



# **GOOD FOOD FOR ALL**

**ADDRESSING INJUSTICE IN THE US  
AND OHIO FOOD CHAIN**



**GOOD FOOD FOR ALL:  
ADDRESSING INJUSTICE IN THE US AND OHIO FOOD CHAIN**

By the  
Cincinnati Interfaith Workers Center

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**SECTION ONE 01** Executive Summary

**SECTION TWO 02** Brief History of US Food Policy and Food Chain Justice Advocacy to the GF2P

**SECTION THREE 05** Nutrition

**SECTION FOUR 07** Sustainability

**SECTION FIVE 09** Valued Workforce

**SECTION SIX 10** Local Economies

**SECTION SEVEN 11** Animal Welfare

**REFERENCES 14**

## **SECTION ONE** Executive Summary

The US food industry is a crucial component of the US economy. The US food industry employs millions of workers and has a significant impact on the environment and the health of the citizenry. Despite the importance of the food industry, sites of injustice pervade the food chain, placing workers in precarious positions, threatening the effects of climate change, and compromising the welfare of animals and the health of the public. Food chain reforms are desperately needed to protect workers, the economy, the environment, and public health.

The following pages detail sites of injustice in five focal areas, each of which permeates the US food chain: nutrition, sustainability, the workforce, local economies, and animal welfare. Each section details the problems associated with each of these five focal areas, describes how these problems pervade the food chain, highlights examples of these forms of injustice in the Ohio food chain, and explains how the Good Food Procurement Program (GF2P) has strategically designed benchmarks to address these injustices. Section Two describes the public health threats associated with the lack of nutritious food, the medical costs that are a consequence, and how the GF2P's Nutrition benchmarks promote healthier consumption practices. Section Three describes the environmental impact of the agricultural industry and how the GF2P's Sustainability benchmarks promote sustainable and efficient agricultural practices that are significantly less harmful to the environment. Section Four describes the precarious conditions many food chain workers face and how the GF2P's Valued Workforce benchmarks improve working conditions and pay. Section Five describes how little food from local sources is actually consumed, how the demand for local food is increasing, and how the GF2P can induce increased consumption of locally sourced foods. Section Six describes the miserable conditions animals suffer in the current US food chain and how the GF2P's Animal Welfare benchmarks can improve their conditions.

Section One begins with a brief history of US school food policy and food chain justice advocacy up to the GF2P. Section One explains why a strategic focus on schools can effect important change in consumption practices. Section One also explains how the structure of the GF2P makes it one of the most comprehensive food reform policies to date and how the GF2P has a capacity to make improvements not only at the strategic focal site of schools, but also at other sites of food procurement. Finally, Section One highlights the GF2P's flexibility and responsiveness to regional variation in the food chain.

The GF2P is a promising food chain reform that is uniquely capable of addressing the many sites of injustice described throughout this report. Its comprehensiveness is evident in the report itself as well as the structure of its compliance benchmarks and system of improvement incentives. The adoption and implementation of the GF2P in Cincinnati is a most significant step to take towards improving the Ohio food chain, protecting worker's rights, energizing the local economy, and respecting the environment.

## **SECTION TWO** Brief History of US Food Policy and Food Chain Justice Advocacy to the GF2P

The history of public school food policy in America is labyrinthine. A series of post-depression era reforms culminated in the passing of the National School Lunch Act (NSLA), a bill Truman signed into law in 1945. The bill was first introduced by General Lewis B. Hershey, who testified before the House Agriculture Committee that same year, informing Congress that the military was turning away as many as forty percent of draftees due to poor health. Congress acted quickly, with bipartisan support, for a bill with dual purposes: to improve the health and well-being of school children and to increase domestic consumption of agricultural commodities. The bill has had a profound and lasting effect. Today's schools continue to receive subsidies and surplus commodities from the USDA, provided they are compliant with nutrition standards and serving low cost and/or free lunches to socioeconomically disadvantaged children (<http://www.fns.usda.gov/nslp/national-school-lunch-program-nslp>). The agricultural commodities are surplus stock, called "entitlement foods," purchased to support the agricultural sector (<http://www.cnie.org/NLE/CRSreports/06Dec/RS20235.pdf>). 72% of these stock "entitlement foods" are meats, eggs, and cheese. The remaining 28% of foods are fruits, limited to apples, oranges, and pears, and vegetables, limited to beans, processed tomato products, potatoes, and corn (U.S. Dep't of Agriculture. Food & Nutrition Serv., *USDA Foods Available for School Year 2010—Schools and Institutions*).

The largest and most substantial addition to the NSLA came with the Childhood Nutrition Act of 1966. The act established milk and breakfast programs as well as preschool programs and assistance programs for the many school food programs (Mortazavi, 2011, 1707). The act also granted the Secretary of Agriculture the power to restrict students' access to so-called "competitive foods," or foods that compete with federally funded meals," such as candy, soda, and other "junk food" sold in schools by corporations, such as Coca-Cola. Some schools, pinched by a lack of funds and having long turned to "competitive foods" for financial support to provide students with additional food, lobbied Congress to repeal the power of the Secretary to restrict access to those foods. Congress responded in accord, only to reinstate the Secretary's power later. However, in 1983, a D.C. district court, delivered a devastating blow to the power in the landmark case *National Soft Drink Association v. Block*, arguing that the USDA's efforts to restrict competitive foods in schools fell outside the federal mandate as delineated by Congress.

The next, and most recent, effort to improve childhood nutrition came on December, 30 2010, when President Barack Obama signed the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act (HHFKA) into law. Essentially a reauthorization of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, HHFKA expanded a number of key federal regulations and nutrition standards long sought after by child health advocates, including the long-coveted ability of the USDA to regulate competitive foods. To curb consumption of those foods, the HHFKA expanded the power of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) to regulate all foods sold on school campuses regardless of time of day, effectively overturning *National Soft Drink Association v. Block*. Other focal areas of the HHFKA included expanded nutritional standards, such as a requirement that all juice drinks sold on school campuses contain 100% juice, a requirement to reduce sodium content, a requirement to provide only fat-free or low-fat milk, a requirement that students take a serving of fruits and vegetables with all school meals, and a requirement that schools serve only whole-grain wheat products, among others.

