

OFFICIAL

PROJECT NUMBER: NE- 185

TITLE: COMMODITIES, CONSUMERS, AND COMMUNITIES: LOCAL
FOOD SYSTEMS IN A GLOBALIZING ENVIRONMENT

DURATION: October 1, 1997 through September 30, 2002

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM:

The regional research project proposed below is designed to address the National Research Initiative, "Enhance Agricultural and Rural Economies" from the 1994 ESCOP publication, **Opportunities to Meet Changing Needs**. This initiative is ranked 5th nationally among the 22 program areas and initiatives identified by the state Agricultural Experiment Station Directors. It includes the following three research objectives noted on page 54: 1) Improve domestic market development potential; 2) Provide alternative farm policy options; and 3) Analyze relationships among the general economy, agriculture, communities, and families.

The proposed research will speak to these issues by focusing on the social, economic, and political factors and conditions associated with changes in food and agricultural systems. Specifically, it will examine, document, and analyze the restructuring of local food and agricultural systems in response to increased global and national competition and consolidation. It will also assess and document the strategies that producers, consumers, and communities are using to reestablish and sustain local/community food and agricultural systems in a globalizing environment.

JUSTIFICATION:

Agriculture and food systems in the United States have changed dramatically over the past 50 years. Smaller, family-labor farms have declined substantially in number and larger, increasingly industrial-like operations have become the main source of food and other agricultural products. Technologically sophisticated and highly standardized production techniques have penetrated most segments of production agriculture, and advances in plant and animal sciences have resulted in substantial increases in production. These advances are linked tightly to a narrow range of products (Drabenstott, 1994).

As U.S. agriculture modernized, it also regionalized. Areas that were once characterized by diverse agricultural activities were driven to exploit their 'comparative advantage.' Farmers in the Great Lake States, for example, have established and maintained a niche in dairy production. Producers in the Plains States have been able to raise hogs cheaper than farmers

elsewhere, while farmers in California and several other sunbelt states have used subsidized water and a favorable growing season to become the leading producers of fresh fruits and vegetables. More recently, U.S. regionalization has given way to global regionalization as producers from all over the world participate in an emerging 'global' agricultural marketplace (Goldberg, 1993; Friedland, 1994).

The emerging configuration of farm production in the United States (and the world) has been guided by an agricultural development paradigm grounded in neoclassical economics. At one level, the production function, which describes the economic sustainability of farming as a function of land, labor and capital, has long served as a blueprint for farm management. When put into practice, the neoclassical model has emphasized substituting capital, in the form of machinery, chemicals and other off-farm inputs, for land and labor.

At another level, the neoclassical paradigm treats agriculture as another industrial sector and calls for the introduction of mass production techniques into the agricultural sector, similar to those found in the manufacturing sector. The guiding principles are that production should be concentrated into fewer units to capture economies of scale, machinery should be substituted for labor whenever possible, and the remaining jobs should be routinized to the point that workers within occupational categories become "interchangeable."

Beyond the farmgate, the processing sector of the food industry has also been shaped by neoclassical precepts. Lack of economies of scale has forced many small processors to expand, merge with larger operations, or to go out of business. During the latter half of the 20th century, large, multinational food processors have become dominant in the food sector of the American economy as they have gained control over large segments of the food system. Today, six large multinational corporations account for over 46 percent of the retail purchases of food in the United States. Mass-production manufacturers and mass market retailers provide abundant quantities of relatively inexpensive, standardized products. While these giant food corporations are still forming, their growth and development has shaped local agricultural and food systems in every region of the country.

Today, no region of the United States can be said to be even substantially self-sufficient in food production. Consumers depend heavily on imported products that can be produced only in climates and soils outside of their regions. In many areas of the country, there is little or no locally produced food in commercial channels.

The relationships between large scale, regionally

concentrated agricultural producers, national and multinational food processors and distributors, and the structure of local food systems are complex, geographically dispersed, and heavily influenced by policy. Yet, they are poorly understood. For example, as the agricultural landscape of California changed in the early part of this century to accommodate large scale, corporately controlled fruit and vegetable farms, the number of fruit and vegetable farms in the Northeast declined. At the same time the food system in the Northeast was transformed from a more locally interdependent system of production and consumption to a more globally oriented system where production was uncoupled from consumption. These changes have impacts that go far beyond the agricultural sector. The character and structure of communities are dramatically altered by these trends.

