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Food is a fundamental human requirement of survival that deeply influences a variety of outcomes for individuals, communities, and the natural environment. Cultures and communities have long been, and continue to be, structured around food development for reasons of general sustenance, celebration and social tradition, economic development and security.

To help make relevant and practical decisions about Salt Lake City’s future, the Mayor’s Office and the Division of Sustainability began considering how to look at challenges and opportunity for a more sustaining local food system. Recognizing the need for more information about the current state of its own food system, the City initiated a process to identify important information that could shed light on specific influences and impacts within the local food framework. In order to move forward with gaining greater knowledge about its entire food system, the Division of Sustainability and the Food Policy Task Force decided to use a Community Food Assessment approach. By using the assessment, the City and Task Force members would have the means for understanding details about farming, food processing, and distribution in Salt Lake City, as well as within the regional foodshed. Obtaining a clearer picture of community well being in relation to the ways in which City residents connect with food in their daily lives, along with discovering more about the local food economy and environmental linkages would be evaluated. And when considered together, insight gained from the Community Food Assessment could provide baseline knowledge for informing future discussion about local food sustainability.

A comprehensive approach to looking at local and regional food shed dynamics was very important to the success of the project and was achieved by gathering both quantitative and qualitative information about food within a 250 mile range surrounding Salt Lake City. Data examining food production, processing and distribution, food

From food assessment information, there is a basis for developing strategies to support local food enterprises, foster rural/urban links, and advancing food access more effectively.
choice, health and urbanization, along with the input from a range of consumer and producer voices were equally important information sources for evaluating existing foodshed conditions.

From food assessment information, there is an opportunity for developing strategies to support local food enterprises, foster rural/urban linkages, and advance food access more effectively. Sources that inform existing food conditions can also help guide recommendations for new ways of thinking about, supporting and developing a more robust local food system. The benefit of this integrated food assessment approach, which utilizes quantitative and qualitative information to examine the present, as well as inform the future, is that it can help Salt Lake City develop sound practices for addressing both the care and support of people along with the natural environment.

As Utah’s most densely populated city, Salt Lake City has grown into an urban center that seeks to gain strength by creating a path toward supporting healthy, diverse, and successful big city living, which includes a future with transformative food planning and development. At the same time, population increases and expanding metropolitan development in Utah and Salt Lake City constrain and diminish nearby land for growing food, while a robust transportation network provides the delivery routes for a wide selection of food choices being consumed at local tables. A sense that shifts in food production and distribution, including global import and export dynamics, demand for greater variety in food choices, emerging methods of urban food production, and increases in the incidence of chronic diseases related to diet, are all strong indications that food production, consumption, and nutrition are issues germane to Salt Lake City’s local discussion on long-term community sustainability.

Gaining a firm understanding of Salt Lake City’s current food system is necessary to assist Salt Lake City and its Food Policy Task Force in creating strategic planning, policy and action steps to strengthen local urban agriculture. Establishing meaningful priorities for the future by using information from the community food assessment will aid Salt Lake City in working toward realistic goals for the future. This community food assessment will serve as foundational information from which collaborative planning and decision making for a resilient, sustainable local and regional food system can move forward.

What is a community food assessment?

Assessing the current situation of Salt Lake City’s food system is a vital first step in establishing the methods necessary to make the system sustainable.
A community food assessment is a broad look at the food system, including everything from production to processing to consumption of food. Where does our food come from? Is food available and affordable to the population? A food assessment seeks to determine where gaps and barriers exist in the food system, and look for ways to develop a more sustainable food economy.

In 2011, the city engaged a local consultant team to analyze aspects of the food system for Salt Lake City. The team was asked to perform public surveys and public outreach, as well as talk to local stakeholders connected to food production, processing, consumption, food waste, community health, and nutrition education.

This community food assessment is a “snapshot in time” of Salt Lake City’s food system. It provides analysis of data and current policy, and supplies the Food Policy Task Force, the City, and the public with basic information about our food system, in order to make informed decisions about how we can work together to develop a more local, affordable, and sustainable food system.

What is Food Sustainability?

A sustainable system is one that meets the needs of the community without limiting the ability of future generations to do the same. A sustainable food system is one that encourages consumption of fresh, local food, encourages investment in local resources, and promotes long-term health and nutrition in the population. Our food system today depends on transportation of large quantities of food long distances, requiring consumption of vast amounts of finite energy resources. The population generally

The number of farmers markets and community supported agriculture programs indicate that demand for a local connection to food is on the rise.
consumes large amounts of highly processed, unhealthy foods, resulting in growing numbers of diet-related conditions in all segments of the public.

Many forces affect our food system, including economic, environmental, social/cultural, and political systems. This food assessment seeks to determine how those systems are affecting food in our region, and develop policies that could be explored by Salt Lake City to create a more sustainable food network.

**Current trends indicate that there is a growing interest in local food production.** The number of farmers markets and community supported agriculture programs indicate that demand for a local connection to food is on the rise. Concern with food provided at public schools continues to grow, and policies related to feeding at-risk populations continue to develop. Increased interest in gardening and at-home food production is seen across the city. The numbers of community gardens continue to grow, and more and more people are having an honest discussion about how we can build in more sustainable policies relating to our food system.
Taking a look at where we stand as a community is a key element of this food assessment. Demographics, population trends, and forecasted changes in our community can influence policy choices that will affect the food system. Understanding the current influence of food on our health and nutrition will play a role in determining “where we go from here.”

Local History

From indigenous peoples dwellings, to present day Salt Lake City, a demonstration of the relationship between local people and local food has been and continues to be important for all who call Salt Lake City home. Whether they are deeply rooted through many generations or newly arrived, the people of Salt Lake continue on a path of developing a unique local food system through both culture and economy.

One of the earliest findings relating to local people and their nearby food dates to an indigenous peoples dwelling place containing a kitchen and food remnants and was located in what is now downtown Salt Lake City. Those arriving in the Great Salt Lake area from the late 1700’s to the mid 1800’s reflect a distinct group of religious people and explorers.

Missionaries like Father Escalante found his way to the Salt Lake Valley in 1776. Jim Bridger, mountain man, trapper, explorer, guide and mediator is believed to be among the first white men to visit the Great Salt Lake in 1824. In June of 1847, Jim Bridger had his first encounter with Mormon leader Brigham Young at Little Sandy River. At this meeting Bridger gave Young an accurate geographical and environmental assessment of the Salt Lake Valley, and he is
Soon after the meeting of Bridger and Young, the Mormon settlers entered the Salt Lake Valley where they would establish and formally develop the city of Salt Lake City.

With the arrival of Mormon pioneers in the Salt Lake Valley in July of 1847, food sustainability was a primary concern for the settlers. Indeed, the advance party of pioneers had already begun to divert City Creek into a field for planting of potatoes before Brigham Young had even entered the Valley. A robust, local economy was the only option for the community, and the harsh environmental conditions took their toll on the population for several years during the early days of starvation and failed crops.

The city itself was laid out using the "Plat of Zion" format that the Mormon pioneers had used in other settlements in the East. With the arrival of the settlers in the Salt Lake Valley, they laid out their new city in a regular grid, with "wards" organized around important public squares. These squares played an important role as gathering places, most importantly for public markets and livestock storage, but also for important religious gathering places. The original city plat for Salt Lake divided large 10 acre blocks into eight parcels, with each family assigned one of those eight parcels. While large by today’s standards, these assigned parcels allowed families to have plenty of space for food production for the feeding of their families. Pioneers used seeds and grafts that they had carried with them across the plains of the Midwest to begin propagation immediately upon arrival in 1847.

The original plat of the city served social purposes, as well as functional. The majority of the population was expected to live "in the city," while larger-scale farms were pushed outside the city limits, in what was called the "Big Field,"—today the area south of 900 South Street to 2100 South Street (originally 1200 South Street). As a utopian community, early Mormon leaders saw wisdom in consolidating the population in one area, while preserving farmland on the outskirts. Because of this concentration of population, the benefits of "urban living" could be found in markets, exchanges, theaters, opera houses, etc, while the "development pressure" was focused in a limited area.

Naturally, conditions have changed in the Salt Lake Valley since the early days of Salt Lake City. What was once perimeter farmland is now considered "inner ring" suburbs, and agricultural production has been

pushed further and further afield. Demographics and culture have changed, and every citizen is not expected to spend their time raising crops for survival of society.

Development of modern irrigation systems and means of transport have changed the way Salt Lake City is fed. We are now able to export what we produce to the far reaches of the globe, and we can relatively easily import food from far-off places to eat any kind of food at any time of year.

**Drivers of Change**

The USDA Economic Research Service identified that Utah has a quickly growing population. The population has nearly doubled since 1980, when the population was 1.46 million. By 2010, that number had grown to 2.76 million. **This population growth has occurred everywhere, but mostly in urban areas.** The rural population has grown by 112,000 people while the urban areas of Utah have added nearly 1.2 million people between 1980 and 2010. The median per capita income in Utah has fallen slightly from 2009 levels, from $32,426 to $31,584 in 2010. This 2.6% reduction in income is for the entire state, but when you break it down further one sees that rural
populations have been affected more than the urban. Rural income fell 3.7%, from $28,425 to $27,373, while the urban income fell just 2.5% from $32,916 to $32,101. In general, urban Utahns are wealthier and fared better than rural Utahns in income loss.