As with previous efforts to expand federal regulations and improve nutritional standards, the passing of the HHFKA was met with political opposition. Small groups of students took to social media to express their displeasure with the new school lunches, using the tags #ThanksMichelleObama and

#BrownBagginIt (<http://eagnews.org/more-students-say-thanksmichelleobama-photos-show-mystery-mush-paltry-lunches/>). The story was quickly picked up by the Drudge Report. One surprising critic of the HHFKA was the School Nutrition Association. Formed in 1946 with the merger of the Food Service Directors Conference and the National School Cafeteria Association, the School Nutrition Association (SNA) was instrumental in Michelle Obama's Let's Move campaign's efforts to improve childhood nutrition, which culminated in the passing of the HHFKA. However, in 2014, the SNA began lobbying Congress for a waiver exempting some schools from the improved nutrition standards set out by the HHFKA (<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2014/06/12/school-lunch-nutrition-vote/10394667/>). Of particular consternation for schools, the SNA argued, was the expanded regulations on competitive foods. The SNA's about-face caused a rift to emerge within its own ranks, as members began circulating and signing a letter of opposition to the SNA's newfound support of school exemptions (<http://cfpa.net/childnutrition/help-support-new-school-meal-standards>). However, in December 2014, as part of the 2015 fiscal omnibus package, Congress passed the waivers, permitting some school districts to opt of whole-grain requirements and improved sodium restrictions, effectively neutralizing the expanded regulations over competitive foods, which often fail to meet the original standards of the HHFKA.

In September 2015, the HHFKA expired. The school meal programs the HHFKA funds do not require their reauthorization, but the expiration of the HHFKA has presented lawmakers with the opportunity to draft fresh legislation. On April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016, Congressman Todd Rokita (R) of Indiana introduced the Improving Child Nutrition and Education Act of 2016 (<https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/5003>). Among other things, the bill repeals Section 5 of the Richard B Russell National Lunch Program, which increases funding for schools participating in the nutrition programs established by the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 by half a cent per lunch provided through the program.

Outside of the federal legislature, a number of grassroots efforts to reinforce and build on the progress made by the HHFKA have emerged in the past few years. School Food Focus, a national collaborative, works to connect the "demand and supply sides of school food...so that every child in the U.S....has access to delicious, nutritious school meals" (<http://www.schoolfoodfocus.org/>). Real Food Challenge targets universities as sites where "the power of youth...may be leveraged to create a healthy, fair and green food system" (<http://www.realfoodchallenge.org/>). These efforts help buffer the USDA's Healthier US School Challenge, a voluntary certification program that gives awards and grants for compliance with the standards and requirements of the School Breakfast Program and National School Lunch Program (<http://www.fns.usda.gov/hussc/healthierus-school-challenge-smarter-lunchrooms>).

Perhaps the most comprehensive effort is the Good Food Procurement Program (GFPP). Created by the LA Food Policy Council in 2012, the GFPP is a value-driven food procurement policy centered on five focal values: local economies, nutrition, environmental sustainability, valued workforce, and animal welfare. To design the program, the LA Food Policy Council brought together a coalition of stakeholders from the Food Chain Workers Alliance, corporate food service professionals, local farmers, county health officials, and others. The coalition researched extant food policy programs, finding that an emphasis on nutrition and local sourcing left a number of lacunas and sites of urgent concern unaddressed. Reflecting the diverse array of contributors, the working group for the food policy council drafted a more extensive and comprehensive food procurement program. Once the program was finalized, it came before the LA city council and was unanimously approved on October, 24<sup>th</sup> 2012. With the help of an executive order by

the LA mayor, a number of institutions, including LA Unified School District, have adopted the program with welcome results. The Center for Good Food Purchasing reports that LA Unified School's adoption of the program has created over 150 new jobs, saved tens of millions of gallons of water, and reduced meat procurement by 15% (Center for Good Food Purchasing, 2016).

Consistent with its aim of having a comprehensive effect on the food chain, the GFPP requires its partners to commit to all five value areas. To be a certified "Good Food Purchaser," an institution adopting the program must be baseline compliant, or adopt a plan to become baseline compliant, with all five focal values, thereby preventing food procurers from passing off costs on one value area for compliance with another. The program articulates two additional compliance levels for each of the five focal values, providing opportunities for partnering institutions to earn additional points. This opportunity is reinforced through the availability of bonus points, which an institution can earn by crafting procurement policies that meet desirable benchmarks beyond those specified in the three compliance levels. And while certification demands commitment to all five value areas, the program is significantly flexible insofar as it permits partnering institutions to earn additional and bonus points for meeting benchmarks in one particular value area.

The GFPP is significant insofar as it buffers and reinforces the nutrition standards as set out by the HHFKA. To be baseline compliant with nutrition value, an institution must comply with, or adopt a plan to become compliant with, 13 out of 25 listed benchmarks. The benchmarks include a competitive foods restriction to "remove candy bars, cookies, chips, and beverages with added sugars...from checkout register areas/point-of-purchase" ([http://www.thegreenhorns.net/wp-content/files\\_mf/1396804772goodfood.pdf](http://www.thegreenhorns.net/wp-content/files_mf/1396804772goodfood.pdf)). Benchmarks also target sodium reductions, increased fruit/vegetable procurement, reduced meat procurement, shifts to 100% fruit juice, among others. Importantly, many of these benchmarks circumscribe nutrition standards explicated in the HHFKA, and some of these benchmarks circumscribe standards Congress chipped away at, as described earlier.

