it for lack of time.
- There is no reason to believe that CSRES is familiar at all with community food security and the types of grants and projects that should be encouraged. OAE on the other hand has gained a good grasp of the complexities of the issue.
- This maneuver may be designed to favor pet projects such as gleaning, AmeriCorps, and food recovery. The new guidelines may eliminate eligibility for consideration of many worthy projects you and others are working on, and favor certain types of initiatives that violate the intent of the legislation.

WHAT YOU NEED TO DO WITHOUT DELAY

With only a couple of days before Congress goes on recess and with the new RFP due in 4 days, we must act **IMMEDIATELY** to protect our hard earned victory.

Call or fax Secretary Dan Glickman TODAY to express your concerns that the program be implemented swiftly and in accordance with the Act's legislative intent. Important: cc a letter as well as your congressional representative.

BULLETS FOR FAXES OR CALLS TO GLICKMAN, CONGRESS

- Urge USDA to keep the same RFP developed by OAE, and to expedite the release of the RFP. This will ensure that the intent of the legislation is maintained as well as that a program does indeed occur this year.
- Urge USDA to fund community food security programs, as the legislation is intended.
- Let them know about all the efforts your organizations and countless others have made over the past year and a half to get this legislation passed.
- Mention how important this program is, not only for your organization, but for the issues it will address and the opportunities it offers;
- Let them know that you are contacting your member of Congress to express your concern over this process;
- Ask USDA to retain training and technical assistance grants, considered essential to the effectiveness of the program.

Secretary Dan Glickman:

House switchboard: 202-225-3121

Tel: 202- 720-3631

Fax: 202-720-5437

e-mail: agsec@usda.gov

Additional CFS Coalition phone numbers:

Mark Winne: 203-296-9325

Hugh Joseph 617-232-6666

DRAFT --- DRAFT --- DRAFT --- DRAFT --- DRAFT --- DRAFT --- DRAFT --- DRAFT

TALKING POINTS ON USDA IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMUNITY FOOD SECURITY ACT

Background

- * At part of this year's Farm Bill (the Fair Act), Congress authorized the Community Food Security Act, requiring the Department to award grants up to \$1.0 dollars in FY1996 and \$2.5 million in each of the fiscal years until FY2002. This grants will go to non-profit organizations to implement community-based projects aimed at developing long-term, structural ways to provide more low-income Americans with sustainable supplies of nutritious food.
- * The Act defines a community food security projects as a "community-based project that requires a 1-time infusion of Federal assistance to become self-sustaining and that is designed to meet the food needs of low-income people, increase the self-reliance of communities in providing for their own food needs; and promote comprehensive responses to local food, farm, and nutrition issues." The act mandates that preference be given to projects "designed to develop linkages between 2 or more sectors of the food system, support the development of entrepreneurial projects, develop linkages between the for-profit and nonprofit food sectors; or encourage long-term planning activities and multi-system, interagency approaches."
- * While the funding for the Act is provided from the Food Stamps account, the act conveys the authority to run the program to the Secretary of Agriculture; the Act does **NOT** specify which USDA agency or agency should run the program.
- * Given that Congress passed the Farm Bill so late in the year but required that the Department award all the FY1996 community Food Security grants by October 1 of this year, the Secretary was required to make a decision rapidly as to which USDA agency would have the lead responsibility for managing the program.

What's Really Happening

- * Secretary Glickman has just directed the Cooperative Research Education and Extension Service (CREES) to be the lead agency in conducting the grant competition.
- * It is the intention of Secretary Glickman that all relevant agencies of USDA --- including, but not limited to, the Food and Consumer Service (FCS), the Food Safety and Inspection Service, the Rural Housing Service and Community Development Service, the Agricultural Marketing Service, and the Rural Business and Cooperative Development Service ---- work closely with CREES in developing the RFP, reviewing the grant proposals, and providing technical assistance to grantees to the extent allowed by law. In particular, FCS will be expected to play a significant role in partnership with CREES.

* Secretary Glickman directed CREES to publish the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the grant competition in the Federal Register as soon as possible and to ensure that all grants are legally and properly awarded by October 1.

* As of June 28, 1996, **NO** final decisions had been made by the Department as to what criteria would be in the actual RFP. Consequently, by law, absolutely no decisions had been made --- nor will be made by the Department --- as to what type of grant proposals may or may not be funded. These decisions can only be made after the RFP is published, proposals are submitted, and proposals are reviewed.

Why the Secretary's Decision Makes Sense

* The Act clearly calls for projects that relate to many of the mission areas of the Department. CREES is the one USDA agency with the most experience in a variety of these mission areas; CREES has considerable experience in community gardening and farming, entrepreneurship, nutrition and food safety education and outreach, business development, services to at-risk-youth, and agricultural marketing. Thus, CREES is the USDA agency best suited to meet the Act's mandate to "promote comprehensive responses to local food, farm, and nutrition issues" and to "develop linkages between 2 or more sectors of the food system."