The proposed research will provide critical information about farmers, food and agricultural firms, families, communities and consumers in different locales and with different resources respond to and manage these changes. For example, the question of how individual food choices support or diminish local food systems is of growing concern in the field of nutrition. For consumers and other community stakeholders to support local food systems, desired choices must be consistently available in the marketplace, and be affordable. We presume that the set of influences on individual food choices are many and interact in complex ways, but not much is currently known about these determinants of food choices as they pertain to local versus global food systems. A better understanding of individual's interactions with local and global food systems is necessary to design appropriate education and community intervention strategies.

A community's food and agriculture system as well as its social, political, and economic environment influence both household food decision-making and the foods that are available from which to choose. Likewise beliefs, values and preferences of community stakeholders can influence both the directions of change in food and agriculture system and what it provides to communities. This interaction between households and their food and agriculture system frames the first objective in this study.

Consumers are the last-link of a long commodity chain. Virtually all agricultural commodities are produced by the linking of various actors from researchers to input suppliers, to farmers, processors, wholesalers and retailers through to final consumers. Yet, little is known or understood about the way in which the complex social and technical relations embedded in these choices are maintained or changed.

The second objective of this project will use a social scientific methodology developed over the past 25 years (Goldberg, 1968; Marion, 1986) to describe and explain the

complex paths taken by commodities as they are transformed from production to consumption. Attention will also be paid to the factors, conditions and changes associated with the global and local dimensions of selected commodity systems.

Although the nature and range of agricultural products found in most American communities are shaped by the decisions made by large multinational firms, important environmental, social, political and economic reasons justify the reemergence of a smaller scale, more locally controlled food system. Community supported agriculture (CSA), farmer's markets, specialized agricultural districts, alternative food stores and consumer cooperatives represent important manifestations of a newly emerging type of agriculture that is taking shape throughout the U.S. These new organizational forms have the potential to nurture local economic development, maintain diversity and quality in products, and provide forums where producers and consumers can come together to solidify bonds of local identity and solidarity. By rebuilding the linkages between commodity production and consumption wherever possible, communities throughout the United States will establish a foundation for a more socially and environmentally integrated food system.

A third objective of this project will examine how local and global dimensions of the food and agricultural system are being organized at the community level. The domains of the local and global sectors will be assessed. Areas of social and economic complementarity and competition between the global and local dimensions of the agricultural and food system will be evaluated.

A collaborative, multi-state, multi-disciplinary approach to all of these issues is central to this research as changes affecting food and agricultural systems are complex and national in scope. Because local food and agricultural systems vary both within and across states, efforts to untangle the social, economic, and political dimensions of these changes will be significantly enhanced by taking a regional approach. Regional differences will provide opportunities for making contrasts that could not be made within one state. Comparing communities, consumers, and commodities will enable us to understand how the local, national and global forces in agricultural and food systems operate across a broad and diverse range of state contexts and will allow for more robust models to be developed.

This research addresses several program areas ranked highly by both ECOP and ESCOP. In addition to representing the issues identified by the Agricultural Experiment Station Directors in the ESCOP publication, "Opportunities to Meet Changing Needs" (see Statement of Problem), this proposal is central to a new national CSREES initiative, "Managing Change in Agriculture." The CSREES initiative is designed to assist ... "people, firms, and communities make important strategic decisions that will

enable them to manage successfully during this period of change." Among other things, the Managing Change in Agriculture Initiative seeks to:

- *Develop effective strategies to adjust to change*
- *Develop integrated systems approaches*
- *Carefully evaluate and adopt technology*
- *Choose survival and growth options using innovation and science-based knowledge*
- *Understand and participate in resolution of public issues involving trade-offs between economic returns, environment, community, and other concerns.*

This research project also relates to the National Research Initiative (NRI), specifically, to the Markets, Trade and Rural Development area. Each of the four subareas listed under Markets, Trade and Rural Development are related to this project:

- *assessment and evaluation of the sustainability implications for new production and marketing technologies on the surrounding environment and rural economies*
- *development of innovative research concepts and methods, data sets and/or their application to further the understanding of how technical, economic, and institutional factors affect the competitiveness of the U.S. agricultural, aquacultural, and forest product sectors in domestic and international markets*
- *understanding forces affecting rural areas*
- *designing new approaches to rural development*

This research will help identify practical ways for rural communities to establish and reinvigorate local agricultural economies. The information generated can be used by Cooperative Extension, community agricultural development groups, state agencies, and local governments to develop programs and institute policies based on informed decision-making that promote local agricultural entrepreneurship.