A significant advantage of the GFPP is the program's capacity for both universal application and local modification. In 2015, the LA Food Policy Council authorized a non-profit organization called the Center for Good Food Purchasing (CGFP) whose aim is to create a national network of Good Food Purchasers. The CGFP measures compliance progress and works with institutions to develop compliance plans and protocols and the universal application of the GFPP extends to the content of the program itself. Many of the GFPP benchmarks rely on third-party certifications that are already universal in character. For example, upper level compliance with the environmental sustainability and animal welfare value areas include earning third party certifications, such as the USDA Organic certification, Non-GMO Project certification, the Food Alliance certification, the Animal Welfare Approved certification, among others. Similarly, compliance levels for the valued workforce area include a baseline compliance level circumscribing existing domestic labor law and upper levels include a Fair Trade certification and a Food Justice certification, as awarded by the Agricultural Justice Project.

These certification and universal compliance targets are balanced with a unique capacity for local modification. For one, the GFPP "can be implemented on a place-based basis rather than an institution-sector basis" (Stoscheck, 2016, 4). In fact, the CGFP's efforts to nationalize the GFPP have targeted cities, such as Oakland, Cincinnati, and the Twin Cities in Minnesota. This is in contrast to other food reform efforts that focus on one particular type of institution, such as public schools or universities, as described earlier. And the GFPP also permits some modifications to the content of its benchmarks. For example, the

CFGP permits locations to modify the definition of a local source to fit the unique needs of a particular location. The CFGP permitted Chicago advocates of the GFPP to modify the Los Angeles standard defining a local source as within a 200-mile radius to a source within a 250-mile radius. Twin Cities advocates suggest a similar definition, given that a 200-mile radius “would cut out the Northwestern agricultural district” and ignore Minneapolis Public Schools precedent (Stoscheck, 2016, 44).

### **SECTION THREE** Nutrition

The past few decades have been witness to a growing public health threat in the United States. According to U.S. Department of Health and Human Services reports, the number of overweight adults has tripled and the number of overweight children has doubled since 1980 ([http://aspe.hhs.gov/health/reports/child\\_obesity/](http://aspe.hhs.gov/health/reports/child_obesity/)). A 2006 Center for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that one-third of American children are either overweight or obese (NHANES 2003-06). The potential economic cost of the public health threat is staggering. The annual cost of obesity related medical expenses is a towering \$150 billion and the annual cost of direct medical treatments for childhood obesity alone is \$3 billion (Nutrition Standards in the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs, 76 Fed. Reg. 2494, 2539). In the state of Ohio, obesity-related medical expenses account for 10% of all medical costs (Trogon et al, 2012). Ohio obesity prevalence among grade school children is consistent with the nation average, with just over one-third of Ohio school children overweight/obese- numbers that are higher for Hispanic children (Ibid.).

These factors signify a momentous need to make fundamental changes throughout the food supply chain. One place where policy changes are likely to have significant impact is in childhood nutrition. Childhood is both a time when habits are formed and when federal programs can have the greatest impact. The “federal child nutrition program feeds over 50 million children a day,” which makes “a focus on child nutrition...the best allocation of government resources and nutrition regulation” (Mortazavi, 2011, 1702).

In the past century, the US federal government adopted a number of reforms designed to impact childhood nutrition. (For more on the history of that legislation, see Section One of this document.) The most recent Ohio state effort came on June 18, 2010 when Governor Ted Strickland signed the Healthy Choices for Healthy Children Act into law. The law requires schools to procure food in consultation with the USDA guidelines for healthy eating, to establish half-hour exercise programs, and to restrict the sale of beverages with added sugars, such as soda pop. The bill also established the Healthy Ohio Advisory Council to monitor and regulate foods and beverages in the state.

Outside of federal and state legislatures, a number of grassroots efforts to reinforce and build on the progress made by the federal government have emerged in the past few years. School Food Focus, a national collaborative, works to connect the “demand and supply sides of school food...so that every child in the U.S....has access to delicious, nutritious school meals” (<http://www.schoolfoodfocus.org/>). Real Food Challenge targets universities as sites where “the power of youth...may be leveraged to create a healthy, fair and green food system” (<http://www.realfoodchallenge.org/>). These efforts help buffer the USDA’s Healthier US School Challenge, a voluntary certification program that gives awards and grants for compliance with the standards and requirements of the School Breakfast Program and National School Lunch Program (<http://www.fns.usda.gov/hussc/healthierus-school-challenge-smarter-lunchrooms>).

The GF2P's stated Nutrition goal is to "promote health and well-being by offering generous portions of vegetables, fruit, and whole grains while reducing salt, added sugars, fats, oils, and red meat consumption" (LA Food Policy Council, Good Food Purchasing Guidelines). The GF2P's nutrition benchmarks involves 25 different targets. To be a certified "Good Food Purchaser," an institution must adopt an implementation protocol to become compliant with 15 out of the 25 benchmarks. To reach Level Two compliance with the Nutrition value area, a partnering institution must adopt an implementation protocol to become with at least 16 out of the 25 benchmarks and to reach Level Three compliance, a partnering institution must adopt an implementation protocol to become compliant with all 25 benchmarks.

GF2P Nutrition benchmarks include the following:

25% of food procurement must come in the form of fruits, vegetables, and whole grains

Prioritize 100% fruit juice

Procure 50% of beverages with fewer than 25 calories per 8 ounces

Require drinking water to be offered

Eliminate the use of hydrogenated and partially hydrogenated oils for cooking/baking

Eliminate the use of deep-frying

Remove candy bars, cookies, chips, and beverages with added sugars from checkout/register areas

Develop a worksite wellness program including nutrition education for employees and/or patrons

Among others (see Good Food Purchasing Guidelines for More)

A significant advantage of the GF2P is its flexibility with respect to how institutions become compliant with its benchmarks. By enabling partners, to choose the benchmarks that are most feasible for them, the GF2P accommodates regional needs and variation amongst its partners. Institutions can identify benchmarks that they are already compliant with under state or federal law and utilize those forms of federal and state compliance in developing an implementation protocol for the GF2P. For example, federal law (see Section One of this document on the HHFKA) directs schools to purchase 100% fruit juice drinks. And the State of Ohio's Healthy Choices for Healthy Children law requires schools to restrict students access to beverages with added sugar. Because the GF2P includes both of these targets as Nutrition benchmarks in its policy program, the GF2P recognizes good purchasing policies in place and rewards institutions for existing compliance with those policies.