* FCS has little experience or legal authority related to working directly with farmers, supporting community gardens, aiding agricultural marketing, etc.

* While FCS has only small regional offices, the Cooperative Extension Service --- under the direction of CREES --- has offices working the grass-roots level in most counties in the nation.

* CREES has one of the largest and most experienced grants staffs in the Department.

* CREES has the best ability to ensure that all relevant agencies in the Department work together to implement the provisions of the Act.

*** The bottom line is this: if critics of this decision had contacted USDA before issuing a public criticism, they would have learned that the Secretary has taken action to expand, rather than limit, the overall assistance to be provided to all aspects of community food security projects.**

Misstatements of Fact in the "Urgent Action Alert"

* Given that authority for administering the Act was never formally given to FCS, it is obviously incorrect to claim that such authority was just "shifted away" from FCS.

* The RFP was not formally "scheduled to be released next week." The earliest drafts of the RFP needed significantly reworking and expansion on policy, legal, and administrative matters.

* The alert claims that "provisions for grants for outside groups may be dropped, and USDA may try to do it themselves, despite their admitted lack of knowledge on community food security." First, USDA does not "admit a lack of knowledge on community food security." Given that the Department regularly provides nutrition assistance to at least one in ten Americans, interacts daily with millions of farmers, and is the main government agency responsible for rural economic development, USDA has a great deal of successful experience in issues related to community food security. Second, as of June 28, 1996, no decision had been made as to whether the first round of grants would include grants for technical assistance. One possibility --- and this is only a possibility --- is that technical assistance proposals would be requested in the second year --- not the first year --- of the program, after it is clear what the actual technical assistance needs are of the actual grantees.

The alert claims that the Departments now "jeopardizes the issuance of the RFP for FY 1996." The Secretary has clearly directed CREES to meet all legal deadlines and the agency will take every step necessary to ensure that it does.

* The alert claims that "There is no reason to believe that CSRES (sic) is familiar at all with community food security.... (FCS) on the other hand has gained a good grasp of the complexities of the issue." First, as explained above, CREES has a great deal of experience in issues related to community food security. Second, the alert contradicts itself by first claiming that USDA know so little about community food security that it could not possibly provide technical assistance but later states that one USDA agency "has a good grasp of the complexities of the issue."

* The alert claims that "This maneuver may be designed to favor pet projects such as gleaning, AmeriCorps, and food recovery. The new guidelines may eliminate eligibility for consideration of many worthy projects.... (and) violate the intent of the legislation." Again, no decisions have been made about what kind of projects might be funded. Gleaning, AmeriCorps, and/or food recovery projects would only be funded if they clearly advance food security in ways envisioned by the Act. The Department is NOT considering ways to eliminate projects from consideration in the RFP; most of the changes being discussed in the internal draft RFP would simply clarify that a great diversity of innovative, non-bureaucratic, approaches can be potentially taken to advance community food security.

**DE LA GARZA FOOD SECURITY GRANT APPLICATION
WORKSHEET FOR SPECIFYING PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

Accomplishment # (At least one, but no more than five, should be included in each grant proposal--- a different worksheet should be used for each accomplishment) _____

Accomplishment Summary (one sentence summary of the accomplishment planned)

1) Process Goal (process is defined as the method/tool used to increase community food security)

- A. Quantity measure (a number) _____
 - B. Quantity unit of measure (what the previous amount measured) _____
 - C. Description of quantity measured (what the previous measures refer to) _____
 - D. Quality measure (a number) _____
 - E. Quality unit of measure (usually percentage) _____
 - F. Description of quantity measured (what the previous numbers refer to) _____
-

2) End Product Goal (end product is defined as the concrete way in which more citizens are provided with a secure source of food)

- A. Quantity measure (a number) _____
 - B. Quantity unit of measure (what the previous amount measured) _____
 - C. Description of quantity measured (what the previous measures refer to --- should almost always refer to the number of people fed) _____
 - D. Quality measure (a number) _____
 - E. Quality unit of measure (usually percentage) _____
 - F. Description of quantity measured (what the previous numbers refer to) _____
-

3. Cost Effectiveness

- A. Approximate amount of money from the grant used to carry out this accomplishment (If there is only one accomplishment proposed in the grant, this number should be the total cost of the grant) _____
- B. Cost per person served (calculate this by dividing the number in "3A" by the number in "2A") _____

**DE LA GARZA FOOD SECURITY GRANT APPLICATION
WORKSHEET FOR SPECIFYING PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

Accomplishment # (At least one, but no more than five, should be included in each grant proposal--- a different worksheet should be used for each accomplishment) _____

