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: *(e.g. September 30, 20XX-September 29, 20XX)*	October 1, 2015 – March 31, 2016
Authorized Representative Name:	Christopher Wharton, PhD
Authorized Representative Phone:	602-827-2256
Authorized Representative Email:	cwharton@asu.edu
Recipient Organization Name:	Arizona State University
Project Title as Stated on Grant Agreement:	Food System Sustainability in the Southwest: Developing a Strategy to Enhance Resilience, Livelihoods, and Food Security Across New Mexico and Arizona
Grant Agreement Number: *(e.g. 14-LFPPX-XX-XXXX)*	14-LFPPX-AZ-0006
Year Grant was Awarded:	2014
Project City/State:	Arizona and New Mexico
Total Awarded Budget:	$23,263 (+$7,867 non-federal matching)

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: Develop a web site with asset map-based functionality detailing aspects of the local food system in two states
        a. Progress Made: We completed these maps and now have two functional sites that can be used to search local foods 'assets,' including food hubs, commercial kitchens, farmers markets, and certain aspects of local food production. The Arizona map may be found at: http://www.public.asu.edu/~paihuiyu/FoodWellness/StartPage.html . The New Mexico map may be found at: http://arcg.is/1OBikpX. We are excited to note that in both cases, we went beyond our original goal of simply mapping assets to include what is referred to as a 'story map.' A story map highlights important examples of the local food system and not only maps their location, but provides text and pictures to depict what that site is about. In our case, we believed this was a vital aspect of our mapping as it helped to highlight strategically important examples of local foods ventures in both states and elevated the maps to a tool for strategic planning.
        b. Impact on Community: This mapping technique has been useful for both states' departments of public health. For example, the Arizona map was noted by the Maricopa County Department of Public Health, which can now use it as a tool for its own purposes (including its programs to address food security via local foods). We have also made the tool available to the Maricopa County Food Policy Coalition. In both cases, Arizona State University now has active collaborations with both groups to help move local foods projects forward. The PI on this project, Dr. Wharton, now leads a team who interacts regularly with the coalition. And the Maricopa County Department of Public Health interacts with ASU's Global Institute of Sustainability on local foods projects specifically and on a recurring basis, leading to more projects that will support local foods and food security well beyond the life of this grant. In New Mexico, the New Mexico Data Collaborative, which is connected to the New Mexico Department of Health, is adding these data to their databases for public health use as well (http://nmcdc.maps.arcgis.com/home/index.html).

    ii. Goal/Objective 2: Identify and describe a series of case studies that represent successful models and best practices in relation to local foods, livelihoods, and healthy food access.
        a. Progress Made: We identified interesting models in both states via qualitative interviews and quantitative paper surveys distributed to farmers and other local foods stakeholders. Interestingly, food hubs were identified as an important model to help grow local foods in Arizona. We have a number of quotes from Arizona stakeholders to this effect. In New Mexico, commercial kitchens were noted as opportunities to improve local foods ventures and healthy food access. Quantitative data also revealed that most farmers saw opportunities to grow operations given appropriate training and access to resources, such as land and water. In general, there was optimism about the state of local food systems in the Southwest. All of these data are currently being finalized for at least one,

but possibly two, publications. And, as mentioned, case studies that were examples of success have been described and mapped in state maps noted above. Also, data collected in this project helped inform a book focused on local foods ventures and community development that was co-authored by Dr. Wharton and published in December, 2015 called, "Growing Livelihoods: Local Food Systems and Community Development." The book can be found here and includes one of the case study examples explored in this project: https://www.amazon.com/Growing-Livelihoods-Community-Development-Earthscan/dp/0415727065. Finally, in response to the needs identified by interviewees about training to improve their local food ventures, we conducted a one-day workshop with a well-known 'market farmer,' who runs a successful small-scale farm focused on selling directly to his community. This event (described here: https://sustainability.asu.edu/foodsystems/events/rsvp/profitable-small-scale-farming-2015-10/) was a major success as it brought farmers from New Mexico, Arizona, California, Nevada, Colorado, and elsewhere to learn about small-scale farming. The farmer who ran the workshop also was happy to allow us to record the event, and we've converted the recording into smaller training modules, which will exist on the website above for free and be made available to anyone who wishes to receive the training. This is another example of a deliverable that will have impact well beyond the life of the grant, yet should strategically improve local foods in both states and beyond as it responded to the needs of local foods stakeholders as expressed during data collection for this project.

