

### III. LOCAL FOOD POLICY GOALS AND ISSUES [F-4]

This section contains a number of examples of goal statements and ordinances from various communities. Also, there is some discussion of the types of policy issues found at the local level.

#### A. Goal statements and resolutions from Knoxville, TN, St. Paul, MN and Onondaga County, NY. [F-3]

##### 1. Knoxville, TN.

- a. Food Policy Council of the City of Knoxville. Flyer, October 1988.
- b. "A Resolution of the Council of the City of Knoxville expressing its support of an effort to improve the quality, availability, and accessibility of food delivery systems for all citizens, and designating the Community Action Committee's Food Supply Project as Coordinator of this effort." Resolution R-202-81. October 31, 1981.

##### 2. St. Paul, MN.

- a. Ordinance of the City of St. Paul, MN, establishing a Food and Nutrition Commission and providing for its powers and staffing, July 8, 1992
- b. St. Paul-Ramsey County Food and Nutrition Commission Mission Statement, March 1995.

##### 3. Onondaga County, NY [F-3]

- a. Onondaga Food System Council, Inc., "A Comprehensive Approach to Our Local Food System." Flyer. 1993.

---

#### B. Different organization approaches used by food policy councils. [F-4]

"Food Policy Councils: The Experience of Five Cities and One County." Ken Dahlberg. Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the Agriculture Food and Human Values Society and the Association for the Study of Food and Society, Tucson, AZ, June 11, 1994.

#### C. Examples of policy statements from St. Paul, and Toronto. [F-5]

1. Saint Paul Food & Nutrition Commission, "Municipal Food Policy." City of Saint Paul, November 19, 1987.
2. "Agricultural policy making must be changed if sustainability is to be achieved, says just released report." News Release from the Toronto Food Policy Council announcing release of its report, "Setting a New Direction: changing Canada's agricultural policy making process." April 25, 1995.

**FOOD POLICY COUNCILS:  
THE EXPERIENCE OF FIVE CITIES AND ONE COUNTY**

A Paper Presented  
at the Joint Meeting of the  
Agriculture, Food, and Human Values Society  
and the  
Society for the Study of Food and Society

Tucson, AZ, June 11, 1994

by

Kenneth A. Dahlberg  
Department of Political Science  
Western Michigan University  
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

(616) 387-5686  
Fax: (616) 387-3999  
E-mail: [Dahlberg@WMICH.EDU](mailto:Dahlberg@WMICH.EDU)

# FOOD POLICY COUNCILS: THE EXPERIENCE OF FIVE CITIES AND ONE COUNTY<sup>1</sup>

Kenneth A. Dahlberg

## I. INTRODUCTION

In doing research on sustainable agriculture over the years, I have been struck by the contrast between the rhetorical stress placed on the need to develop local and regional food systems and the actual focus of most research on sustainable agriculture - which has been primarily concerned with agricultural, farm, and to some degree rural issues. This, of course, raises a basic question: Why has there been so little serious discussion and analysis of the general role of cities and towns in local and regional food systems, not to mention their potential for helping to increase the amount of locally grown food for local consumption?

There are several possible answers. One relates to the mental compartmentalization that results from our categories of "rural" and "urban." This compartmentalization affects not only our understandings, but the research on agriculture and food. Cities and towns are simply and unconsciously assumed by most to be only consumers of food. This perception is confirmed and reinforced by the fact that no U.S. city has a Department of Food. Food is not seen to be an issue or a problem for municipalities. Equally, few citizens or officials are aware of how dependent their town or city is upon distant national and international systems (public and private) for their food and how vulnerable those systems are. Nor are they aware of the extent and complexity of their local food systems, much less their potential. The extent of this potential just in the production sector is illustrated by the fact that the value of the produce from all U.S. gardens (urban and rural) is roughly equivalent to that of the corn crop (approx. \$18 billion/year!).<sup>2</sup>

This project has sought to remedy this general neglect by exploring the potential of cities to be more self-reliant and more efficient in operating their local food systems. In addition, it has sought to understand how these local food systems might fit into regional food systems. Much greater development of this potential is not only desirable in the shorter term, but will definitely be required in the longer term as fossil fuel prices increase and multiply prices throughout our energy-inefficient food system.<sup>3</sup>

The concept of food systems used here is a very broad one, which extends through interacting levels from the household to the international and global scale.<sup>4</sup> This paper focuses on how local food systems and cycles operate at the household, neighborhood, and municipal levels. At each level there are major issues associated with each portion or sector of the food system: from production issues (farmland preservation, farmers markets, household & community gardens), to processing issues (local vs. external), to distribution issues (transportation, warehousing) to access issues (inner city grocery stores, co-ops, school breakfasts & lunches, food stamps, the WIC program, etc.), to use issues (food safety and handling, restaurants, street vendors), to food recycling (gleaning, food banks, food pantries and soup kitchens) to waste stream issues (composting, garbage fed to pigs, etc.). Besides the social, economic, and environmental issues associated with the above, there are also a number of ethical and value issues involved.