Accomplishment Summary (one sentence summary of the accomplishment planned)

1) Process Goal (process is defined as the method/tool used to increase community food security)

- A. Quantity measure (a number) _____
 - B. Quantity unit of measure (what the previous amount measured) _____
 - C. Description of quantity measured (what the previous measures refer to) _____
 - D. Quality measure (a number) _____
 - E. Quality unit of measure (usually percentage) _____
 - F. Description of quantity measured (what the previous numbers refer to) _____
-

2) End Product Goal (end product is defined as the concrete way in which more citizens are provided with a secure source of food)

- A. Quantity measure (a number) _____
 - B. Quantity unit of measure (what the previous amount measured) _____
 - C. Description of quantity measured (what the previous measures refer to --- should almost always refer to the number of people fed) _____
 - D. Quality measure (a number) _____
 - E. Quality unit of measure (usually percentage) _____
 - F. Description of quantity measured (what the previous numbers refer to) _____
-

3. Cost Effectiveness

- A. Approximate amount of money from the grant used to carry out this accomplishment (If there is only one accomplishment proposed in the grant, this number should be the total cost of the grant) _____
- B. Cost per person served (calculate this by dividing the number in "3A" by the number in "2A") _____

DECISION MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY

From:

Subject: **Community Food Security Act and Food Recovery Implementation**

Issue:

The issue is whether the Community Food Security act provisions of the Farm Bill will be implemented as a traditional grant program administered solely by the Food and Consumer Services or whether they will be implemented by a cross-agency task force that can also help implement your broader food recovery initiative.

Background:

As part of this year's Farm Bill, Congress authorized the Community Food Security Act, requiring the Department to award grants totaling \$1.0 million in FY96 and \$2.5 in each of the subsequent two fiscal years to implement community-based anti-hunger projects. Significant work will be required immediately in order to meet the Department's statutory requirement to award the first year's grants before October 1.

Grants under this act have the possibility to advance your food recovery initiative, welfare reform, AmeriCorps, the Empowerment Zone and Enterprise Community initiative, and other key Administration priorities.

Furthermore, even though we clearly do not want to create a new government bureaucracy to promote food recovery, there is a need to provide expanded staff support to implement even the barest plan to use USDA as a "bully pulpit" to advance your food recovery initiative. Our current difficulties in implementing regional round tables highlight the reality that, if this initiative is to achieve concrete accomplishments, it needs at least a small staff dedicated solely to food recovery.

Option 1: Community Food Security Act is managed by the Food and Consumer Service**How option 1 would work:**

The Food and Consumer Service would use its existing staff and utilize its routine grants management processes to implement the provisions of the Community Food Security Act.

Advantages of option 1:

This option would place the least strain on USDA agencies other than the Food and Consumer Service, would require the least time and effort from the Office of the Secretary, and would pose the least risk of controversy.

Disadvantages of option 1:

This option would provide fewer resources for your food recovery initiative, would make it more difficult to advance other Administration priorities, would obtain significantly less visibility for the Department, and could the Act's overall benefit to the public.

Option 2: Both the Community Food Security Act and the food recovery initiative are managed by a cross-agency task force**How option 2 would work:**

This option would allow for a broader-scale implementation of both the Community Food Security Act and the food recovery initiative that would include all the relevant agencies of the Department. The Department would not only give out the food security grants in the manner proscribed by the law, but we would advance other key Administration initiatives such as: food recovery and gleaning, the EZ/EC initiative, AmeriCorps, reinventing government, welfare reform, etc. The management structure created to give out the grants would also be able to take many additional concrete steps to advance your vision for food recovery, and could significantly expand the ways in which the Community Food Security Act could benefit the public.

Both initiatives would be overseen by one high-level Director directly appointed by you . This person would have a formal delegation of authority to approve cooperative agreements and sign documents on behalf of the initiatives.

The Director would report directly to you, to the Deputy Chief of Staff, and to the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional Affairs.

Reporting to the Director would be a staff comprised of USDA employees from a wide variety of USDA agencies on one-year, non-reimbursable details. While the final staffing pattern could be approved by yourself or the Deputy Secretary at a later date, the staff would likely have a small staff of about 11 employees in addition to the Director:

- 1 administrative/budget officer
- 1 deputy administrative/budget officer
- 1 policy coordinator
- 2 grants officers
- 1 office manager
- 3 support staff
- 1 computer specialist
- 1 external affairs specialist (focusing on intergovernmental and Congressional affairs and communications)

Excluding the non-reimbursable salaries for the staff listed above, this office could easily run on a budget of \$150,000 assessed from the relevant agencies. In the future years, this entire budget could theoretically be funded by the Food Recovery Foundation.