Farmers and smaller-scale food processors will benefit from the information we will gather from consumers about the demand for locally grown and processed food. Agricultural producers and processors will be better able to match what they produce and process to the demands in their local markets. Consumers will also benefit from this research. Their wants and demands will be measured and analyzed. Barriers to satisfying consumer demands will be identified and strategies to overcome these barriers will

be explored.

In sum, this project will add to our scientific base by creating a better understanding of the local and global dimensions of the U.S. food and agricultural system. We will identify the structural transformations taking place in the U.S. food and agricultural system, examine the forces behind these changes, and evaluate the strategies that producers, processors, consumers, households, and communities are using to manage these changes. Other research projects dealing with specific commodities (e.g., dairy, apples, corn, etc.), production practices, or the competitiveness of U.S. agriculture will benefit from the results of this project.

RELATED CURRENT AND PREVIOUS WORK:

A search of the Current Research Information System (CRIS) and other research data bases was undertaken to identify current or recently completed projects addressing the following topics: local food system(s), global food system(s), community food system(s), local agriculture, global agriculture, community agriculture, commodity system(s), commodity chain, commodity subsector. This search uncovered several projects that speak to different aspects of the agricultural and food system. However, only a few are directly relevant to the research proposed here.

A Hatch project in New York (Gillespie, Hilchey, and Lyson, 1996) is designed to identify, examine, and compare the economic and geographic spaces occupied by large-scale, globally oriented agricultural producers and smaller scale, community integrated agricultural entrepreneurs. Measures of community welfare and socioeconomic well-being associated with each type of agriculture are being examined. This research is confined to New York State and deals primarily with agricultural production and not with the distribution and consumption aspects of the food system.

In New York, results of a survey of 500 northeasterners were used to provide background support for the development of a Regional Food Guide (Wilkins, 1995). Respondents expressed a preference for locally produced foods as well as reducing the cost and resources used to transport food from great distances, the preservation of the region's farmers and farmland, and their role as individuals in maintaining this agriculture. Nearly all respondents (98.2 %) agreed that keeping farms viable in the Northeast is important and 97% noted that buying local produce is an effective way to keep farms viable in the northeast.

Another New York project (Bills and Boisvert, 1996) has been designed to estimate the relationship between production agriculture and the wider New York economy in the major economic regions of the state. This is a highly technical, econometric

analysis of how the agricultural sector links to other economic sectors in the state and will result in a set of economic multipliers for different agricultural activities. It does not address the social and community linkages of farming and food production.

Researchers at the University of Maryland (Falk and Brinsfield, 1996) are documenting the historical changes in agriculture on Maryland's Eastern Shore, with particular attention given to the rise of the poultry industry from 1970 to 1990. These researchers are concerned with documenting the degree to which local labor markets changed as prevailing forms of agriculture changed. While this research relates to some of the social and community dimensions associated with agriculture and food system changes, it is not a comprehensive treatment of these issues.

Several other state-level projects have examined agriculture and community linkages. A project in Missouri (Gilles, 1993) used survey data from two agriculturally dependent towns to examine the relationship of export agriculture to community vitality. In California, a recently completed project (Rudy, 1995) examined changes in agriculture and rural communities in the Imperial Valley. The relationship of sustainable agricultural practices to the viability of rural communities is the focus of a Minnesota project (Levins, 1996). Finally, an Idaho project (Harp, 1996) is centered on modelling the relationship between social well-being of rural communities and the structure of the local economic base. All of these projects deal with only one or two communities and none treat the agricultural and food system comprehensively.

Researchers at the Economic Research Service (Brown, Henderson and Majchrowicz, 1994) examined the relationships between production agriculture and farm inputs, processing and marketing, and other agribusiness industries giving special attention to the metro/nonmetro distribution of these industries. However, this research did not account for variation in the structure and dynamics of the food and agricultural system across a range of different community contexts.