The specific research involved focused on the activities of food policy councils in five cities and one county: Charleston, SC; Kansas City, MO; Knoxville, TN; Onondaga County, NY; Philadelphia, PA; and St. Paul, MN.<sup>5</sup> The paper seeks to analyze the various factors that have influenced their successes or failures and to provide a brief overall comparison of their effectiveness. By so doing, it will hopefully give us a better understanding of the problems and potential of local food policy councils. The findings, while reasonably firm at this point, should not be read as final for two reasons. First, while the reports on the three most active councils have been completed (Knoxville, TN; St. Paul, MN; and Onondaga County, NY), additional details can be expected to emerge in the final reports on the remaining cities. Second, the whole area of local food systems is only now attracting the attention of a relatively small number of researchers. Those involved are in the process of sorting out the key issues and the best ways to try to conceptualize local food systems.

One other qualification is that in this kind of report there is a tension between the desire to be candid and honest about the role of key individuals, while at the same time respecting the confidences they and others provided me - all of which can touch upon strong personal and local sensitivities.

## II. FACTORS INFLUENCING THE "SUCCESS" OR "FAILURE" OF FOOD POLICY COUNCILS.

A. Defining "success" and "failure." The basic question here is: Which evaluative criteria should be used to assess "success" and/or "failure." There are several possible answers. First, local food policy councils can and should be assessed in terms of their own goals - to the degree that they are spelled out and are specific enough to do so. Second, councils can be evaluated in terms of their local context, where one can look at policy results in terms of the nature and scope of proposals adopted and what was possible in that context. Third, one can estimate the degree to which the councils contribute to the education of political leaders, local government officials, and the public more generally on local food system issues. Finally, local food policy councils need to be evaluated in terms of larger and longer term set of goals relating to sustainability. That is, in terms of the degree to which such councils do or might contribute to ameliorating the larger urban crisis facing the U.S. and assist in creating what the World Health Organization calls "healthy cities." This imagery of "healthy cities" is important as it captures the underlying shift in basic evaluative criteria that is a central part of moving towards more sustainable/regenerative systems. This image, however, needs to be broadened beyond a public health conception - to include healthy natural, social, and technological systems.

B. Factors influencing "success" or "failure." The following factors are not presented in order of importance. Attempts at any ranking will have to wait for the completion of the remaining final city reports. It seems clear even at this point, however, that the relative importance of different factors varies from city to city.

In reviewing each factor, the cities/county will be discussed in alphabetical order. Tables will be used to summarize the main points for each of the cities and county. Where appropriate there is some discussion of the importance of each factor and/or a brief evaluation of how the different cities/county compare. A brief summary evaluation then follows.

1. Regional values. These do appear to vary considerably, although their importance in influencing behavior is hard to assess. Also, the number of people questioned was small and certainly not random. I asked people what they thought were important regional values relating to the land, agriculture, and food, as well as to community. I also asked for their assessment of the general political climate. The

comments differed within communities as well as between them. Table 1 summarizes the main views expressed.

2. City/county size and demographics. These are largely self-explanatory. It should be noted that the study does not include any smaller-sized communities. Among the mid- to large-sized cities included here it does appear that population size is a significant factor in what cities can or cannot do as well as in the organizational strategies that may work best for each. Table 2 summarizes the main size and demographic features of each city and/or county. Numbers are also included for each metropolitan area since one of the problems that food policy councils face is the fragmentation of the area "foodshed" into a number of different jurisdictions.

3. The historical and political context. The general history and political setting of a city or county makes a difference in how issues are handled. Obviously, it also affects the way in which advisory bodies, such as food policy councils, operate. There are important differences between strong mayor and council/manager forms of local government. Beyond the general setting, there are differences between individual mayors and the degree of support that they provide for recommendations coming from their advisory councils. As indicated earlier, each of the mayors involved in creating the five city food policy councils had to demonstrate a fairly high level of interest and commitment in order to participate in the US Conference of Mayors project. The range of groups and stakeholders represented (or not represented) in the original taskforces set up to draft recommendations was important because it tended to set the initial direction and membership of the councils. These, of course, can change over time, just as mayors and the level of support can change over time. Staff support is another important factor in providing continuity, access, and assistance in promoting and implementing recommendations.