City Demographics

Salt Lake City’s demographics are following national trends, generally, and to some degree, has similar demographics to the state of Utah. The population pyramid on the previous page shows a relatively young population, with a large population cohort between the ages of 20 and 34. A young population can suppress the per capita income of a community, but can also show larger than average household sizes, typical of the state of Utah.

Salt Lake City is generally more ethnically diverse than the rest of the state. A diverse population, when it comes to food systems, can also
provide for more variety in food available to the larger community, and for more demand for a range of food options. Salt Lake City can see this in the availability of many different kinds of specialty markets and restaurants.

Generally, as Salt Lake City becomes more ethnically diverse, rates of diet related disease is also growing. Lower-income neighborhoods have generally higher rates of diabetes and high cholesterol, which can impact the health of the community.

**Diet Related Disease in Salt Lake City**

Food has a major impact on the health and well-being of a community. Nationally, we can see the impacts of industrialized food and the rise of highly processed foods high in sugars, salts, and fats. The prevalence of diet-related diseases tells how the food we consume is affecting us, and can give us data on where to focus health-education efforts.

There are numerous diet related diseases such as high blood pressure, diabetes, high cholesterol, and obesity. Salt Lake City fares better than the rest of the nation in many of these categories. The State of Utah Department of Health gathers and monitors health statistics by zip code for the state, following these key indicators of diet-related disease occurrences.

Body Mass Index (BMI) is a ratio of height and weight used as an indicator to monitor health generally. A BMI under 25 is considered "normal," with rates over 25 labeled "overweight" and a BMI of more than 30 classified as "obese."

Generally, the "overweight" category of a BMI of between 25 and 30 has grown across the cities neighborhoods in the last ten years. The Rose Park and Avenues neighborhoods have seen the largest increases in this category.

In 2010, 22.63% of Salt Lake City residents were classified obese. **Compared to the national average of 35.7%, Salt Lake City is relatively healthy.** Salt Lake City’s obesity rate is fairly consistent with other cities in Salt Lake County and the rest of Utah. There are differences in various areas of Salt Lake City. Glendale and Rose Park report the highest levels of obesity, while the Avenues and Foothill areas report the lowest levels of obesity.

In 2009, 30% of Salt Lake City residents said they had been told that their cholesterol was high. This number is much higher than 23.5% of Utah residents who report that they have been told their cholesterol is high.
In 2009 Salt Lake City had a 25.78% rate of high blood pressure. When compared to the national average of 31%, Salt Lake City is relatively healthy. Salt Lake’s rate is slightly higher than the rates in Salt Lake County and Utah, but is within a two percent margin of error.

**In 2010 Salt Lake City had a slightly higher level of diabetes than the national average of 6.75%, with 7.64%**. These numbers were also higher than the county and Utah averages. The national rate of diabetes has increased nearly 3% since 2001; however Salt Lake City’s numbers have grown about 4%. Diabetes rates are especially concerning, as they are indicative of unhealthy diets broadly in the population, and once diagnosed, affect you throughout your life. With the rates of increase over the last ten years, the city and its allied health agencies should confront this issue more aggressively.

The health awareness of the city’s population was part of the public survey that was conducted during the process of developing this assessment. When asked if they thought that fruit and vegetable consumption affected personal health, more than 90% of respondents indicated that they are “sure” they help, while 7% responded they “might” help (see chart to the left).

**SLC Public Survey**: Do you think that eating fruits and vegetables can help prevent illness, like diabetes, heart disease, and help you feel healthier?

- 90.5% “I am sure they help.”
- 7.9% “They might help.”
- 1.4% “I don’t know.”
- 0.2% “No, they don’t help.”
Understanding where the food local people is produced is an important part of developing a more sustainable food system. Many factors affect where food comes from, including market economics, energy costs, land values, land use policy, and population demographics. For the purpose of this study, two “demographic production ranges” are considered, looking at agricultural production within the city limits, along with production within a 250 mile radius of the city. Many prime farmland areas are found within 250 miles of the city, and understanding what is and isn't produced within the city limits can tell us a lot about community priorities and local markets.

**What are the Characteristics of Food Producers?**

Knowing the demographics of Utah’s farmers helps develop an understanding of current occupational and individual operator trends. Utah’s farmers are 88% male and 12% female, with only 38% of the principal farm operators reporting farming as their primary occupation. One significant factor influencing this low number of farming as a primary occupation is that farming in Utah is not sufficient to financially support most operators and their families. Often, farmers must turn to other jobs or income sources for additional benefits and insurance. Presently, seventy percent of principal farm operators live on the farm that they operate, with the other 30% living elsewhere. The average age of Utah’s farmers as of the 2007 USDA Agriculture census was 57.4 years, increasing in average age by just over 2 years since 2002. This follows national trends, which show a rapidly aging demographic of farmers. With a statewide general population average age of around 27 years old, the difference in general population age with the average age for farmers is an indicator that fewer young people are choosing to enter the farming sector. This is a concern for establishing a more sustainable food system.
Utah organic farms have interesting demographic traits compared with all farms in Utah combined. The operator of an organic farm is 8% more likely to be a female compared to traditional farm operators. Organic farmers tend to be about 3 years younger than traditional farmers, and organic farmers are 10% more likely to live on their farm. Also, an organic farmer is 13% more likely to consider farming as their primary occupation.

Utah’s farmers tend to be owners of the land they farm, with 71% of all farms being fully owned by the principal operator(s), only 24% are part owners and 6% are tenants on the land they farm. An upward trend since 1997 is for more farmers to own the land they are farming. A substantial majority of Utah’s farmers are also sole owners of their farm, at 81.5%. Other organizational structures that make up the mix of farms in Utah are: 5.5% family corporations, 10% partnerships and only 1% non-family corporations, with 3% under estate, trust or co-operative structure. Single owner operations are still the norm in Utah, as they have been in the past. Ethnically, the demographics of farmers within the 250 mile demographic range is almost exclusively Caucasian, with more than 91% of farmers in the demographic foodshed listed as “Caucasian.” Only 4% of the principal operators of farms in the demographic range are Hispanic, despite a higher percentage of Hispanic representation in the broader population.

Since 2002, the total number of farms in the state of Utah has risen, which had been preceded by a precipitous drop in that number. While the general population of the state continues to rise, the total number of farms has not risen correspondingly.
Agricultural Land Use Statistics

Since 1978, there has been a slow and steady increase in the number of Utah farms, growing from 12,764 farms in 1978 to 16,700 farms in 2007. Despite the growth in number of farms, the percentage of land in farms has only grown a small percent from 19.9% in 1978 to 21.1% in 2007. This means that the average farm has shrunk from 820 acres in 1978 to 668 acres in 2007.

When considering the total number of farms within Salt Lake City's 250 miles foodshed area, Utah has the most farms of the areas studied, with 16,600 farms. The selected counties in Idaho have 13,694 farms. Selected counties in Colorado, Wyoming and Nevada have fewer farms with 6,250, 3,350, and 994 respectively. Utah has the most farming acreage, with 11,100,000 acres. In the surrounding counties of other states, Idaho and Wyoming top the list, with over 7,000,000 acres each. Nevada and Colorado have over 3,000,000 each. The average farm in Utah is 664 acres, selected counties of Idaho averages 567 acres, selected counties of Wyoming averages 2,148 acres, selected counties of Colorado averages 510 acres, selected counties of Nevada has the largest farms with 3,365 average acres per farm.

Source: USDA Agricultural Census 2007
40,988 FARMS WITHIN 250 MILES

16,600 FARMS IN UTAH

SOURCE USDA

Average Acreage of Farms in Utah

Farms in Utah

Source: USDA Agricultural Census 2007
Alarming for farmers and local food consumers, the best, or prime agricultural land, is also prime developable land. Based on research and mapping from the American Farmland Trust’s ‘Farming on the Edge’ it is clear that land in Utah and surrounding states are under the pressure of conflict between these two interests. The green areas indicate high quality farmland with low development pressure, while the red areas indicate high quality farmland under high development pressure. For Salt Lake City, and its surrounding foodshed, consideration of a future regional food system will require multijurisdictional coordination in land use policies which directly address the relative scarcity of high quality farmland, and the need to establish more sustainable land use patterns supporting a sustainable food system.
Organic Farming

Organic farming has risen in popularity since the 1990’s. In 1997, Utah had just 3 certified organic operations. In 2008, that number grew to 46. Of all counties within Salt Lake City’s foodshed, Idaho currently has the most number of organic farms at 160, closely followed by Utah with 154. The included counties of Colorado also have a strong showing with 119, where Wyoming and Nevada lag behind with just 10 and 17 respectively. Idaho also leads with organic farmland acreage, with 90,772 acres. Again Utah is close behind with 86,084. Colorado has 6,627, Nevada has 1,965, and Wyoming has just 162 acres. When compared to the amount of overall farmland in the foodshed, organic farms make up a very small percentage of the overall farmland. There are 185,610 acres of organic farmland compared to 32,592,113 acres of traditional farmland. Of the 41,448 farms in the study area, organic farms make up just 460, which is about 1%. When comparing the total number of sales, organic farms in the study area, organic had $7.3 million in sales where traditional farms had over $1.4 billion in sales.
One of the major issues concerning the future of farming in Salt Lake County is land development. The Landsat maps from the Cooperative Extension show an aerial view of Salt Lake County surrounded by the mountains – north is up on the map. Ag land or vegetation is bright red in the valley, less dense vegetation such as trees and landscaping in yards or in other development is a dull red. From 1973 to 2009 the difference in available ag land and open space is astounding – most of the bright red pieces are gone by 2009, taken over by development. Also notice the north/south I-15 corridor and its accompanying development that shows no red at all, as well as other places in Salt Lake City that have relatively no vegetation. This trend is alarming for farming in Salt Lake County, as available land will become increasingly scarce and expensive if this continues.