Several state-level projects touch on different aspects of local food and agricultural systems. The role of cooperatives in rural community development was the topic of a recently completed project at the University of Wisconsin (Cropp, Acton and Cottingham, 1994). Research at the University of Vermont (Kolodinsky, 1996) is focusing on factors related to the decision to join a CSA (community supported agriculture). In New York (Gillespie, 1996) attention is being directed at the role small-scale food processors play in sustainable agriculture systems.

The global aspects of food and agricultural production are the focus of research projects underway in several states. In New

York (McMichael, 1996), research will develop a systematic comparative analysis of the regional and global institutional forces affecting the structure and trajectory of the U.S. farm sector. In Missouri (Heffernan, 1996), an on-going research project is documenting the process of vertical and horizontal integration of the global food system and attempting to discern the effects of the globalization process of local agriculture and rural communities. A second Missouri project (Bonanno, 1996) deals with farmers' perceptions of the globalization process.

While numerous studies have examined specific types of farms as well as specific commodity price structures and policies, only a few have studied entire commodity systems with local development and equity as central issues of concern. Most of the projects focus on only a very limited set of aspects of the commodities examined. For example, Davis (1995) proposes to develop and test export market assessment models for dry beans. Similarly, Ray (1993) proposes to develop a linear programming model of agricultural policy. Yonkers and Ford (1991) are working on developing a model of factors influencing profitability in the dairy industry. Ricks (1993) is examining the competitiveness of the US fruit and vegetable production system. Anderson, Gates and Wessels (1991) are working on an analysis of strategies used by firms operating in the food system.

Although there are many regional research projects with a commodity focus, virtually all of these projects deal with the economic or technical aspects of the commodity (see for example, NC-186 -- Structural Changes in the U.S. Grains and Oilseeds Marketing System in a Dynamic and Global Marketplace; NC-119 -- Dairy Herd Management Strategies for Improved Decision Making and Profitability; or NE-177 Organizational and Structural Changes in the Dairy Industry). Similarly, regional projects dealing with the food system have a decidedly economic focus to them (i.e., NE-165 Private Strategies, Public Policies, and Food System Performance).

The recently completed regional project S-246 (The Transformation of Agriculture: Resources, Technologies, and Policies) was designed to examine the consequences of agricultural restructuring on farms, families, communities and society. While this project addressed some of the issues related to farming and community linkages, it did not deal with food system issues comprehensively at the local level, nor did it address the linkages between global and local food systems.

No current or recent regional research project takes into account the social, economic, and political factors and conditions associated with changes in food and agricultural systems and examines the restructuring of local food and agricultural systems in response to global and national trends towards increased competition and consolidation. And no regional or state projects

are assessing and documenting comprehensively the range of strategies that farmers, food and agricultural firms, households, communities, and consumers are using to sustain local food and agricultural systems in a globalizing environment.

OBJECTIVES:

Objective 1: Document and assess how social, economic, political forces influence the interaction between community stakeholders, consumers and the local and global food system. (IA, KS, MO, NJ, ME, NY, PA, TX, WA, WI)

Objective 2. Identify, examine and assess the factors, conditions, and changes associated with the global and local dimensions of selected commodity systems (inputs, production, processing, and consumption). (IA, KS, MI, MO, NC, NY, TX, WA, WI, Wallace Institute)

Objective 3. Examine and analyze the local and non-local components of community food systems and quantify the economic and social contributions of local food systems to their communities. (CA, IA, KS, LA, MO, NJ, NY, PA, PR, TX, WI, WV)

Objective 4: Collaborate with ongoing educational efforts to enhance the viability of local food systems. (IA, KS, ME, MI, MN, MO, NC, NJ, NY, PR, TX, WI)

PROCEDURES:

Objective 1: Document and assess how social, economic, political forces influence the interaction between community stakeholders and the local and global food system.

The procedures for this objective are designed to answer the following questions:

What do people in representative communities think about their food system/supply?

What are people's understandings of where their food comes from?

From community members' perspectives, what factors have most greatly shaped the current food and agriculture system? (Specifically, what influences access, to availability of, affordability of and appropriateness of commodities in the food supply?)

What are community members' perceptions of what the "ideal" food system would look like and what do they see as barriers

to achieving this.

How do community members understand the local vs. global issues and implications of the current food system?

To what extent do people think local food and agricultural systems should be maintained? If so, what steps would people take to redevelop local food and agricultural systems?

The procedures will characterize individuals according to how they interact with the food system (Typologies). Differences in community groups will be determined with respect to adoption and non-adoption of behaviors related to food production and consumption.

