

Local Food Promotion Program (LFPP) Final Performance Report

The final performance report summarizes the outcome of your LFPP award objectives. As stated in the LFPP Terms and Conditions, you will not be eligible for future LFPP or Farmers Market Promotion Program grant funding unless all close-out procedures are completed, including satisfactory submission of this final performance report.

This final report will be made available to the public once it is approved by LFPP staff. Write the report in a way that promotes your project's accomplishments, as this document will serve as not only a learning tool, but a promotional tool to support local and regional food programs. Particularly, recipients are expected to provide both qualitative and quantitative results to convey the activities and accomplishments of the work.

The report is limited to 10 pages and is due **within 90 days** of the project's performance period end date, or sooner if the project is complete. Provide answers to each question, or answer "not applicable" where necessary. It is recommended that you email or fax your completed performance report to LFPP staff to avoid delays:

LFPP Phone: 202-720-2731; Email: USDALFPPQuestions@ams.usda.gov; Fax: 202-720-0300

Should you need to mail your documents via hard copy, contact LFPP staff to obtain mailing instructions.

Report Date Range: <i>(e.g. September 30, 20XX-September 29, 20XX)</i>	October 1, 2015 – March 31, 2016
Authorized Representative Name:	Mike Skinner
Authorized Representative Phone:	206-235-6029
Authorized Representative Email:	Mike.skinner@cie-nw.org
Recipient Organization Name:	Pinchot University
Project Title as Stated on Grant Agreement:	Green Cart Cooperative Planning Project
Grant Agreement Number: <i>(e.g. 14-LFPPX-XX-XXXX)</i>	15-LFPPWA0011
Year Grant was Awarded:	2015
Project City/State:	Seattle, Washington
Total Awarded Budget:	\$25,000

LFPP staff may contact you to follow up for long-term success stories. Who may we contact?

- Same Authorized Representative listed above (check if applicable).
 Different individual: Name: _____; Email: _____; Phone: _____

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0581-0287. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 4 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable sex, marital status, or familial status, parental status religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program (not all prohibited bases apply to all programs). Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

1. State the goals/objectives of your project as outlined in the grant narrative and/or approved by LFPP staff. If the goals/objectives from the narrative have changed from the grant narrative, please highlight those changes (e.g. “new objective”, “new contact”, “new consultant”, etc.). You may add additional goals/objectives if necessary. For each item below, qualitatively discuss the progress made and indicate the impact on the community, if any.

- i. Goal/Objective 1: Outreach the concept to the broader stakeholder community to create opportunity for stakeholder input into the planning process.

- a. Progress Made:

During this planning project, the Center for Inclusive Entrepreneurship (CIE) conducted deep community engagement, including listening sessions, surveys, interviews and review of work that has already been accomplished around the issues of food security and economic development.

Beginning in October, 2015, CIE began to schedule and organize materials for stakeholder input listening sessions, and designed a South King County Mobile Grocery Survey. During the course of the planning project, we conducted over 30 individual interviews and 5 formal listening sessions in partnership with several local organizations, reaching over 60 individuals who are concerned about food access, entrepreneurship and economic development in South King County. These sessions were planned to include individual sessions to reach out to Cart Operators, Growers, Distributors, Commissaries, and Consumers, however we realized that the most meaningful interactions and feedback came from mixed sessions. We completed 5 total listening sessions: 2 consumer, and 3 that were a mix of the 5 target groups. We also collected 144 survey responses.

The groups reached through these methods included low income Latina women, recent East African immigrants, volunteers and staff working with Seattle Tilth and Pike Place Market, Pinchot University students, members of Healthy King County Coalition, Roots of All Roads (ROAR) produce stand staff, local farmers and food producers, and consumers throughout South King County. Through these outlets we reached over 175 stakeholders.