Table 3 indicates the type of government, my assessment of the degree of support by the mayor and staff for the local food policy council, as well as the degree of representativeness of the original taskforces.<sup>6</sup>

4. The mandated role and powers of the councils. There is significant variation between the councils in this regard as can be seen in Table 4. Only one of the councils (St. Paul) has its legal basis in ordinances.<sup>7</sup> One (Knoxville) has its legal basis in a resolution. One (Onondaga County) was originally established by the Legislature and now - as a public non-profit organization - has its members appointed by the County Executive and Legislature. The other three have little or no formal status within their city governments. Philadelphia never had a formal city status, only public support from then Mayor Goode. The Charleston Commission was originally appointed by the Mayor, but has ceased to function. The council in Kansas City was appointed by the Mayor until they chose to separate from the city and become a private non-profit advocacy group that could address issues in the entire metropolitan area.

Three of the cities have developed formal food policy statements which either have been accepted by the Mayor (Philadelphia) or formally adopted by the city council (Knoxville and St. Paul).

Only St. Paul has anything more than advisory powers - where the Food and Nutrition Commission now reviews the food-related programs and activities of other city departments. Each year Knoxville gains attention and publicity through the annual report it presents to the Mayor and Council. Thus, the councils generally have a minimal power base in terms of their formal institutional position and powers.

5. The organizational position and degree of integration into city government. One of the of the key institutional questions (along with the type of city government) is just how much difference the location of a food policy council makes. There are several dimensions to this. One is how close or distant a food policy council is to the mayor's office. There are obvious trade-offs involved here. If a FPC is a part of the Mayor's office, then the degree of support it receives (whether budgetary or policy) can change significantly as mayors change. Also, the FPC is more likely to be politicized and to be pushed/pulled according to the priorities of the current mayor. On the other hand, if a FPC is distant from the mayor's office, then it is much freer to pursue its own agenda and priorities, but may not receive as much support for them from the mayor's office.

The particular department/agency where the FPC is located makes a real difference as does the type of support that a FPC is able to build with other departments or agencies through formal or informal linkages. One important type of formal linkage is to have people from various departments and agencies formally designated as staff support for the FPC. This formal designation of liaison people as staff support for the FPC seems to be much more effective than simply having them serve as regular members of the FPC. This latter approach was used in both Charleston and Kansas City (which had a particularly large Mayor's Committee), but does not seem to have been very effective in generating support. Perhaps it is the specific assignment as a liaison and staff support person that encourages greater efforts to perform those functions. Another consideration in this regard is that by making city staff members of a FPC, it is less clearly seen as a citizen advisory body.

In addition to formal linkages, there are many forms of informal linkage - the effectiveness of which depend primarily upon the political/bureaucratic skills of FPC leaders and staff.

Table 5 gives a summary of my evaluation of these factors. It will be noticed that the rankings in Table 5 are generally low. One reason for this is that food policy councils generally receive little substantive attention or support from mayors, councils, and city administrators. They (like many other advisory groups) are seen as useful bodies to keep the city informed of needs and issues and what non-profit groups are doing. Given their immediacy and visibility, hunger issues can easily come to dominate both food policy council agendas and city awareness. As a result, the many other important aspects of local food systems often receive little or no attention unless the food policy council or other groups push them vigorously. Another reason for the low rankings is that no American city has a department of food. What this means - as compared say to economic planning - is that the percentage of city budget and staff time that is spent on food-related issues is very low.

Any attempt to try to assess what would be an appropriate level of city support for food system issues really requires one to imagine what city governments would look like if they were reconceptualized and reorganized around the needs and requirements of sustainability. A "healthy cities" approach would suggest organizing cities around clusters of overlapping systems: food, shelter, health, education, neighborhoods, environment, resources, and sustainable development. The contrast with current administrative structures (based upon functional specialization) and current economic development priorities is very great.

6. The composition of food policy councils. Table 6 gives my impressions of the strengths and weaknesses of the composition and representativeness of the different food policy councils. Judgements are difficult here. First, the membership of the councils changes over time. Also, one person may speak for more than one group. Thus, the listing of "main groups represented" as contrasted

to "groups with no spokesperson." The idea is to indicate which groups not only have no direct representative, but no one to speak for that concern/issue. The question arose whether or not to include "consumers." Upon reflection, it was decided not to include them since there really is no broad-based consumer group concerned about food system issues (as distinct from groups concerned about labeling, food safety, nutrition, etc.). Also, each member of a FPC is also a "consumer" of food and is in a position to address any general consumer concerns.