The Director would work closely and meet regularly with a multi-agency task force, which would include:

- The Deputy Chief of Staff
- Director of the Office of the Consumer Advisor
- The Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional Affairs
- The Director of Intergovernmental Affairs
- The Director of the USDA EZ/EC Initiative
- The Director of National Service

The task force would also include one working representative each from FSA, RD, FSIS, ERS, Extension, AMS, OBPA, OGC, and the Office of Communications.

The State Directors of FSA and RD in each state would be included in any formal review of applications and projects proposed from their state -- as well in eventual project implementation in their state.

Advantages of option 2:

The advantages of this option are that it would provide more focus on the entire food recovery initiative, would significantly aid other Administration priorities, would provide a way to reinvent government by allowing a new program to transcend traditional agency turfs, and would raise the profile of the Department in important areas. Given that the Department is already required by Congress to utilize staff to implement the Community Food Security Act, this option would allow the Department to assign staff to also help with food recovery in a manner that would cost least and cause the least possible opposition from Congress. Management structures similar to this one have already worked well in implementing Departmental programs such as AmeriCorps.

Disadvantages of option 2:

The disadvantages of this option are that it would place a strain on agencies other than the Food and Consumer Service, would require more time and effort from the Office of the Secretary, and would slightly increase the risk opposition to the food recovery effort. The Office of the Secretary, the Office of the Deputy Secretary, and or the Office of Budget and Program Analysis would need to spend some effort ensuring that agencies provide the appropriate staff and budget.

Recommendation:

I recommend option 2. This option would allow the Department to advance two key initiatives at the lowest possible cost and with the greatest cooperation between all USDA agencies. If this option is selected, the you would need to rapidly appoint a Director of the program and sign a formal delegations of authority --- approved by OGC -- to that director.

Agree _____

Date _____

Disagree _____

Discuss with me _____

ADVANTAGES OF RELATIONSHIPS
BETWEEN
COMMUNITY FOOD PROJECTS AND AMERICORPS PROGRAMS

There are two basic ways in which AmeriCorps programs can work with or be part of Community Food Projects (CFP): first, an AmeriCorps program could apply directly for a Community Food Project grant; second, a Community Food Project grantee could enter into a partnership with an AmeriCorps program. In both instances, the AmeriCorps program would be used as one of the mechanisms by which the CFP grantee delivers the service or activity being funded by the CFP grant. Based on the Department's work with its AmeriCorps anti-hunger projects, this utilization of AmeriCorps offers several advantages:

1. **COST.** AmeriCorps members are will to accept a low basic living allowance amount in return for an education award of \$4,725. Since the education award is not the responsibility of any individual AmeriCorps program but is paid by the National Service Trust, it is possible to acquire the services of highly motivated, skilled, and educated personnel for a relatively low cost. The Department's experience with its AmeriCorps members bears this out.
2. **EXPERIENCE.** Existing AmeriCorps projects throughout the country represent a wide cross-section of community efforts related to developing entrepreneurial projects, links between non-profit and for-profit organizations, and multi-system, interagency approaches to food issues.
3. **NETWORKS.** As a national program run at the local level and driven by local or community needs, AmeriCorps offers the best of two worlds. First, each project is based on local needs established by members of the community in which the service is to be performed, thus providing a clear "community" level focus. Second, AmeriCorps projects operate within a national framework that provides for communication and interaction with projects and organizations across the entire country. Each project is affiliated with a state AmeriCorps commission and through the Corporation for National Service has affiliation with national non-profits, government agencies, and AmeriCorps projects in other states, especially those doing similar work.

SUGGESTED LANGUAGE ON HOW AMERICORPS MAY BE INCLUDED IN COMMUNITY FOOD SECURITY PROJECT APPLICATIONS

Background

AmeriCorps is the President's domestic national service program --- passed with bi-partisan support from Congress --- that allows Americans of all background to provide community service in exchange for an educational award that can be used to pay for college, job training, graduate school, or to pay back existing student loans. The program is authorized by the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-82).

Currently, USDA sponsors a small portion of the overall AMERICORPS program. USDA AMERICORPS projects are currently focused on anti-hunger and nutrition, environmental, and rural development work.