- b. Impact on Community:

Individuals reported feeling engaged and interested in the idea of a Mobile Grocery in South King County, and were extremely honest and forthcoming about their wishes and their concerns about a potential Mobile Grocery in their area. Price and location were two major concerns. Individuals also were extremely knowledgeable about the entire system that impacts food access: in one group, we were told that if immigration reform would make it easier to find living wage work, that food security would no longer be an issue for their family. And while 51% of the stakeholders we reached expressed that they were either “very interested” or “somewhat interested” in starting a mobile grocery business with the right support, they also expressed real worries about crime, logistics, business training that would be made available, and family obligations that might interfere with success.

- ii. Goal/Objective 2: Through community gatherings, focus groups, surveys and interviews, gather input from the broader stakeholder community that informs the development of the business plan.

a. Progress Made:

Using the Harwood Model of active listening sessions, the team conducted listening sessions with potential consumers, entrepreneurs, and current vendors. In the beginning, listening sessions were pointedly broad, designed to encourage authentic feedback around the themes of grocery needs and potential business strategies to meet those needs.

Our first listening sessions focused on “Buying Healthy Foods.” Participants were given a brief outline of the project, but there was little to no focus on mobile grocery carts. The intention at this stage of research was not to focus on mobile food carts, but rather to understand community needs around buying healthy food. Over time, our listening sessions became more focused on the ideas that had come out of earlier sessions. By our fifth listening session, we had interviewed and met with over 30 individual stakeholders and were narrowing down to three business models that we heard that the community was considering to be the most interesting and feasible.

Those three potential business models were:

Green Carts	Small, stationary mobile markets such as those implemented by the New York City Green Cart Program and the Philadelphia Healthy Cart Program.
Pop-Up Grocery	A food-truck style grocery store that moves from neighborhood to neighborhood, with planned stops each day.
Travelling Market	A small scale, local, cooperatively owned grocery that pops-up in unused community spaces such as kiosks, vacant buildings, farmers market spaces during non-farmers market days, community centers and in low income housing developments. This “flash grocery” could be worker-owner run, member-and community-owned, providing a grocery option in a food desert area.

During our fifth listening session, stakeholders narrowed the potential models further and settled on a Pop-Up Grocery as best fulfilling the project goals of identifying a business model that would (1) increase food access, (2) create economic opportunity, and (3) support local food systems.

b. Impact on Community:

Community stakeholders became more engaged and interested in this project, and everyone who participated in any stage of this project asked to be kept informed of our outcomes. Many individuals and organizations expressed interest in seeing our final study and business plans. In addition, several

community members have signed up for membership in CIE to pursue their own goals of entrepreneurship.

One major impact is the interest of the City of SeaTac, which is an area that has not allowed mobile food businesses or farmers markets in the past. Currently, members of the administration are considering how to change legislation to allow for a Mobile Grocery, and have asked for CIE to attend a city council meeting to present on our findings.

iii. Goal/Objective 3: Develop a feasibility plan and a market assessment culminating in a business plan that serves as the basis for an LFPP implementation grant in 2016 and that includes the following elements:

- Identifies potential markets and cart locations
- Determines the most effective way to recruit potential food cart operators to participate
- Informs the development of the curriculum, toolkit and other resources for first step training and support for participants
- Identifies sources of hyper local, local and regional produce that can be purchased at wholesale prices sufficient to sustain profitable operations
- Describes the cooperative's operational and logistical requirements
- Identifies potential food hubs to serve as commissaries and provide access to wholesale local produce

a. Progress Made:

CIE has completed a feasibility study, plan, and market assessment, and produced a for Pop-Up Grocery, a mobile food business. The feasibility report and business plan are available on request and online at <http://www.cie-nw.org>. The feasibility study and business plan include information on community and stakeholder engagement, as well as a plan that was used to create a proposal for implementation funding. Included in the report is information about:

- The problem of food access, producer markets, and entrepreneurship in South King County,
- Description of Pop-Up Grocery (PUG), a mobile grocery business proposed for South King County,
- Market, operational, and geographic feasibility,
- Business model alternatives, including sole proprietorship, for profit business, and hybrid for-profit/nonprofit model,
- Discussion of cooperative development and worker-ownership as part of mission and operations,
- Financial feasibility and projections showing profit after three years of subsidized operations,
- Outreach and marketing plans including commitment from community organizations and existing grocery cooperatives to assist with outreach to their client bases,