Second, the listing of groups is based upon the elements of local food systems discussed earlier (see p. 1). Thus, waste stream issues are seen as an integral part, even though most FPCs do not include them. The same largely applies to schools, although several FPCs are concerned not only about school breakfast and lunch programs, but in trying to educate students about food issues. Yet, few, if any, K-12 teachers or curricular people are members. Farmers are also only occasionally represented, although several councils are concerned about loss of farmland. None of the councils has representatives from or liaison with environmental groups, although some members are concerned about environmental issues. The lack of formal representation or liaison with farmers and environmentalists means that most councils are not seeking to build bridges with groups that have a basic interest in a number of food-related issues and need to be made more aware of them.

In terms of the groups that are most commonly represented, one can see that they are hunger advocates and health and nutrition groups. This is consistent with the tendency of both the public and city governments to see hunger and related health issues as the main local food issue. While it is not obvious from this table, those councils which have been more successful are those that are not dominated by hunger issues and groups (see below). Finally, as mentioned above, if FPCs are to be understood by all as citizen advisory bodies, it is probably better not to appoint city staff as members, but rather have them serve in a liaison function as support staff to the FPC.

As in the previous table, the relatively low ranking of the various councils in terms of their links with other groups is based upon a criterion of effective linkages; that is, linkages that go beyond simple networking (of which there is plenty) to those that can provide concrete support for recommendations or programs.

7. Staff and budget support. The generally low priority of food and hunger issues in local government is clearly reflected in the low level of budget and staff support provided for the various councils. This is not surprising, nor unique to these issues. As with any "new" issue (such as environment, energy, recycling, etc.) that doesn't fit into existing bureaucratic rubrics, it is difficult either to generate new budget/staff or to reallocate from existing programs, many of which are underfunded. The federal cutbacks for urban programs in the 80s, combined with economic uncertainties and taxpayer revolts have made it very difficult for local governments to provide traditional basic services, much less be open to adding new ones. Thus, even the modest support received is important. As suggested above, most of this would appear to be focused on hunger issues.

Only Knoxville has had regular (but very modest) staff and budget support over the years. St. Paul and Ramsey County have passed ordinances which give the FNC new powers, plus a half-time staff person and a modest budget. Onondaga County has just completed a two year W. K. Kellogg Foundation grant which has provided a half-time staff person to the FSC through the Extension Service. They are now searching for ways to continue that support. All of the other councils have had shifting and/or minimal staff/budget support. Philadelphia had staff support during its early years, but not later. The same applied to Charleston until its council ceased to function. Kansas City's Mayor's Taskforce and

Municipal Food Policy Committee had city staff support until the new Heart of America Coalition, a private non-profit advocacy group, was created. Some staff support is now provided by the local food bank (Harvesters: The Community Food Network). See Table 7 for a summary.

As discussed in Section 5 above, the use of staff liaison people from relevant agencies to assist the primary staff person is an important way that a couple of the cities involved have strengthened both their staff support and their access and effectiveness. The presence of such liaison staff in FPC meetings encourages a two-way information sharing between the FPC and the respective agencies, plus offering possibilities for a more general coordination of programs and sometimes a leveraging of resources.

Another element here involves the background and training of the primary staff people. The kind of orientation people bring to the job influences their general approach to, and understanding of food system issues. The types of backgrounds found in this study included: social service people, professionals (nutritionists), and administrators. Other types found elsewhere include grassroots activists and academics who have moved into the public sector.

8. Consultants and advisers. It is interesting that the more successful FPCs all had formal or informal consultants (see Table 8). Knoxville has had regular and consistent help from planning consultant Robert L. Wilson, who originally thought of, and then helped to create the FPC there. His tasks have been the most regular. St. Paul has been able to draw upon the knowledge and expertise of the Minnesota Food Association and its Director Ken Taylor and staff, particularly Margo Stark. Onondaga County has had the regular presence of Professor Kate Clancy, as well as some of her students.

The availability of such experienced and knowledgeable consultants and advisers whether on a regular or occasional basis - is extremely important. Not only can they produce important reports and conduct retreats and focus meetings, but they offer an independent source of ideas, evaluation, and judgement. They typically have a broad public policy orientation so that they can explain the importance of not focusing exclusively upon hunger issues. Also, their typically longer-term perspective is particularly valuable in identifying emerging needs and opportunities.

9. Overall program leadership and management. The figures presented in Table 9 are based on my rough evaluation of how the overall leadership in creating and running programs has been distributed between the FPCs themselves, their major committees, staff, and consultants. These are particularly difficult estimates and evaluations to make. The figures are not meant to represent the amount of time or effort expended, but the relative amount of effective leadership and management by each group.