Source:
Charles W. Gay
Associate Vice President
for Cooperative Extension
In 2010, over half of all cash receipts from Utah farmers came from just 3 different areas: Dairy (22%), Cattle and Calves (21.4%), and Hogs (13.7%). The top ten commodities account for 90.3% of all cash receipts. The other commodities include: hay (10.8%), Greenhouse/nursery (7.4%), Turkeys (4.9%), Chicken Eggs (4.8), Wheat (2.6%), Sheep and lambs (1.7%), and Corn (0.8%). This means that raising animals produces more money in sales than growing crops for Utah farmers. Another interesting point is that Utah produces 9.4% of the nation’s safflower sales, 7.5% of Wool sales, and 4.3% of sheep and lamb sales.

Utah’s farm sales come mostly from traditional farms, not from organic operations. The total market value of agriculture products sold from traditional farms is $1.408 billion, and organic farms total $7.316 million. When you consider the average sales per farm, organic farms are not still behind but not as much as it originally seems: traditional farms average approximately $85,000/farm and organic farms average $54,000/farm.

According to the 2007 USDA Ag Census, the selected parts of Idaho in our study of 250 miles from Salt Lake City, are by far the most lucrative out of all the areas studied. They have a high dollar value for crops sold and also have a massive cash value for livestock sold. These areas in Idaho produced over $4.5 billion in crops and livestock. Utah comes next with just over $1.4 billion, followed by selected parts of Colorado, with $278 million, then selected parts of Wyoming with $263 million. Selected parts of Nevada were the least lucrative, with just $186 million in crops and livestock.

Please note that direct comparisons between totals for the states are skewed because all counties in Utah are considered in the study area, while only portions of the surrounding states were included in the study to reflect an approximate 250 mile radius to Salt Lake City. However, when another state has higher numbers for their select counties than all of Utah, it does make quite a statement.
What is Produced in Utah?
Top 10 agricultural products expressed as percent of total agricultural sales in 2010

- 22% DAIRY
- 21.4% CATTLE
- 13.7% HOGS
- 10.8% HAY
- 7.4% NURSERY
- 4.9% TURKEY
- 4.8% CHICKEN & EGGS
- 2.6% WHEAT
- 1.7% SHEEP
- 0.8% CORN

Utah Farm Sales

- Avg sales per farm
- Total Market Value of Ag Products Sold
- Market Value of livestock, poultry and their products
- Market Value of crops sold (including nursery and greenhouse)
### FARM FACTS: Agricultural Production within 250 miles of Salt Lake City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>farm acres</th>
<th>average farm acreage</th>
<th>number of farms</th>
<th>farm cash receipts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO 3,188,530 ACRES</td>
<td>CO 510 ACRES</td>
<td>NV 994 FARMS</td>
<td>NV $186M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV 3,344,805 ACRES</td>
<td>ID 567 ACRES</td>
<td>WY 3,350 FARMS</td>
<td>WY $264M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY 7,197,135 ACRES</td>
<td>UT 668 ACRES</td>
<td>CO 6,250 FARMS</td>
<td>CO $278M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 7,767,603 ACRES</td>
<td>WY 2,148 ACRES</td>
<td>ID 13,694 FARMS</td>
<td>ID $4.5B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT 11,094,700 ACRES</td>
<td>NV 3,365 ACRES</td>
<td>UT 16,700 FARMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USDA.gov
Utah Leading Cash Receipt Commodities

- Dairy products
- Hogs
- Greenhouse/nursery
- Chicken eggs
- Sheep and lambs
- Cherries
- Safflower
- Peaches
- Honey
- Oats
- Farm chickens
- Cattle and calves
- Hay
- Turkeys
- Wheat
- Corn
- Barley
- Apples
- Wool
- Aquaculture
- Apricots

Leading Commodities for Cash in Utah

Value of Receipt (1,000 dollars)
Salt Lake City Area Community Gardens 2012

Gardens with Non-Profit Support

Neighborhood House
1050 West 500 South

Grateful Tomato
800 South 600 East

Fairpark
1037 West 300 North

People’s Portable Garden
900 South 200 West

4th East Garden
553 South 400 East

Cannon Greens Community Garden
778 West California Ave.

Sugar House Community Garden
2225 South 900 East

Rosepark
871 North 1525 West

Unity Gardens
1300 South 900 West

Self-organizing Gardens

LDS Ward

U of U Married Student Housing

Private Property

Private Property

Community Garden Production

Recent years have shown an increased interest in more “decentralized” production, both at home and in community gardens. The total number of community gardens has increased steadily over the last ten years, and the diversity of gardens has increased as well. More and more schools in the Salt Lake City area are establishing community gardens, providing educational space for their teachers and students, but often acting as a space where community members can have access to space for growing of fresh food.

Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County are both working to increase the
number and accessibility to community garden space. Salt Lake
County has begun to allow use of County owned land for community
gardens. Salt Lake City has recently hired a “community garden liason”
to provide support and management for community gardens in the
city.

Wasatch Community Gardens is an established resource for many
gardeners, and provides education for new growers, as well as training
for those interested in designing and building new community
gardens. Interest in these programs has continued to grow each year.

**SLC Public Survey:** Do you grow any of your own food?

- **YES** 67.1%
- **NO** 32.9%

**SLC Public Survey:** If you would like to start a food garden,
what can help you get started this year?

---

**Salt Lake City Area School Gardens**

- Jackson Elementary 750 West 200 North
- McGillis School 668 South 1300 East
- Open Classroom 134 D Street
- Riley Elementary 1410 South 800 West
- Mountain View Elementary 1380 South 1450 South
- Guadalupe 340 South 1040 West
- Dual Immersion 1155 South 1450 West
- Rowland Hall Lower 720 South 1550 East
- Washington Elementary 500 North 200 West
Once food has been produced, it needs to get to market. To some extent, all food needs to be “processed” before it reaches our table. Processing can be as simple as rinsing a head of lettuce picked from your own garden, to as complex as large-scale industrialized processing for longer term storage or shipping. Looking at the distribution system that brings us our food can inform our decisions in the future about energy inputs and land use policy.

**Present-day Farming in Salt Lake City**

As the capital city, Salt Lake City possesses Utah’s largest population and the state’s largest daily workforce. Its traditional grid layout now includes a modern composition of development and transportation systems that continues to support the needs of a growing and diversifying residential and transient population. Full filling the demand for an unfolding array of urban requirements is ongoing, and includes ever diversifying housing and transport choices, new recreational, entertainment and shopping sites, accompanied by a variety of local, state and federal government facilities, commercial and healthcare enterprise, as well as headquarter locations for religious and large institutions. Notwithstanding its traditional agrarian settlement history, ongoing population and development changes within the geographic area of Salt Lake City have marginalized agriculture operations to a point where very few commercial farm or ranching activity exists within the city limits.

In 2012, the City finds itself in a place where formal agricultural zoning is constrained to a small northwest section of the city limits where a handful of beef cattle ranchers are still able to graze cattle, raise hay and vegetables. Although Salt Lake City is a major urban city, the vast majority of single family homes still retain the
historical quality of large residential backyards, and now in the early 21st Century, it is in some of these backyards that a new slice of urban agricultural innovation is taking shape. For a segment of Salt Lake City’s small grower population, backyards have become the fertile ground upon which their new brand of farming is emerging, and it is also where they are finding opportunity to broaden their entrepreneurial opportunity.

Notwithstanding the agricultural land in the city’s northwest quadrant, the city’s urban farming activity is currently worked on small and micro size farms where self taught, high intensity organic application is common. The micro and small farm operations are located in areas of as small as 1/2 acre, which are sometimes scattered over several plots in various locations. Most of these farmers own a portion of their land, but when they find a need for more space, innovative land sharing practices are proving profitable for several Salt Lake growers.

A variety of crops are grown on these small plot and small acre farms, and among the selection of food that is produced in the City, local farmers are reporting success in growing a range of produce that includes, but is not limited to, micro - greens, tomatoes, squashes, green beans, carrots, beats, radishes, eggplant, cilantro, basil, rosemary, and other herbs, spinach, lettuce, other cold crops and root vegetables, and several hundred organic vegetable starts.

Along with large acre scarcity, challenges such as Salt Lake City’s hot-dry summer climate, and cold-dry winter climate, where weather may include extended seasonal cold, the surprise of late spring frost, or very hot summers, compounded by urban heat are part of the local farming environment. With the exception of a scant number of producers who have greenhouses or utilize hoop houses, most producers in the City grow within a spring, summer, early fall growing season.