- Resources for purchasing from hyper-local, sustainable, healthy food producers, including preliminary discussions of purchasing for PUG, and
- Locations for PUG to operate, as well as store food and vehicles.

b. Impact on Community:

- Increased interest in using entrepreneurship as a way to address issues such as food security in low income areas of South King County,
- Interest from groups such as the Food Innovation Network in using research and feasibility study as the basis for future projects,
- Commitment from Delridge Grocery Cooperative to host the first PUG cohort and to assist with continued outreach and operations,
- Commitment from Lifelong’s Chicken Soup Brigade to allow PUG to use kitchen space, storage space, and to assist with operations advice as PUG moves toward implementation,
- The ongoing interest of over 70 individuals in being part of a PUG cohort and a founding worker-owner.

2. Quantify the overall impact of the project on the intended beneficiaries, if applicable, from the baseline date (the start of the award performance period, September 30, 2015). Include further explanation if necessary.

- Number of direct jobs created: Because this was a planning project, no direct jobs have yet been created. During the implementation state, we estimate that 12 jobs will be created.
- Number of jobs retained: Because this was a planning project, no direct jobs have yet been retained.
- Number of indirect jobs created: Because this was a planning project, no indirect jobs have yet been created.
- Number of markets expanded: Because this was a planning project, no markets have been expanded, although the purpose of this planning project was to develop new markets and plans are now in place to expand those markets at the implementation phase.
- Number of new markets established: We estimate that during the implementation stage, this project will reach 7-10 new markets.
- Market sales increased by \$NA and increased by NA%.
- Number of farmers/producers that have benefited from the project: Farmers and producers have benefited from the conversations sparked by this project, and by the availability of the final feasibility study and business plan to incorporate into their own operations if desired. Whether this has led to an increase in sales at this time is unknown.

a. Percent Increase: NA

3. Did you expand your customer base by reaching new populations such as new ethnic groups, additional low income/low access populations, new businesses, etc.? If so, how?

Throughout the project period, CIE was able to reach into communities that we had limited stakeholder feedback from previously, specifically the SeaTac Latina community, the East African immigrant community, and hyper-local food production community such as farmers active as part of Pike Place

Market, ROAR, and local Farmers Markets. As part of the survey process, we visited grocery stores in food desert, low-income areas of South King County and were able to speak one-on-one with many individuals who had not yet heard of CIE and our free business support services.

4. Discuss your community partnerships.

i. Who are your community partners? CIE works with over 50 community partners. The partners who were directly involved in this project were:

- a. Lifelong and Chicken Soup Brigade
- b. Food Innovation Network
- c. Global to Local
- d. Delridge Grocery Cooperative
- e. Lutheran Community Services
- f. Got Green
- g. Mercy Housing
- h. Pinchot University
- i. Seattle King County Public Health
- j. City of SeaTac
- k. City of Tukwila
- l. Seattle Tilth
- m. City of Seattle
- n. Pike Place Market
- o. Northwest University
- p. South East Effective Development
- q. 21 Acres/Puget Sound Food Hub
- r. WSDA
- s. ROAR
- t. Steer Wheel Farm
- u. Martin Family Orchard
- v. Northwest Cooperative Development Center

ii. How have they contributed to the overall results of the LFPP project?

Partners assisted with outreach to the community around listening sessions and survey recruitment. Each of these organizations either shared information about our listening sessions with their own clients or provided direct feedback as we worked through the planning process. Lifelong passed out information about our surveys and listening sessions as part of their food distribution activities. The Food Innovation Network heard monthly updates at steering committee meetings, and forwarded information to stakeholders about the project. Delridge Grocery provided feedback, technical information, and committed to being part of the implementation project moving forward. Pike Place Market, Mercy Housing, Lutheran Community Services, ROAR and Seattle Tilth assisted with organizing and hosting listening sessions. The Cities of SeaTac, Tukwila, and Seattle provided feedback and technical information. Northwest University provided the format for a listening session embedded in one of their classes on public administration. 21 Acres, Puget Sound Food Hub, Steer Wheel Farm, and Martin Family Orchard assisted with pricing information, and technical feasibility. Got Green and South East Effective Development provided information around specific community needs and outreach.