Focus group interviews will elicit the underlying issues and themes related to community member interactions with the food system. Stakeholder groups including buyers, local government officials, growers, retailers, and consumers will be identified for this part of the study. Interviews will be structured for each individual group.

Under the coordination of New Jersey, a semi-structured interview guide will be developed for each stakeholder group. The guide will be used by all states participating on this objective. Questions included will cover local foods, the food and agriculture system, use of local/seasonal foods, access to the food system, interactions with the food system, influences on food decision-making, and the importance of localized systems. Qualitative methods will be used for data analysis. Each participating state will conduct focus group interviews with the same stakeholder group types.

A second set of interviews will be conducted to more precisely define emerging themes as well as to gain insight into people's willingness to consider alternate scenarios. The second phase will utilize participatory action research (PAR) techniques to gain group consideration of incorporating the food system into other community activities. For this phase, "contexts" will be developed that allow different groups to consider localized food systems within non-traditional contexts.

Objective 2: Identify, assess, and examine the factors, conditions, and changes associated with the global and local dimensions of selected commodity systems (production, processing, consumption).

Participating states will select commodities for study based both on these commodities' significance for the US food and agricultural system, their significance for the researchers' home states, and on the competencies and interests of the researchers.

Among commodities to be selected are: grapes (Cornell), tuna (Missouri), beef cattle and wheat (Kansas), chickens (Missouri), soybeans (Michigan), and canola (Michigan). Michigan State will coordinate this objective.

A uniform set of quantitative data for the post World War II period (approximately 1945-present) will be assembled in each state for each commodity. In addition, historical data prior to 1945 will be assembled as needed to explain the structure and trends of each particular commodity system. Data now identified for collection and the uses to which they will be put include:

(1) Data from the censuses of manufacturing, wholesale and retail trade, and transport on economic concentration ratios by SIC code will be used to examine the changes in economic concentration at each stage of the commodity system (i.e., inputs, production, processing, distribution, etc.).

(2) Data on employment and reporting units from County Business Patterns will reveal the changing spatial distribution of a given commodity system as well as production unit size.

(3) Data from the Census of Agriculture on characteristics of each producer's commodity and localities of production will permit a similar spatial and temporal analysis for the production aspect of each commodity system.

(4) USDA data on farm-retail price spreads for each commodity will permit documenting the distribution of value among the major sectors in the system.

(5) Consumption data for each commodity will be gathered from Bureau of Labor Statistics market basket studies, industry trade association reports, USDA nutrition studies and other relevant sources so as to produce a picture of domestic consumption over time.

(6) In addition, historical and contemporary qualitative data will be gathered for each commodity on standards, technology, policy, and other issues.

First, changes in each of three types of commodity standards (governmental, industry, and private). The industry impact of changes in standards will be examined through a review of trade magazines and other relevant trade publications. This will permit researchers to gain an understanding of the interests and issues involved in changes in standards and how changes in standards have affected commodity system organization.

Second, major technological changes that have affected each commodity that will permit researchers to examine how these technical changes have affected commodity system organization.

Third, agricultural and food policy changes that relate to each particular commodity and that will permit researchers to see how policy changes relate to each commodity system.

Finally, in-depth interviews with key informants in each commodity system will permit researchers to gain an understanding of the dynamics of each commodity system.

Furthermore, in addition to the in-depth studies of selected commodities, The Wallace Institute will engage in a statistical review of changes in commodity system organization among a wide range of major commodities at the national level. This will permit researchers in each state to assess the degree to which changes in a particular commodity system fits a general pattern or has specific unique characteristics. It will also facilitate theorizing why different groups of commodity systems display different historical trajectories of development.

We stress that a central part of the analysis under this objective will be the comparison of the selected commodity systems as well as the comparison of trends and changes in particular commodities with the overall trends for major commodities. These comparisons will permit the researchers to make variable what must be constant in any study of a single commodity. For example, the import of the physical characteristics of the commodity (e.g., fresh produce versus grains) and the social organization surrounding it (e.g., vertical integration vs. an open market) can only be understood when multiple commodities are compared. In addition, participating researchers will take advantage of their dispersed locations to assist each other by conducting interviews with key informants from commodity systems other than the one they are studying.