Presently, twenty-seven growers and ranchers have been identified as operating in Salt Lake City. Because most farms within the city limits are small, and discretely scattered around various neighborhood locations, this total number of operators in the City may be incomplete. Producers identified within Salt Lake City limits were located through various methods including CSA postings, local magazines, farmers markets, internet, direct personal contact, and snowballing, or reference by another grower.

To develop a better understanding of the characteristics, conditions and challenges as well as explore the potential for farming business development in the area, a confidential contact was made with 168 small farmers including producers in Salt Lake City, along with Utah operators outside of the city limits. Producers were asked if they would be willing to talk about their farming practice and experience.
Among the growers contacted, a small response size of 12% informs the community food assessment in establishing a framework for understanding specific elements of the city and regional food shed farming experience.

In addition to sharing information about production method, crops and acreage, farmers were asked about how they get their produce to market. For all of the growers who responded, none of the producers distributed through commercial means, rather, 99% of the producers delivered their product to market themselves by using their own vehicles; either a car, or truck. When speaking about delivering produce with his own truck, one farmer reported that he “Doesn’t feel there are any other options other than using his own truck.” Another farmer stated that while he uses his own vehicle, “Transportation and fuel costs are a real problem.”

All growers within the city limits who reported that they individually take all of their product directly to market which includes supplying restaurants, a local grocer, farmers markets, and at least 9 CSA locations. When asked about exporting, or distributing to markets outside of the City, it was shared that the vast majority of food grown in Salt Lake City stays in the City. On this question, one grower reported that he does distribute about 1% of his crop outside of the city proper to a nearby ski resort.

Of all growers responses, including those whose farms are outside of the municipal boundary, only one farmer reported that some of their product was distributed outside of the state. In addition to delivering his product by personal vehicle to the local market, this farmer uses internet marketing and UPS shipping to distribute product out of state. Like the urban farmers of Salt Lake City, farmers outside of the city limits are also marketing their products directly at farmers markets, direct to grocers, via farm stands, and direct to CSAs. Two producers are also currently using the Internet as a means of selling their product. Only one farmer responded affirmatively to being part of a formal distribution network.

When thinking about the next growing season, zero farmers expressed an intention of reducing their production in 2013. While this bodes well for the upcoming season, concerns about barriers and challenges were shared with 50% of the respondents reported being limited in expanding their operations due to either land or water access, or land or water costs. For Salt Lake City farmers who all reported using culinary water for irrigation, the financial burden of acquiring more water is a big issue. Leveraging land acquisition was a difficulty, and it was shared that limitations on expansion in is prohibitively difficult because of nearby housing development.

Local farmers are looking for more education on how to increase year-round growing, and business planning, as well as struggling to find ways to compete with consumer demand within Utah for ever lower prices.
Top five exports per state for the demographic range as well as their value in millions on dollars.

Utah
Total Utah agricultural exports equals $441 million. Utah’s top five exports represent 79% of the total cash value of its agricultural exports.

1) Wheat/wheat products $144.8
2) Hides and skins $80.6
3) Live animals and meat $62.8
4) Feeds and fodders $37.6
5) Other $34.1

Total exports: $441.0
Difference from top 5: $91.1

Colorado
Total Colorado agricultural exports equal $1,492.3 million. Colorado’s top five exports represent 80% of the total cash value of agricultural exports.

1) Wheat/wheat products $344.4
2) Live animals and meat $280.5
3) Feed grains and products $196.0
4) Feeds and fodders $165.9
5) Hides and skins $149.1

Total exports: $1,492.3
Difference from top 5: $293.4

The pressures of development and time constraints was best summed up by one farmer who said,

“I am losing some of my leased property to development this year. I am constantly under time and resource pressure which may lead to decreased production.”

Among other reasons reported as being a cause for reduction in productivity were a concern over a potential lack of a strong customer base. Farming does not offer traditional job benefits such as health insurance and retirement, and this leads some farmers to work at another job to fill the health insurance/retirement gap. Where farming is not the primary means of employment, time conflicts with a primary job and increased job responsibility away from the farm were reported as reasons where farming might end up suffering. For three respondents, only death would be the reason why they would cut back on their production in the upcoming season.

Looking at concerns related to limiting their future business growth, there were several issues expressed. First is a need for more staffing or employees. We heard a strong desire to get help with establishing a brand identity or brand name for their farm and product. Advertising costs associated were seen as prohibitive, and farmers are serving as their own sales force for marketing within Utah. Utah’s Own was shared as a bright spot in helping to create a positive image of local farming and products. We also found that there is a lack of greenhouses, and/or hoop-houses which are preventing year-round growing opportunities. These farmers are looking for more education on how to increase year-round growing, and business planning, as well as struggling to find ways to compete with consumer demand within Utah for ever lower prices.

What we heard the most in terms of what would help the farmers is as follows:

A Salt Lake City based processing center, or commercial kitchen to aid in processing locally grown products into value added products
Quick freeze units and cooling boxes.
Education on a variety of issues including: business management planning, especially in the areas of licensing, taxes and long-term planning. We found that people were open to either going to a traditional class setting or webinar setting
Grant writing assistance
Education about how to grow year round
Infrastructure to increase year-round growing opportunities
Local Processing & Processing Capacity

Food processing in Salt Lake City is done in a variety of different ways and encompasses several different types of food value. Baking, cereal production, candy, jams and jellies, salsas and sauces, meats, pasta and pizzas, flour and flour products, snack foods, beverage production, and pickling are among the types of value added food processing occurring in the city. Each of the aforementioned types of food processing is done by individual companies and corporations at their own manufacturing site, whether it is a home kitchen, in a small business setting or a commercial grade manufacturing site, that focuses on processing in product niche.

Unfortunately for micro growers, small-scale farms, and entrepreneurial enterprise, there are no commercial facilities available for rent to create value added products. This lack of availability for local food processing plants was a common theme expressed from our grower respondents, as well as among participants who gathered at three different sessions to dialogue on local food accessibility, affordability, health and economic opportunity. Capacity limitations for Salt Lake City may also include a lack of product supply, of raw locally grown ingredients. Within Salt Lake City, and the Salt Lake Valley, there is not enough produce and livestock grown within the city limits in order to meet demand for all of the existing commercial processing. Also, for growers and other value added entrepreneurs, start up costs of planning and financing a commercial processing kitchen are beyond the scope of capability for these groups. This means under current constraints, potential business expansion for value added items in Salt Lake City will be slow to start up, or may never actually materialize for many future businesses.

A present limitation expressed by growers and community alike, is the fact that Salt Lake City, unlike the Cache Valley, does not have a shared community kitchen incubator equipped with commercial ovens, freezers and food processors which in turn drives demand for local product, advancing the local food chain from production to processing. A venture similar to the Cache Valley incubator in Michigan called The Starting Block is a commercial kitchen incubator with processing and manufacturing facilities, and also includes training programs in small business management which helps it’s entrepreneur’s build a framework for success for new businesses as they enter the market place.

NAFTA & Exports from Utah Farms

Since 1994 when NAFTA was implemented, Canada and Mexico have become the United States two larges export markets with exports to Mexico having doubled in that time period. As of 2008 all tariffs and quotas on US exports to Canada and Mexico were eliminated.

Idaho

Idaho’s agricultural exports equal $1,565.7. Top five exports represent 92% of the total cash value of agricultural exports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables and preparations</td>
<td>$469.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeds and fodders</td>
<td>$389.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat/wheat products</td>
<td>$299.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy products</td>
<td>$208.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed grains and products</td>
<td>$80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total exports:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,565.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference from top 5:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$119.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevada

Top five exports represent $61.0 million dollars. Top five exports represent 98% of the total cash value of agricultural exports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeds</td>
<td>$26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables and preparations</td>
<td>$19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeds and fodders</td>
<td>$6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat/wheat products</td>
<td>$3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total exports:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$61.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference from top 5:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wyoming

Wyoming agricultural exports equal $128.3 million dollars. Top five exports represent 91% of the total cash value of agricultural exports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeds and fodders</td>
<td>$63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeds</td>
<td>$17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed grains and products</td>
<td>$14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat/wheat products</td>
<td>$12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live animals and meat</td>
<td>$9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total exports:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$128.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference from top 5:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

creating the world’s largest free trade area encompassing more than 454 million people and $17.2 trillion dollars worth of goods and services as of 2010.

The USDA -“(It) estimated that U.S. farm and food exports to Mexico exceeded $11.5 billion in 2007 -- the highest level ever under NAFTA. From 2001 to 2006, U.S. farm and food exports to Mexico climbed by $3.6 billion to $10.8 billion. U.S. exports of soybean meal, red meats, and poultry meat all set new records in 2006.”

“In the years immediately prior to NAFTA, U.S. agricultural products lost market share in Mexico as competition for the Mexican market increased. NAFTA reversed this trend. The United States supplied more than 72 percent of Mexico’s total agricultural imports in 2007, due in part to the price advantage and preferential access that U.S. products now enjoy. For example, Mexico’s imports of U.S. red meat and poultry have grown rapidly, exceeding pre-NAFTA levels and reaching the highest level ever in 2006.”