In the second column, it was thought useful to separate hunger from non-hunger projects and programs, since each council has spent considerable time and effort on hunger issues. Interestingly, those cities that have focused primarily upon hunger issues have been the ones that have been the least successful overall.

The two right hand columns distinguish between staff leadership and consultant leadership. The percentages for Knoxville and St. Paul represent the contributions of the paid consultants there, while for Philadelphia, they represent the unpaid consulting provided by Libby Goldstein.

Finally, it should be kept in mind that this table does not attempt to assess the success or failure of the programs and policies of each city or county. Rather, it seeks to point out where the leadership activity

is taking place and how it can shift with organizational changes, particularly increases or decreases of staff time.

### III. A SUMMARY EVALUATION.

At this point in the project, no detailed evaluation of the "successes" or "failures" of the different councils will be attempted. Even so, it may be useful to give my current evaluation of the relative success of the different FPCs.

Among the six FPCs studied, Knoxville and St. Paul appear to be the most successful. Knoxville has nicely survived the transition from its founding to a new FPC Staff Coordinator and is continuing to pursue a broad agenda of issues. St. Paul has now become a joint city/county operation and has half time staff support (currently the most of any of the FPCs).

Onondaga County, after years of hard work, many accomplishments, and completion of a two year period of half time staff support (grant funded), is now at a crucial transition point - where the amount of local funding and staff support its council can generate will determine its form and future.

Philadelphia, Kansas City, and Charleston have been less successful. Philadelphia has many important food-related activities going on, but these are no longer coordinated through the Food and Agriculture Taskforce. In Kansas City, the change its council from a city advisory body to a non-profit body has meant a broadening of its geographic coverage to the entire metropolitan region, combined with a narrowing of its focus to hunger issues. The demise of the Charleston Food Policy Commission suggests the least success, although the role of Hurricane Hugo in this was significant. No other city or county suffered a comparable trauma - something that makes comparisons difficult.

### IV. CONCLUSIONS

The following reasonably firm conclusions regarding the various factors that influence the success or failure of FPCs can be made. Additional details will be added as the final reports for the remaining cities are completed.

The first three factors (regional values, size and demographics, and the historical and political context) constitute the larger-context setting elements or givens that councils must work with and within. Among the various aspects discussed, it would appear that the most important are city size and the presence of a strong mayor system. Generally, the larger the city, the more difficult it appears to be to organize an effective FPC. Part of this is the pure logistics of trying to bring the relevant groups together, plus the kinds of jurisdictional fragmentation that is ever-present in metropolitan areas. Generally, strong mayor systems offer the chance (given support from the mayor) for new groups/issues to make an impact. The lack of examples of council/manager systems in this study make it difficult to confirm that this general tendency applies to all food policy councils.

In terms of the mandated role and powers of the councils, the most important aspect appears to be the degree of formal institutionalization of the council. The more institutionalized the council, the more likely it is to have budget and staff support as well as perhaps some review and/or planning powers. How much such institutionalization reflects the success of the organizers and advocates of the council

in getting such recognition and how much it reflects the political priorities of the mayor or council is an interesting question - and one where the answers may vary from city to city.

Among the various aspects of organizational location, it appears that the presence of liaison staff and the organizational linkages and leverage which they can contribute are perhaps more important than the actual organizational location of the council in terms of closeness or distance to the mayor/council.

The last four factors (composition of the council, staff and budget support, consultants and advisers, and leadership) involve a mix of individuals, structures, and group decision making styles. While not discussed above, it is clear that individual personalities and capabilities have been extremely important in terms of what has happened at each site. Yet, the rules and structures at each site are also important. Perhaps the way to see it is that representative councils, good staff and budget support, and the presence of consultants/advisers are all necessary, but not sufficient conditions for a successful food policy council. Beyond these, dedicated, competent, compatible, and savvy individuals are needed to make the right things happen at the right time. A final factor here (discussed in the Knoxville and St. Paul reports) is that there is a major difference in approach and style between council members from the private sector (who often have an action orientation focused on results) and those from the non-profit or public sectors (who often have a process orientation focused on change and reform). Such differences in group decision-making styles (as well as interests) complicate one of the major challenges of a FPC - to make sure that it is pursuing an agenda which seeks to protect and enhance the long-term public interest, something, that as noted at the outset, needs to be (re)defined to include all the various issues of sustainability.

Among the last four factors, it does seem clear that staff and budget support are crucial to the success of FPCs. The presence of consultants and advisers is also very important.