b. Impact on Community: We believe this is having direct impact on communities in both states given advocacy, public health, and other groups have been using the tools we created to learn about how to support and grow local foods in both states. The book noted above is being used in classrooms and over 250 copies were purchased in the first quarter of 2016. And the modules we've created should continue that impact for years to come.

iii. Goal/Objective 3: Develop a series of outreach deliverables, including reports, strategies, and other tools.

a. Progress Made: A number of deliverables have now been created that we are excited are being used. As noted above, we have asset maps including strategic case studies, scientific publications now being written up from our data collection for the scientific community, a book for the lay public and local foods advocates alike, and training modules to be uploaded shortly to a website for long-term consumption, for free. We also presented these data at a national meeting last year, and we continue to work with community partners developed out of this project who are focused on local foods.

b. Impact on Community: We believe all of these deliverables have strong impact because of the relationships and knowledge developed from this project. In each case, deliverables are being used currently for teaching and learning, development of new local foods projects, and opportunities for new research on local foods livelihoods and food security.

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, 2014). Include further explanation if necessary.

i. Number of direct jobs created: N/A as this was a planning grant.
ii. Number of jobs retained: N/A
iii. Number of indirect jobs created: N/A
iv. Number of markets expanded: N/A
v. Number of new markets established: N/A
vi. Market sales increased by $insert dollars and increased by insert percentage%. N/A
vii. Number of farmers/producers that have benefited from the project: N/A
    a. Percent Increase: N/A

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?
    i. Of course, we were not focused on growing a 'customer base,' but we did include the opinions and needs of multiple local foods stakeholders who represented diversity in gender, race, and ethnicity. For example, see data below:
        a. New Mexico: Workshop (Silver City, NM- March 7, 2015)
            1. 19 total, 9 white male, 8 white female, 1 Hispanic male, 1 Hispanic female.
        b. Arizona: Workshop (Scottsdale, AZ – October 30, 2015)
            1. 71 total (demographics not available, but local foods stakeholders were represented from 5 different states).
        c. New Mexico interview demographics
            1. 5 males and 3 females, including three Hispanic individuals
        d. Arizona: Interview demographics
            1. 8 males and 3 females, including two Hispanic individuals

4. Discuss your community partnerships.
    i. Who are your community partners?
        a. New Mexico: Thornburg Foundation and New Mexico Data Collaborative.
        b. Arizona: Maricopa County Department of Public Health, ASU mapping team for mapping, Maricopa County Food Policy Coalition, Routledge Earthscan (for book)
    ii. How have they contributed to the overall results of the LFPP project?
        a. Thornburg Foundation, in particular, has served to connect our two states and the various local food systems efforts taking place there. They also supported mapping activities, particularly in New Mexico.
        b. Departments of Public Health made practical use of the maps but also extended partnerships to both universities more broadly. Now local foods-specific groups continue work on local foods projects.
        c. The Food Policy Coalition works with Dr. Wharton and ASU to develop new projects and find local foods-focused graduate students for new projects. They allowed Dr. Wharton to come speak at their meetings, which included well over 50 interested local organizations.
    iii. How will they continue to contribute to your project's future activities, beyond the performance period of this LFPP grant?
        a. The Foundation has assisted through ongoing coordination efforts and dissemination of results when they become available.

b. Maricopa partners will provide avenues for results distribution and education. As noted above, students and faculty continue to be involved in new project development.
c. Routledge helps to promote the local foods book and supports efforts to distribute it at appropriate scientific meetings.

5. Are you using contractors to conduct the work? If so, how did their work contribute to the results of the LFPP project?
   i. Not directly. We worked with mapping teams to complete the AZ and NM maps. However, those relationships are complete as the maps now exist. As such, contracted work is finalized and partners simply help to disseminate deliverables as appropriate.