“In 2010 Canada and Mexico were the top two purchasers of US exports with $248.2 billion and $163.3 billion respectively. U.S. exports of agricultural products to NAFTA countries totaled $31.4 billion in 2010. Leading categories include: red meats, fresh/chilled/frozen ($2.7 billion), coarse grains ($2.2 billion), fresh fruit ($1.9 billion), snack foods (excluding nuts) ($1.8 billion), and fresh vegetables ($1.7 billion). U.S. imports of agricultural products from NAFTA countries totaled $29.8 billion in 2010. Leading categories include: fresh vegetables ($4.6 billion), snack foods, (including chocolate) ($4.0 billion), fresh fruit (excluding bananas) ($2.4 billion), live animals ($2.0 billion), and red meats, fresh/chilled/frozen ($2.0 billion)”

According to the Utah 2011 Economic Report to the Governor, ‘The two countries closest to Utah, Canada and Mexico, were Utah’s second and ninth highest export destinations, respectively. In contrast to the United Kingdom, where the vast majority of Utah exports were in the form of gold, Canada and Mexico imported a wider array of goods. In 2010, the largest categories of goods exported to Canada were primary metals ($292.1 million), transportation equipment ($191.5 million), and machinery ($132.1 million). The largest categories of goods exported to Mexico were transportation equipment ($96.2 million), chemicals ($77.4 million), and minerals ($58.7 million). From 2008 to 2009, total exports to Canada decreased 5.8% and total exports to Mexico increased 15.5%. From 2009 to 2010, total exports to Canada increased 24.1% and increased 63.3% to Mexico.”
Although the recent economic downturn has had detrimental effects on trade globally and within the NAFTA region, trade (imports and exports) for 2010 reached $61.3 billion dollars. Even accounting for this downturn, agricultural trade within NAFTA has more than tripled since 1994. Additionally, advantages for North American consumers include a wider diversity of products available throughout the year due to the warmer climate of Mexico. These include but are not limited to tomatoes and avocados. This has also allowed Mexican supermarkets to expand their offerings of products such as peaches, pears, and apples from the US and Canada. While ongoing disputes still exist regarding trucking to and from the US and Mexico resulting in retaliatory tariffs from the Mexican Government, the net overall effect of NAFTA has resulted in increased trade within the region with a minimal effect on farm jobs in the US.  

While full implementation of NAFTA has been achieved in terms of trade, there were no mechanisms built into the agreement which provide for food safety or sanitation policies. Currently the interested parties are working together to set standards which can be agreed upon in order to realize the full potential of trade liberalization within the region in terms of agricultural trade. Thus, the future success of NAFTA is contingent upon outside policy matters such as border security and immigration. With a total population increase of over 90 million people within the NAFTA region projected for the next 20 years, implementation of policies which ease the transfer of goods in a secure manner are crucial to ensuring that free markets remain in place for the benefit of Canada, Mexico and the United States.

3. 2011 Economic Report to the Governor, p. 79
5. NAFTA at 17: Full Implementation Leads To Increased Trade and Integration, ERS/USDA, pps. 10, 19
How and what we consume tells us a lot about the food system. On a daily basis, we make choices about where and what we eat, and markets often reflect broader trends in community interest. Recent data indicates growing demand for local food production, and a closer connection with those that grow and process our food. The rise in community supported agriculture, community gardens, and small-scale production indicates growing interest in food that comes from outside the larger industrial agricultural system.

A local consumer’s food choices are affected by various personal reasons and decision-making. Understanding more about how people in Salt Lake City access to markets, the affordability of food, food choice and the places people enjoy their food all inform how the local food system is functioning.

Public Input on Food Consumption

For the Salt Lake City Food Assessment, several approaches for gaining insight into the local consumer food environment took place. Starting in February 2012 the consultant team in conjunction with the Salt Lake Division of Sustainability initiated a 42 question, on-line community food survey for all residents of the city.

To assure broad outreach, the survey was announced through several avenues including: Mayor’s Press conference with local print and TV news, direct electronic communication from the Salt Lake City Mayor’s Office via the city’s website, and electronic communication from all City Councillors to constituents and neighborhood organizations.
Mayor Becker sent a personal letter to religious leaders throughout Salt Lake City explaining the food assessment and asking for the participation of faith communities in taking the survey. Additionally, individual Food Policy Task force members sent out announcements through personal channels, and direct mail through the Public Utility newsletter, as well as Salt Lake non-profit organizations serving diverse groups, and business organizations all served as ways to introduce citizens to the survey.

Because not every resident has electronic access, the team also held 6 hours of on-site, in-person opportunities at a local library, elementary school event, and provided paper survey’s for adult ESL classes.

The survey was available on-line from February 2012 through September 7, 2012. At the time of completion in September 2012, 431 residents had completed the on-line survey.

Another way for exploring community ideas about local food was by inviting the public into conversation and knowledge sharing through the Community Dialogue on Local Food Accessibility, Affordability, Health and Economic Opportunity. In each of three 2-hour sessions, community members learned about the Salt Lake Community Food Assessment and were invited to share thoughts and ideas about local food experiences and the goals for the future.

Why are you interested in the Local Food Dialogue?

Attendees hope for a new food system for Salt Lake City that includes a vision for a:

- Neighborhood Calle De Comidas, where fruit trees line the streets.
- Create a food system that works with nature and environment.
- Improve health and expand community traditions, some hoped for more vegetarian and fresh produce in the City
- Develop a community kitchen to expand new business opportunity in the food production and restaurant industry. A community kitchen can also help with business education and build necessary business skills.
Favorite places and kinds of food in SLC?

Seafood, smaller markets, veggies, ethnic food, ethnic market, big box stores, and local supermarkets.

Like local ethnic market because they provide a variety of interesting foods, but they can be intimidating if you are not from that culture.

Attendees noticed an emergence of ethnic markets (African, Asian, Mexican, etc.) but weren’t sure if they were someplace they would go regularly, mainly due to unfamiliar items and a sense that they did not know where the food came from.

Break down cultural barriers by making sure cultural and ethnic markets are in various areas of the city. Learn about new recipes to cook with unfamiliar produce. City could promote ethnic markets around the city through website and blogs.

Public Survey Results

SLC Public Survey: Do you currently get food from any of the following food sources? Check all that apply.
SLC Public Survey: About how far is the one way distance to your nearest grocery store?
SLC Public Survey: What are the most common ways you travel to buy groceries? Check all that apply:

- 0.7% Taxi
- 2.2% Other
- 2.9% Train
- 3.3% Home Delivery
- 4.4% Bus
- 5.5% Ride from Friend
- 24.2% Bike
- 38.5% Walk
- 92.3% Car
Note:
Poverty data is from U.S. Census Bureau.
Residential land use areas are used to clip U.S. Census Tracts to increase data resolution.
**SLC Public Survey:** Which *local foods* do you purchase?

![Bar chart showing the percentage of purchases for various local foods.]

- **85.6%** FRUITS & VEGETABLES
- **59.4%** EGGS
- **59.2%** HONEY
- **53.4%** DAIRY
- **47.6%** BAKED GOODS
- **36.4%** MEATS
- **16.9%** NUTS
- **11.6%** DON'T KNOW
- **7.9%** FISH

**SLC Public Survey:** How many servings of fresh fruit and vegetables do you eat per day?

![Pie chart showing the number of servings per day.]

- **50.1%** 3-5 per day
- **37.7%** 1-2 per day
- **11.3%** 1 or more per day
- **0.9%** 0 per day

**SLC Public Survey:** Which location do you most often purchase *locally grown* fruits and vegetables?

![Pie chart showing the percentage of locations.]

- **89.8%** SUPERMARKETS
- **59.8%** FARMERS MARKETS
- **30.9%** NEIGHBORHOOD GROCERS
- **30.0%** SPECIALTY FOOD MARKETS
- **27.7%** BIG BOX RETAILERS
- **13.3%** ETHNIC MARKETS
- **12.1%** PRODUCE STANDS

**SLC Public Survey:** What are the top three places where you shop for fresh produce?
**SLC Farmers Markets**

**Winter Market**  
900 West North Temple

**Campus Edible Gardens Market**  
300 S. 1400 E. 84112

**Sugar House Farmer’s Market**  
Sugar House Park, 84106

**University of Utah Farmer’s Market**  
Tanner Plaza at the Union 84112

**Market on State**  
556 West 600 South

**SLC Downtown Farmer’s Market**  
Pioneer Park 84101

**People’s Market**  
Int’l Peace Gardens 1000 S. 900 W. 84114

**Downtown Tuesday Farmer’s Market**  
327 S 500 E, 84101

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farmers Markets</th>
<th># of farms attending</th>
<th>SUN</th>
<th>MON</th>
<th>TUES</th>
<th>WED</th>
<th>THURS</th>
<th>FRI</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Winter Market (Utah State Fairpark)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Campus Edible Gardens Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sugar House Farmers Market</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. University of Utah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Market on State</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SLC Downtown Farmers Market</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Peoples Market</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Downtown Tuesdays Market</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. International Refugee Farmers Stand</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Westminster College Farm Stand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Supported Agriculture (CSAs) provides consumers and farmers with a mutually beneficial relationship. Consumers can buy an annual “membership” to a CSA that gives them a weekly share of produce during the growing season. They purchase this membership early in the year, when farmers are in need of the capital to plant and prepare for the growing season.

While each CSA operates in its own way, a majority of them have pick-up locations around the city that bring fresh, local food into the neighborhoods of those with memberships for the year. A few CSAs provide choice for the consumer as to which food items they’d like for the week by providing options at the Downtown Farmers Market. Members pick up their weekly share at the farmers’ food stand at the market, allowing them to select the produce they’ll use.