Finally, it appears that a strong emphasis on hunger issues - whether in the composition of the council, the staff, or the leadership - negatively affects the longer-term success of a FPC. An important reason for this is that a predominant focus on hunger easily reinforces ideas and approaches which, in practice, tend to make people dependent rather than empowering them. Also, by focusing on relieving hunger rather than trying to reduce the sources of hunger (the lack of access to land and/or to jobs), such an approach reduces pressures to reform urban systems in ways which will make them more equitable and sustainable. Conversely, vigorous and diverse FPCs that address the full range of local food system issues can assist in the process of moving towards more sustainable and healthy cities.



**Table 1: REGIONAL VALUES**

	<u>Region</u>	<u>Key Values</u>
Charleston, SC:	South	A strong attachment to the land (with the focus on private property, not the commons). A long tradition of gardening (food for the poor; ornamentals for middle/upper classes). Some concern for preserving sea island land and farming.
Kansas City, MO:	Midwest/South	A long tradition of farming and support for farmers. Little concern about farmland or open space preservation.
Knoxville, TN:	Appalachia	An emphasis on independence and self-reliance combined with a strong tradition of volunteerism. Distrust of government and taxes. Attachment to one's own property.
Onondaga County, NY:	Upper Great Lakes/East Coast	Fairly high level of concern in protecting farmland and "progressive" state political tradition. People conservative socially and in accepting new foods.
Philadelphia, PA:	East Coast	Concern about preserving open space in the city. Less concern about farmland. State less "progressive" politically than the city. Less of a "hands-on" approach to problems than the Midwest.
St. Paul, MN:	Upper Great Lakes/Midwest	A strong work ethic. An emphasis on reliability generally and self-reliance at the family level. Many with farm backgrounds. Less concern for farmland preservation than in the Northeast.

**Table 2: CITY SIZE AND DEMOGRAPHICS (1990)**

	<u>Area (Sq. km.)</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Ethnic Mix (in%)*</u>	<u>Poverty Figures (in %)</u> <u>Persons / Families</u>
<u>Charleston, SC:</u>				
City:	112	80,414	57.2; 41.6; 1; 1	21.8 17.1
Metro:	6,713	506,875	66.8; 29.8; 1; 1.5	15.1 12.1
<u>Kansas City, MO:</u>				
City:	807	435,146	66.8; 29.6; 1; 4	13.2 9.4
Metro:	121919	1,566,280	81.9; 12.4; 1; 3	11.0 8.1
<u>Knoxville, TN:</u>				
City:	200	165,121	82.7; 15.8; 1; .7	19.6 13.9
Knox County:	1,317	335,749	89.2; 8.8; 1; .6	14.1 10.2
<u>Onondaga County NY:</u>				
City (Syracuse):	65	163,860	75; 20; 2; 3	18.4 12.9
County:	2,021	4687973	88; 8; 1; 1.5	10.3 7.1
<u>Philadelphia, PA:</u>				
City:	350	1,585,577	54; 40; 3; 6	20.6 16.6
Metro:	911111	4,856,877	74; 18.50; 2; 3.5	11.4 8.3
<u>St. Paul, MN:</u>				
City:	137	272,235	82.9; 7.4; 7; 4.2	10.9 8.0
Ramsey County	404	485,765	85.6; 4.5; 5; 2.8	11.4 8.1
Metro:	11,213	2,413,873	85.9; 4.5; 5; 2.5	16.7 12.4

\*The percentages (in sequence) are for whites; blacks; Asians & Pacific Islanders; and Hispanics. Totals may be more than 100% due to rounding and/or double identifications.

**Table 3: HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL FACTORS**

	<u>Type of Government</u>	<u>Backing by Mayor/staff</u> (1 = low; 10 = high)	<u>Representativeness of the Taskforce</u> (1 = low; 10 = high)
<u>Charleston, SC:</u>	Strong mayor?	1985 - 5 (Mayor Riley) 1992 - 5 (Mayor Riley)	5
<u>Kansas City, MO:</u>	Strong mayor.	1985 - 5 (Mayor Berkley) 1992 - 3? (Mayor )	5
<u>Knoxville, TN:</u>	Strong mayor.	1982 - 8 (Mayor Testerman) 1992 - 8 (Mayor Ashe)	8
<u>Onondaga County, NY:</u>	Strong County Executive.	1984 - 5 (County Exec. 1992 - 7? (County Exec. Pirro)	9
<u>Philadelphia, PA:</u>	Strong mayor.	1985 - 3 (Mayor Goode) 1992 - 3 (Mayor	10
<u>St. Paul, MN:</u>	Strong mayor.	1985 - 5 (Mayor Latimer) 1992 - 9 (Mayor Scheibel) 1994 - 6? (Mayor )	8

