Farmers Market and Local Food Promotion Program Outcomes and Indicators

The grant program outcomes and performance measures outlined below reflect direct stakeholder feedback and provide a framework that allows grant recipients to evaluate project activities more accurately in relation to each program’s statutory purpose.

For recipients, the measures are:

- More feasible to accomplish and measure within a grant’s period of performance;
- Better aligned with grant program purpose and recipient activities; and
- More reflective of work performed during the project.

These performance measures will go into effect beginning with the FY2022 grant application cycle.

**Outcome 1: Develop Business Plans and Feasibility Studies**

| 1.1 Number of feasibility studies conducted ___.
| 1.2 Number of the following identified through needs assessment or feasibility studies: |
| | 1.2a New markets ___.
| | 1.2b Unmet consumer needs ___.
| | 1.2c Barriers to local foods ___.
| | 1.2d Unserved populations ___.
| | 1.2e Supply chain gaps ___.
| | 1.2f Partnership opportunities ___.
| | 1.2g Other identified needs ___.
| 1.3 Number of projects: |
| | 1.3a Deemed viable after conducting feasibility study, or ___.
| | 1.3b Deemed not viable after conducting feasibility study ___.
| 1.4 Number of business development plans created ___.

**Outcome 2: Facilitate Regional Food Chain Coordination and Increase Capacity of Direct-to-Consumer Entities**

| 2.1 Total number of partnerships and/or collaborations established between producers/processors and local/regional supply networks ___.
| Of those established: |
| | 2.1a The number formalized with written agreements (i.e. MOU’s, signed contracts, etc.) ___.
| | 2.1b The number of partnerships with underserved organizations ___.
| 2.2 Of the total number of partnerships and collaborations identified in 2.1, the number that reported: |
| | 2.2a Expanded/improved regional food systems ___.
| | 2.2b Higher profits ___.
2.2c More efficient transportation.
2.2d Improved marketing channels.
2.2e Other mid-tier value chain enhancements.

2.3 Total number of stakeholders trained on how to develop or sustain a direct-to-consumer enterprise.
   2.3a Of those trained, the number that are new/beginning producers.

2.4 Number of strategic plans developed or updated.

2.5 Total number of new direct producer-to-consumer market access points established. Of those, the number that were:
   2.5a Farmers markets.
   2.5b Roadside stands.
   2.5c Agritourism.
   2.5d Grocery stores.
   2.5e Wholesale markets/buyers.
   2.5f Restaurants.
   2.5g Agricultural cooperatives.
   2.5h Retailers.
   2.5i Distributors.
   2.5j Food hubs.
   2.5k Shared-use kitchens.
   2.5l School food programs.
   2.5m Community-supported agriculture (CSAs).
   2.5n Other.

Outcome 3: Develop the Market for Local/Regional Agricultural Products

3.1 Number of stakeholders that gained technical knowledge about producing, preparing, procuring, and/or accessing local/regional foods. Of those, the number that were:
   3.1a Farmers markets.
   3.1b Roadside stands.
   3.1c Agritourism.
   3.1d Grocery stores.
   3.1e Wholesale markets/buyers.
   3.1f Restaurants.
   3.1g Agricultural cooperatives.
   3.1h Retailers.
   3.1i Distributors.
   3.1j Food hubs.
   3.1k Shared-use kitchens.
3.1 School food programs ___.
3.1m Community-supported agriculture (CSAs) ___.
3.1n Other ___.

3.2 Total number of delivery systems/market access points that increased engagement with local/regional producers ___. Of those, the number that were:

3.2a Farmers markets ___.
3.2b Roadside stands ___.
3.2c Agritourism ___.
3.2d Grocery stores ___.
3.2e Wholesale markets/buyers ___.
3.2f Restaurants ___.
3.2g Agricultural cooperatives ___.
3.2h Retailers ___.
3.2i Distributors ___.
3.2j Food hubs ___.
3.2k Shared-use kitchens ___.
3.2l School food programs ___.
3.2m Community-supported agriculture (CSAs) ___.
3.2n Other ___.