Each year there is growth in the number of CSAs operating in Salt Lake City, and increased demand from consumers wishing to participate.
Affordability and Household Food Security

The USDA defines food security as access by all people at all times to enough food for an active healthy life (USDA Community Food Security) Communities that are food secure, make certain that people can acquire food in socially acceptable ways, that all community members have food that is nutritional and safe.

The USDA Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion works in conjunction with other federal agencies in evaluating and publishing guides on four economic levels of healthy food baskets for Americans. Four official USDA meal plans represent a nutritious diet at four different cost levels. The plans include, the thrifty plan, the low – cost plan, moderate cost plan and liberal plan. The Thrifty Food Plan (TFP) represents a market basket of varied and nutritionally sound foods from which food stamp allotments are determined. Within this economical meal plan, food basket options are grouped into selections which contain either breads, cereals and other grain products (tortilla’s, pasta, etc.) milk products, fruits and vegetables, (fresh, frozen and canned), meats, fish and beans and other food items like spices, sugar, and baking goods.

To understand more about food security a survey team conducted a confidential in-store price assessment among selected Salt Lake City supermarkets. This study was carried out during the month of August 2012, and an in-store Thrifty Food Plan grocery shopping occurred October 2012. A total of 14 stores permitted the in store survey. The purpose of the study was aimed at finding out if low-income individuals or families in Salt Lake City, who are receiving full food stamp allotments are be able to afford a healthy food market basket.

Meal Planning

Through a large consumer sampling process, coupled with nutrition advice, all of the USDA meal plans are designed to reflect a market basket of realistic food choices that people in the US population will eat at home. An important element of the four food plan market baskets is that they can be used as a helpful guide in purchasing healthy food at various income levels. For people on a low income, or a food stamp budget, the Thrifty Food Plan market basket is a useful resource for meal planning that assures a balanced, affordable diet. For the consumer, grocery shopping using the Thrifty Food Plan assumes that all purchases are made at the most economical in store cost for each food choice.

In Utah, the full food stamp allotment for an individual adult is $200.00 per month, (-$50.00 per week of groceries), and $668.00, (- $167.00per week) for a family of four. It is important to recognize that most individuals and families do not receive the...
maximum food stamp allotment if they earn any income. With even a small addition in household income, food stamp funding is reduced, and recipients must find other means to cover any food cost gap.

**Pricing Thrifty Food Plan Items**

To better evaluate the buying power and healthy eating opportunity of the Thrifty Food Plan on a food stamp budget, an in store food audit of 14 Salt Lake City supermarkets was conducted throughout the month of August 2012. The in-store survey evaluated and compared the price of a list of similar size and weight items, based on USDA Thrifty Food Plan food groups.

The Salt Lake City supermarket grocers assessment revealed that there were ten stores where some items were missing from the list. These items were scattered throughout the sampling of stores. These missing items would not seriously prevent a Thrifty Food Plan shopper from achieving menu selection success or absolutely compromise nutritional needs significantly; however, not having these items available could prove to be an additional challenge for budgeting and for food choice.

While all stores across the survey have a high frequency of food items, one item, ground turkey, which is a lean meat choice, was found missing in four stores. Ground pork and reduced sodium chicken bouillon cubes were found missing in three of the stores surveyed. These foods represent the highest number of missing items in the supermarkets, and indicate that overall, Salt Lake City food stamp recipients have access to a high level of thrifty food options.

Within the market basket, the cost of purchasing the entire fresh fruit category (bagged apples, bananas, grapes, melon and oranges) ranged from the most economical purchase at one store location of $3.42, to the high end one store purchase of $10.10, with an average of $5.73.

The cost of purchasing the entire fresh vegetable market basket, which included bagged, unpeeled carrots, celery, green peppers, lettuce, onions, tomatoes and potatoes, ranged from a low price in store cost of $5.39 to the highest price location which cost $11.72. The average price of the full fresh vegetable basket across all stores was $6.66.

**Shopping the Thrifty Meal Plan**

To gain a complete understanding of the possibility of purchasing healthy and tasty food on food stamp budget, a complete Thrifty Food market basket was planned and purchased for a family of four using the full food stamp allotment as the budgetary guideline by the

For people on a low income, or a food stamp budget, the Thrifty Food Plan market basket is a useful resource for meal planning that assures a balanced, affordable diet.
At this point in time, it was possible to shop for a variety of healthy foods, including a wide selection of fruits and vegetables, within the food stamp budget for a family of four.

The reward for using the meal plan resource guide to shop for value, flavor and nutrition, was the ability to budget and shop within the food stamp weekly share for a family of four. At this point in time, it was possible to shop for a variety of healthy foods, including a wide selection of fruits and vegetables, within the food stamp budget for a family of four. The food purchased assumed planned meal preparation, very careful shopping, and at-home food preparation based on a weekly menu. The weekly menu was established using specific portions for each meal for each family member. For individuals or family members who are physically active, the Thrifty Food Plan, which is informed by average activity, will most likely be insufficient in providing enough calories for a healthy and physically active lifestyle.
Local community nutrition is significantly impacted by food resources for sub-populations in the community. Several "at-risk" populations rely on the broader community for providing food at some point in their lives. Many community organizations exist with the primary purpose of providing food to various populations in Salt Lake City. How we support these organizations can influence the availability of food for large segments of the population.

**Federal Food Assistance Programs**

**SNAP** This program is known in Utah as Food Stamps, but is known federally as The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). This is the largest program in the United States, with over 40 million participants who received some $65 billion in assistance in 2010 alone. SNAP focuses on providing assistance to persons of all ages that are members of low income households. In Utah in 2010 there were some 283,971 participants in this program, yet that is only 56% of eligible Utah participants. In December 2011, there were 22,780 participants in Salt Lake City alone. SNAP provides people with a type of card that they can purchase items directly from grocers, with the aim that they can increase their purchasing power to obtain more nutritious food. This is a largely grocer distributed program. In 2010, 83% of the program was distributed directly through grocers and supermarkets.

**WIC** The Women, Infants and Children or WIC program is aimed at providing nutrition to low income mothers and children up to age 5. It provides these families with vouchers and/or means to purchase approved nutrient rich food and formula directly from grocers and supermarkets. WIC had over 9.17 million participants in 2010, with 2.15 million using the WIC program directly at farmers markets. There

22,780
FEDERAL FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS
SALT LAKE CITY HOUSEHOLDS DEC 2011

$668
MAXIMUM FAMILY OF FOUR MONTHLY FOOD STAMP ALLOCATION

$200
MAXIMUM SINGLE ADULT MONTHLY FOOD STAMP ALLOCATION
were 80,244 participants in the WIC program in Salt Lake County in January of 2012. WIC is not an entitlement program. It is funded by an annual congressional grant.

**NSLP** The National School Lunch Program (NSLP) is a federally supplemented program that allows school children to get food at school. Parents pay for their children to participate in the program, and where circumstances allow they may qualify for either a reduced lunch cost or a free lunch all together. This is a national program, with some 31 million daily participants in 2010. Salt Lake City had 26,380 students participate on a daily basis in 2011.

**SBP** The School Breakfast Program allows school aged children to get breakfast at school. While any child can participate, the program aims to support poor and low income students who might not get breakfast at home. It operates similar to the NSLP, where students can purchase breakfast, and qualifying students can get either reduced cost or free breakfast. In 2010, there were 11.6 million students participating daily. In Salt Lake City there were nearly 1 million breakfasts served in 2010, with a daily average of 5,287 students served.

**SFSP** Summer Food Service Programs keep school cafeterias open year round to provide nutritious meals to students. The program operates similar to the NSLP, where students can pay for lunch, or if they qualify, pay a reduced rate or get a free lunch. In 2005, 2 million students participated in this program.

**Special Milk Program** This federal program provides reimbursements to schools and child care facilities for the milk they serve. The program targets children 19 and younger. Institutions may qualify for reimbursements of milk served if they do not participate in other school meal programs. This program has been steadily declining in the number of pints of milk it paid for since the peak in 1969 when the program covered 3 billion pints of milk. By contrast, in 2010, the program covered 72 million pints of milk.

**Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program** This federal program was aimed at providing a wide range of fresh fruit and vegetables to children eating meals at schools. This program began as a pilot in 2002 and has been gradually expanding every year. In the 2011/2012 school year, the program will give $158 million in assistance to schools that participate. Utah’s allotment was $2,264,162 in assistance for this program in 2011. Currently there are 15 elementary schools in Salt Lake City that participate.

**Child and Adult Care Program (CACF)** This federal program provides reimbursement to child care and adult care facilities for
providing nutritious meals. The program pays the cost of meals for 3.2 million children and 112,000 adults daily. Utah had 326 participating locations and served an average of 15,049 people a day.

**After School Snack Program (ASSP)** Provides children with USDA approved snacks to children at some 27,000 after school programs and child care facilities nationwide. In 2010 the program cost $156 million. In 2011, Utah served 927,514 snacks in 135 locations.

**Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP)** This program supplies nutrient rich food to Mothers and children up to age 5 and also to seniors. The program is similar to WIC, but instead of giving a way to buy food, CSFP distributes food directly to participants. The program averaged 518,000 monthly users nationwide. Most of whom were low-income Seniors; only 21,000 of the participants were women, infants, and children.