**Table 4: LEGAL STATUS AND MANDATED ROLE**

	<u>Legal Status/Basis</u>	<u>Official Food Policy?</u>	<u>Mandated Role and Powers</u>
<u>Charleston, SC:</u>	Commission appointed by the Mayor (no longer functioning).	Yes	Advisory.
<u>Kansas City, MO:</u>	1985-90: Taskforce and Committee appointed by the Mayor. 1990-: Heart of America Coalition set up as a non-profit group.	No	Advisory (1985-90). Advocacy (1990-).
<u>Knoxville, TN:</u>	Council resolution.	Yes	Advisory. Issues an annual report to the Mayor and Council.
<u>Onondaga County:</u>	1984-89: Council elected by County Legislature. 1989-: Council incorporated as a public non-profit group. Members appointed by the County.	No	1984-89: advisory. 1989-: advisory.
<u>Philadelphia, PA:</u>	Informal private-public coalition with support from the Mayor.	Yes	Advisory.
<u>St. Paul, MN:</u>	City Council resolution (1985). City Council ordinance (1992). County Council ordinance (1994).	Yes	Advisory. Advisory, plus review of city & county food plans & programs.

**Table 5: ORGANIZATIONAL POSITION AND DEGREE OF INTEGRATION**

		Distance/closeness to Mayor/Council (1 = far; 10 = close)	Liaison staff (Number and agencies*)	Linkages to other agencies/units (1 = few; 10 = many)	Integration into City Government (1=low; 10=high)
<u>Charleston, SC:</u>	1985-89	4	1 (OoM)	2	2
	1989-	0	0	0	0
<u>Kansas City, MO:</u>	1985-90:	4	1 (NCS)	7	3
	1990-	0	0	0	0
<u>Knoxville, TN:</u>	1982-88:	4	4 (OoM; MPC; KCDC; CAC)	5	3
	1988-	4		5	3
<u>Onondaga County, NY:</u>		2	7 (HD; CPA; SS; CL; Ext; OoM)	3	2
<u>Philadelphia, PA:</u>	1985-89:	1	(2) (All members of the FAT; Ext; CCs)	1	1
	1989-	1		1	1
<u>St. Paul, MN:</u>	1985-89	3	(3) (All members of the FNC; Oom; CC; Ext)	4	3 (1989-92)
	1989-	5		4	5 (1992- )

\*Agencies: CAC=Community Action Committee; CC=City Council; CGs= City Council staff; CL=County Legislator; CPA=County Planning Agency; Ext=Extension; HD=Health Dept; KCDC=Knoxville Community Development Corp; MPC= Metropolitan Planning Commission; NCS= Neighborhood = Community Services; OoM=Office of the Mayor.

**Table 6: FPC COMPOSITION**

	<u>Main groups represented</u>	<u>Groups with no spokesperson</u>	<u>Links to other groups and units (public and private)</u> (1 = few; 10 = many)
<u>Charleston, SC:</u>	Gd, Hg, HI, R	C E N, P, S, W	2
<u>Kansas City, MO:</u>	E, Gd, Hg, HI, N	C, F, P, R, S, W	2
<u>Knoxville, TN:</u>	D, R, Hg, HI, Gr, R	C, E, F, N, P, S, W	6
<u>Onondaga County, NY:</u>	D, F, Hg, HI, Gr	C, E, Gd, S, W	6
<u>Philadelphia, PA:</u>	D, Gd, Hg, HI, N, P, R	C, E, Gr, S	4
<u>St. Paul, MN:</u>	Hg, HI, Gr, R	C, D, Gd, E, P, So, W	6

Groups: C = consumers; D = distributors; E = environmentalists; F = farmers; Gd = gardeners; Gr = grocers; Hg = hunger; HI = health and nutrition; Nh = neighborhood; P = processors; R = restaurateurs; S = schools; W = waste stream.

**Table 7: STAFF AND BUDGET SUPPORT**

	<u>Staff (% of time for FPC)</u>	<u>Background of Main Staffperson</u>	<u>FPC Budget and Services (excluding staff time)</u>
<u>Charleston, SC:</u> 1985-89:	25%?		Mail, phone, & duplication
<u>Kansas City, MO:</u> 1985-90: 1990-	5% 5%	Social services; administration Non-profit	Mail, phone, & duplication “ “ “
<u>Knoxville, TN:</u> 1982-92: 1992-	10% 20%	Social services Social services; farming	\$2,000?, plus mail, phone, & duplication
<u>Onondaga County NY:</u> 1985-92: 1992-94 1994-	10% 50% ?	City & Regional Planning Communications ?	Mail, phone, & duplication ? ?
<u>Philadelphia, PA:</u> 1985-89? 1989?-	25%? 0%	Literature	Mail, phone, & duplication
<u>St. Paul, MN:</u> 1985-88: 1988-93: 1993-	5% 5% 50%	Nutrition Nutrition Nutrition	Mail, phone, & duplication “ “ “ ?