There are two basic ways in which AmeriCorps can work with or be part of Community Food Projects (CFP): first, an AmeriCorps program could apply directly for a Community Food Project grant; second, a Community Food Project grantee could enter into a partnership with an AmeriCorps program. In both instances, the AmeriCorps program would be used as one of the mechanisms by which the CFP grantee delivers the service or activity being funded by the CFP grant. Based on the Department's work with its AmeriCorps anti-hunger projects, this utilization of AmeriCorps offers several advantages:

1. **COST.** AmeriCorps members receive a low basic living allowance and an education award worth \$4,725 in exchange for their service. Since the education award is not the responsibility of any individual AmeriCorps program but is paid by the National Service Trust, it is possible to acquire the services of highly motivated, skilled, and educated personnel for a relatively low cost. The Department's experience with its AmeriCorps members bears this out.
2. **EXPERIENCE.** Existing AmeriCorps projects throughout the country represent a wide cross-section of community efforts related to developing entrepreneurial projects, links between non-profit and for-profit organizations, and multi-system, interagency approaches to food issues.
3. **NETWORKS.** As a national program run at the local level and driven by local or community needs, AmeriCorps offers the best of two worlds. First, each project is based on local needs established by members of the community in which the service is to be performed, thus providing a clear "community" level focus. Second, AmeriCorps projects operate within a national framework that provides for communication and interaction with projects and organizations across the entire country. Virtually every project is affiliated with a state AmeriCorps commission and through the Corporation for National Service has affiliation with national non-profits, government agencies, and AmeriCorps projects in other states, especially those doing similar work.

Prohibited AmeriCorps Activities

By law, AmeriCorps members can not perform services that directly benefit for-profit entities. In addition, AMERICORPS Members can not spend the bulk of their service time providing routine office support help to grantees. Lastly, AmeriCorps Members may not lobby or engage in political advocacy work, may not support religious instruction, and may not engage in efforts to aid or hinder union organizing work. However, since such grants are not the major focus of the Community Food Project program this does not appear to be a significant issue.

Possible AmeriCorps Community Food Security Activities

AmeriCorps Members could possible be used as the entire delivery mechanism or part of the delivery mechanism for projects related to:

- * community gardening and farming
- * farmer's markets
- * nutrition education and program outreach
- * job training and youth apprenticeships related to food security

The above possibilities only offer only a few examples of the many potential ways of how AMERICORPS could be involved in this program.

How to Include AmeriCorps in the Grant Application

The precise role for AmeriCorps members would need to be specified exactly in both the application narrative and in the "worksheet for specifying project accomplishment." The application needs to be exact how many hungry people with be fed directly as a result of the efforts of the AmeriCorps members.

4-3

1 \$1,236,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, \$1,268,000,000 for
2 fiscal year 2000, \$1,301,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and
3 \$1,335,000,000 for fiscal year 2002”.

4 (g) AMERICAN SAMOA.—The Food Stamp Act of
5 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended by adding at
6 the end the following:

7 “SEC. 24. TERRITORY OF AMERICAN SAMOA.

8 “Effective October 1, 1995, from amounts made
9 available to carry out this Act, the Secretary shall pay to
10 the Territory of American Samoa not more than
11 \$5,300,000 for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2002
12 to finance 100 percent of the expenditures for the fiscal
13 year for a nutrition assistance program extended under
14 section 601(c) of Public Law 96-597 (48 U.S.C.
15 1469d(c)).”.

16 (h) ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITY FOOD
17 PROJECTS.—The Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C.
18 2011 et seq.) (as amended by subsection (g)) is amended
19 by adding at the end the following:

20 “SEC. 25. ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITY FOOD PROJECTS.

21 “(a) DEFINITION OF COMMUNITY FOOD
22 PROJECTS.—In this section, the term ‘community food
23 project’ means a community-based project that requires
24 a 1-time infusion of Federal assistance to become self-sus-
25 taining and that is designed to—

statutory
Language
in the
Farm
Bill

O:\END\END96.224

[Title IV—Nutrition Assistance]

S.L.C.

4-4

1 “(1) meet the food needs of low-income people;

2 “(2) increase the self-reliance of communities in
3 providing for their own food needs; and

4 “(3) promote comprehensive responses to local
5 food, farm, and nutrition issues.

6 “(b) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—

7 “(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts made avail-
8 able to carry out this Act, the Secretary may make
9 grants to assist eligible private nonprofit entities to
10 establish and carry out community food projects.

11 “(2) LIMITATION ON GRANTS.—The total
12 amount of funds provided as grants under this sec-
13 tion may not exceed—

14 “(A) \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 1996; and

15 “(B) \$2,500,000 for each of fiscal years
16 1997 through 2002.

17 “(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible for a grant
18 under subsection (b), a private nonprofit entity must—

19 “(1) have experience in the area of—

20 “(A) community food work, particularly
21 concerning small and medium-sized farms, in-
22 cluding the provision of food to people in low-
23 income communities and the development of
24 new markets in low-income communities for ag-
25 ricultural producers; or

4-5

1 “(B) job training and business develop-
2 ment activities for food-related activities in low-
3 income communities;

4 “(2) demonstrate competency to implement a
5 project, provide fiscal accountability, collect data,
6 and prepare reports and other necessary documenta-
7 tion; and

8 “(3) demonstrate a willingness to share infor-
9 mation with researchers, practitioners, and other in-
10 terested parties.