**Food Assistance for Disaster Relief** This program provides emergency food to organizations such as the Red Cross in the event of a disaster such as an earthquake, hurricane, or wildfire. In 2011 the program helped 1 million people nationwide. The distribution frequently shifts because the program only helps areas where disasters have taken place.

**WIC Farmers Market Program** This program allows WIC users to purchase food directly from growers at farmers markets. This program did not include Utah in 2011.

**Local Participations in Food Assistance Programs**

**Wasatch Community Gardens** This program provides gardens where participants can grow their own food. **Salt Lake City has 5 gardens with 243 gardeners in 2011.** The program is accessible to persons of all ages and focuses on teaching about where food comes from. They also teach classes and workshops to children and other community members.

**Utah Food Bank for Seniors**- This service provides seniors with food delivered to their door from the Utah Food Bank. In Salt Lake County there are 2600 seniors receiving this service each month.

**Meals on Wheels** This program delivers prepared meals to homebound seniors. The program has one kitchen in Salt Lake County.

**Backpack Program** This program targets children that might not have access to regular meals over the weekend. The program gives children a backpack at the end of the school week filled with easy to open and prepare foods to help them last over the weekend. There
were 600 children in Utah who relied on this program. Last year the program provided 17,864 backpacks to these children.

**Kids Café** This program provides an evening meal on weeknights for children in low income areas around Salt Lake County. These meals are served out of school cafeterias, community centers and after school programs. Approximately 1300 meals are served on weeknights.

**Salt Lake Senior Center Lunch Program** This program provides seniors with lunch at senior centers. The program is administered by Salt Lake County. Salt Lake City has 5 participating senior centers.

**Emergency Food Resources**

**Catholic Community Services (CCS)** CCS operates a soup kitchen called the St. Vincent de Paul Dining Room. In 2010 they served 224,916 meals. They also run a program called the Good Samaritan Program. Each month this program distributes thousands of sack lunches and other material goods directly from the rectory in Salt Lake City.

**Salt Lake County Community Action Program** This program consists of emergency pantries around the valley. Persons in need of food can come to these pantries and get food items. Salt Lake City has one of the 5 distribution sites. In total the Community Action Plan helped 149,484 people in 2008.

**Crossroads Urban Center** This local program has an emergency pantry located in Salt Lake City to help people get emergency food. In 2010, Crossroads Urban Center helped 18,801 households totaling 40,410 people.

In Salt Lake City, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (LDS Church) provides food assistance to over 150 people a day at Welfare Square. In addition they feed 50-75 homeless people a day. They also operate Bishops Storehouses where some 150 items are stocked and available to church members and others in need of food assistance. The Bishop's Storehouses help approximately 100-200 people every day in Salt Lake City.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Range of Service</th>
<th>Number of locations</th>
<th>Number Served</th>
<th>Local Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Breakfast Program SBP</td>
<td>Breakfast served in educational facilities</td>
<td>School-aged children</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>11.6 million daily (2010)</td>
<td>985,399 breakfasts in 2010 (daily average 5,287)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Food Service Programs SFSP</td>
<td>Serves meals (mostly in schools) while school is out of session.</td>
<td>Low income school-aged children</td>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 million (summer 2005)</td>
<td>466,695 in 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Infants &amp; Children WIC</td>
<td>Voucher system</td>
<td>Child-bearing women and children up to age 5</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>8 in SL county/ 3 in SLC</td>
<td>9.17 million (2010)</td>
<td>80,244 in Salt Lake County in January 2012* (data not collected at city level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS Church Welfare Programs</td>
<td>Church run food pantries</td>
<td>General population</td>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Community Services</td>
<td>Soup Kitchens and food distribution</td>
<td>General population</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>224,916 meals (2010)</td>
<td>8,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch Community Gardens</td>
<td>Gardens, backyard sharing</td>
<td>General population</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>7, 5 in Salt Lake City</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>243 Gardeners in Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program SNAP</td>
<td>Electronic bank transfer cards to pay for food</td>
<td>General population</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>283,971 in Utah (2011)</td>
<td>22,780 in Dec 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC Farmers Market Program / WIC Senior Farmers Market Program</td>
<td>Voucher system redeemable at farmers markets</td>
<td>Child-bearing women and children up to age 5 / Low income adults who are 60+</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*no presence in Utah in 2011</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program</td>
<td>Serve fresh produce in schools</td>
<td>School aged children</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>15 in SLC</td>
<td>$2,264,162 in 2011/2012 school year.</td>
<td>8,970 students in Salt Lake School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Milk Program</td>
<td>Milk distributed to schools that do not participate in the NSLP</td>
<td>School aged children</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>9 in Utah</td>
<td>72 million half pints of milk served in 2010</td>
<td>0 in Salt Lake School District 125,400 in Utah in 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Target Group</td>
<td>Range of Service</td>
<td>Number of locations</td>
<td>Number Served</td>
<td>Local Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and Adult Care Program</td>
<td>Provides reimbursements for day care facilities for meals served to enrolled persons</td>
<td>School aged children / impaired or 60+ adults</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>326 in Utah</td>
<td>3.2 million children daily</td>
<td>112,000 adults daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School Snack Program</td>
<td>Provides money for schools and child care facilities to serve snacks to kids</td>
<td>School aged children</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>27,000 nationally</td>
<td>$156 million in 2010</td>
<td>927,514 Snacks served in Utah in 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Assistance for Disaster Relief</td>
<td>Supplies relief organizations (such as the red cross) with food for emergency situations</td>
<td>General Population</td>
<td>National <em>Not Available</em></td>
<td>1 million in 2011</td>
<td>*not available. This provides food for disasters and is highly irregular with distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake County Community Action Program</td>
<td>Emergency food distribution centers</td>
<td>General population</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>1 in SLC, with 5 centers in SL county</td>
<td>149,484 in SL county (2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Food Bank for Seniors</td>
<td>Food Delivery</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>n/a *delivery</td>
<td>2,600 in Salt Lake County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals on Wheels</td>
<td>Food Delivery</td>
<td>Homebound Seniors 60+</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>1 kitchen for SL County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake Senior Centers Lunch Program</td>
<td>Provides lunch at senior centers</td>
<td>Seniors 60+</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>5 in SLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpack Program</td>
<td>Distributes food to children at school for weekend meals</td>
<td>School aged children</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>13 sites in school year, 5 in summer</td>
<td>17,864 meals annually for 600 Children</td>
<td>19,884 backpacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids Café</td>
<td>Weeknight meals served at schools</td>
<td>School aged children</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>29 School Year Sites and 16 summer sites</td>
<td>222,837 meals served</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP)</td>
<td>Similar to WIC but distributes food directly.</td>
<td>Child-bearing women and children up to age 5 / Low income seniors</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>518,000 monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASSISTANCE
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At the “end” of the food system is found how much food we discard. We can classify our food waste into “consumable” and “non-consumable” waste. Consumable food is often donated by grocers or individuals to community food support organizations. Non-consumable waste often ends up in the landfill, but could be an un-tapped resource for production of compost for use by local producers.

**Consumable Food Waste**

Consumable food waste is food waste that could still be used by others. The Utah Food Bank and others market their services broadly to the community to request donations of consumable food for distribution to those in need.

In addition, the Utah Food Bank operates a “grocery rescue” program throughout the state of Utah. This program teams the UFB with local grocers who have consumable food that has either passed its “best by” date, or is otherwise no longer saleable. **Each week the UFB gathers donations from participating grocers, and delivers it immediately to local pantries** where it is distributed to individuals and families in need of assistance as soon as possible.

Since its beginnings in 2006, the program has grown each year in scale and in the number of participating stores. In 2012, the program will collect and distribute nearly four million pounds of perishable food in Salt Lake County alone. The chart below shows the growth of the program over the last five fiscal years.

In 2012, the Utah Food Bank Grocery Rescue program will collect and distribute nearly four million pounds of perishable food in Salt Lake County alone.
Utah Food Bank Grocery Rescue Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Pounds Collected</td>
<td>300,572</td>
<td>613,262</td>
<td>859,950</td>
<td>1,146,921</td>
<td>1,539,193</td>
<td>1,695,765</td>
<td>2,752,104</td>
<td>7,775,847</td>
<td>3,445,672</td>
<td>8,878,530</td>
<td>11,879,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating Stores</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Donation per store per Month</td>
<td>3,578</td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td>4,215</td>
<td>3,823</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>3,475</td>
<td>4,224</td>
<td>4,351</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>4,157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fiscal Year for the Utah Food Bank: July 1 - June 30

~33 Million
POUNDS OF FOOD DIVERTED FROM THE LANDFILL TO THE UTAH FOOD BANK THROUGH THE GROCERY RESCUE PROGRAM FROM 2006-2012.

Year officially started in Utah: 2006
Retail stores participating in 2006: 14
Utah counties served: 1
Participating partner agencies: 0

Current Year: 2012
Total participating stores: 200
Utah counties served: 18
Participating partner agencies: 21

Life of the Program, 33,177,062 pounds of food diverted to the Utah Food Bank.
Non-consumable Waste

In 2012, Salt Lake City completed a waste study to determine the quantity and ratio of waste items ending up in the landfill. Included in this analysis was the study of food waste ending up in the landfill. A sampling of 2011 waste revealed that 22.17% of waste was food. It is estimated that this equated 10,039 tons of food.