Objective 3: Examine and analyze the local and non-local components of community food systems and quantify the economic and social contributions of local food systems to their communities.

To understand the structure and dynamics of the local and global components of a community food system, each participating state will select as study sites at least three counties (or regions), representing different degrees of urbanization and farming. A selection protocol will be established to insure that each participating state identifies counties in which the local and non-local aspects of community food systems can be identified and evaluated. It is expected that one of the study sites in each state will represent large urban communities and high value farming, a second will represent a mix between rural and urban populations and a diverse farm base, and a third will be highly rural with a strong agricultural base.

Special attention will be paid to identifying and assessing the linkages between local production and local consumption within each county. This has two parts: 1) direct marketing; and 2) local food processing and delivery systems. In direct marketing, farmers' markets, roadside stands, u-pick operations, community gardens and community supported agriculture are important manifestations of the linkage between production and consumption. Such outlets are often overlooked when 'official' statistics about the food system are collected. Data on this segment of the food system will be collected from available secondary sources such as county planning offices, chambers of commerce, Cooperative Extension offices and from key informants in each county.

In local food processing and delivery systems, food processing enterprises and wholesale and retail food outlets are also important links between production and consumption. The flows of locally produced and non-locally produced commodities into the processors will be assessed by interviewing the procurement managers at each processor. This will be used to assess changes in the balance between locally and non-locally produced food that have occurred over time. Produce and dairy managers at local grocery stores will also be interviewed to assess the amount of locally produced food that is available to consumers throughout the year.

Using both primary and secondary data collection techniques, information will be collected on economic and social indicators of local and global food production and consumption for each of the counties selected. Below are examples of the types of data that will be collected.

Economic indicators (from Census of Agriculture, State Agriculture Departments, interviews, others)

- direct sales volume (roadside stands, farmers' markets, etc.)
- sales to processors
- sales to institutions and restaurants, retail outlets, co-ops
- taxes paid by local producers/processors
- jobs generated by local producers/processors
- dollar value of agriculture-related tourism
- estimated value of foods donated by farms to food banks, etc.
- participation in the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program
- dollars generated in the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program
- estimated value of food produced in community gardens

Social indicators (from Census of Agriculture, interviews, others)

- number and characteristics of agricultural producers
- commodities produced
- number and characteristics of food processors

- number and type of wholesale and retail outlets
- nutrition education efforts connected with local marketing

A common protocol will be developed for all states to use in collecting and coding the data on local production and consumption. Special attention will be paid to the linkages among agricultural organizations in the community and to the consumer/customer base. Insofar as possible, GIS techniques will be developed in each state to map the location of these organizations and activities in each county. New York, California, and Louisiana will coordinate this activity.

The final product will be a data base composed of statistical and geographical information about the local and global components of community food systems as they are found in each of the three counties in each state. When pooled together these data will present a comprehensive picture of how community food systems are organized across different social, demographic, and economic contexts. This information will not only serve as the raw data for analyses by the project participants, but community agricultural development groups, economic planners, educators, and government officials will find the statistical and GIS information on local food systems useful in their work.

Objective 4: Collaborate with ongoing educational efforts to enhance the viability of local food systems.

The following activities will be undertaken to address Objective 4.

Provide appropriate electronic access to project information. (NY will coordinate this activity)

A listserv (RSSUSTAG-L) has been established to coordinate activities of the project members. In addition, coordinated efforts will be made to disseminate project results electronically through various channels. Examples include a world-wide website for project summaries, reports, lists of available data and papers downloadable map layers through the CLEARs laboratory (Cornell Laboratory for Environmental Applications of Remote Sensing); and posting in existing locations such as the home pages for Agriculture & Human Values and SANet.

Publish a project newsletter through the 'Farming Alternatives Program.' (NY will coordinate this activity)

This newsletter will be disseminated to each participating state in a format that allows for regional customization.

Convene an international policy forum to report results of the project and make policy recommendations based on discussion of these outcomes. (All participating states will help coordinate this activity)

Grassroots agricultural groups, educators and policy makers are the target audiences for this conference. They will actively participate in conference planning and assist in seeking funding to support the conference and ensure diverse participation. At this time the location of the conference has not been determined, but efforts will be made to tie this forum to another important international meeting taking place near the end of the project's term. The organization of the conference will be coordinated through North Carolina State University.