## **SECTION FOUR** Sustainability

Current global industrial production provides for the consumption of more natural resources than the Earth is capable of regenerating (Fagan 20008). This problem is compounded by the exploding global population, which is expected to increase by more than 2 billion people over the next fifty years (US Census Bureau, 2004), and by the fact that the available land and water needed to sustain the global population is certain not to increase (Connor & Minguez, 2012). In fact, the available land for food production is likely to decrease given current trends in urbanization, pollution, and land erosion (IAASTD, 2009). The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) estimates that the per person land area available to produce food decreased from 1.30 to .72 hectares in the forty years between 1967 and 2007 (FAO, 2010). Currently, about 40% of ice-free land is already appropriated for agricultural industry (Ramankutty et al, 2008). In fact, agriculture is the most dominant use of land on Earth (Tilman et al, 2011).

The two trends of increased population growth and decrease in available agriculture land make it the case that “land and water will become even more precious as resources” and that “there will be intense competition for different agricultural uses” (Albajes et al, 2013). The problem deepens when the negative environmental impacts of many current agricultural practices are considered. Current agricultural practices erode and salinate the soil, make use of exorbitant amounts of water, and rely heavily on green-house gas emitting fossil fuels (GO-Science, 2011). The FAO estimates that water use grew more than twice the rate of population increase in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and that in the coming decades billions of people will be living in conditions of extreme water scarcity or extreme water stress (FAO, 2007). Run-off from the agricultural industry can have deleterious effects on nearby ecosystems. Phosphorus run-off from agricultural production sites can cause eutrophication of lakes resulting in fish kills and harmful blooming of algae (Carpenter, 2005). Eutrophication of water sources causes an increase in water purification costs. Agriculture can also produce excessive amounts of nitrogen waste, which when converted into nitrous oxide by denitrifying bacteria contributes more greenhouse gas to the atmosphere.

Many of these negative environmental impacts can be seen in the state of Ohio. The Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) has observed high numbers of fish deformities in the Little Miami River and found that these deformities were correlated with increased amounts of phosphorus in the water (OEPA, 2000). The eutrophication of water sources due to nutrient enrichment from run-off is also associated with algae blooms, a significant problem for Lake Erie. Chang & Bayes (2013) found that cropland and strip mine areas are “erosion hotspots,” or places where soil erosion is particularly extensive. Erosion of soil is a particular challenge, given the need for efficient uses of land, and it accounts for approximately \$36.7 billion in productivity losses in the US alone (Lang, 20006). Ohio agriculture is also a significant contributor of greenhouse gas emissions as it is a significant component of the Midwestern agricultural sector, which is witness to “the greatest rates of expansion and intensification” of nitrogen and other greenhouse gases emitting production (Nicholas Institute, 2011, 26).

The GF2P’s Environmental Sustainability Purchasing Goals are divided into five categories: fruits and vegetables, milk and dairy, meat and poultry, seafood, and grains. The GF2P specifies benchmarks for three compliance levels for each category. The Level One Fruits & Vegetables baseline involves an agreement to participate in the Stewardship Index for Specialty Crops or to receive a PRiME score with no high risk components for Integrated Pest Management. The Stewardship Index for Specialty Crop is an

evaluative tool that measures a farm's water use efficiency, energy use, nitrogen use, phosphorus use, and the organic material in the farm's soil. PRiME is an online evaluative tool developed by Oregon State and the University of Arizona that ranks pesticide products relative to their impact on the environment. The Level One Milk & Dairy baseline requires the procurement of products containing no antibiotics and no Rbgh/RBST hormones. The Level One Meat & Poultry baseline requires the procurement of one of the following: cage-free eggs, pasture raised meat, USDA grassfed meat, or antibiotic free meat. The Level One Seafood baseline requires institutions not procure seafood listed as "Avoid" in the Monterey Bay Aquarium's Seafood Watch Guide (see Appendix). And the Level One Grains baseline requires the procurement of pesticide free grains.

The Level Two Sustainability targets involve procuring food from sources that are certified by a number of third-party groups. The Level Two Milk & Dairy baseline involves the procurement of either Non-GMO Project Verified products or Animal Welfare Approved products, the Level Two Grains baseline involves the procurement of Food Alliance Certified or Non-GMO Project Verified products, and the Level Two Meat & Poultry baseline involves the procurement of either AGA Grassfed, Non-GMO Project Verified, or Animal Welfare Approved products. The Level Two Seafood baseline involves purchasing of "Good" and "Best" choices as listed in the Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Guide. The Level Two Fruits & Vegetables baseline involves one of the following: the adoption of annual improvement targets in accord with the Stewardship Index for Specialty Crops, the procurement of Project Harvest certified products, Non-GMO Project Verified products, or Food Alliance Certified products.

Level Three benchmarks involve procurement of food from sources with similar certifications. The Level Three Fruits & Vegetables, Milk & Dairy, Meat & Poultry, and Grains benchmark involve purchasing USDA Organic products or either Biodynamic certified (Fruits &Vegetables) or Food Alliance certified (Milk & Dairy/Meat & Poultry) products. The Level Three Seafood baseline involves the procurement of either 100% of fish listed as "Best Choice" in the Monterey Bay Aquarium's Seafood Watch Guide or Marine Stewardship Council certified products.

The GF2P has adopted these benchmarks given their capacity to ameliorate many environmentally devastating impacts of current industry practices. The PRiME Pest management scores as well as the Stewardship Index for Specialty Crops involve monitoring of pesticides and other chemicals used by the agricultural industry while the Protected Harvest certification awards points for decreased use of toxic pest and weed management materials and the Biodynamic certification ensures products are free of synthetic pesticides and fertilizers. Many of these substances are also absent from USDA Organic products. Their restricted use is reinforced in the Food Alliance certification, which also involves the monitoring of soil and water use and habitat and biodiversity conservation as well as specific labor standards for agricultural workers.