- iii. How will they continue to contribute to your project's future activities, beyond the performance period of this LFPP grant?

If implementation funding is secured, **Lifelong's Chicken Soup Brigade** has committed to providing a total of \$105,000 in in-kind support for three years (\$35,000 per year) through food storage space, vehicle storage space, and classroom use. In addition, the director of Chicken Soup Brigade will provide coordination and technical support valuing \$10,500 over three years.

Northwest Cooperative Development Center has committed to providing 80 hours per year of technical advising to the project team and participants.

Global to Local has committed to providing technical advice and support to the project, through the use of classroom space, Community Food Advocate outreach and support, and networking opportunities and introductions to other community partners.

As part of the Food Innovation Network, CIE will leverage the resources of FIN and FIN's network of 14 member organizations to outreach and involve the community in next steps of the project. CIE will continue to report on the status of this project at FIN steering committee meetings, through FIN's newsletter and social media outlets, and at FIN-sponsored networking events.

Delridge Cooperative Grocery will support this project through sharing their own work in the Delridge area of Seattle, a food desert and underserved community, as well as hosting the first PUG worker-owner cohort as part of their own operations.

Other organizations that we partnered with through the planning project are also standing by and waiting to hear how they can support this project through the implementation phase.

5. Are you using contractors to conduct the work? If so, how did their work contribute to the results of the LFPP project?

This planning project was completed purely making use of existing CIE staff time.

6. Have you publicized any results yet?* Yes.

- i. If yes, how did you publicize the results?

We are offering the complete feasibility study and on our web site at <http://www.cie-nw.org>. Press releases and email updates are ongoing, and a sample press release can be found at <http://www.cie-nw.org/blog/2015/12/11/green-cart-cooperative-to-bring-healthy-food-to-king-county-food-deserts>.

To whom did you publicize the results?

CIE partners and stakeholders who also forwarded information about the project to their clients and stakeholders, regular CIE and Pinchot University newsletters, local blogs such as West Seattle Blog, SeaTac Blog, and The B-Town Blog (Burien), and newspapers such as the News Tribune collection of neighborhood papers, Seattle Weekly and The Stranger. We also gave presentations at various events and were active in resource fairs.

- ii. How many stakeholders (i.e. people, entities) did you reach? Over 3500 individuals.

*Send any publicity information (brochures, announcements, newsletters, etc.) electronically along with this report. Non-electronic promotional items should be digitally photographed and

emailed with this report (do not send the actual item).

7. Have you collected any feedback from your community and additional stakeholders about your work? Yes.
- i. If so, how did you collect the information? We collected feedback through interviews, as part of the listening sessions, at an open house feedback session, and through surveys.
 - ii. What feedback was relayed (specific comments)?

“We know the farmers market is better, but it is more expensive and difficult. The grocery store is better because it is cheaper and we can find more things. I would shop at Renton (Farmers Market) if it was cheaper and not so far away from my home. A food cart would make it easier for my family.”

“The closest thing to here is 7-Eleven. They only really have bananas and apples. My 7-Eleven has Injera but definitely no greens. I would rather buy from people I know.”

“I would be very comfortable if I knew the persons name and they spoke my language. The person at Sars knows my name and knows what I like.”

“A mobile grocery store would be good if it had things I want: injera, greens, cabbage, cactus. If it was safe.”

“I would like it if the cart had food from my home country.”

“Thank you for speaking Spanish with us.”

“I like that you asked these questions here, by where we live.”