3.3 Number of new tools/technologies developed to improve local/regional food processing, distribution, aggregation, or storage ___.

3.3a Number of stakeholders trained to use new tools/technologies ___.

3.4 Number of delivery systems/market access points that reported increased or improved:

3.4a Processing ___.
3.4b Distribution ___.
3.4c Storage ___.
3.4d Aggregation of locally/regionally produced agricultural products ___.

3.5 Total number of delivery systems/market access points that established and/or expanded local/regional agricultural product or service offerings ___. Of those, the number that were:

3.5a Farmers markets ___.
3.5b Roadside stands ___.
3.5c Agritourism ___.
3.5d Grocery stores ___.
3.5e Wholesale markets/buyers ___.
3.5f Restaurants ___.
3.5g Agricultural cooperatives ___.
3.5h Retailers ___.
3.5i Distributors ___.
3.5j Food hubs ___.
3.5k Shared-use kitchens ___.
3.5l School food programs ___.
3.5m Community-supported agriculture (CSAs) ___.
3.5n Other ___.

3.6 Number of delivery systems/market access points that reported increased:
   3.6a Revenue ___.
   3.6b Sales ___.
   3.6c Cost savings ___.

Outcome 4: Increase Viability of Local/Regional Producers and Processors

4.1 Number of producers/processors who gained knowledge about new market opportunities ___.

4.2 Number of producer/processors that reported increased engagement with new delivery systems or market access points ___.

4.3 Number of producers/processors that implemented new or improved operational methods ___.

4.4 Number of value-added agricultural products developed ___.

4.5 Number of producers/processors that reported selling new local/regional food products ___.
   4.5a Number that reported selling new value-added products ___.

4.6 Number of producers/processors that reported a reduction in on-farm food waste through new business opportunities and marketing ___.

4.7 Number of producers/processors that reported increased:
   4.7a Revenue ___.
   4.7b Sales, and/or ___.
   4.7c Cost savings due to local/regional food, operational, and/or value-added product activities ___.

4.8 Number of local/regional agricultural jobs ___.
   4.8a Created ___.
   4.8b Maintained ___.

4.9 Total number of new producers who went into local/regional food production ___. Of those, number who are:
   4.9a Beginning farmers/ranchers ___.
   4.9b Socially disadvantaged farmers/ranchers ___.
   4.9c Family farmers/ranchers ___.
   4.9d Veteran farmers/ranchers ___.
5.1 Number of stakeholders that gained knowledge about prevention, detection, control, and/or intervention food safety practices, including relevant regulations to mitigate risk (and to improve their ability to comply with the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA) and/or meet the standards for aligned third party food safety audits such as Harmonized GAP/GHP) ___.

5.2 Number of stakeholders that:
   5.2a Established a food safety plan ___.
   5.2b Revised or updated their food safety plan ___.

5.3 Number of specialty crop stakeholders who implemented new/improved prevention, detection, control, and intervention practices, tools, or technologies to mitigate food safety risks (and/or to improve their ability to comply with the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA) and/or meet the standards for aligned third party food safety audits such as Harmonized GAP/GHP) ___.

5.4 Number of prevention, detection, control, or intervention practices developed or enhanced to mitigate food safety risks ___.

5.5 Number of stakeholders that used these grant funds to:
   5.5a Purchase ___.
   5.5b Upgrade food safety equipment ___.

6.1 Total number of consumers who gained knowledge about local/regional agricultural products ___. Of those, the number of:
   6.1a Adults ___.
   6.1b Children ___.

6.2 Total number of consumers who purchased more local/regional agricultural products ___. Of those, the number of:
   6.2a Adults ___.
   6.2b Children ___.

6.3 Number of additional local/regional agricultural product customers counted ___.

6.4 Number of additional business transactions executed for local/regional agricultural products ___.

6.5 Increased sales measured in:
   6.4a Dollars ___.
   6.4b Percent change ___.
   6.5c Combination of volume and average price as a result of enhanced marketing activities ___.