## **SECTION FIVE** Valued Workforce

The US food industry (including food production, processing, distribution, and retail/service) contributes over 13 percent to the US Gross Domestic Product and sells approximately 2 trillion dollars in goods and services annually (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2007). The US food industry is one of the largest employers in the country. Including positions in food production, processing, distribution, and retail/service, the US food industry employs approximately 20 million people, or one-sixth of the entire workforce in the country (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010).

Workers in the US food industry face serious human rights abuses that disproportionately affect immigrants and people of color. Food industry workers are subjected to substandard wages and poor working conditions. The majority of food workers qualify for government subsidies and use food stamps at double the rate of the rest of the US workforce (Ibid.). More than 86 percent of workers in the food industry earn low or poverty wages, and people of color are most often impacted by these unjust wages. In fact, African-Americans and workers of Asian and Latino heritage are more likely to hold low-paying positions than white workers. These jobs include “Back of House” roles, such as barbacks, dishwashers, line chefs, etc. This racial disparity exists in fields of agricultural farms in California to fisheries in the Gulf of Mexico as well (Food Chain Workers Alliance, 2012).

The food industry employs approximately 500,000 in the food preparation/service sector of the state of Ohio alone. Ohio food preparation/service workers earn an average wage of \$10.29 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, Food Preparation and Service Related Occupations). That average is only slightly above the living wage for a single adult and significantly below a living wage for an adult with at least one child (MIT, Living Wage Calculator). The food industry employs approximately 2,000 farmworkers and laborers and approximately 4,500 workers in farming, fishing, and forestry occupations (Bureau of Labor Statistics, State Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates Ohio). These workers earn an average of \$12-\$14, livable wages for single adults, but below the livable wage estimates for adults with at least one child (MIT, Living Wage Calculator).

The GF2P’s Valued Workforce benchmarks include a requirement that partnering institutions procure food from a distributor with a policy to respect the freedom of association of farmers, ranchers, and fisherfolk and to procure food from vendors and supplier that sign an agreement to comply with domestic labor law and the standards of the International Labor Organization (ILO). The ILO’s standards include the freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining, the elimination of forces of forced and/or compulsory work, the abolition of child labor, and the elimination of employment discrimination. Level Two Valued Workforce compliance requires institutions to procure food from vendors that have signed a social responsibility policy, which includes a commitment to providing non-poverty wages, a commitment to respect collective bargaining rights, a commitment to provide safe working conditions, health care benefits, paid sick days, and profit sharing with employees. Level Three compliance requires institutions to procure food from vendors and suppliers that have a union contract with their employees, are a worker-owned cooperative, have signed the CIW Fair Food Supplier Code of Conduct, are Food Justice certified by the Agricultural Justice Project, or are Equitable Food Initiative certified.

By requiring partnering institutions to procure food from distributors, vendors, and suppliers that meet the GF2P’s compliance benchmarks, the GF2P serves to protect the health and well-being of all food

chain workers, from production to consumption. By challenging the corporate misconduct that impacts communities across the country, institutions will have to meet standards in their sourcing efforts to ensure the safety and welfare of the workers.

## **SECTION SIX** Local Economies

The United States Farm Act of 2008 defines local food as any food product consumed less than 400 miles from its site of origin or is consumed in the state of origin (Martinez et al, 2010). In recent years, the market demand for local food has significantly increased. According to the USDA, the number of farmers' markets in its National Directory of Farmers' increased by five times between 1994 and 2013 and increased 3.6% from 2012 to 2013 alone. The USDA estimates that, in 2007, direct-to-consumer sales totaled \$1.2 billion dollars, or approximately twice the amount sold in 1997 (USDA, Economic Service Report).

Ohio residents purchase \$29 billion of food each year, but \$26 billion of that food comes from sources outside of the state (Cincinnati Union Cooperative Initiative). A recent study identified 80 growers in the southwest of Ohio and found that among 45 growers in the state of Ohio and Indiana 59% either grow organically or naturally. The survey also found that fruit/vegetable production could be increased by 31% in the two years following the study, which was conducted in 2012 (Ibid.).

The GF2P's Local Economies baseline requires partnering institutions to procure food from local, defined as within 200 miles, sources or outside of the 200-mile range, but from medium scale operations, or from out of the state, but from small scale operations. The Level Two baseline requires partnering institutions to procure food from medium scale operations within 200 miles or from outside of the 200-mile range and from small scale operations. The Level Three baseline requires partnering institutions to procure food from small scale operations within 200 miles.

As indicated in Section One, the Center for Good Food Purchasing has accepted changes to the Local Economies benchmarks, given regional variation. Minnesota has modified the definition of local to 250-miles to accommodate precedent and to include a significant agricultural sector of the region that would otherwise be excluded (Stoscheck, 2016). However, the definition of local need be modified, the GF2P's Local Economy benchmarks induce an increase in demand for nearby food and smaller scale operations.

## **SECTION SEVEN** Animal Welfare

Each year in the United States, billions of animals are killed and prepared as food (Fetissenko, 2011, 151). In Ohio alone, millions of animals are killed for the purpose of feeding humans (USDA-NASS, 2015). In the state of Ohio, over 1 million cows, 2.5 million pigs, 80 million chickens, 5 million turkeys were commodified and held as property for the purposes of food production in 2015 (USDA-NASS, 2015). Many of these animals are kept in animal feeding facilities (AFFs) where they are confined for months and kept in debilitating conditions. As of 2009, the state of Ohio contained more than 180 such AFFs (Morrow et al, 2013, 8). There are two major types of AFFs that require permits distributed by the Ohio Department of Agriculture: Concentrated Animal Feeding Facilities (CAFFs) and Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency considers CAFOs polluters and requires all such operations to obtain permits and be subjected to two annual state department inspections, but CAFFs are only required to obtain such permits if they are classified as “mega” or “large facilities” (Ibid.).