8. Budget Summary:
- i. As part of the LFPP closeout procedures, you are required to submit the SF-425 (Final Federal Financial Report). Check here if you have completed the SF-425 and are submitting it with this report:
 - ii. Did the project generate any income? No
 - a. If yes, how much was generated and how was it used to further the objectives of the award?

9. Lessons Learned:
- i. Summarize any lessons learned. They should draw on positive experiences (e.g. good ideas that improved project efficiency or saved money) and negative experiences (e.g. what did not go well and what needs to be changed).

The method of using listening sessions within the community to help guide the project was extremely helpful. We started the project with an idea of what the proposed implementation project might be (a cooperative of food cart operators), but because we were open to, and in fact reliant on, community feedback and design within the communities we were attempting to reach, we quickly realized that there were intrinsic problems with that business model. Individuals told us concerns about security, about

being able to earn enough in sales to make a difference in their households, and about the practicalities of shopping around for the best price and whether a particular outlet is more convenient or not.

We also learned that there are some mental models within the community around whether such a project would work. We heard concerns about feasibility from individuals involved in food justice, neighborhood development, and farmers' market organizations. We were warned that the project might not be economically or culturally feasible, so we focused our following listening sessions and research on learning what the barriers might be and using design and systems thinking within the community to develop a plan that felt more feasible to all stakeholders.

Another lesson that was solidified for us was that there are many more barriers to starting a food distribution business than simply offering business training and support: immigration rights, earning a living wage, family issues, language and cultural barriers all play into whether a family or individual chooses to start a business. While our thesis is that entrepreneurship creates community wealth, we also know that there are more issues that come into play that are beyond the scope of this planning project.

- ii. If goals or outcome measures were not achieved, identify and share the lessons learned to help others expedite problem-solving:

As we advise our clients who are planning businesses, we also needed to pivot and change our priorities quickly. When we realized that there was a resistance to helping us organize listening sessions in neighborhoods that already felt a bit of fatigue around being surveyed again and again around food security issues, we went back to the studies that those other surveys had supported. In some demographics, we learned that it worked best to coordinate with community leaders to gather a group together, for example a healthy food club based at a low income housing complex created a rich opportunity to talk about food, entrepreneurship and community wealth. However, we also realized that such groups were slightly biased (a healthy food club is already thinking about and dedicated to the idea of health and healthy food).

- iii. Describe any lessons learned in the administration of the project that might be helpful for others who would want to implement a similar project:

Strong recordkeeping is essential in a planning product such as the Green Cart Cooperative Planning Project. Not only keeping good records and notes, but also keeping citations and organizing research is extremely important. Follow-up with groups and individuals who provided early feedback and interviews solidified that we were focusing our planning in the right direction and helped us gain even richer knowledge around planning for our implementation project.

10. Future Work:

- i. How will you continue the work of this project beyond the performance period? In other words, how will you parlay the results of your project's work to benefit future community goals and initiatives? Include information about community impact and outreach, anticipated increases in markets and/or sales, estimated number of jobs

retained/created, and any other information you'd like to share about the future of your project.

CIE has applied for an implementation funding for this project from the USDA to further this LFPP work.

- ii. Do you have any recommendations for future activities and, if applicable, an outline of next steps or additional research that might advance the project goals?

Our next step will be to further work on implementation plans, including operational steps, training, recruitment of individuals and communities, hiring staff to act as program manager and a trainer, and to form the first cohorts of worker owners, as seen below in an excerpt of implementation draft timeline:

October 2016: Press release announcing program launch

October 2016 – January 2017: Recruit first cohort

December 2016: Develop dashboard and make available to program participants and other stakeholders, secure facilities, develop and update curriculum, recruit business manager.

January 2017: Planning training and beginning training.

March 2017: Identifying farmers and food hubs, negotiate purchasing agreements, obtain all necessary licenses and permits, create marketing materials, soft launch.

April 2017: Official launch of mobile grocery.

September 2017: Breakeven of mobile grocery.

October 2017: Begin repeating process for second cohort, first cohort continues to receive support and technical assistance from CIE.