6. Have you publicized any results yet?*
   i. If yes, how did you publicize the results? Yes, but indirectly. Thus far, a local foods book has been published that includes one of the case studies we highlighted in mapping and presentations at conferences. We are currently writing up manuscripts for scientific publication. Also, the maps exist and we have had dozens visit those sites for specific purposes.
   ii. To whom did you publicize the results? To the broad public, but not using data from this project directly. Rather, we highlighted one of the food hub case studies in Arizona, but also, case studies in New Mexico and around the country.
   iii. How many stakeholders (i.e. people, entities) did you reach? Thus far, 250 books have been sold. We also reached dozens of audience members at the conference we presented at.

   *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?
   i. If so, how did you collect the information?
      a. Yes. For example, we did follow-up surveys to see how our trainings were used by participants in an attempt to measure impact. Some results follow:
         1. Of the major tools and ideas presented at the Arizona workshop, between 50-80% of respondents noted that they implemented these techniques in their own practices or planned to in the future.
         2. Also, 75% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the training they attended improved the finances of their operation.
   ii. What feedback was relayed (specific comments)?
      a. We had excellent feedback from our workshops in particular. Here are some example quotes:
         1. "Fantastic and well-presented workshop, would definitely recommend this to anyone that have interest into small- scale farming."
         2. "The value of this workshop is amazing."
         3. "Overall VERY Good! Please, more of this caliber events. Thank you very much!"

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, it did not as it was not focused on that.

a. If yes, how much was generated and how was it used to further the objectives of the award? N/A

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).

a. We learned that strategic models for local foods livelihoods and food security differ by region, even within a similar geography between New Mexico and Arizona. We also learned that despite concerns over some issues (land and water availability, training needs, etc.), some basic training can go a long way to support those trying to have livelihoods in food systems. Also, alternative models can be built to support those producing local foods to help extend their reach to those who may suffer from food insecurity. We also learned, however, that it will be important to consider climate change impacts in the future. In qualitative work, a number of farmers discussed concerns about water availability and even adaptation to temperature irregularities. This will be important to consider even as we look for opportunities in growing markets for local foods.

b. We will look to see how our strategic examples of local foods ventures are utilized over time via the map, online training modules, and book, as well as scientific publications. Outside of relationships built and new projects developed, it is hard to know how these deliverables will have specific impacts, beyond returning Google analytics analyses. However, we believe with the data we have so far that we have extended the lessons we learned from this project quite far.

c. One of the more difficult aspects of the project was attempting focus groups. Farmers are difficult to pin down for interviews given how busy they are, and it proved extremely difficult to pull them together for focus groups. However, our strategy of gathering data via workshops served this need adequately while also providing useful information to farmers and other local foods advocates. We hope to use this strategy in future projects as well.

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

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: If focus groups are problematic, creating workshops that provide immediately useful information to your stakeholders can bring people together in a practical way that also allows for data collection all at once.

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.

a. We've noted a number of deliverables that will live beyond the life of the grant as well as significant relationships that have now been 'institutionalized' as well. We believe these will continue to pay dividends in both states as local foods advocates now have opportunities to work with students and faculty, and learn from deliverables we created, to launch new efforts to bolster local foods livelihoods and food security in Arizona and New Mexico.

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?

a. Yes. We believe it will be useful to conduct further trainings in our states on how to connect to ventures that could make local foods ventures more profitable and extend their reach. For example, in 'new farmer training' programs that are ongoing in both Arizona and New Mexico, it could be useful to teach farmers how to connect to food hubs and build diversified marketing models. It'll also be useful to explore how entrepreneurial efforts related to commercial kitchens (which were noted in New Mexico) could be leveraged in the same way. One interesting example of this, though not in New Mexico or Arizona (but in Colorado so in close proximity) is the Food Corridor, found here: http://www.thefoodcorridor.com/. Future research should consider if and how these models can be replicated and utilized for local foods growth in the future.