11 “(d) PREFERENCE FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS.—In se-
12 lecting community food projects to receive assistance
13 under subsection (b), the Secretary shall give a preference
14 to projects designed to—

15 “(1) develop linkages between 2 or more sectors
16 of the food system;

17 “(2) support the development of entrepreneurial
18 projects;

19 “(3) develop innovative linkages between the
20 for-profit and nonprofit food sectors; or

21 “(4) encourage long-term planning activities
22 and multi-system, interagency approaches.

23 “(e) MATCHING FUNDS REQUIREMENTS.—

24 “(1) REQUIREMENTS.—The Federal share of
25 the cost of establishing or carrying out a community

4-6

1 food project that receives assistance under sub-
2 section (b) may not exceed 50 percent of the cost of
3 the project during the term of the grant.

4 “(2) CALCULATION.—In providing for the non-
5 Federal share of the cost of carrying out a commu-
6 nity food project, the entity receiving the grant shall
7 provide for the share through a payment in cash or
8 in kind, fairly evaluated, including facilities, equip-
9 ment, or services.

10 “(3) SOURCES.—An entity may provide for the
11 non-Federal share through State government, local
12 government, or private sources.

13 “(f) TERM OF GRANT.—

14 “(1) SINGLE GRANT.—A community food
15 project may be supported by only a single grant
16 under subsection (b).

17 “(2) TERM.—The term of a grant under sub-
18 section (b) may not exceed 3 years.

19 “(g) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND RELATED INFOR-
20 MATION.—

21 “(1) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—In carrying out
22 this section, the Secretary may provide technical as-
23 sistance regarding community food projects, proc-
24 esses, and development to an entity seeking the as-
25 sistance.

4-7

1 “(2) SHARING INFORMATION.—

2 “(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may
3 provide for the sharing of information concern-
4 ing community food projects and issues among
5 and between government, private for-profit and
6 nonprofit groups, and the public through publi-
7 cations, conferences, and other appropriate fo-
8 rums.

9 “(B) OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES.—The
10 Secretary may share information concerning
11 community food projects with researchers, prac-
12 titioners, and other interested parties.

13 “(h) EVALUATION.—

14 “(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide
15 for the evaluation of the success of community food
16 projects supported using funds under this section.

17 “(2) REPORT.—Not later than January 30,
18 2002, the Secretary shall submit a report to Con-
19 gress regarding the results of the evaluation.”

20 **SEC. 402. COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM, COMMOD-**
21 **ITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM.**

22 (a) REAUTHORIZATION.—The first sentence of sec-
23 tion 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act
24 of 1973 (Public Law 93-86; 7 U.S.C. 612c note) is
25 amended by striking “1995” and inserting “2002”.

JOEL: NOTES THAT SOME OF
MEMO IS TAKEN FROM; SOURCE
OF MORE VERBAGE.

COMMUNITY FOOD SECURITY ACT R.F.P.
EZ/EC-ORIENTED ACTIVITIES

I. A WORD ON EZ/EC ACTIVITIES IDENTIFIED IN THE BENCHMARKS

Nearly all EZ/EC communities would be eligible entities under Sec (c)(1)(B) of the Act, "job training and business development for food-related activities in low-income communities."

Some have identified explicit projects that would fall under the above mentioned section, and Sec (c)(1)(A): "community food work..small farms..development of new markets," and so on.

East Central, Arkansas EC: Develop Delta Ag Technology Center to promote and assist promising on-farm and value-added processing.

Beadle-Spink, South Dakota EC: Revolving loan fund for agriculture producers. They are also developing and adult education curriculum for farm and business management.

Scott McCreary, Tennessee EC: Farmers market.

Northeast Delta, Louisiana EC: Farmers market.

Kentucky Highlands EZ: Development financing and working capital for area cooperative members and other farmer-suppliers.

Lower Yakima, Washington EC: Promote expansion of area's value-added agriculture industry.

II. POTENTIAL PROJECTS FOR RURAL EZ/EC COMMUNITIES

Many communities identify priorities in job growth and business development, entrepreneurial and local-business development, job training, low-income and elderly resident health and well being, new public-private partnerships, and overall quality of life without mentioning a specific type of project, businesses or industry as a vehicle. Community food security and related agricultural development is likely of greater general interest to these communities than their plans let on.

Example
A. Targeted Revolving Loan Funds

1. Crop Specific: Funds would be loaned to area farmers to encourage greater production of produce and other perishables. In some instances, this would support efforts by farmers seeking alternative to crops such as tobacco or cotton that are negatively impacted by changes in demand or Farm Bill provisions. Payments could have some risk-sharing mechanism reflecting local intra-annual conditions.

2. Enterprise Specific: Funds would be targeted to specific types and sizes of agricultural-production units, such as small farmers, first-time farmers, or low-income farmers.