Implement an ongoing evaluative review of project procedures and findings by involving interested publics. (NY will coordinate this activity)

All project members will document questions from individuals who come into contact with the project. These questions will be compiled by Cornell and analyzed to provide ongoing guidance. Questions may include: What are the key points of interest for the publics involved? What are confusing or difficult results to understand? What are key elements not included in the project design that may provide direction to future research? Results of analysis will be shared with project members (and other interested parties) as the project advances. At the end of the project, the analyses will be synthesized and published in print and electronic forms.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES:

This research should help identify practical ways to establish and reinvigorate local agricultural economies. The information generated can be used by Cooperative Extension, community agricultural development groups, state agencies, and local governments to develop programs and institute policies that promote local agricultural entrepreneurship.

Farmers and smaller-scale food processors will benefit from information gathered from consumers about the demand for locally grown and processed food. Agricultural producers and processors will be better able to match what they produce and process to the demands in the local market.

Consumers will also benefit from this research. Their wants and demands will be measured and analyzed. Barriers to satisfying

consumer demands will be identified and strategies to overcome these barriers will be explored.

ORGANIZATION

A Regional Technical Committee will be organized according to procedures in the "Manual for Cooperative Research," dated 1992. The voting membership of the Committee includes one representative from each cooperating experiment station, appointed by the Station Director, and a representative of each cooperating USDA-CSREES research division. Other representatives of participating organizations, including the Administrative Advisor, Administrative Representative and CSREES representative, are nonvoting members. All voting members of the Technical Committee are eligible for office.

The primary role of the Technical Committee will be coordinating the work of the project. Annual meetings will be held for the purpose of conducting business related to the project.

The offices of the Regional Technical Committee will be Chairperson, Vice-chairperson and Secretary. Subcommittees will be named by the Chairperson. The Chairperson, in accord with the Administrative Advisor, will notify the Technical Committee of the time and place of annual meetings, prepare agendas and preside at meetings of the Technical and Executive Committees. The Chairperson's responsibilities will include preparation of annual and regional reports. The Vice-chairperson will assist the Chairperson in all functions. The Secretary will record minutes and perform other duties assigned by the Technical Committee or Administrative Advisor.

ATTACHMENT 1: PROJECT LEADERS AND RESOURCES

TITLE: COMMODITIES, CONSUMERS, AND COMMUNITIES: LOCAL FOOD SYSTEMS IN A GLOBALIZING ENVIRONMENT

AREA OF WORK CODE: NEC-

ADMINISTRATIVE ADVISOR: Ronnie Coffman

SCREENS REPRESENTATIVE:

Project Leaders and Resources:

Location (Objectives)	Project Participants	Resources			Discipline
		SY	PY	TY	
California (3)	W. Liebhardt	.20			Agronomy
Iowa - Iowa State University (1,2,3,4)	M. Bell	.15			Rural Sociology
	S. Hendrich	.15			Nutrition
	Other			.50	
Kansas - Kansas State University (1,2,3,4)	L. Bloomquist	.30			Rural Sociology
Louisiana - Louisiana State University (3)	J. Singelmann	.10			Rural Sociology
	C. Tolbert	.10			Rural Sociology
Maine - Univ. of Maine (1,4)	C. Giesecke	.10			Nutrition
Michigan - Michigan State University (2,4)	L. Busch	.20			Rural Sociology

Minnesota - Univ. of Minnesota (4)	D. Wyse	.20	Minn. Inst. for Sustainable Ag.
Missouri - Univ. of Missouri (1,2,3,4)	W. Heffernan Other	.10 .25	Rural Sociology
New Jersey - Rutgers Univ. (1,3,4)	M. Hamm Other	.30 .50	Nutrition
New York - Cornell Univ. (1,2,3,4)	G. Gillespie T. Lyson J. Wilkins	.20 .20 .20	Rural Sociology Rural Sociology Nutrition
North Carolina - North Carolina State Univ. (2,4)	S. Lilley	.10	Rural Sociology
Pennsylvania - Penn State University (1,3)	K. Smith	.15	Agric. Econ.
Puerto Rico - Univ. Of Puerto Rico (3,4)	V. Carro-Figuero C. Alamo- Gonzalez	.50 .10	Rural Sociology Agric. Econ.
Texas - Texas A&M Univ. (1,2,3,4)	D. Kyle Other	.25 .25	Rural Sociology
Washington - Washington State University (1,2)	R. Jussaume	.20	Rural Sociology