In 2011, there was 45,294 tons of waste that was sent to the landfill. This number has dropped by nearly 10,000 tons from 2008 levels. With 2,332 tons of recycled waste, the levels of curbside recycling have fallen from the 3,382 tons in 2009. The levels of yard waste have grown dramatically from 1,190 tons in 2008 to 12,485 tons in 2011. This suggests that garbage levels have been roughly the same, but yard waste is being processed separately, rather than being included in regular trash disposal.

Recommendations for new city programs related to food waste, prepared by CalRecovery, Inc., 2454 Stanwell Drive Concord, California 94520:

Food Scraps Program (Curbside)
Sector: Residential
Stream: Food Scraps
Facility: None at this time

Description: Nearly 200 communities in the United States divert food scraps from the landfill and the most common model is the addition of food scraps to an existing yard scraps program with automated weekly collection. Additionally, the largest material type by weight in Salt Lake City’s residential waste stream is food scraps (approximately 20%). Under this program, residents are banned from disposing food scraps in the trash container (similar to current regulations for yard scraps/recyclables) and instead must source separate food scraps and put them in the yard scraps/organics container. Example Communities: Seattle WA, San Francisco CA

How it would work in Salt Lake City: The program requires no significant changes for City staff, and depending on where the materials are processed, it does not require any significant changes in the hauling practices. The program does require a behavior change on the part of residents and it would require that the existing compost facility changes its processing to accept food scraps or that a new facility be developed. In order to achieve the change in residential behavior, the City would first pass an ordinance barring the disposal of food scraps in the trash cart (similar to existing ordinance 9.08.030). This would be followed by outreach/education on the new program, including new sticker/decals for the organics carts. Some communities have included the purchase and delivery of small (2-3 gallon) kitchen containers for each household in the program.
deployment. SERA instead recommends making coupons for ‘free’ containers available for each household that must be redeemed at selected locations. This method of distribution cuts down on delivery costs and ensures that only people that want the small kitchen containers obtain them.

Pitfalls/Barriers: The current compost facility does not accept food-soiled paper. The common potential barriers to food scraps collection are:

- **Political issues**: Getting decision-makers on-board with a food scraps diversion program and building support for the program among residents can be a challenge.

- **Facility issues**: The current facility does not accept food scraps. There may be permitting issues as well as processing issues that must be overcome in order to ensure that the collected materials are processed appropriately and in an environmentally acceptable manner.

- **Pests/vectors**: Concerns among generators and elected officials that the collection of food scraps will increase the number of problems with respect to pests and vectors are common. It is important to note that under the proposed program, no quantities of new materials are being generated or disposed. Currently, food scraps go into a cart and are put out at the curb for collection and transported to a landfill; under the new program, food scraps are put into a cart and are put out at the curb for collection and transported to a compost facility. The same materials are being placed into the same type of container and in the same location; they are just being delivered to a compost facility instead of buried in a landfill. So, while increased problems of pests and vectors may be a fear, it tends not to be an issue in operating programs assuming collection is as frequent as currently used for MSW.

- **Potentially higher tipping fees**: In 88% of the communities in the United States, with food scraps collection the tip fees for organics are lower than the tip fees for MSW. However, there is the possibility that it will cost more for Salt Lake City to tip organics than it does to tip MSW, making the program more challenging economically.

- **The “Yuck” factor**: Residents can be reluctant to participate in the program because of perceived issues of odor, mess, etc. The best way to overcome these concerns is through an effective education campaign. Food scraps can be layered in the yard waste container with yard waste on top to reduce odor; kitchen containers can be lined with paper towels or bio-bags; dairy, where existing, can go down the garbage disposal to reduce
odors; and meats can be wrapped in a paper bag or other compostable item before being set out for collection.

- **Contamination:** As with a successful curbside recycling program, education, outreach, and ongoing monitoring are the keys to overcoming potential contamination issues. The largest contaminants in combined food scrap/yard waste streams are reported to be non-compostable plastic items (bags, dining ware, cups). Whether a community chooses to allow compostable bags in the stream depends on the processing site. Some communities actively promote compostable bags as a way to increase participation while others have banned all bags in the stream, compostable or not, due to challenges in processing.

### Commercial Food Scraps Pilot

**Sector: Commercial**

**Stream: Food Scraps, Food-soiled paper**

**Facility: None at this time**

**Description:** The modeled program targets a few partner establishments (restaurants/grocery stores/schools) to pilot a curbside food scraps collection and diversion program (food scraps are estimated to make up over one-fifth of the commercial waste collected in compactor routes in the city). Example Communities: Cambridge MA, Davis CA

**How it would work in Salt Lake City:** The City would first identify a partner hauler and then work with the hauler to find sufficient businesses to generate a full collection route’s worth of clean, pre-consumer food scraps with 3 times per week collection. Ideally, the generators would be located near each other in order to minimize transportation costs. The City would provide a subsidy to the generator (or hauler) per cubic yard of food scraps collected so that food scrap collection is not more expensive than MSW collection. The City and partner hauler would also go to each business to conduct staff training and provide signs and indoor containers for the food scraps. Pre-consumer waste would be targeted in the pilot to reduce contamination in the stream. Collection would occur in multiple 64-gallon containers. Because this is a pilot, the program would be monitored closely throughout its duration to track the actual costs and impacts as well as barriers, tips, and changes for future programs.

**Pitfalls/Barriers:** As with the residential food scraps programs, the largest barrier at this time is that there is no local processing facility accepting food scraps. Assuming that this barrier is overcome, other typical barriers in commercial food scrap programs include the ‘yuck’ factor, contamination, and costs. The pilot program would be designed to overcome these barriers through education (yuck factor),
staff training, only targeting pre-consumer food (contamination), and a City subsidy (cost).
Key Websites

Food Assessment  http://www.foodsecurity.org/cfa_home.html
http://www.fns.usda.gov/fns/research.htm
Through GIO, you can ask government information librarians who are
experts at finding information from government agencies of all levels.
Policy http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/MENU/Published/Research/
StudyandEval.htm
Published/FoodSecurity/FoodSecurity.htm
FOOD ATLAS
http://www.ers.usda.gov/Emphases/Healthy/
Production-Distribution
http://www.manta.com/mb_45_B61AF000_45/fruit_and_vegetable_
markets/utah  70 Fruit-Vegetable+Produce Mkts. in Utah.
Food Insecurity:
htm#statisticalhttp://hdl.handle.net/10113/32791
Maps: Restaurants, Grocery Stores, Food Stores, Food Assistance, Food
Eaten at Home,
http://ers.usda.gov/foodatlas/documentation.htm
FOOD EXPENDITURE
http://www.ers.usda.gov/Briefing/CPIFoodAndExpnditures/recommended_data.htm
http://www.ers.usda.gov/Briefing/CPIFoodAndExpnditures/consumerpriceindex.htm
http://www.ers.usda.gov/Briefing/CPIFoodAndExpnditures/Data/cpiforecasts.htm
http://www.ers.usda.gov/Briefing/CPIFoodAndExpnditures/threetypesoffoodexpndituresseries.htm
Search: 2007 Economic Census and Surveys
http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DatasetMainPageServlet?_program=ECN&_submenuId=&_lang=en&
BUREAU OF ECONOMIC ANALYSIS
http://www.bea.gov/iTable/iTable.cfm?reqid=70&step=1
FOOD AND NUTRITION
WHAT WE EAT AT HOME
USDA_ Agricultural Research Service _ Research Development_ Surveys
http://www.ars.usda.gov/is/pr/2004/040614.htm
http://www.norc.org/Pages/default.aspx = National Opinion Research Center
Best Practices
http://www.cityharvest.org/programs/food-and-fitness
http://www.cityharvest.org/hunger-in-nyc/research-reports
Nutrition and Health
http://www.schools.utah.gov/cnp/Fresh-Fruit-and-Vegetable-Program.aspx
2012.02.16 Utah Dept. of Education program
http://ers.usda.gov/Briefing/DietQuality/DietaryPatterns.htm
Insidious Consumption http://ers.usda.gov/AmberWaves/June07/
Features/Insidious.htm
Food Assistance Programs http://ers.usda.gov/Briefing/
FoodNutritionAssistance/
Food Stamps http://www.census.gov/acs/www/
Nutrition Education
http://www.snapretailerlocator.com/
Food Availability
http://www.ers.usda.gov/Data/FoodConsumption/
FoodAvailSpreadsheets.htm
Farm Atlas By County
Economics of Food Relocalization
The 25% Shift - Benefits of Food Localization for Northeast Ohio and How to Realize Them
Study downloadable here: http://www.neofoodweb.org/
resources/137
BALLE leakage calculators!
http://www.livingeconomies.org/leakage_calculators
Studies That Support Local Living Economies (using leakage analyses)
http://www.livingeconomies.org/aboutus/research-and-studies/studies
The 10% Campaign
http://www.ncsu.edu/project/nc10percent/index.php
The Local Multiplier Effect poster
http://www.yesmagazine.org/issues/go-local/the-local-multiplier-effect
Plugging the Leaks - LM3 resources
http://www.pluggingtheleaks.org/resources/plm_lm3.htm