The agricultural industry is a significant component of the Ohio economy, contributing over \$70 billion and comprising approximately 13% of the state’s total economy (USDA-NASS, 2009). Animal agriculture constitutes a significant portion of this sector. In some Ohio counties, the average dairy cow herd per farm is four times larger than the US average (Bender, 2003, 73). And in some counties, the “total liveweight pig production per farm” is “about twice as great” as the US average (Bender, 2003, 74). For these counties, animal food products can account for as much as 90% of the economic value of all agricultural products in the county (Bender, 2001).

The state of Ohio has adopted a number of animal cruelty statutes, but many exempt species subjugated in the animal agriculture industry. For instance, Ohio Statute 959.13 forbids persons from keeping animals “other than cattle, poultry or fowl, swine, sheep or goats in an enclosure without wholesome exercise and change of air” (National Agricultural Law Center). Protections under federal law are similarly scant and even minor provisions are ineffective at improving quality of life for animals in the animal agriculture industry. There are documented instances of USDA inspectors being fired for enforcement of welfare laws. In one such instance, a USDA inspector was fired for trying to protect animals being skinned alive (Cox, 2002).

The practice of animal agriculture pervades the US food chain system despite the fact that consumption of animal food product is not necessary for optimal human health, regardless of stage of life (Craig & Mangels, 2009). In fact, the animal agricultural industry presents serious difficulties for human health. Residents living near AFFs are at risk for a number of respiratory issues, including wheezing and coughing (Cole et al, 2000; Donham et al, 2007). And these symptoms are reported as more severe by those who live near an AFF than by those who do not (Wing & Wolf, 2000). The health impact of animal agriculture extends to consumers as well. According to the American Dietetic Association, a vegetarian diet is associated with lower risk of ischemic heart disease, lower cholesterol levels, lower rates of type 2 diabetes, a lower body mass index, and lower overall cancer rates (Position of the American Dietetic Association, 2009).

The practice of animal agriculture is also environmentally devastating. Manure overflow and runoff from fields near AFFs poisons water supplies and results in the death of fish (US EPA, 2009). The production of livestock generates an exorbitant amount of greenhouse gases, such as methane, carbon dioxide, and nitrous oxide, compared with that generated by a vegan diet (Eschel & Martin, 2006, 9).

According to the Worldwatch Institute, animal agriculture is by far the leading contributor of greenhouse gases to the environment (<http://www.worldwatch.org/agriculture-and-livestock-remain-major-sources-greenhouse-gas-emissions-1>). The production of animal food products is also excessively wasteful. The production of a pound of animal protein requires as much as 17 times more land than is required to produce a pound of soy protein (Reijnders & Soret, 2003). This is largely due to the fact that raising a pound of animal protein requires the production of soy protein that humans could otherwise directly consume were they to adopt a plant-based diet. As such, the shift to a plant-based food system does not require “large investments of capital, creation of massive new infrastructure, or development of new technologies that may not be ready for years” (Fetissenko, 2011, 169). Although such a shift does require intensive changes in consumer patterns, political will, and regulatory bodies.

The GF2P’s Animal Welfare compliance levels involve two tracks: one for milk and dairy and one for meat and poultry. The Level One baseline compliance for milk and dairy requires institutions to purchase USDA organic milk or milk from pastured cows. The Level One baseline compliance for meat and poultry involves compliance with Step One of Global Animal Partnership or the purchasing of USDA meat and poultry or the purchasing of cage-free eggs or the purchasing of pastured beef. Level Two compliance requires the purchasing of American Humane certified milk and dairy and the purchasing of meat and poultry that is either American Humane certified or is compliant with Step Two of the Global Animal Partnership’s 5-Step Animal Welfare rating. Level Three compliance requires the purchasing of Animal Welfare Approved or Humane Raised and Handled milk and dairy and the purchasing of Animal Welfare Approved or Humane Raised and Handled or Step Three of the Global Animal Partnership’s 5-step Animal Welfare rating compliant meat and poultry.

The USDA Organic certification requires year-round access to “the outdoors, shade, shelter, exercise areas, fresh air, clean water for drinking, and direct sunlight” (USDA, Agriculture Code of Federal Regulations, Title 7, Section 205.239). “Access to the outdoors...means that a producer must provide livestock with an opportunity to exit any barn or other enclosed structure” (NOP, Policy Memorandum 11-5). The provision does not “require...a specific space or stocking rate requirement” (Ibid.). The USDA Organic certification does require “ruminant livestock” to “have free access to certified organic pasture for...at least 120 days” (USDA, Organic Livestock Requirements).

The American Humane certification requires animals have access to adequate food and water so that they are “free from hunger, thirst, and malnutrition. The certification also requires confined animals to have adequate space so that they are afforded “sufficient freedom of sideways movement...and sufficient room to lie down and freely stretch their limbs.” Cattle “must have access at all times to a lying area...of sufficient size to accommodate all cattle lying down together in normal resting posture.” Specific chicken requirements include a mandate that chickens arriving at “processing facilities” “be slaughtered...no later than 10 hours after arriving” and that processed birds “not be suspended for more than 90 seconds before they are stunned” and prepared for “bleeding,” a process in which the suspended and stunned bird’s arteries and jugular veins are severed. Dairy cow requirements include a mandate that “no more than 2% of all cows...have very pendulous udders or broken udder suspension,” among others (American Humane Certified, Animal Welfare Standards).

The Animal Welfare Approved certificate requires all animals have “access to clean, fresh water at all times” and a diet that promotes the health of the animal. The certification requires cattle and pigs to have “continual outdoor pasture access” and prohibits the use of confinement systems, such as “in-house

or field-based pens or cages” for chickens. Chickens “must have space to fly, run, and stretch their wings” and they must have “continuous access to at least 4 square feet of range and foraging area.” The Animal Welfare certificate also prohibits “all mutilations or physical alterations.” Additional care and maintenance restrictions prohibit handlers from using hot prods or electric shocks to handle animals as well as a requirement that handlers maintain a threshold body score, which rates the health of animals, for all animals. And the certification requires all slaughterhouses to pass a review by the Animal Welfare Approved program for compliance with the American Meat Institute’s slaughtering standards (Animal Welfare Approved, Standards).