**Table 8: CONSULTANTS AND ADVISERS**

	<u>Formal/informal</u>	<u>Regular/occasional</u>	<u>Tasks</u>
<u>Charleston, SC:</u>	None	None	None
<u>Kansas City, MO:</u>	None	None	None
<u>Knoxville, TN:</u>	Formal (Robert L. Wilson)	Regular	Prepare annual report; committee charges, special reports; organize retreats; provide advice.
<u>Onondaga County, NY:</u>	Informal (Kate Clancy) (Elizabeth Crockett)	Regular Occasional	Provide general advice. Prepare special reports.
<u>Philadelphia, PA:</u>	Formal (Ross Koppel) Informal (Libby Goldstein)	One time grant Occasional	Prepare a special report.
<u>St. Paul, MN:</u>	Formal (Ken Taylor) (Margo Stark)	Often, but not on any regular schedule	Prepare special reports; organize focus groups; provide general advice.

**Table 9: SOURCES OF PROGRAM LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT**  
 (Relative percentages per group and topic)

	<u>Council</u>	<u>Committees/Projects</u> (non-hunger / hunger)	<u>Staff</u> (govt. / non-profit)	<u>Consultants</u>
<u>Charleston, SC:</u>	20%	10% / 40%	30% / 0%	0%
<u>Kansas City, MO:</u>				
1985-90	30%	10% / 40%	20% / 0%	0%
1990-	20%	10% / 40%	0% / 30%	0%
<u>Knoxville, TN:</u>				
1982-92:	25%	25% / 15%	25% / 0%	15%
1992				
<u>Onondaga County, NY:</u>				
1984-92	40%	30% / 10%	30% / 0%	
1992-	40%	40% / 10%	0% / 30%	
<u>Philadelphia, PA:</u>				
1985-89?	20%	30% / 20%	30% / 10%	
1989?-	20%	25% / 35%	0% / 10%	10%
<u>St. Paul, MN:</u>				
1985-88	40%	10% / 25%	10% / 0%	15%
1988-93	40%	10% / 25%	10% / 0%	
1993				15%



## ENDNOTES AND REFERENCES

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is based upon a project entitled "Local Food Systems: Policies and Values Influencing their Potential." The research was supported by the Ethics and Values Studies Program of the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DIR-9022243. The government has certain rights in this material. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

<sup>2</sup> National Gardening Association. 1989. National Gardening Fact Sheet. Burlington, VT: National Gardening Association.

<sup>3</sup> It takes approximately ten energy calories to put one food calorie on our plates. Steinhart, John, and Carol Steinhart. 1974. "Energy Use in the United States Food System." *Science* 184: 307-316.

<sup>4</sup> For a full discussion, see Kenneth A. Dahlberg. 1993. "Regenerative Food Systems: Broadening the Scope and Agenda of Sustainability." In Patricia Allen (ed.), *Food for the Future: Conditions and Contradictions of Sustainability*. New York: John Wiley, pp. 75-102.

<sup>5</sup> Of the six, all except Onondaga County participated in a 1984-85 project conducted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors to establish local food policy councils in those cities. Knoxville, TN, had developed its Food Policy Council prior to the US Conference of Mayors project and served as a model for it. The Onondaga Food Systems Council was also created prior to the U.S. Conference of Mayors project. While the cities chosen for the project varied in population, location, and poverty rates, a "principal element used in the selection of the cities, of course, was that hunger and malnutrition were major concerns of the mayor and the city government" and that they were willing to allocate staff time to organizing and running the taskforces and public hearings required. For details, see United States Conference of Mayors, *Municipal Food Policies: How Five Cities Are Improving the Availability and Quality of Food for Those in Need*, Washington, DC: October 1985.

<sup>6</sup> For Onondaga County, there is no comparable figure to a mayor. The Chairman of the Board of Commissioners has some powers, but nothing comparable to a strong mayor. The County Executive has more overall power in terms of the kinds of policies which the county food policy council recommends.

<sup>7</sup> The St. Paul Food and Nutrition Commission gained legal status through a city ordinance passed July 2, 1992. Recently, it became a joint city/county commission by the passage of a county ordinance which also helped to increase the base funding to include a half time staff person.