- * Local farmer and school-system partnerships that encourage greater use of locally-grown fruits and vegetables in school menus. Projects could fit within more comprehensive strategies to improve child nutrition and support area farmers.
- * Projects that help lower the costs of transporting and storing food. These might include transportation and distribution facilities, the manufacturing of food packaging and storage materials, improving infrastructures and facilities directly involved in food-related activities, and increasing backhaul opportunities.
- * Activities that address the impediments to food stores locating in low-income areas, such as reducing crime and improving safety, and enhancing neighborhood appearance.
- * Food-related job training and education programs in the schools. Programs would offer technical food and agricultural-production education. Hands-on experience could be gained in nutrition and meal planning, and procuring, processing, and distributing food. Special consideration would be given to gleaning and food rescue activities, which could involve school youth groups.

3. Function Specific: Funds would be targeted to types of activities. Examples would be transporting, storing, and further processing of gleaned or rescued food products. Another would be facilities for processing and preserving locally-produced crops. Special consideration would be given for those hiring low-income residents.

The EZ/ECs could directly provide the project match, or provide a part in partnership with State, local, or private sources.

B. Cooperatives

1. Buying or Purchasing: Builds on the EZ/EC principal of empowering local residents. Non-profit entities could organize local residents into the necessary "critical mass" needed for food purchasing cooperatives. Partnerships would then be sought with local producers, food wholesalers, and processors for supply arrangements. The foodstuffs would be purchased. Start-up costs for the store and warehouse could be met jointly by CFS and EZ/EC funds. As cooperatives are a "service-at-cost" organization, they in theory can operate at lower margins and lower prices than for-profit firms. Often the primary impediment are the start-up costs and a sufficient working capital base.

2. Agricultural Cooperatives: Empowers local farmers to extend into more value-added operations and keep more of the profits in the local area.

C. Cost of Transporting Food and Operating Supermarkets

1. Neighborhood Safety and Crime: Part of comprehensive program to directly identify and address impediments to stores locating in low-income areas.

2. Infrastructure

3. Backhaul and Other Factors Affecting Transportation Costs

D. School-System Linkages

1. Technical food and ag production programs with hands-on experience: Could directly assist in the procurement, preserving, and distribution of gleaned and rescued food. Students could directly assist in assisting residents in nutrition, meal planning, and food preservation.

2. Local Producer-School System Partnerships: Encourage more use of local production by community schools. A comprehensive approach is needed, given the budget constraints of the schools--mainly price-driven purchasing.

Southern California
Interfaith Hunger Coalition

Operating Site Name:

Parent Organization Name: same USDA

	Activity (one per objective)	Result	Measure	Standard Beneficiaries	Number
Example	Tutoring reading deficient students	Increased reading skill	Pre/post test administered by teacher	50% of students will attain grade level	34 students
Objective 1	The service work to be done is educating homeless low-income and senior citizens about good nutrition	The intended result is the improvements of their diets	The measure of quality is a 3 day menu plan personally designed by people who re- ceived nutrition education	The standard of success is 25% of people who were educated will continue menu planning for themselves	500 individual will benefit by having healthier diet through menu planning
Objective 2	The activity to be done is training community organi- zations in disaster pre- paredness	The intended result is that organizations will be prepared to assist their communities at the time of disaster	The measure of impact is a set of disaster simulations exercises fol- lowed by a debriefing.	The standard of success is that 75% of community organizations trained will be skilled to meet the needs of the community in a disaster	clients of one hundred trained community organizations will benefit from their new disaster skills.
Objective 3	The activity to be engaged in is the promotion of eating breakfast and breakfast alternatives available to youth	The intended result is an increase in youth eating breakfast	The measure of impact will be a poster contest for youth to enter showing a drawing of their favorite break- fast accompanied by their own breakfast recipe	The standard of success is a notable increase in 25% of the youth's break- fast eating habits	1000 youth will benefit by having know- ledge of breakfast alternatives

COMMUNITY SERVICE OBJECTIVES

1995 AMERICORPS DIRECT RENEWAL APPLICATION

Operating Site Name: Swisher College Int'lizanth Hwy Co Parent Organization Name: _____

	Activity (one per objective)	Result	Measure	Standard Beneficiaries	Number
Example	Tutoring reading deficient students	Increased reading skill	Pre/post test administered by teacher	50% of students will attain grade level	34 students
Objective 1	The Activity to be done is organizing low-income communities to participate in community gardening	The intended result is community members will be organized to work in community gardens	The measure of impact is that three gardens will have regular work done by community members	The standard of success is 75% of community members will be trained to maintain the gardens without additional on-going assistance	The community organizing will attract 100 new community members volunteers
Objective 2	The activity to be done is to coordinate the 1996 Youth-Anti Hunger Conference	The intended result is to provide youth with resources about hunger	The measure of impact is an on site evaluation and commitment "to help" sign up and a six month follow-up	The standard of success is 50% of attendees committed to volunteering, or being involved in anti-hunger issues in their communities	1000 youth will have new skills and resources on making a difference regarding hunger issues in their communities
Objective 3	The activity to be done is "fill gaps" regarding unmet needs of the community	The intended result is to meet the needs that surface from community members	The measure of impact is a survey from community members addressing needs, proposed activities and results	The standard of success is assisting the communities in 25% of their requests regarding food accessibility issues	30 food accessibility gaps will be met in the community