The Humane Farm Animal Care/Humane Raised and Handled certificate requires all animals to be a fed a “wholesome diet” and “have continuous access to an adequate supply of clean, fresh drinking water at all times.” The certificate requires “beef cattle” have “continual access to the outdoors” with “sunshades” and “access at all times to a lying area which is...of sufficient size to accommodate all cattle lying down...in normal resting posture.” Confinement for “cattle” is prohibited and housed “cattle” must have “sufficient freedom of sideways movement,” “room to lie down,” and “room to rise and turn around.” The certificate prohibits all surgical alterations of chickens and requires chickens have “sufficient freedom of movement” “to be able to...stand normally, turn around and stretch their wings.” The certification does not require that chickens “have access to range,” but “provisions must be made to keep indoor chickens active by enriching their environment.” Pigs must be “provided with a total floor space no less than 1.5 times their minimum lying area” and “must be free to turn around without difficulty at all times.” Pigs must also have “access to straw or other suitable media” and access to “chains, balls, and materials such as rope” for environmental enrichment. The certificate requires all slaughter systems to follow the American Meat Institute guidelines for “processing” and that processors be “audited by Humane Farm Animal Care Inspectors” (Humane Farm Animal Care/Humane Raised and Handled, Our Standards).

Finally, the Global Animal Partnership’s 5-Step Animal Welfare rating involves a first step that prohibits crates and confinement systems for pigs and chickens and requires “cattle” to spend at least 2/3 of their life on range or pasture. Step Two requires environmental enrichment materials for pigs and slight increases in space for chickens. Step Three requires at least two types of environment enrichments be provided for chickens and “continuous unobstructed access to the outdoors during daylight hours” for pigs. Step Four requires “cattle” spend at least ¾ of their life on range or pasture, requires pigs to live continuously on pasture, and space increases for chickens. Step Five prohibits physical alterations for all animals and requires cows to live continuously on pasture, and increases space for chickens. All steps require animals be provided daily food and water and handled in a manner that does not cause harm.

## REFERENCES

- Albajes, R., Cantero-Martinez, C., Capell, T., Christou, P., Farre, A., Galceran, J., Lopez-Gatius, F., Marin, S., Martin-Belloso, O., Motilva, Ma-J., Nogareda, C., Peman, J., Puy, J., Recasens, J., Romagosa, I., Romero, Ma-P., Sanchis, V., Savin, R., Slafer, G.A., Soliva-Fortuny, R., Vin, I., & Voltas, J., (2013). Building bridges: an integrated strategy for sustainable food production throughout the value chain. *Molecular Breeding*, 32, 743-70.
- American Humane Certified, Animal Welfare Standards. Retrieved from <http://humaneheartland.org/our-standards>
- Animal Welfare Approved, Standards. Retrieved from <http://animalwelfareapproved.org/standards/list-of-standards/>
- Bender, M.H. 2001. An economic comparison of traditional and conventional agricultural systems at a county level. *Amer. J. Alternative Agric.* 16:2±15.
- Bender, M.H., (2003). Animal Production and farm size in Holmes, County Ohio and US Agriculture. *American Journal of Alternative Agriculture*, 18 (2), 70-9.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, US Department of Labor, (2010). Occupational Employment Statistics, National Sector NAICS Industry Specific Estimates. Retrieved from: [http://www.bls.gov/oes/oes\\_dl.htm](http://www.bls.gov/oes/oes_dl.htm)
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, US Department of Labor, (2007). US Economic Census for total sales for NAICS codes 311, 722, and 445. Retrieved from: [http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2007/full\\_report/volume\\_1\\_Chapter\\_1\\_Us/st99\\_1\\_001\\_001.pdf](http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2007/full_report/volume_1_Chapter_1_Us/st99_1_001_001.pdf)
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, US Department of Labor, (2015). Food Preparation and Service Related Occupations. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes350000.htm>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, US Department of Labor, (2015). State Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates Ohio. Retrieved from [http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes\\_oh.htm#45-0000](http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_oh.htm#45-0000)
- Carpenter, S.R., (2005). Eutrophication of aquatic ecosystems: Biostability and soil phosphorus. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102 (29), 10002-5.
- Castillo, A. & Nettles, M. F. (2011). *The impact of healthy menu choices on school nutrition programs*. University, MS: National Food Service Management Institute.
- Cole, D., Todd, L., & Wing, S. (2000). Concentrated swine feeding operations and public health: A review of occupational and community health effects. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 108(8), 685–699.
- Chang, T.J., & Bayes, T.D., (2013). Development of Erosion Hotspots for a Watershed. *Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering*, 1011-17.
- Cincinnati Union Cooperative Initiative. Cincinnati Food Hub Feasibility Study.
- Connor, D.J., & Minguez, M.I., (2012). Evolution not revolution of farming systems will best feed and green the world. *Global Food Security*, 1, 106–113.