West Virginia - West Virginia University (3)	G. D'Souza	.10		Agric. and Resource Econ.
Wisconsin (1,2,3,4)	J. Kloppenburg	.40		Rural Sociology
	S. Stevenson	.20		Rural Sociology
	J. Voichick	.10		Nutrition
Total Land Grant		4.80	.75 1.25	
Other Participants				
Wallace Institute for Alternative Agriculture (2)	Rick Welsh	.15		Rural Sociology

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. L., Gates, J. M., Wessels, C. R. 1991. Private Strategies, Public Policies, and Food System Performance. Kingston: Hatch project #RI00176.
- Bills, Nelson and Richard Boisvert. 1996. Agriculture and Macro Economy of New York. Cornell University: NYC-173490.
- Bonanno, A. 1996. The Globalization of the Agricultural and Food Sector: The Perception of Missouri Farmers. University of Missouri: MO-SSSL0042.
- Brown, D., D. Henderson, and A. Majchrowicz. 1994. Agriculture and Community Linkages. USDA/ERS: ARED-ACL-4942.
- Cropp, R., R. Acton, and J. Cottingham. 1994. An Analysis of the Potential of Agricultural Cooperatives in Rural Community Development. University of Wisconsin: WIS00138-M.
- Davis, S.P. 1995. Developing and Testing Models of Export Market Assessment: Case Studies In Colorado Agriculture. Fort Collins: Hatch project #COLO00641.
- Drabenstott, Mark. 1994. "Industrialization: Steady current or tidal wave?" Choices 9:4-8.
- Falk, W.W. and R.B. Brinsfield. 1996. Agriculture on Maryland's Eastern Shore: Historical Changes, Contemporary Problems. University of Maryland: MD-X-6.
- Friedland, William H. 1994. "The global fresh fruit and vegetable system: An industrial organization analysis." Pp. 173-189 in P. McMichael (ed.), The Global Restructuring of Agro-Food Systems." Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Gilles, J.L. 1993. Contribution of Hinterlands to Small Town Viability. University of Missouri: MO-SSHB0240.
- Gillespie, G. 1996. Commercial Small-Scale Food Processing in New York: Value-Adding for Sustainable Agriculture. Cornell University: NYC-159307.
- Gillespie, Gilbert W., Duncan Hilchey and Thomas Lyson. 1996. The Potential of the New Agriculture to Enhance Community Well-Being. Cornell University: NYC-173489
- Goldberg, Ray A. 1993. "New international linkages shaping the U.S. food system." Choices 8:15-17.

- Goldberg, Ray A. 1968. Agribusiness Coordination: A Systems Approach to the Wheat, Soybeans, and Florida Orange Economies. Boston: Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration.
- Harp, A.J. 1996. Economic Change and Social Well-Being in Rural Idaho. University of Idaho: IDA01047.
- Heffernan, W.D. 1996. The Emerging Structure of the Global Food System: Social Consequences and Alternatives. University of Missouri: MO-SSSL0048.
- Kolodinsky, J. 1996. Community Supported Agriculture: Factors Affecting the Decision to Join. University of Vermont: VT-AE-00529.
- Levins, R.A. 1996. Economic and Sociological Aspects of Sustainable Agriculture. University of Minnesota: MIN-14-024.
- Marion, Bruce W. 1986. The Organization and Performance of the US Food System. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- McMichael, P.D. 1996. Impact Assessment of Regional/Global Regulation on U.S. Farm Sector. Cornell University: NYC-159415.
- Ray, D. E. 1993. An Integrated System For Analyzing Agricultural and Environmental Policies. Knoxville: Hatch project #TEN00037.
- Ricks, D. J. 1993. Economic Issues Affecting the U.S. Fruit and Vegetable System. East Lansing: Hatch project #MICL01530.
- Rudy, A.P. 1995. Sustaining Agricultural, Communities, Economics, and Ecologies: Imperial Valley, CA. University of California, Santa Cruz: CALA-9302727.
- Wilkins, J. 1995. Northeast Regional Food Guide. Cornell University:
- Yonkers, R. D., Ford, S. A. 1991. Impact of Changes In Exogenous Variables On the Profitability of the Pennsylvania Dairy Industry. University Park: Hatch project #PEN03204.