COMMUNITY SERVICE OBJECTIVES

1995 AMERICORPS DIRECT RENEWAL APPLICATION

6/27/96

QUESTION 13. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACCOMPLISHING ORIGINAL COMMUNITY SERVICE OBJECTIVES

(Fill in All Blank Columns or Those with Question Marks. Use the Attached Blank Form to Enter New Objectives.)

As you are aware, one of the key pieces of information you are to provide with this 2nd QTR progress report is whether or not you intend to renew this site for the next program year beginning approximately Sept/Oct 1996. If you intend to renew this site for the next program year, indicate whether the objectives listed below will remain the same for the next year's program. If they will remain the same write OK next to them, if one will not be an objective to be performed at this site for next year, write the word DELETE next to it. If you are proposing one or more new objectives for this site identify them using the format attached to question 14. You may write them on this sheet (be sure to include quantity and quality measures) or you may use a separate piece of paper BUT be certain you clearly identify the operating site to which they belong.

State	OP Site	Obj No.	PGM Code	Obj/Impact Statement	Year's QTY Target	QTY Unit of Measure	2 nd QTR Quantity	Year's Success Target	Success Unit of Measure	2 nd QTR Success
CA	C06A	1	EN-H010A	Nutrition outreach to homeless people	500	people - nutrition education	867	25	% who continue menu	20
CA	C06A	2	EN-H002A	Train community organizations in disaster preparedness	100	organizations - trained	70	75	% or org. w/skills	50
CA	C06A	3	EN-H029A	School breakfast outreach	1000	people - school breakfast	4164	25	% improvement in breakfast habits	19
CA	C06A	4	EN-E007A	Involve community residents in community gardening activities	100	people - gardening	137	75	% trained to continue gardens	80
CA	C06A	5	EN-H039A	Coordinate the 1996 Youth Anti-Hunger Conference	1000	people - conference attendees	0	50	% committed to volunteering	50
CA	C06A	6	EN-H026A	Fill food accessibility gaps	30	gaps - identified	5	25	% of Community requests met	35
CA	C06A	7	EN-H038A	Recruit volunteers for youth anti-hunger clubs	100	volunteers	120	500	# hours of community service	350

June 26, 1996

To: Joel Berg, Director of National Service

From: Jim Jacobs, EZ/EC Office

RE: COMMUNITY FOOD SECURITY ACT R.F.P.

EZ/EC COMPONENT

What the Initiative Is: "The EZ/EC Initiative is designed to afford poor and economically distressed communities real opportunities for growth and revitalization. The framework of the program is embodied in four key principles: Economic Opportunity, Sustainable Community Development, Community-Based Partnerships, and Strategic Vision for Change. Empowerment Zones, Enterprise Communities, and Champion Communities all represent, by definition, communities with poverty rates well above the national average."

The following are examples of the types of activities EZ/ECs could engage in:

* Revolving loan funds or grants targeted to food-related activities, such as: 1) Crop Specific: Funds targeted to area farmers or their cooperatives to encourage more local production of produce and other perishables. These funds could support efforts to find alternatives to crops adversely affected by changing demand or Farm Bill provisions. 2) Enterprise Specific: Funds targeted to size and type of farm, such as small and low-income farmers, and first-time farmers. 3) Function Specific: Funds targeted to food-related activities. Examples might include transporting, storing, and further processing of gleaned or rescued food products. Others would be facilities for processing and preserving locally-produced crops that would be made available to low-income residents. Others would include supermarkets, stores and other food-delivery systems, wholesale and terminal markets, farmers' markets, value-added processing, home canning and preserving projects, and nutrition and education programs.

* Buying or purchasing cooperatives that empower local citizens to join together for more economical and efficient purchasing of foodstuffs. Members could trade labor in the cooperative for food. As the owners, low-income residents would have more say in what food is made available to them. As a cooperative, service-at-cost operation helps to ensure food is more affordable.

* Agricultural cooperatives that empower local farmers, especially low-income, to receive a better return by participating more in the value-added portion of the food system. Operating a processing facility or farmers' markets are just two of a range of value-added activities. With a cooperative, more dollars spent on food stays in the community, and can be a building-block for increasing participation of area farmers in the activities of their local communities.