- Cox, P. (2002). *You don't need meat*. New York, NY: Thomas Dunne Books/St. Martin's Press.
- Craig, W., & Mangels, A. (2009). Position of the American Dietetic Association: Vegetarian diets. (2009). *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 109(7), 1266–1282.
- Donham, K., Wing, S., Osterberg, D., Flora, J.L., Hodne, C., & Thu, K.M. (2007). Community health and socioeconomic issues surrounding concentrated animal feeding operations. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 115(2), 317–320.
- Eshel, G., & Martin, P. A. (2006). Diet, energy, and global warming. *Earth Interactions*, 10 (paper no. 9).
- Fagan, Brian. *The Great Warming: Climate Change and the Rise and Fall of Civilizations*. New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2008.
- FAO (2007) World Water Day 2007. Coping with Water Scarcity Challenge of the 21st Century. FAO: Rome.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) (2010) The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2009. FAO: Rome.
- Food Chain Workers Alliance (2012). The Hand that Feeds Us. Retrieved from: <http://foodchainworkers.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Hands-That-Feed-Us-Report.pdf>
- Fried & Simon. (2007). The Competitive Food Conundrum: Can Government Regulations Improve School Food? *Duke Law Journal*, 56, 1491-1539.
- Global Animal Partnership. The 5-Step Animal Welfare Standards. Retrieved from: <http://www.globalanimalpartnership.org/5-step-animal-welfare-rating-program/standards>
- GO-Science (Government Office for Science) (2011) Foresight. The Future of Food and Farming: Challenges and Choices for Global Sustainability. Final Project Report. The Government Office for Science: London.
- Humane Farm Animal Care/Humane Raised and Handled. Our Standards. Retrieved from <http://certifiedhumane.org/how-we-work/our-standards/>
- International Water Management Institute (2007) Water for Food, Water for Life: A Comprehensive Assessment of Water Management in Agriculture. Earthscan: London and International Water Management Institute: Colombo.
- Lang, S. S. (2006). "Slow, insidious soil erosion threatens human health and welfare as well as environment." Chronicle Online, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.
- Ludwig et al. (2001). Relation Between Consumption of Sugar-Sweetened Drinks and Childhood Obesity: A Prospective, Observational Analysis. *Lancet* 505.
- Martinez, S., M. Hand, M. Da Pra, S. Pollack, K. Ralston, T. Smith, and S. Vogel. 2010. Local Food Systems: Concepts, Impacts, and Issues. United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Report 97, May 2010.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Living Wage Calculator. Retrieved from <http://livingwage.mit.edu/states/39>

Morrow, S.M., O'Quinn, J., Hoet, A., Wilkins, J.R., DeGraves, F., & Smith, K.A., (2013). Complaints Associated with Animal Feeding Facilities as Reported to Ohio Local Health Departments, 2006-08. *Journal of Environmental Health*, 75 (9), 8-13.

Mortazavi, (2011). Are Food Subsidies Making Our Kids Fat? Tensions Between the Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act and the Farm Bill. *Washington & Lee Law Review*, 68, 1699-1735.

The National Agricultural Law Center. Ohio Animal Cruelty States. Retrieved from [nationalaglawcenter.org](http://nationalaglawcenter.org)

Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Nitrogen Use in US Agriculture. October 2011. Retrieved from <https://nicholasinstitute.duke.edu/sites/default/files/publications/greenhouse-gas-emissions-and-nitrogen-use-in-u.s.-agriculture-paper.pdf>.

NHANES 2003-06. Retrieved from [http://www.nchs.gov/nhanes/search/nhanes05\\_06.aspx](http://www.nchs.gov/nhanes/search/nhanes05_06.aspx)

NOP, Policy Memorandum 11-5. Retrieved from <https://www.ams.usda.gov/sites/default/files/media/NOP-PM-15-2-Nanotechnology.pdf>

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency. 2000. Biological and water quality study of the Little Miami River and selected tributaries. Volumes i and II. Ecol Assessment Unit. Monitoring and Assessment Sect, Div of Surface Water, Columbus, OH.

Ramankutty, N., Evan, A.T., Monfreda, C., Foley, J.A, (2008). Farming the planet: 1. Geographic distribution of global agricultural lands in the year 2000. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 22, 1003.

Reijnders, I., & Soret, S. (2003). Quantification of the environmental impact of different dietary protein choices [supplement]. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 78(3), 664s-668s.

Stoscheck, (2016). *Adapting the Good Food Purchasing Policy to the Twin Cities*. University of Minnesota.

Tilman, D., Balzer, C., Hill, J., Befort, B.L., (2011). Global food demand and the sustainable intensification of agriculture. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 108:20260-20264.

Trogon, J.G., Finkelstein, E.A., Feagan, C.W., & Cohen, J.W., (2012). State and payer specific estimates of annual medical expenditures attributable to obesity. *Obesity*, 20 (1), 214-220.

US Census Bureau (2004) Global population profile: 2002. US Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland. <http://www.census.gov/population/international/files/wp02/wp-02.pdf>.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. Organic Standards. Retrieved from <https://www.ams.usda.gov/rules-regulations/organic>

U.S. Department of Agriculture-National Agriculture Statistics Survey. (2009). *2007 census of agriculture (Vol. 1)*. Retrieved from [http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2007/Online\\_Highlights/County\\_Profiles/Ohio/index.asp](http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2007/Online_Highlights/County_Profiles/Ohio/index.asp)

U.S. Department of Agriculture. Organic Livestock Requirements. Retrieved from <https://www.ams.usda.gov/publications/content/organic-livestock-requirements>

US Department of Agriculture, (2010). Economic Service Report. Retrieved from [http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/122864/err97\\_reportsummary\\_1\\_.pdf](http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/122864/err97_reportsummary_1_.pdf)

U.S. Department of Agriculture, (2013). Farmers Markets and Local Food Marketing. Retrieved from <http://www.ams.usda.gov>.

U.S. Department of Agriculture-National Agriculture Statistics Survey. (2015). Retrieved from [https://www.nass.usda.gov/Quick\\_Stats/Ag\\_Overview/stateOverview.php?state=OHIO](https://www.nass.usda.gov/Quick_Stats/Ag_Overview/stateOverview.php?state=OHIO)

USDA, Agriculture Code of Federal Regulations, Title 7, Section 205.239

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2009). *Potential environmental impacts of animal feeding operations*. Retrieved from <http://www.epa.gov/agriculture/ag101/impacts.html>

Wing, S., & Wolf, S. (2000). Intensive livestock operations, health, and quality of life among eastern North Carolina residents. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 108(3), 233–238.

Worldwatch Institute. Retrieved from: <http://www.worldwatch.org/agriculture-and-livestock-remain-major-sources-greenhouse-gas-emissions-1>